

Having attended the Specific Hearing 2 on the 29<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> July 2025 at Mill Farm, Wesham, I was disappointed to learn that due diligence requirements had not prevented the applicant and Fylde Council from employing noise experts from the same parent company to provide advice causing the agenda item Noise and Vibration not to be considered.

I therefore have listed my concerns and observations below.

In the outline construction noise and vibration plan Document Reference J1.3 Sep 2024

1.1.1.3 The deadline for amendments and clarifications has been pushed back to Deadline 6 which feels very late. Can this not be brought forward or at least an update provided at Deadline 5 which includes some greater safeguards if the project is allowed to proceed? There is a difference between 1.1.3.1. 'The Applicants and any Contractor (and subcontractors) will ensure compliance with relevant legislation, requirements, standards, and best practice relating to construction noise, and the practical application stated in the 12<sup>th</sup> bullet point of 1.2.11 'Where noise complaints are received, construction noise and vibration monitoring may be undertaken at the relevant receptors to ensure the threshold values are not exceeded and notify the principal contractor if exceedances occur.' Please can we have clarification it will be managed and enforced. Caveats such as 1.4.1.4 "Where reasonably practical." gives contractors an option for justification of non-compliance and diminished the commitment to ensuring.

1.2.2.1 page 4 Erection of Physical Barriers. The applicant refers to the possibility of using noise screening but gives no indication or commitment to where this is likely to take place nor the visual impact of such additions. Could consideration be given to identifying the locations and a commitment to consultation with those affected about the visual impact and effectiveness of such measures. Such measures will assist in reducing the fears of those who live and work in close proximity to the proposed route. At what stage will this information be provided?

1.3.1.3 page 5 The applicant states "piling is expected to take place during the day..." This is a very loose phrase. I would suggest it should be firmed up so that it reads "Piling will only take place in the day" or more acceptable still would be between the hours of 8.00 a.m. and 6.00 p.m.

I note that at Section 1.2.2.20 it states BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014 provides basic information and recommendations for methods of noise control relating to construction and open sites where work activities/operations generate significant noise levels. It includes sections on:

- community relations;
- noise and persons on site;
- neighbourhood nuisance;
- project supervision;
- and • the control of noise.'

Can I ask what the applicant has completed/is proposing to ensure they are compliant with BS5228 and the need to establish a relationship with local communities? I heard a lot of challenges from the local community but few, if any, endorsements of the applicants chosen route and delivery. The mitigations within the document are extremely generic and suggest the listed mitigations are industry norms but there is nothing that indicates what is specific to this project and its peculiar issues and locations that then justifies the overall conclusion of minor impact.

It is a further concern that 1.2.1.1 General noise and vibration management page 4 indicates at bullet point 8 "The appointment of a site contact to whom complaints/queries about construction activity can be directed - any complaints should be investigated, and action taken where appropriate." There is no commitment about time frames for following through the complaint investigation and raises questions about the objectivity/independence of the of the process.

I note that the Construction Noise and Vibration Assessment Clarification Note S\_D3\_11(July 2025) acknowledges in their qualitative assessment, 1.3.1.3 that there will be high, medium and low impacts which are greater than the impacts reported in APP117 with more properties affected if there is concurrent construction. It was unfortunate that the Hearing was unable to hear from Fylde Council as to their concerns as, like so many other issues, the applicant appears very comfortable that such details are delayed until the close or even beyond the close of the evaluation period.

Given the Hearing heard that there is no detail on design of the substations, no agreement with LCC Highways regarding roads to be used, haul routes or access routes, how can we be confident that this approach is accurate and mitigations will be effective. It is my view that there are serious gaps in planning that should be identified in the evaluation process, especially considering that Outline Construction Noise and Vibration Monitoring Plan J1.3 section 1.5.1.1 indicates that monitoring is the responsibility of the principal contractor.

In choosing this route the applicant is, in my opinion, introducing unwanted and unjustified noise pollution into the area. This, linked with the disruption to travel around the area, will increase the stress and strains of daily living, degrade the rural areas, disrupt travel for many years with no perceivable short term or long-term benefits to the areas affected.

These are long term projects. Disruption and noise has already started to impact on people's wellbeing and we know projects of this size and complexity rarely progress as planned. The report indicates that the numbers of receptors are large. Other routes are available which would have less impact on fewer homes and businesses and without ruining farms and reducing the capacity of the area for food production for up to 20 years if you include the lead in periods to reduce milking herds and then breed again when land is restored.

The constant pushing back of deadlines for key information demonstrates that either the chosen route is more complex than anticipated or the applicant's competency/capacity to deliver it.

I am concerned about what I have heard and read on the information provided to date. But of even greater concern is the lack of communication with the community, landowners and their agents and the thousands of people who still are unaware of how this project will negatively impact their lives over the next fifteen years and for some, who continue to live and work in the area, for the remainder of their lives.

The approach is one of stealth rather than openness, decision rather than consultation, complexity rather than simplicity. As someone who has worked pastorally in this area for many years I see no engagement with the community only alienation.

I would ask that the applicant looks again at its approach as at the moment it is perceived by many as coming to plunder and degrade the area. We need an application that is not a tweaked plan from another project but is site specific, detailed to the Fylde and its wellbeing during and post construction. Perhaps that is not achievable or not achievable by Morecambe and Morgan or by this route.

In evaluating the application, we must not lose sight of what we are changing and who benefits commerce or community?