



## Preliminary meeting note

**Application:** Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms Transmission Assets  
**Reference:** EN020028  
**Time and date:** 10:00am 29 April 2025  
**Venue:** Grand Hotel, North Promenade Sea Front, Blackpool, FY1 2JQ and by virtual means using Microsoft Teams

*This meeting note is not a full transcript of the preliminary meeting. It is a summary of the key points discussed.*

### 1. Welcome and Introductions

David Cliff (DC) welcomed those present and introduced himself as the lead member of the panel of Examining Inspectors. Jonathan Gorst, Richard Morgan and Maria Rokicka also introduced themselves as panel members to examine the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms Transmission Assets application.

DC explained the appointment was made by delegation from the Secretary of State (SoS) for the Department for Housing, Communities and Local Government on 22 January 2025.

DC explained that the ExA would be examining the application made by Morgan Offshore Wind Limited and Morecambe Offshore Wind Limited ('the applicants') before making a recommendation to the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero who will decide whether an order granting development consent for the proposed project, which is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP), should be made.

DC explained the purpose of the preliminary meeting (PM) and confirmed that all documents and submissions received and accepted during the examination will be published on the [project-specific page of the National Infrastructure Planning website](#).

All parties wishing to speak at the PM were given the opportunity to introduce themselves.

It was confirmed that the recording of the PM would be available on the National Infrastructure Planning website and can be accessed here: [part 1](#) and [part 2](#).

The ExA explained the Planning Inspectorate's duties under General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). Further information relating to the GDPR can be found in the Planning Inspectorate's ['Privacy Note'](#).

### 2. Examination process

JG for the ExA briefly explained the examination process under the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008), further info can be found [here](#).

### 3. Initial assessment of principal issues

MR for the ExA explained the purpose of the initial assessment of principal issues (section 88 of the PA2008), which can be found in [Annex C](#) of the [Rule 6](#) letter of 28 March 2025 and asked for any observations on them.

- Fylde Council raised concerns relating to four areas:
  - In relation to the HNDR (Holistic Network Design Review) process which it believed need to be explored further.
  - That there was a lack of technical detail from the applicants, for example in areas such as construction management and the defined asset decommissioning processes and funding relating to this.
  - Social value commitments. More information regarding apprenticeships and contractor registration
  - Risk and Resilience. And that the application should be a front loaded application with all relevant matters considered and that the application is currently not sufficiently evidenced and there should be a separate topic that relates to Risk and Resilience.
- Angus Walker representing Newton with Clifton Parish Council, Freckleton Parish Council and Newton Residents Association referred to [Item 5](#) on the agenda and raised concerns that an obvious material alternative route to the north of the planned project should be considered. He also raised concerns in relation to construction scenarios and whether these would be simultaneous or sequential and stated this would double the environmental impact if it was sequential.
- Paul Forshaw representing BAE Systems highlighted aviation related concerns, principally the risk of bird strikes, the impact on surveillance and navigation equipment at Warton aerodrome and any potential conflicts there may be with a nearby solar farm that provides power to the aerodrome.
- Samantha Grange representing BAE Systems in relation to statements of common ground advised that BAE Systems was representing the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) and the MOD (Ministry of Defence) and that the MOD have a safeguarding role and at present are referring to BAE Systems and wanted to flag that depending on the outcome of this further assessment and the impact it will have on the aerodrome that will inform BAE systems of its requirements and as a result may need to involve the DIO or the MOD and that some joint statements may be necessary between BAE Systems and the DIO/MOD.

MR explained that these comments would be taken into consideration noting that the examination would take account of all the representations and evidence submitted to the ExA.

### 4. Draft examination timetable

The ExA noted requests, already received in writing, to amend the draft examination timetable contained in [Annex D](#) of the Rule 6 letter and also welcomed further suggestions from the parties in attendance.

These included the applicants' request that Deadline 2 is moved by 4 working days to accommodate time to respond to the submissions that were likely to be received. Angus Walker (see above) stated that Deadline 2 was too close to Deadline 1. The applicants also requested that Deadline 3 be put back from 4 July to 8 July 2025.

All comments received were noted by the ExA and its considerations will be reflected in the Rule 8 Letter. Comments regarding matters parties wish to be included for discussion at future issue specific hearings will also be considered by the ExA in planning for future hearings.

The ExA confirmed that the examination period would begin once the preliminary meeting had finished.

## **5. Procedural decisions**

The ExA clarified the procedural decisions in [Annex F](#) of the Rule 6 letter, made under section 89(3) of the PA2008 and asked for any observations. Discussion followed and submissions were made on several of the items.

Attracta Uí Bhroin, representing herself, An Taisce and An Cláíomh Glas requested that the examination does not start citing the procedure for written submissions and the UK procedure to become an interested party, which had required her to register as an interested party and that this deadline had expired before the Irish public had been notified of the transboundary consultation. As a result she had been advised she was unable to become an interested party and would only be able to participate in the examination at the discretion of the ExA. She cited conventions that this would contravene and therefore requested an adjournment of the examination process.

DC for the ExA explained that, whilst noting the representations made, the ExA intends that the examination continues as planned. The ExA encouraged that written representations are made on the proposed development which then could be responded to by the applicants. It was also explained that the ExA would seek to accept further submissions from Attracta Uí Bhroin and the organisations that she is representing throughout the examination. Furthermore, the ExA will also be seeking to ensure that Ms. Uí Bhroin and other parties are fairly given the opportunity to be involved in the examination within the regulations. It was confirmed that the matter would be further addressed in the Rule 8 letter.

## **6. Close**

The ExA closed the preliminary meeting at 1.09pm.