

With reference to what is assumed to be 52a and 52b of the applicants plan. The applicants have not provided a detailed plan to myself or other local residents the same as the one used for the 1st hearing. the following factors, incorrect assumptions and omissions have emerged:

Firstly, the applicants have not established the ownership rights of an area adjacent to entry to Fieldway FY8 3BL. This is shown on their plan as a significant part of their secondary (non airport route). We note that the applicant had put small stakes in the ground concerning ownership of the land. It has been communicated to the applicant that this is private land, maintained by the 6 residential owners of property on Fieldway. This has been communicated to them on two occasions with insufficient or non existent responses.

Secondly, according to the plans outlined by the applicants regarding Leach Lane and Fieldway, the applicants have not allowed for traffic along Leach Lane and traffic joining Leach Lane from Fieldway. It has not been explained how local residents will gain access to their properties, run businesses in the area during the planned disruption by the applicants. Thirdly, the area between Blackpool Road Playing Fields and Fieldway has an unmarked boundary between the FBC assets and area of community interest ie the playing fields and the private land at Fieldway. At no time has the extent of private and community FBC Land been addressed in the applicants plans. Further to this the applicants have not produced any sort of protection plan for the mature trees which act as the natural boundary between the playing fields and the private land on which Fieldway and the residences therein stand.

Fourthly, the same trees act as a natural drainage aid to water run off from a large part of the north side of Blackpool Road Playing Fields, Fieldway, The Hamlet, Richards Way and Appealing Land. The applicants appear not to have formulated localised flood mitigation or given due diligence to the issue of standing water should the trees be felled or damaged.

Point number 5, The issue of local bat roosts in the trees adjacent to [REDACTED] have been raised with the applicants. This issue has not been treated with sufficient seriousness by the applicants. The response by the applicants was glib at best. Local residents are aware that the applicants have set aside an area for local wildlife mitigation. The wildlife survey produced by the applicants used historic data. It has been noted that the "local" wildlife survey has not used sufficiently robust analysis and data drawn from an area at the very edge of what is permissible by distance rather than the specific area in which the bats are roosting.

Point six, should the route across Leach Lane, Blackpool Road Playing Fields and The Hamlet be adopted how will this work be managed against the development by a rival "green" energy provider to adopt a significant parcel of land to the east and south of the Blackpool Airport for a solar farm. Would the concurrent construction of same and the applicants secondary route Leach Lane, Blackpool Road Playing Fields and the Hamlet lead to issues around siting, transportation, noise, congestion and traffic. At present both applications appear to suggest work will run concurrently.

Point seven have the applicants approached Historic England to establish whether the pill box on Airport Land adjacent to Leach Lane consistent with other pill boxes in the U.K> now a protected building or monument. Further to this have the applicants produced plans for preservation regarding the same structure.

Point eight - complexity adds costs. Whilst there are clearly two applicant organisations at no time have the applicants identified the need for split routes across the Airport Land solely and the route via 52a 52b etc, local residents can see no rationale for the secondary route. Why not integrate both routes across the Airport in one single trench across brownfield land. Again the applicants have no satisfactory rationale for the added route across FBS Land.

Finally, it appears that there has been insufficient diligence and a lack of local knowledge from the applicants as their "assumptions" about the cable route most notably in the FY8 3 area but along other parts of the route also. There is the need for a serious rethink, combined with a more fine grained approach to the analysis and evaluation of local and environmental impacts on the part of the applicants particularly in the context the identification of the so called "Stanah" route.