

Interested Party Number: 20054042

Application by Morgan Offshore Wind Limited and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Limited for an order granting development consent for the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms Transmission Assets

Issue specific hearing 2 Wednesday 30th July 2025

Comments and issues with

- General Matters (Construction Timetable)
- Transport

Item 1 General Matters (Construction Timetable)

APP-024 F1.3 Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description

Section 3.9 Programme and construction scenarios

I own land (LA924541) that has been in the search area. My first visibility in a detailed formal way with this project was in March 2022 when I signed a Non Intrusive Survey Licence with Dalcour McLaren. Since then I have taken a particular interest in this project. Whilst our land is outside the DCO red cable and substation zone, the project will have a major impact on my life during the construction stage and beyond.

The above document refers to 3 construction scenarios, one of which is..

- Scenario 2: Concurrent construction i.e., construction of the Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Transmission Assets and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets at the same time

In all the time I have been to pre-DCO public engagements and met directly on our land with Dalcour-Maclaren representatives, Scenario 2 has always been elucidated as the method of construction, there has been no talk or discussion of the alternative scenarios. The construction of the cable corridor was described as 6 underground cables, 4 for Morgan and 2 for Morecambe, all 6 being installed simultaneously with a 'typical' construction period of up to 2 years.

You can imagine my surprise when on attending the hearing, all of the discussion was about a Scenario 3 Project A and B construction method, namely:

- Scenario 3: Sequential construction, where the Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Transmission Assets are constructed first and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets are constructed second
- .. with a gap of up to 4 years

This is by far the worst construction scenario resulting in the maximum harm to landowners, farmers, equine users and the local community.

The 4 year gap effectively means that the impacted agricultural holdings will be affected for up to 7 years as there is no practical, commercial sense advantage in restarting operations during the gap.

In my view this now favoured construction scenario adds to the existing serious criticism of the pre-DCO consultation, and indeed supports the view that it was totally inadequate.

This situation proves that the harm caused by this project in its current form is unacceptable and should be rejected.

The alternative, what I understand is the “Stanah proposal/option” should now be adopted.

Item 10 Traffic and transportation

Verbal issues raised by JH Duckworth on behalf of TASC

Reference: Outline Highway Access Management Plan [REP3-024]

1. Local Authority Resources

Throughout this document the applicant states that the Local Highway Authorities will need to be involved in their plan (for example)

- Example 1.3.3.5 All temporary speed limit restrictions associated with temporary accesses will be implemented by the relevant highways authority following an application by the Applicant(s) or Principal Contractor(s).
- the location and design of these signs would be agreed with the relevant highways
- Prior to the commencement of the relevant stage of works, the CTMP Co(s) would agree with the highway authorities an appropriate response time to remove any reported detritus / material on the highway following a report.
- and many others

The Highways authorities are going to have a significantly increased workload from this project. We, as local tax payers, pay for these authorities through our council tax for “steady state” situations, we should not have to pay to support a national infrastructure project *that is proceeding in its current form when there is a much better option*. Perhaps the ExA could agree a section 106 agreement (or other mechanism as appropriate) whereby the applicant pays for a significantly increased resource within the Highways Authorities to support the additional significant workload they will impose upon these authorities before, during and post construction.

Note: This situation also applies to Planning Authorities where for example detailed planning applications for these accesses will be required. Perhaps similar funding of

authority resources could be provided by the applicant. There may be other authority resources requiring the same arrangement.

2. With regard to the actual process in the plan itself

Regarding damage to the highway and/or debris on the highway and/or other obstructions

The community wants any problems fixing as soon as possible to minimise the risk of harm to the local community.

But the process as described in the document proposes that the applicant will agree damages and financial impact before remediation. This is the wrong sequence - can you imagine how long the argument would take for the applicant to justify and seek agreement on their proportion of liability for each specific item of damage. The remediation may be more time critical than the ability to forge an agreement.

Could we request the ExA to ask the applicant to create a more proactive, timely process that gets the problem fixed and the financial agreement to follow later. The local community already have a widely understood and used "Report-It" service which is fully integrated into the management of Highway remediation by LCC Highways.

Perhaps the applicant can fund an increase to the authorities' Highways resources for the duration of the project and propose a way of doing this. Please note that this approach was recommended by Mr Stevens from LCC Highways.

3. With regard to the technical plan for the Routes

Last year the applicant performed and documented a Fylde coast traffic study. They separated the roads network into over 100 links, a link being a stretch of road between junctions. This comprehensive plan included an assessment of the sensitivity of each link to the use by the proposed HGV movements.

We assume this information subsequently was used to inform the applicant in their choice of routes as evidenced by the diagram in Appendix A page 40 of document Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP2-016].

But the choice of routes must have also been informed by other criteria, what were these? When the choice of routes to a particular construction access point have the same sensitivity in the above study, how was the choice made?

For local people with a deep knowledge of the area the choice of routes to the substations and cable route areas are understandable, except for 2 of the routes.

We would request that the ExA ask the applicant to explain the reasoning behind the choice of two of the routes

The yellow route through Wrea Green to Bryning Lane Links 43&45&46 chosen for access to A34/35 Bryning Lane rather than southern link 47 from A584. (Both of the links had the same sensitivity)

The green route Link 41 along Ballam Road to the cluster of access points at the junction of Ballam and Peel Roads rather than the shorter Link 30 route direct from M55 J4 at Blackpool, which uses a much shorter distance on lower classification roads. (Both of the links had the same sensitivity)

4. Design of Access Points exiting/entering a highway

Document reference "Outline Highway Access Management Plan" [REP3-024]

Another situation is that the applicant has planned on the basis that the speed limit at each access point will remain unchanged. This would seem to us to be a missed opportunity to mitigate risk, particularly when very large vehicles are frequently entering and exiting the access points. Perhaps the ExA could ask the applicant to review the speed limits at each access point and review whether or not they should request a lowering of the limit at these points. We are particularly concerned regarding the A583 access points at A01, A50, A52, A53. Specifically, the A01 access which is off the A583 at a point where it is possibly one of the last 4 lane highways without a central reservation in the country – surely such roads are already a risk prior to any additional HGV traffic.

Thank you for your attention

JH Duckworth
A resident of Newton with Scales