

Morgan and Morecambe have failed to put in writing any of our reasonable requests despite many meetings repeating ourselves.

These include :

1. Moving the permanent access out of my elderly parents domestic curtilage to their property Eastham Hall Farm on

[REDACTED].

2. Reducing the construction roads off Ballam Road, Lytham, FY8 4NJ

from 2 to 1 construction road when the construction roads are barely 100 metres apart. Further, why not access off Pegs Lane where there is to be permanent access post project completion.

3. We have requested the cables are buried a minimum 2.5 metres deep on our land as, to quote LCD Ltd, the designated land drainage consultants, the only way to re-instate the drainage is if the cables are buried to that depth on our land.

Otherwise it will be impossible to re-drain the land post project as the land is less than 3 metres above sea-level and very prone to flooding.

4. Failure to align any construction tracks in line with ditches and tramlines. This would effectively divide our fields into triangles which would make it impossible to economically grow arable crops.

General comments :

1. The proposed plans including mitigation area would affect 7 out of 8 fields which we actively farm. We would be left with just one field to farm without major disruption. This would ensure our business inoperable, uneconomic and redundant during construction over several years. The compensation for this is inadequate.

2. The land will be blighted permanently regarding future development and the compensation levels are totally inadequate to reflect this.

For example part of the proposed route runs very close to our holiday park which we hoped to expand in to the land where the cable route is planned. The applicants have not allowed any contingency for this.

Further, the noise, dust, mud and heavy traffic will inevitably cause a negative impact on our long established holiday park whose main attraction is peace, tranquility and wildlife. The loss in touring customer and holiday home sales income has not been accounted for in this application and would like a response from the applicant regarding compensation.

3. The environmental assessments, particularly within the planned route are inadequate, incomplete, glossed over and the effect will be severe.

For example the applicant plans to fill in a pond near our holiday park which attracts many rare wildfowl - pintail in particular. There is no mention of this in the assessments.

Further, there are at least 2 other ponds within the route which are not coloured in on the map and so effectively they have not been assessed and appear not to exist. Will these ponds be filled in also ?

I would like the inspectorate to investigate these matters thoroughly.

4. The mitigation areas to attract wildfowl and pink footed geese in particular is nonsensical.

The geese will go further afield away from the noise.

The proposed plan will attract geese directly under the flight path to Blackpool airport.

Pink footed geese travel much further to feed than the applicant states in their application.

It would be more sensible to feed the pink footed geese 10 miles away from the planned route !

In any case, said pink footed geese have only grazed in the planned route area in the last 20 years.

Prior to that they grazed between Southport and Liverpool and between Out Rawcliffe and Cockerham between 8 and 30 miles away !

5. The proposed route is basically totally invalid when there is an alternative route which would save £900 million and cause probably 1- 2% of the economic, social and environmental cost.