

# MORGAN AND MORECAMBE OFFSHORE WIND FARMS: TRANSMISSION ASSETS

Annex 9.5 to the Applicants response to Hearing Action Points: ISH2 43, 44



Deadline: Deadline 4  
Application Reference: EN020028

Document Numbers:  
MRCNS-J3303-JVW-19148MOR001-  
FLO-CON-CAG-RPT-0126  
Document Reference: S\_D4\_9.5  
8 August 2025  
F01

**Document status**

Version	Purpose of document	Approved by	Date	Approved by	Date
F01	Deadline 4	HK	August 2025	IM	August 2025

---

**Prepared by:****Haskoning****Prepared for:****Morgan Offshore Wind Limited,  
Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Ltd**

---

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1	Purpose of this document .....	5
<b>2</b>	<b>RESPONSE TO ISH2.43 .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>RESPONSE TO ISH2.44 .....</b>	<b>8</b>

## Tables

Table 1-1	Issue Specific Hearing 2 Action Points 43 and 44. ....	5
Table 2-1	Daily Heavy Vehicle (HV) Movements to Construction Accesses .....	6
Table 3-1	Proposed approach to engagement with LCC upon the 'last leg' routes .....	8

## Glossary

Term	Meaning
Applicants	Morgan Offshore Wind Limited (Morgan OWL) and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Ltd (Morecambe OWL).
Commitment	This term is used interchangeably with mitigation and enhancement measures. The purpose of commitments is to avoid, prevent, reduce or, if possible, offset significant adverse environmental effects. Primary and tertiary commitments are taken into account and embedded within the assessment set out in the ES.
Construction Traffic Management Plan	A document detailing the construction traffic routes for heavy goods vehicles and personnel travel, protocols for delivery of Abnormal Indivisible Loads to site, measures for road cleaning and sustainable site travel measures.
Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets	The offshore export cables, landfall, and onshore infrastructure required to connect the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm to the National Grid.
Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms: Transmission Assets	<p>The offshore export cables, landfall, and onshore infrastructure for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm. This includes the offshore export cables, landfall site, onshore export cables, onshore substations, 400 kV grid connection cables and associated grid connection infrastructure such as circuit breaker compounds.</p> <p>Also referred to in this report as the Transmission Assets, for ease of reading.</p>
Transmission Assets	See Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms: Transmission Assets (above).

## Acronyms

Acronym	Meaning
CTMP	Construction Traffic Management Plan
DCO	Development Consent Order
HV	Heavy vehicle
ISH	Issue Specific Hearing
LCC	Lancashire County Council

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1.1 This document is provided in response to Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH 2), agenda item 10 for the Action Points ISH2.43 and ISH2.44 as detailed within EV7-018 and provided in Table 1-1.

**Table 1-1 Issue Specific Hearing 2 Action Points 43 and 44.**

No.	Party	Action	Where Addressed within Document
ISH2.43	Applicants	Submit a table on level of access use and use of crossing points with reference to HGV usage	Section 2
ISH2.44	Applicants (a and b), Lancashire County Council (a only)	<p>a) Provide a specific note detailing the feasibility of 13 link routes and corridors to Lancashire County Council, which shall be agreed and submitted into examination by D5; and</p> <p>b) Applicants to provide a document containing outline steps to be taken to achieve the actions under (a).</p>	Section 3

## 2 Response to ISH2.43

- 2.1.1.1 The following Table 2-1 has been produced by the Applicants in response to action ISH2.43 from the second Issue Specific Hearing (ISH2).
- 2.1.1.2 Table 2-1 sets out the numbers of heavy vehicles (HVs) travelling to each of the proposed accesses for the Transmission Assets. The location of these accesses is taken from Figure 1.1 of the outline Highways Access Management Plan (REP3-024). Table 3-1 included detail of the numbers of peak HVs per day (i.e. the worst-case month) and the average numbers of HVs per day during construction. Hourly HV movements to each access are also provided for context (these have been derived by assuming deliveries occur over a ten-hour period).
- 2.1.1.3 A copy of the detail provided in Table 2-1 for all access was requested by Lancashire County Council (LCC) and provided by the Applicants on 17 July 2025. Following ISH2, the Applicants have also updated Table 3-1 to include numbers of HVs that would be using crossing points (as requested).
- 2.1.1.4 The Applicants would note that the numbers presented in Table 2-1 are two-way movements, e.g. at Access A5 there would be seven arrivals and seven departures per day during the peak periods (14 two-way movements).

**Table 2-1 Daily Heavy Vehicle (HV) Movements to Construction Accesses**

Access	Peak two-way HVs movements per day	Peak two-way HVs per hour	Average two-way HV movements per day	Comments
A1	n/a	n/a	n/a	No access by HVs proposed. Only for light vehicle use
A2 and A3	47	5	8	Link 17 covers accesses to Beach works compounds (A2 and A3), 100% assigned to that link which covers compounds and ensures appropriate link assessment. Total Link 17 HV movements shown (i.e. not disaggregated between accesses A2 and A3).
A4	n/a	n/a	n/a	No access by HVs proposed. Only for light vehicle use
A5	14	1 to 2	7	-
A6 and A7	107	11	50	All traffic for cable section 1 assigned to link 22b to the compound (A6) which covers all traffic to A6 and A7. Traffic for each access not disaggregated, therefore flows to each access would likely be lower.
A8	113	11	51	-
A9	21	2	10	-
A10 - A13 Crossing point, no access	11	1	5	HVs would assign between the two crossing locations, approx. 5 to 6 daily HV movements per crossing location at peak.
A14, A15, A17, A18	105	11	50	Link 41 serves four points of access, A14, A15, A17 and A18. Approx. 26 HV daily movements per access at peak
A16 & 19	38	4	17	-
A21 - A24 Crossing point, no access	38	4	17	HVs would assign between the two crossing locations, approx. 19 HV daily movements s per crossing location at peak
A25 - A28	13	1	6	Link 39b serves four points of access, A25, A26, A27 and A28. Approx. 3 to 4 HV daily movements per access at peak
A29 – 32 Crossing point, no access	12	1	5	HVs would assign between the two crossing locations, approx. 6 HV daily movements per crossing location at peak
A33	12	1	5	-

Access	Peak two-way HVs movements per day	Peak two-way HVs per hour	Average two-way HV movements per day	Comments
A34 - A37	110	11	44	Link 46 serves four points of access, A34, A35, A36 and A37. Approx. 28HV daily movements per access at peak
A38 - 41 Crossing point, no access	55	6	22	HVs would assign between the two crossing locations, approx. 28 HV daily movements per crossing location at peak
A42 , A43	60	6	20	Link 53 provides access to A42 and A43. Approx. 30 HV daily movements per access at peak
A44 - A47 Crossing point, no access	30	3	10	HVs would assign between the two crossing locations, approx. 15 HV daily movements per crossing location at peak
A48 (incorporating A03)	149	15	54	-
A49	120	12	62	-
A50	58	6	26	-
A51	95	10	53	-
A52	5	1	2	-
A53	5	1	2	-
A55	16	1 to 2	9	-
A56	14	1 to 2	7	-
A57	11	1	6	-
A58	106	11	33	-
A59 - A61	79	8	22	Link 101 provides access to A59, A60 and A61. Approx. 27 HV daily movements per access at peak
A62	176	18	50	-
A63	14	1 to 2		-
A01	173	17	51	-
A02	n/a	n/a	n/a	Operational access only.



### 3 Response to ISH2.44

- 3.1.1.1 The following Table 3-1 has been produced by the Applicants in response to action ISH2.44 from the second Issue Specific Hearing (ISH2).
- 3.1.1.2 Table 3-1 outlines the steps that have been and will be undertaken to provide information to Lancashire County Council (LCC) of the location/link specific traffic management strategy (if required) for approximately 12 'last leg' routes by Deadline 5. The Applicants note that the LCC identified 13 last leg routes (rather than 12), however the Applicants' understanding from SoCG discussions with LCC is that only 12 links are in discussion. This matter will be clarified within the Stage 2 Technical Note referred to in Table 3-1 below.
- 3.1.1.3 These 12 last leg routes are those where LCC identify that highway width is potentially constrained, being: Links 22b, 31a, 39a, 39b, 39c, 41, 43a, 43b, 46, 53, 101 and 102).
- 3.1.1.4 The following Table 3-1 presents that Applicants view upon how matters will be progressed with LCC, however (due to timescales) it has not been possible to formally discuss this approach with LCC in advance of the D4 submission.

**Table 3-1 Proposed approach to engagement with LCC upon the 'last leg' routes**

Stage and description	Stage activities	Stage timescales
<b>Stage 1:</b> Collation of salient information	<p>The Applicants have collated relevant data in order to inform further dialogue with LCC upon the traffic management strategy for the 12 last leg routes, this includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Details of the existing levels of use of each link by Heavy Vehicles (HVs) and buses to inform discussions upon the current levels of accepted use. It is the Applicants consideration that many of the links already accommodate HV traffic and this level of use is a material consideration when discussing the need for a proportionate mitigation strategy.</li> <li>b) Details of the forecast levels of use by the Transmission Assets at peak and on average. It is the Applicants consideration that for many links, the forecast levels of HV traffic are such that management measures can be adopted to remove/reduce the propensity for two HVs to pass.</li> <li>c) Details of non-motorised user (NMU) data at sample locations to understand if this user group is a material consideration when developing traffic management plans.</li> <li>d) Detailed road width and highway envelope widths (e.g. verges either side of the road) at regular chainages. It is the Applicants assertion that the focus should not be just on road width but also upon highway space, e.g. areas of the highway into which wingmirrors can oversail or widening could be provided.</li> </ul>	These discrete tasks (a to d) have all been completed and are being collated into a note and supporting plans for issue to LCC (Stage 2).

Stage and description	Stage activities	Stage timescales
<b>Stage 2:</b> Submission of a Technical Note	The workstreams described in Stage 1 will be collated into a Technical Note (with supporting plans) for issue to LCC.	Issue to LCC following Deadline 4 – Estimated date for issue August.
<b>Stage 3:</b> Workshop with LCC	<p>Following the issue of the Technical Note to LCC (Stage 2), the Applicants proposed to hold a ‘workshop’ meeting with LCC to discuss the content of the note and plans. The suggested aims of the meeting would be to discuss and agree:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Locations along links where the width is constrained (road and highway);</li> <li>b) The propensity for the Transmissions Assets traffic to materially alter the existing level of risk and as such the requirement for mitigation;</li> <li>c) The form of proportional mitigation/solutions that could be provided at identified locations;</li> <li>d) How the final mitigation strategy is secured and the level of detail expected at this stage; and</li> <li>e) Review the status of the matters within the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG).</li> </ul>	Following issue of the Technical Note estimated August) and prior to Deadline 5 (22 September).
<b>Stage 4:</b> Update to the SoCG	Agree with LCC changes to the SoCG to reflect the latest position from Stage 3.	Deadline 5