

MORGAN AND MORECAMBE OFFSHORE WIND FARMS: TRANSMISSION ASSETS

Applicants' response to Public Deadline 3 submissions



Deadline: Deadline 4
Application Reference: EN020028

Document Numbers:
MRCNS-J3303-JVW-19139
MOR001-FLO-CON-CAG-RPT-0119

Document Reference: S_D4_4

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

Contents

1	APPLICANTS' RESPONSE TO PUBLIC DEADLINE 3 SUBMISSIONS	1
1.1	Introduction.....	1
2	RESPONSES TO IP SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED AT DEADLINE 3	2
2.1	Brian Harrop	2
2.2	David Thompson	2
2.3	Fylde Against Cable Transmission and Substations (F.A.C.T.S)	5
2.4	Fylde Against Cable Transmission and Substations (F.A.C.T.S)	9
2.5	Gillian Batty	11
2.6	Gordon Ashworth	11
2.7	Judy Battersby.....	12
2.8	Karen Leeming.....	14
2.9	Lynn Adele Plant	17
2.10	Michael Wright.....	20
2.11	Ralph Cairns.....	20
2.12	Sarah-Lee Broadhead.....	24
2.13	Squires Gate Residents Group	25
2.14	Trevor Bethell.....	31
2.15	Colette Watson.....	37
2.16	David Ashton	38
2.17	Georgina Smith	38
2.18	John Thomas Plant	39
2.19	Naomi June Fox	40
2.20	Sally Louise Fiddler.....	41

Tables

Table 2.1:	REP3-115 – Brian Harrop.....	2
Table 2.2:	REP3-117 – David Thompson.....	2
Table 2.3:	REP3-118 – Fylde Against Cable Transmission and Substations (F.A.C.T.S)	5
Table 2.4:	REP3-119 – Fylde Against Cable Transmission and Substations (F.A.C.T.S)	9
Table 2.5:	REP3-120 – Gillian Batty	11
Table 2.6:	REP3-121 – Gordon Ashworth	11
Table 2.7:	REP3-122 – Judy Battersby	12
Table 2.8:	REP3-123 – Karen Leeming.....	14
Table 2.9:	REP3-124 – Lynn Adele Plant.....	17
Table 2.10:	REP3-125 – Michael Wright	20
Table 2.11:	REP3-126 – Ralph Cairns	20
Table 2.12:	REP3-128 – Sarah-Lee Broadhead	24
Table 2.13:	REP3-132 – Squires Gate Residents Group.....	25
Table 2.14:	REP3-133 – Trevor Bethell.....	31
Table 2.15:	REP3-135 – Colette Watson	37
Table 2.16:	REP3-136 – David Ashton.....	38
Table 2.17:	REP3-137 – Georgina Smith	38
Table 2.18:	REP3-138 – John Thomas Plant.....	39
Table 2.19:	REP3-139 – Naomi June Fox.....	40
Table 2.20:	REP3-140 – Sally Louise Fiddler.....	41

1 Applicants' response to Public Deadline 3 submissions

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1.1 Following Deadline 3, Morgan Offshore Wind Limited and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Limited (hereafter, 'the Applicants') have reviewed each of the submissions received from stakeholders who registered as Interested Parties (IPs) in the Examination.

1.1.1.2 Details of the Applicants' response to each of the Public IP submissions received at Deadline 3 are set out in this document.

2 Responses to IP submissions received at Deadline 3

2.1 Brian Harrop

Table 2.1: REP3-115 – Brian Harrop

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP3-115 115.1	<p>Response to REP2-059 Lancashire Association of Local Councils Energy Committee lines 17-18. When I requested information from NGET under an FOI I did not ask for any detail and was satisfied with a speedy response (see REP1-117).</p> <p>The assertion that "NGET was unable or unwilling to show any complete and consistent comparative assessment against relevant criteria" is an unfair retrospective one, and a mischaracterisation of what they were asked to provide. I am a lay resident – technical aspects are for the professionals.</p>	The Applicants note this response.

2.2 David Thompson

Table 2.2: REP3-117 – David Thompson

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP3-117 117.1	<p>Hello,</p> <p>Please find attached the formal response submitted on behalf of the Thompson family following the in person representation on Tuesday 24th June 2025.</p> <p>We object to siting of the Morgan and Morecambe onshore substations so close to our village and considers the process that arrived at the shortlist of one site for Morgan and two for Morecambe and the consultation generally to have been seriously flawed and believe our small village is in danger of being engulfed in an energy corridor.</p>	<p>The Applicants note the response from D Thompson, and refer to Volume 1, Annex 4.3: Selection and Refinement of the Onshore Infrastructure (AS-028). This document demonstrates the robust process of site selection and refinement, including consultation, undertaken by the Applicants in determining the routing and placement of the Transmission Assets onshore infrastructure through from inception to DCO submission.</p> <p>The Applicants refer to Annex 5.4 to the Applicants report to Hearing Action Points: ISH1 6, 8, 9, 19, 26 & 28 (REP1-039), which provides clarity on the need for two onshore substations as the projects must be electrically independent.</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	<p>We will continue to challenge and object throughout the process until their impacts have been reduced to acceptable levels, most easily achieved by moving to a more satisfactory location away from residential receptors.</p> <p>Kind Regards D Thompson.</p>	
REP3-117 117.2	<p>RELEVANT REPRESENTATION ON THE PROPOSED MORGAN AND MORECAMBE OFFSHORE WIND FARMS TRANSMISSION ASSETS DCO PLANNING INSPECTORATE REFERENCE NUMBER: EN020028</p> <p>This is a Relevant Representation (RR) regarding the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Transmission Assets Project (the Project), promoted by Morgan Offshore Wind Limited and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Limited (the Applicant) made by the Thompson household</p> <p>We moved to Newton a pleasant and tranquil village over 21 years ago bringing up our daughter who attended both Newton Bluecoat primary school and then Carr Hill secondary school.</p> <p>For over a decade both my wife and I have supported technology lessons on Friday afternoons in addition to after-school IT and chess clubs at Newton Bluecoat primary school, both of which are included on the schools list of extra-curricular activities. It fills us with pride to see our children thrive and develop.</p> <p>Our willingness to support our wonderful community does not end there, in 2018 we joined the "Friends of Newton Community Park" (FoNCP) who over the last 7 years have as the name says been champions of the community in our endeavours to develop our community park and last year we were very honoured, as a group, to be awarded the Kings award for Voluntary Service (KAVS)</p> <p>Here is an extract from the commendation ceremony: "FROM PARK TO PALACE"</p>	<p>The Applicants note this response.</p> <p>The Applicants are advocates of education and have been actively working with local schools, colleges and universities to promote Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) education. Our aim is to spark curiosity and inspire the next generation of engineers, scientists, designers, innovators, and environmental professionals within the energy sector.</p> <p>The Applicants would welcome the opportunity to collaborate and deliver STEM engagement to Newton Bluecoat primary school and Carr Hill secondary school, as well as other education providers in the area.</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	<p>This award is equivalent to an MBE and is the highest Award that can be given to local voluntary groups. This Award would not have been possible without the tremendous help we have received from the residents of Newton and local organisations supported throughout our journey with advice and grants from Fylde Borough Council, Lancashire Environmental Fund and Newton with Clifton Parish Council. Without their help, and belief in our project, nothing would have been achieved.</p> <p>Aligned to the FoNCP and supported by the “Sensory Working Group” our park has been fortunate to also be recognised by the “It's Your Neighbourhood” programme run by North West In Bloom (NWIB) resulting in a significant achievement of gaining “Level 5” the highest level of award “ for 2 consecutive years and additionally we were awarded the NWIB sustainability award, out of about 700 groups.</p>	
REP3-117 117.3	<p>What are we to expect if this project is approved especially given the way it has been ill managed through unclear consultation, missing information, and a total disregard for residents' concerns which is telling and we believe the full scale of this plan is still not clear to many, including M&M themselves.</p> <p>We are asking for a full reassessment of site selection, a full and improved report on environmental impacts, and following the deeply flawed consultation process we would also request that the consultation is re-run, this time including ALL residents and stakeholders impacted by this significant infrastructure project.</p>	<p>The Applicants have responded to concerns in relation to Consultation in Section 2.2.2 of their Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 – Introduction and thematic responses (PDA-005) in particular noting that the Acceptance Checklist (s55) (PD-003) where the Planning Inspectorate confirms in relation to adequacy of consultation it “is satisfied that the Applicants have complied with their statutory obligations.” The Applicants note this was similarly acknowledged by the Examining Authority (see paragraph 30 of the Applicants' Hearing Summary of the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (REP1-036)).</p> <p>A number of non-statutory consultations, alongside statutory consultations in accordance with the Planning Act 2008 were held in the vicinity of the proposed Transmission Assets, including online events, exhibitions and pop-up events between November and December 2022, April and June 2023, and October and December 2023. These events were advertised in local newspapers, on local radio, on posters in the local area, through postcards and newsletters distributed through the local area and on social media. Further details can be found in the Consultation Report (APP-170).</p> <p>The Applicants refer Mr Thompson to paragraphs 2.31 Site selection and assessment of alternatives (PDA-005) which explains in detail the Applicants' approach to site selection. The Applicant also refer Mr Thompson to ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives (AS-026).</p>



Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP3-117 117.4	<p>Finally, the dimensions of the substations are disproportionately large and intrusive, next to Newton with a proposed 22.35 hectares of Green Belt being lost. We would request that the applicant should provide scaled representations of the substations and a 3D model should be provided as would be the case for any other significant infrastructure project of this scale. Civil engineers can now produce visualisations to new levels using tools and workflows that enable them to create 3D models that can be viewed and explored in real time, just as though the viewer was walking or flying through the completed project.</p> <p>Please can the Examining Authority listen to people and recognise that the human cost and the rural cost will be permanent.</p> <p>We need and require a smarter solution which protects the Fylde for our children who are our future.</p>	<p>The Applicants provided a comparison of the size of the onshore substations against the size of onshore substations which form part of other offshore wind farms infrastructure, this can be found in Annex 5.5 to the Applicants response to Hearing Action Points ISH1 20 Comparable Onshore Substation Platform Footprints (REP1-042).</p> <p>The Applicants do not intend to produce a scaled-down model of the onshore substations, as visualisations of the onshore substations for the Transmission Assets are available within Volume 3, Figures – Part 6 of 7 (APP-136) which provide appropriate representations of the proposals, and a technical note regarding landscape and design matters (including cross sections and indicative layouts) was submitted at Deadline 3 (REP3-064).</p>


2.3 Fylde Against Cable Transmission and Substations (F.A.C.T.S)

Table 2.3: REP3-118 – Fylde Against Cable Transmission and Substations (F.A.C.T.S)

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP3-118 118.1	<p>These comments relate to the proposal by the Applicant to use Three Nooks Lane (presently closed to through traffic) for their HGV traffic in their proposed construction route.</p> <p>1. The route is used by cyclists and pedestrians who are public transport users (including wheelchair users) as the only safe route to the bus stops from Clifton village via Lodge Lane.</p> <p>1. There are no pavement available on the Lane for pedestrians.</p> <p>2. There are no cycle lanes available and indeed no room for them given the 5ft requirement for motorists clearance of cyclists.</p>	<p>The Applicants re-confirmed at Issue Specific Hearing 2 that Three Nooks Lane (otherwise known as Lytham Road) is not proposed to be used for constructive traffic and therefore has no requirement for HGVs to pass agricultural traffic.</p> <p>The Applicants have committed to the production of detailed Construction Traffic Management Plans (CTMPs). These CTMPs would set out measures to ensure that the numbers of HGV movements are managed and monitored so that the assessed numbers assessed in Volume 3: Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport (APP-108) of the ES are not exceeded. The requirement to produce the detailed CTMP(s) in accordance with the OCTMP is secured by Requirement 9 of Schedules 2A and 2B of the draft DCO (REP3-009).The Applicants are aware of concerns relating to the interaction of cyclists and construction vehicles and consider that both uses of the road network can be accommodated. Volume 3,</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	3. Cyclists would have to use the existing bypass at Preston New Road where the road narrows and is dangerous for cyclists.	Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport (APP-108) of the Environmental Statement assessment has considered the potential impacts of the construction of the Transmission Assets and increases in traffic flows as a result of construction traffic upon non-motorised user delay and fear and intimidation (non-motorised user amenity) for users of the local and strategic road networks. The assessment concludes (with the application of the identified mitigation measures) that the residual effects would not be significant in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) terms.
REP3-118 118.2	4. The Lane is in constant use by two farmers, for access to their fields (3 fields to the west of Three Nooks Lane - access on the left at the entrance) and the triangular field on the right of the entrance to Three Nooks Lane. The farmers load cows from the triangular field regularly and the cattle trucks are parked there for up to an hour at a time. This would not allow sufficient room for an HGV to pass. I confirm I have spoken to the representative of both farmers and he has given permission for me to make this representation- I understand their Land Agent will also be making allied representations on this point.	<p>The Applicants in their response to Issue Specific Hearing Action Point 46 confirmed that they are aware that there are different types of agricultural and rural business across the Transmission Assets order limits, including dairy, beef, mixed livestock, arable, mixed and equine. These businesses all have slightly differing farming calendars throughout the seasons and therefore the use and timings of activities on the land differ.</p> <p>The Applicants addressed concerns relating to agricultural land impacts at section 2.3 of The Applicants' Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 - Introduction and thematic responses (PDA-005) which sets out how the Applicants have sought to minimise impacts on agricultural land.</p> <p>Potential impacts on farm holdings and agricultural land were also discussed at Issue Specific Hearing 1 (see paragraphs 65 – 75 of The Applicants' Hearing Summary of Issue Specific Hearing 1 – Day 2 (REP1-035)) and Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (see paragraph 22 of The Applicants' Hearing Summary of Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (REP1-036)) following which the Applicants have responded to a number of Hearing Action Points relating to these matters. Please see ISH1 46, ISH1 47 and CAH1 5 of The Applicants' response to Hearing Action Points due at Deadline 1 (REP1-037).</p> <p>The Applicants re-confirmed at ISH2 that Three Nooks Lane (otherwise known as Lytham Road) is not proposed to be used for constructive traffic and therefore has no requirement for HGVs to pass agricultural traffic. The Access to Works Plan (APP-157) illustrates on Sheet 15 of 19 that the only use of Three Nooks Lane is for operational access. This is marked by OAR_MGMC_45 for access to the onshore cable corridor post-construction. Section 3.15.6 of Volume 1, Chapter 4: Project Description of the Environmental Statement (REP2-008) states that "No construction is proposed for operational accesses (i.e. only a permanent right of</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
		access is being sought)" and that "routine inspections can expect to take place on an annual basis". Finally, "operational accesses for the onshore export cable corridor would typically be accessed using a Light Goods Vehicle or other 4x4 or multi-terrain vehicle".
REP3-118 118.3	<p>The first photograph shows the west bound farmers access gate. The second photograph shows the eastbound access farmers gate.</p> <p>The third photograph shows the view from the cut through by Three Nooks Lane looking east on the west bound carriageway on Preston New Road.</p>  	<p>This photography is noted and welcomed by the Applicants.</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
		
REP3-118 118.4	I have also been asked by the FACTS chairman to reassert the importance of a site visit to Three Nooks Lane and to obtain permission from the landowners to view the nature and route of the Ethylene pipeline	<p>The Applicants refer F.A.C.T.S to its response to RR-704.3 within Annex 3.1.1 to Response to RR -Fylde Against Cable Transmission and Substations (RR-704) (PDA-006) which addresses the concerns raised relating to Three Nooks Lane.</p> <p>The SABIC ethylene pipeline (MGMC_GCC_UT_1224/1231 as shown on the Onshore Crossing Schedule, REP1-016 and REP1-018) is the one which the Applicants believe is being referred to. This pipeline was part of the original utilities search data from Atkins and was considered by the Applicants and included in the crossing schedule submitted with the application in September 2024.</p> <p>The Applicants are in dialogue with all parties, including SABIC, regarding protective provisions, crossing agreements or other required consents. Through the Applicants' discussions with SABIC, they are aware of SABIC's strict working protocols, and in turn, the protective provisions will require the Applicants to adopt appropriate working methods, provide advance notice of works, engage with SABIC and implement safeguards for pipeline infrastructure during construction. The Applicants are committed to adhering to these requirements to ensure the highest standards of health and safety during the construction phase of the Project.</p> <p>The Applicants have provided protective provisions for SABIC at Part 3 of Schedule 10 to the draft DCO (REP3-009). The status of current discussions with SABIC is presented in the SU Negotiations Progress Tracker (S_D3_10). The Applicants are confident all matters can be agreed before the close of examination which is confirmed by SABIC in REP1-195.</p>

2.4 Fylde Against Cable Transmission and Substations (F.A.C.T.S)

Table 2.44: REP3-119 – Fylde Against Cable Transmission and Substations (F.A.C.T.S)

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP3-119 119.1	<p>Conservation.</p> <p>The Ribble Eastary is the largest in Europe.</p> <p>SSI, Ramsort Site and part of the North West National Nature Reserve NNRA.</p> <p>The Cable Route is only one mile away at its closest.</p> <p>One third of the route east of Hillock Lane drops down to a floodplain.</p> <p>This Area of 4.500 Acres is massive Conservation stronghold for Thousands of migratory birds in winter.</p> <p>The Bird survey that I've seen does not include the Winter Habitats of such species that I've spent the last 30 years developing wetlands, ground cover, sub sustainable flora and fauna.</p> <p>Working with BASC the British association of shooting and conservation the areas in question have been specifically designed for migrant Birds.</p> <p>Wintering Birds from September to the end of March.</p> <p>Pink footed geese 20 to 50 Thousand.</p> <p>Ducks 50 to 100 Thousand.</p> <p>Wader's 20 to 30 Thousand.</p> <p>These birds need to feed, wetlands are their habitat.</p> <p>The cable route would be devastating for the habitats for these birds.</p> <p>The fields at Three Nooks from October to February in the evening on flood waters often can hold Thousands of feeding birds.</p>	<p>The Applicants have previously responded to concerns relating to biodiversity matters at section 2.12 of The Applicants' Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 - Introduction and thematic responses (PDA-005). A number of biodiversity matters were discussed at Issue Specific Hearing 1. In response to ISH_39, the Applicants have submitted a note on Site Selection of the Environmental Mitigation and Biodiversity Benefit Areas (REP2-046) at Deadline 2. The Applicants note that they have also submitted an Outline Wildlife Hazard Management Plan (REP3-065), updated outline Ecological Management Plan (REP3-022) and an updated Biodiversity Benefit Statement (REP2-020) at Deadline 2 which seek to address various concerns raised in relation to biodiversity including birds.</p> <p>The Applicants have made a commitment (CoT129 of Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments Register (REP3-013)) submitted at Deadline 3 that no construction activities at landfall on Lytham St Annes beach will be undertaken between November and March (inclusive). This is to mitigate disturbance to roosting wader features of Ribble and Alt Estuary SPA and Ramsar site. This is detailed within the Outline Ecological Management Plan submitted at Deadline 3 (REP3-022).</p> <p>The Applicants have assessed potential adverse impacts through their environmental impact assessment reported through the relevant chapters of the Environmental Statement (ES). The ES identifies appropriate mitigation measures to minimise those impacts which are secured through the Requirements set out in Schedules 2A and 2B of the draft DCO (REP3-009). The Applicants refer Mrs Abbot to ISH1_22 of REP1-037 which explains how the Environmental Statement has been carried out in using the Rochdale Envelope approach. This ensures that the Applicants have assessed the worst case scenario and therefore have a full understanding of the implications of onshore environmental impacts. Mitigations are set out in the Commitments Register (Annex 5.3: Volume 1 (REP3-013)).</p> <p>The Applicants confirmed at Issue Specific Hearing 1 that there is no legal requirement for the Transmission Assets to provide BNG and as such, it is being provided on a voluntary basis. (See paragraph 86 of The Applicants' Hearing Summary of Issue Specific Hearing 1 – Day 2 (REP1-035).) The Applicants Onshore</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	No survey would ever recognise this, you have to be present at midnight to witness a spectacular display.	Biodiversity Benefit Statement (J11/F03) explains the approach taken by the Applicants and confirms that the calculation undertaken for biodiversity benefit utilises the latest Defra Biodiversity Metric (version 4.1) in line with guidance and NPS EN-1. These matters were also discussed further at ISH 2.
REP3-119 119.2	<p>Flooding.</p> <p>M and M don't want to discuss the depth of the cables.</p> <p>No details have been submitted.</p> <p>From Freckleton to Three Nooks is a flood plain.</p> <p>1780 all the land was under water, hence the village of Clifton the title in the name.</p> <p>You can clearly see the floodplain from Freckleton looking east to Preston.</p> <p>In winter most of the land is only six inches above sea level.</p> <p>The water table is very high and flooded land is often seen for months.</p> <p>Obviously perfect for wintering birds.</p>	<p>As outlined in the Project Description (F1.3/F03), the trenchless method at landfill involves installing cables to a minimum depth of 10m, ensuring no surface disturbance or habitat disruption occurs within sensitive areas.</p> <p>The Applicants have responded to the matter of flood risk at Section 2.16 within document The Applicants' Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 – Introduction and thematic responses (PDA-005) and in response to Issue Specific Hearing Action points 48 and 49 contained in the Applicants' response to Hearing Action Points due at Deadline 1 - Rev F01 (REP1-037).</p> <p>The Applicants refer to above response to REP3-119 119.1 regarding consideration of wintering birds.</p>
REP3-119 119.3	<p>I will be speaking again, I honestly can't believe how damaging this Project is and the lack of awareness and understanding from an organisation that can't do a full consultation to the Residents.</p> <p>Hope you take this in consideration.</p> <p>Kindest regards Andrew Lee</p>	The Applicants note this response.

2.5 Gillian Batty

Table 2.5: REP3-120 – Gillian Batty

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP3-120 120.1	I wanted to ask if the other possibilities for a wind farm have been costed?? The current plan seems to be the largest and would probably incur the most financial profit for Morecambe and Morgan. The other options mentioned on the open hearing in May are more beneficial for local people, businesses and the environment. Please ensure the alternative proposals have been costed in terms of all the benefits. Thank you Gillian Batty	<p>In relation to costs and the hypothetical "Northern Route" via Stanah and Hillhouse, the Applicants' refer to their response to REP2-064 – Newton with Clifton and Freckleton Parish Councils, submitted at Deadline 3 (REP2-035).</p> <p>The optimum route for an onshore grid connection is generally considered to be the shortest route from A to B from landfall to Penwortham National Grid Substation with consideration of a range of constraints. The final route presented is considered to effectively achieve this, within the environmental, technical and social constraints that have been identified along the proposed onshore export cable corridor route.</p>

2.6 Gordon Ashworth

Table 2.6: REP3-121 – Gordon Ashworth

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP3-121 121.1	Do not agree with this project in its entirety!!	The Applicants note this comment.

2.7 Judy Battersby

Table 2.7: REP3-122 – Judy Battersby

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP3-122 122.1	With reference to the fyle m and m project. Access routes chosen are inappropriate and dangerous. The roads are narrow without footpath used by pedestrians and especially school children	The Applicants have responded to the matter of traffic and transport at Section 2.32 within document The Applicants' Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 - Introduction and thematic responses (PDA-005).
REP3-122 122.2	The project is going to obliterate wildlife. Given the project is meant to be environmentally. Sound. It will destroy landscape and farming for decades to come.	The Applicants are committed to developing the Transmission Assets in a way that is sensitive to the environment, avoiding or minimising potential effects wherever possible. Impacts which have the potential to give rise to likely significant effects have been carefully assessed and appropriate mitigation identified throughout the Environmental Statement. Those measures are secured through the Requirements set out in Schedules 2A and 2B of the draft DCO (REP3-009). Mitigations are also set out in the updated Commitments Register (Annex 5.3: Volume 1 (REP3-013)) submitted at Deadline 3.
REP3-122 122.3	Tourism which is the life blood of this area will be destroyed and may never recover.	The Applicants addressed concerns relating to disruption to tourism and local communities and businesses at section 2.21 of The Applicants' Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 - Introduction and thematic responses (PDA-005). At the request of the ExA the Applicants will also be submitting a Local Tourism Assessment. Unfortunately it has not been possible in the time available to submit the assessment for Deadline 4. It has been concluded that it would be better to submit a completed assessment at Deadline 5 and take the opportunity to consult with the relevant local authorities on the scope of the assessment. It may be possible to submit the assessment before Deadline 5, however this will be at the discretion of the Examining Authority.
REP3-122 122.4	Most importantly the substations are enormous and located extremely close to residential properties and schools. The noise that these 'factories' will emit will have a detrimental effect on their physical emotional psychological and	The Applicants refer to the response provided in REP1-042, where a comparison has been by the Applicants with other offshore wind farm substation footprints. The Applicants also acknowledge Ms Battersby's concerns around the size and location of each project's substation buildings. The Applicants have assessed potential adverse impacts through their environmental impact assessment reported

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	educational development and this will be an issue which will impact them for generations.	<p>through the relevant chapters of the Environmental Statement (ES). The ES identifies appropriate mitigation measures to minimise those impacts, which are secured through the Requirements set out in Schedules 2A and 2B of the draft DCO (REP3-009). For example, the Applicants note that the substations are subject to a number of controls including Requirements 4 (substation works), 5(1) (Detailed design parameters onshore), 15 (Fencing and other means of enclosure), 17 (Control of operational artificial light emissions), 18 (Control of noise during operational stage) and 20 (Operational drainage management plan) of Schedules 2A and 2B of the draft DCO (REP3-009). Further, they are also subject to measures contained within the outline Code of Construction Practice (REP3-018), outline Ecological Management Plan (REP3-022) and the outline Landscape Management Plan (AS-050) pursuant to Requirements 6, 7, 8 and 10 of Schedules 2A and 2B of the draft DCO (REP3-009).</p> <p>The Applicants acknowledge noise and vibration resulting from the construction of the Projects may lead to minor adverse impacts and effects, as reported in APP-117 and indicated in the Applicants response to REP1-214.17. However, with the implementation of mitigation measures to be detailed within the Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan(s) for the Projects, noise and vibration will be suitably controlled to minimise adverse impacts and effects, which is secured by Requirement 8 of the draft DCO (REP3-009). Operational noise from the substations will be controlled by Requirement 18 (Control of noise during operational stage) of the DCO.</p>

2.8 Karen Leeming

Table 2.8: REP3-123 – Karen Leeming

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP3-123 123.1	<p>This was my contribution to the Open floor Hearing 2 which I have now added to in respect of the Planning Inspectorate's site visits of 25th and 26th June 2025.</p> <p>I'm commenting as a resident of Freckleton about the effects these proposals will have on my village, together with my involvement in the local opposition to the project's current onshore proposals.</p> <p>I have lived in the Fylde all my life and spent the last 25 years living in Freckleton, married to a born and bred Freckletonian.</p> <p>Freckleton is a special community. We are now a large village but still have a small village community spirit. We have a well known brass band, an annual Club Day and we stage the oldest half marathon in the UK, the route of which could be disrupted by these proposals during construction of the cable corridor and substations.</p> <p>Surrounding the village we have many local footpaths, rights of way and bridleways which are enjoyed by locals for walking, cycling, horse riding etc. These activities will be majorly affected by the cable corridor, together with the two substations and their associated noise and lighting, and the visual disturbance across previously open views. To be denied access to parts of the countryside which have always been available will impact on local people's general health and wellbeing.</p>	<p>The Applicants welcome Ms Leeming's attendance at the Open Floor Hearings and welcome this further submission. The Applicants note the community and recreational activities mentioned.</p> <p>The Applicants refer to their response to Relevant Representations Part 1 - Introduction and thematic responses (PDA-005) regarding public footpaths, rights of way, and bridleways.</p> <p>The Applicants stress that no Public Rights of Way will be closed.</p>
REP3-123 123.2	<p>I attended the first public consultation by Morgan and Morecambe in Newton back in October 2023 and was shocked at the extent of the proposals but it wasn't until our local history group learnt about the proposals and realised the cable</p>	<p>As outlined in the Project Description (F1.3/F03), the trenchless installation technique will ensure no surface disturbance or habitat disruption occurs in sensitive areas including Quaker's Wood. The final depth of the trenchless</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	<p>corridor could cut through the Quaker burial ground in Freckleton that I became more involved. We set up a small group, there were 8 of us at the first meeting, but this quickly grew as others joined and the group widened to become involved in the whole project across the Fylde. This group became what we now know as F.A.C.T.S. (Fylde Against Cable Transmission and Substations). I agreed to take up the position of secretary and since then this has become a huge part of my life. Together with the Facebook group, set up by [redacted], we have done our very best to try to gather information, raise awareness within the community and, together with others, push for an alternative route which would cause far less damage and disruption to the Fylde community as a whole. Being so involved has affected my life in ways I never envisaged, taking up much time and effort and always being somewhere in my thoughts.</p>	<p>technique beneath Quaker's Wood will be determined at the detailed design stage, post consent.</p> <p>The detailed design will reflect the complexity of the trenchless technique and the launch and receiving pit locations, depth of drill and a standoff between the quaker burial ground and the trenchless technique.</p> <p>The matter of heritage and archaeology is discussed in the Applicants' Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 - Introduction and thematic responses (PDA-005) at Section 2.18. The Applicants are committed to respecting the heritage of the local area and Requirement 11 of Schedules 2A and 2B of the draft DCO (REP3-009) requires that detailed Onshore and Intertidal Written Schemes of Investigation will be implemented by the Applicants as approved by Lancashire County Council in consultation with Historic England, as appropriate. Further, any archaeological works must be carried out by a suitably qualified and competent person or body previously notified to the relevant planning authority.</p> <p>The Applicants provided an initial response on site selection and the assessment of alternatives at section 2.31.1 of The Applicants' Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 - Introduction and thematic responses (PDA-005). Following discussions relating to site selection and alternatives at Issue Specific Hearing 1 and in response to a number of the Examining Authority's Hearing Action Points, the Applicants provided a detailed technical response on these matters including explaining why the proposed alternative connection to Stanah or via an alternative route or Point of Interconnection for the Transmission Assets is not feasible. This was provided at Deadline 1 in Annex 5.2 to the Applicants response to Hearing Action Points: ISH1 6, 8, 9, 19, 26 & 28 - Rev F01 (REP1-039).</p>
REP3-123 123.3	<p>Since speaking at the Open Floor Hearing I attended the site inspections of 25th and 26th June, particularly in the area of the proposed substations.</p> <p>The two sites had been pegged out to give an idea of size. I think all members of the public who attended were shocked at the size, particularly as the pegging out was just showing the size of the substations themselves and not the whole compound areas. To see the area of land that is going to be</p>	<p>Please see Applicants' response to REP3-117 117.1 regarding substation location and size.</p> <p>The Applicants addressed concerns relating to agriculture impacts at section 2.3 of The Applicants' Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 - Introduction and thematic responses (PDA-005) which sets out how the Applicants have sought to minimise impacts on agricultural land. Potential impacts on farm holdings and agricultural land were also discussed at Issue Specific Hearing 1 (see paragraphs 65 – 75 of The Applicants' Hearing Summary of Issue Specific Hearing 1 – Day 2</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	<p>taken for these proposals including the cable corridor itself, haul roads, temporary compounds etc was horrendous. This enabled me to see first hand the amount of farmers' land required and the effect it will have on their livelihoods, the proximity to three schools in the area (Strike Lane Primary School, Newton Bluecoats, Carr Hill Secondary School and also Timbertots Nursery) and nearby residential properties.</p> <p>The access points during construction from major A roads are also a serious concern together with the increase in traffic.</p>	<p>(REP1-035)) and Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (see paragraph 22 of The Applicants' Hearing Summary of Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (REP1-036)) following which the Applicants have responded to a number of Hearing Action Points relating to these matters. Please see ISH1_46, ISH1_47 and CAH1_5 of The Applicants' response to Hearing Action Points due at Deadline 1 (REP1-037).</p> <p>The Applicants note the concerns regarding the proximity of schools to the onshore substations and onshore export cable corridor. The Applicants have undertaken a rigorous and robust route planning and site selection process in relation to the onshore infrastructure for the Transmission Assets. This included the siting of infrastructure away from sensitive receptors such as schools. The nearest school is approximately 330m from the Transmission Assets Order Limits which is the closest point at which the onshore export cables could be installed.</p> <p>The Applicants have undertaken an assessment of vulnerable groups within the Human Health Annex (APP-035) which includes consideration of impacts on young people and schools including traffic related impacts and summarises relevant mitigation measures to manage and minimise potential impacts during construction and operation of the Transmission Assets.</p> <p>A full reasoning and justification for the selection of the onshore infrastructure, including the range of criteria used and developed throughout the iterative process is provided in Section 4.9 of Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (AS-026). This is also supported by Volume 1, Annex 4.3: Selection and Refinement of the Onshore Infrastructure (AS-028).</p> <p>The Applicants have undertaken an assessment of vulnerable groups within the Human Health Annex (APP-035) which includes consideration of impacts on young people and schools and summarises relevant mitigation measures to manage and minimise potential impacts during construction and operation of the Transmission Assets.</p>
REP3-123 123.4	<p>The submissions at the Open Floor Hearing seemed to be well put together and valid but Morgan & Morecambe's representatives appeared to dismiss any concerns that were raised as if they were of no consequence.</p>	<p>The Applicant provided a comparison of the size of the onshore substations against the size of onshore substations which form part of other offshore wind farms infrastructure, this can be found in Annex 5.5 to the Applicants response to Hearing Action Points ISH1 20 Comparable Onshore Substation Platform Footprints (REP1-042).</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	As far as I am aware the applicant has yet to provide any renderings/plan views to enable members of the public to visualize the substations' appearance and how they will fit into the surrounding environment.	The Applicants do not intend to produce a scaled-down model of the onshore substations, as visualisations of the onshore substations for the Transmission Assets are available within Volume 3, Figures – Part 6 of 7 (APP-136) which provide appropriate representations of the proposals and a technical note regarding landscape and design matters was submitted at Deadline 3 (REP3-064).
REP3-123 123.5	Given my above concerns, I remain strongly opposed to these elements of the project, particularly in relation to the fact that the applicant has failed to explore the alternative option at The Hillhouse Technology Local Enterprise Zone.	<p>The Applicants note the comments of Ms Leeming and refer her to sections 2,3,4,5 and 6 of the Applicants' response to Hearing Action Points: ISH1 6, 8, 9, 19, 26 & 28 - Rev F01(REP1-039).</p> <p>In particular, the Applicants refer to Section 3.4.1.8 – 3.4.1.10 of REP1-039 which explains the comparative consideration given to the Point of Interconnection (PoI) options during the HND process, including Stanah (see also the footnoted reference to the HNDR showing the plan of the existing NGET substations considered which includes Stanah - Figure 32 of Appendix B to Appendix 2 to the HNDR).</p> <p>Also as set out Section 4.1.1.4 of REP1-039, the separate statutory functions, process, technical standards and expertise which govern identifying a PoI means the "Northern Route via Hillhouse Stanah" is manifestly not an "obviously material consideration".</p>

2.9 Lynn Adele Plant

Table 2.9: REP3-124 – Lynn Adele Plant

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP3-124 124.1	Recently I was among the group of residents who accompanied the applicants and inspectors on the site visits of Morgan and Morecambe's planned cable route and substations. Whilst being appalled at the complete route I will concentrate my objections to the areas of Lower Lane, Eke	This is noted by the Applicants, with responses to points raised provided below.

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	Lane, Quaker's wood and the dairy farm belonging to [redacted].	
REP3-124 124.2	<p>Lower Lane is an essential route for people trying to travel between Freckleton and Kirkham, avoiding the very busy main route ie Kirkham Rd. At school times Kirkham road is persistently blocked by parked cars and local traffic as Strike Lane School parents drop off and collect their children. Simultaneously buses and cars are transporting the high school pupils to and from Carr Hill.</p> <p>Lower Lane is a winding country lane, with sharp, blind bends. It floods regularly and suffers from persistent and deep pot holes. At the best of times it is a dangerous road and both exiting roads are the victims of numerous accidents. Only yesterday there was an accident involving a car on the A584 end of the lane. The consideration that Lower Lane could be used for HGV traffic is very ill conceived.</p> <p>This is the feeder lane to Eke Lane which goes to the dairy farm which will house the substations. It is narrow and unsuitable for most traffic, let alone industrial vehicles. The entrance to and from Lower Lane is dangerously situated and holds the prospect of many accidents waiting to happen.</p>	<p>The Applicants note the concerns regarding the proximity of schools to the onshore substations and onshore export cable corridor. The Applicants have undertaken a rigorous and robust route planning and site selection process in relation to the onshore infrastructure for the Transmission Assets. This included the siting of infrastructure away from sensitive receptors such as schools. The nearest school is approximately 330m from the Transmission Assets Order Limits which is the closest point at which the onshore export cables could be installed.</p> <p>The Applicants acknowledge the comments in regard to potential traffic congestion and disruption. The Applicants would however note that no construction traffic for the Transmission Assets is forecast to travel via Lower Lane. Details of proposed routes for construction traffic can be found at Figure 7.1 within Volume 3, Figures – Part 4 of 7 (APP-134).</p> <p>The Applicants note Ms Plant's concern regarding previous accidents on the Lower Lane road. The Applicants would however note that no construction traffic for the Transmission Assets infrastructure will be routed via Lower Lane. Details of proposed routes for construction traffic can be found at Figure 7.1 within Volume 3, Figures – Part 4 of 7 (APP-134).</p>
REP3-124 124.3	<p>Whilst still on Lower Lane, I come to the subject of Quaker's wood. In my nearly [redacted] years of living in Freckleton I have passed that wood many, many times, and not once have I passed it without acknowledging, in my mind, its presence. The applicants dismiss its importance because it is not consecrated ground, but to the people of Freckleton it is Sacred ground. Each tree in that small wood represents the soul of the person lying beneath it. It is part of Freckleton's rich history, and to disturb that place would be deeply hurtful and offensive.</p>	<p>As outlined in the Project Description (F1.3/F03), the Applicants have had due regard to the sensitivity of Quakers Wood and are committed to trenchless technique installation in this location to ensure no surface disturbance to habitats or burial ground disruptions occur in the area around Quaker's Wood. The final depth of the trenchless technique beneath Quaker's Wood will be determined at the detailed design stage, post consent, and will be significantly deeper than the woodland and the burial ground.</p> <p>The detailed design will reflect the complexity of the trenchless technique and the launch and receiving pit locations, depth of drill and a standoff between the quaker burial ground and the trenchless technique.</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
		The commitment to trenchless installation techniques is set out in the CoT44 (Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments Register of the ES (REP3-013)) and is secured by Requirement 8 of Schedules 2A and 2B of the draft Development Consent Order (REP3-009).
REP3-124 124.4	<p>Finally I wish to express my deepest distress at the size and siting of the proposed substations.</p> <p>Many times, by myself and various residents, Morgan & Morecambe have been asked to supply scale models of these sites, I now understand why they have not been forthcoming. If people had been allowed to actually see the magnitude of these structures ALL the villagers would have been in uproar. They have only been given complex diagrams which cannot possibly relay the size of the substations to Joe Public. If my technological expertise allows, I will add the small video I took whilst walking the length/depth of the structures .. I was horrified at the reality. I posted this on social media and people had had absolutely no concept of the size of them. They are totally inappropriate for a village, especially when they could so easily be sited elsewhere on industrial land NOT, our precious greenbelt. My heart goes out to [redacted], who's livelihoods are being destroyed; and for [redacted] who's plans for an idyllic retirement are being turned into a horrific nightmare; and also [redacted], who's peace will be shattered by the traffic travelling down Eke Lane, and their peaceful country view obliterated by the monstrous substations; and for all the people affected so adversely by these ill thought out, unnecessary plans.</p> <p>Please, please don't allow this project to go ahead. Our countryside and our farmlands are precious, please save them.</p>	<p>Please see Applicants response REP3-117 117.1 regarding substation location and size, and REP3-117 117.4 regarding scale models of substations.</p> <p>The Applicant provided a comparison of the size of the onshore substations against the size of onshore substations which form part of other offshore wind farms infrastructure, this can be found in Annex 5.5 to the Applicants response to Hearing Action Points ISH1 20 Comparable Onshore Substation Platform Footprints (REP1-042).</p> <p>The Applicants do not intend to produce a scaled-down model of the onshore substations, as visualisations of the onshore substations for the Transmission Assets are available within Volume 3, Figures – Part 6 of 7 (APP-136) which provide appropriate representations of the proposals and a technical note regarding landscape and design matters was submitted at Deadline 3 (REP3-064).</p> <p>The Applicants refer to their response to REP3-123 123.2 regarding site selection and alternatives considered.</p>

2.10 Michael Wright

Table 2.10: REP3-125 – Michael Wright

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP3-125 125.1	My interest is in promoting the "Alternative Route" for M&M's on-shore transmission assets from landfall at Rossall to the HTEZ at Stannah. There must be a clearly reasoned statement as to why M&M refuses to consider this shorter, MUCH cheaper and easier route.	<p>The Applicants note the comments and refer Mr Wright to sections 2,3,4,5 and 6 of the Applicants' response to Hearing Action Points: ISH1 6, 8, 9, 19, 26 & 28 - Rev F01 REP1-039).</p> <p>In particular, the Applicants refer to Section 3.4.1.8 – 3.4.1.10 of REP1-039 which explains the comparative consideration given to the Point of Interconnection (PoI) options during the HND process, including Stanah (see also the footnoted reference to the HNDR showing the plan of the existing NGET substations considered which includes Stanah - Figure 32 of Appendix B to Appendix 2 to the HNDR).</p> <p>Also as set out Section 4.1.1.4 of REP1-039, the separate statutory functions, process, technical standards and expertise which govern identifying a PoI means the "Northern Route via Hillhouse Stanah" is manifestly not an "obviously material consideration".</p>


2.11 Ralph Cairns


Table 2.11: REP3-126 – Ralph Cairns

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP3-126 126.1	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>In addition to the submissions I made previously at deadline 1 and deadline 2 in respect of the Applicants proposal to use Three Nooks Lane as a thoroughfare for HGV traffic - there are</p>	<p>The Applicants re-confirmed at Issue Specific Hearing 2 that Three Nooks Lane (otherwise known as Lytham Road) is not proposed to be used for constructive traffic and therefore has no requirement for HGVs to pass agricultural traffic.</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	additional factors to consider. I will be submitting the more information on behalf of F.A.C.T.S. Which may involve some overlap to the points raised here.	<p>The Applicants have committed to the production of detailed Construction Traffic Management Plans (CTMPs). These CTMPs would set out measures to ensure that the numbers of HGV movements are managed and monitored so that the assessed numbers assessed in Volume 3: Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport (APP-108) of the ES are not exceeded. The requirement to produce the detailed CTMP(s) in accordance with the OCTMP is secured by Requirement 9 of Schedules 2A and 2B of the draft DCO (REP3-009).</p> <p>The Applicants are aware of concerns relating to the interaction of cyclists and construction vehicles and consider that both uses of the road network can be accommodated. Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport (APP-108) of the Environmental Statement assessment has considered the potential impacts of the construction of the Transmission Assets and increases in traffic flows as a result of construction traffic upon non-motorised user delay and fear and intimidation (non-motorised user amenity) for users of the local and strategic road networks. The assessment concludes (with the application of the identified mitigation measures) that the residual effects would not be significant in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) terms.</p>
REP3-126 126.2	1. Firstly Three Nooks Lane is the thoroughfare for public transport users from Clifton Village travelling to and from Preston Lytham or Blackpool. This includes wheelchair users, as well as pedestrians. Presently public transport users from Clifton village enjoy a safe walk from the village centre from Preston Old Road down Lodge Lane to the east and west bound carriageways of Preston New Road where the bus stops are located adjacent to Three Nooks Lane. Whilst this does involve crossing the dual carriageway at Preston New Road for west bound bus users it is relatively safe given the bend of the road which provides a long view of the traffic travelling west to east. And returning they would not have to cross the blind corner as the bus stop is located on the west bound carriageway. Whilst there is some danger from travellers exiting the bus stop from a west bound no 68 bus at Three Nooks bus stop enroute to Clifton village, pedestrians are at	<p>As stated in response to REP3-118.2, the Applicants re-confirmed at ISH2 that Three Nooks Lane (otherwise known as Lytham Road) is not proposed to be used for constructive traffic and therefore has no requirement for HGVs to pass agricultural traffic.</p> <p>The Access to Works Plan (APP-157) illustrates on Sheet 15 of 19 that the only use of Three Nooks Lane is for operational access. This is marked by OAR_MGMC_45 for access to the onshore cable corridor post-construction. Section 3.15.6 of Volume 1, Chapter 4: Project Description of the Environmental Statement (REP2-008) states that "No construction is proposed for operational accesses (i.e. only a permanent right of access is being sought)" and that "routine inspections can expect to take place on an annual basis". Finally, "operational accesses for the onshore export cable corridor would typically be accessed using a Light Goods Vehicle or other 4x4 or multi-terrain vehicle".</p> <p>Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport (APP-108) assesses the potential impacts of the Transmission Assets traffic in relation to driver delay severance, non-motorised user delay, fear and intimidation, road safety and abnormal loads.</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	<p>less risk than motorists. Pedestrians have a better view than motorists who have to push their nose out onto the fast lane in order to secure a view of the east bound carriageway from the cut off. Pedestrians having once negotiated this crossing the route presently becomes a safe pedestrian route.</p> <p>There are NO footpaths on Three Nooks Lane and wide enough for only one large HGV vehicle allowing for margins of safety. If this route were used it could create not only a hazardous route for pedestrians but once that would induce fear from those pedestrians using the Lane due to the close proximity of HGV's. Permitting pedestrians an additional cycle in any three way lights would cause intolerable delays to existing traffic given the length of the Lane.</p> <p>Furthermore Three Nooks Lane is not made for heavy HGV traffic and the surface will suffer damage by constant use by HGVs.</p> <p>The Lane is also the preferred route of cyclists crossing from Clifton. Cyclists would be similarly affected if the Lane were to be given over to HGV traffic. cyclists do not like to use the alternative main road here because the road visibly narrows towards the Three Nooks Lights area and brings them uncomfortably close to HGV road users.</p>	<p>The assessment concludes (with the application of the mitigation measures) that the residual effects upon all road users (including pedestrians) would not be significant in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) terms.</p> <p>The Applicants acknowledge the concerns relating to potential traffic congestion and disruption, and damage to road surfaces.</p> <p>The Applicants have provided a response to these concerns at section 2.32 of The Applicants' Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 - Introduction and thematic responses (PDA-005). Subject to the grant of the DCO, the Applicants would note that the effects of construction traffic and highway works from Transmission Assets would be managed, monitored and controlled through the development of the detailed Construction Traffic Management Plans (CTMPs). In compliance with Requirement 9 of Schedules 2A and 2B of the draft DCO (REP3-009), the detailed CTMPs would need to be agreed with the relevant highway authorities. In approving the detailed CTMPs the relevant highway authorities Reference Written Representation Comment Applicants' response would apply their statutory duties under the Traffic Management Act, 2004 to ensure the "expeditious movement of traffic on the authority's road network".</p> <p>The Applicants are aware of concerns relating to the interaction of cyclists and construction vehicles and consider that both uses of the road network can be accommodated. Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport (APP-108) of the Environmental Statement assessment has considered the potential impacts of the construction of the Transmission Assets and increases in traffic flows as a result of construction traffic upon non-motorised user delay and fear and intimidation (non-motorised user amenity) for users of the local and strategic road networks. The assessment concludes (with the application of the identified mitigation measures) that the residual effects would not be significant in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) terms.</p> <p>The Applicants note that an access strategy has been developed that seeks to reduce the requirement for construction traffic to travel via local roads and instead aims to prioritise the use of motorways and A and B roads for the movement of construction traffic where possible. To facilitate this strategy the Applicants have made extensive commitments to the use of temporary haul roads through the</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
		cable corridor, thereby reducing the requirement for construction traffic to avoid travel via the local road network.
REP3-126 126.3	<p>Since the Ex A have taken the decision not to have a site visit of the Three Nooks Lane area. I have provided photographs in the uploaded files which seek to provide the views from the various positions and also the condition and limits of the lane for pedestrians and cyclists and potential HGV users.</p> <p>The first photograph shows the south facing view from Three Nooks Lane to Blackpool Road. The pot holes and deterioration in the road surface are already prevalent due to taxis and vans using it as a lunchtime parking/ waiting area.</p> <p>Once can only imagine the damage that would quickly be done by a significant level of HGV traffic.</p> 	<p>The Applicants acknowledge the concerns relating to potential damage to road surfaces. The Applicants response to this issue is provided in above response to REP3-126 126.2.</p>
REP3-126 126.4	<p>The second photograph looks at the north bound view</p> <p>The third photograph shows the limited view motorists have exiting the west bound carriageway through the cut off to execute a u turn or access Three Nooks Lane. Pedestrians have the option of pushing their head around and getting a clearer view of the traffic flow from the eastbound carriageway.</p>	<p>As stated in response to REP3-118.2 and REP3-126.2, the Applicants re-confirmed at ISH2 that Three Nooks Lane (otherwise known as Lytham Road) is not proposed to be used for constructive traffic and therefore has no requirement for HGVs to pass agricultural traffic. The Access to Works Plan (APP-157) illustrates on Sheet 15 of 19 that the only use of Three Nooks Lane is for operational access. This is marked by OAR_MGMC_45 for access to the onshore cable corridor post-construction. Section 3.15.6 of Volume 1, Chapter 4: Project Description of the Environmental Statement (REP2-008) states that "No</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
		<p>construction is proposed for operational accesses (i.e. only a permanent right of access is being sought)” and that “routine inspections can expect to take place on an annual basis”. Finally, “operational accesses for the onshore export cable corridor would typically be accessed using a Light Goods Vehicle or other 4x4 or multi-terrain vehicle”.</p>

2.12 Sarah-Lee Broadhead

Table 2.12: REP3-128 – Sarah-Lee Broadhead

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP3-128	I am writing to formally object to the proposed offshore wind farm off the coast of Lancashire, specifically the associated	The Applicants note the response.

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
128.1	<p>infrastructure works that will affect Freckleton Village and surrounding communities.</p> <p>While I support the principle of renewable energy, I have serious concerns about the environmental, social, and economic consequences of this particular proposal.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to developing the Transmission Assets in a way that is sensitive to the environment, avoiding or minimising potential effects wherever possible. Impacts which have the potential to give rise to likely significant effects have been carefully assessed and appropriate mitigation identified throughout the Environmental Statement. Those measures are secured through the Requirements set out in Schedules 2A and 2B of the draft DCO (REP3-009). Mitigations are also set out in the updated Commitments Register (Annex 5.3: Volume 1 (REP3-013)) submitted at Deadline 3.</p>
REP3-128 128.2	<p>My village, Freckleton, will be directly affected by construction traffic associated with the laying of the cable route to the coast. It is proposed that large construction vehicles will travel along the bypass and down Kirkham Road, a route that runs straight through our village. This road is not designed to handle frequent heavy traffic of that scale. It raises serious concerns about road safety, noise pollution, air quality, and disruption to everyday life for residents — including children, elderly people, and local businesses. Our narrow roads and village infrastructure are wholly unsuitable for such industrial use.</p>	<p>The Applicants acknowledge the comments in regard to potential traffic congestion and disruption. The Applicants would however note that no construction traffic for the Transmission Assets is proposed to be routed via Lower Lane. Details of proposed routes for construction traffic can be found at Figure 7.1 within Volume 3, Figures – Part 4 of 7 (APP-134).</p>

2.13 Squires Gate Residents Group

Table 2.13: REP3-132 – Squires Gate Residents Group

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP3-132 132.1	<p>I raised a number of concerns on behalf of myself and Squires Gate Residents Group including those below. There are some additional points that have arisen following the last hearing here too.</p>	<p>The Applicants note the request from Squires Gate Residents Group.</p> <p>Landowners have been shown an example of an onshore export cable to provide context for the size and nature of the cables to be installed underground on land. The Applicants will, if available, provide a true to size example of the onshore export cable and /or explain the diameter of the offshore cable that will pass under</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	1. Firstly I'd like to comment on this consultation itself. My first point is that given that M&M seemed to be able to afford to bring 45 or more people along to some of the hearings and hire expensive legal consultants and venues we're sure they can do better than just sharing bird's eye view maps covered in red squiggles with us to demonstrate what will be happening to our coastline here along the Fylde. At one of the earlier hearings we witnessed someone from the M&M team saying, under their breath, 'it's only a cable! If this is the case then might M&M be able to construct a cheap true to size mock up of part of this cable and bring it down to the beach at Squires Gate to demonstrate to the community just how inoffensive and unobtrusive it will actually be when it's shoved under our precious sand dunes? This will help us to properly appreciate that it is in fact, 'only a cable'. Thanks in advance.	<p>the dunes.. This can be shown/explained at the next set of hearings (ISH3) in early October, or at a meeting between the Applicants and Squires Gate Residents Group.</p> <p>The Applicants are willing to discuss the methodology for undertaking trenchless technique installation of the offshore expert cable beneath the Lytham St Annes sand dunes. This can also be discussed at a meeting between the Applicants and Squires Gate Residents Group.</p> <p>The Applicants' stakeholder engagement team will reach out to Squires Gate Residents Group to arrange a meeting to discuss these points.</p>
REP3-132 132.2	2. There is also much concern about the lack of realistic and focused communication with all our blue light services including the ambulance service, fire service and sea rescue. Responding to queries about this with, 'an email has been circulated', is woefully inadequate and we would like to see a focused meeting convened at the earliest opportunity, rather than implying that the lack of response to the M&M email constitutes some kind of passive agreement that this work would not impact on these services. There needs to be a much more proactive approach to this and a public meeting convened of all the emergency services who will be impacted in addition to these hearings.	The Applicants refer to their response provided to REP1-206 1.1 regarding consultation with the emergency services.
REP3-132 132.3	3. Similarly - the information that was shared about the increased potential for bird strikes around Blackpool airport and the impossibility of mitigating these gave rise to concern within the community with its very glib and dismissive tone. We need more information about this increased risk and details of how	<p>The Applicants do not consider that the projects will increase or alter the risk posed by bird strike to aircraft operating out of Warton Aerodrome/Blackpool Airport or that the projects will create an increased risk to public safety.</p> <p>It is the Applicants' position that the existing Bird Strike Risk Assessments that are currently in place at Warton Aerodrome and Blackpool Airport (as per the requirements of CAP 772 Wildlife hazard management at aerodromes/airports)</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	this has impacted elsewhere in the country when projects of this nature have included activity around the sites of airports.	<p>would be updated to ensure that, in the unlikely event there would be any changes in bird strike risk as a consequence of the Transmission Assets mitigation, the existing technical mitigation solutions remain appropriate.</p> <p>An outline Wildlife Hazard Management Plan was submitted at Deadline 3 (REP3-065), as explained within the Strategy for Wildlife Hazard Management Plan (REP2-047) submitted at Deadline 2.</p> <p>The approach to production of an outline Wildlife Hazard Management Plan has been agreed with Blackpool Airport and the Applicants are in the process of discussing updates with the airport, as communicated at Issue Specific Hearing 2.</p>
REP3-132 132.4	4. This proposed cable route is giving rise to multiple and increasing issues here on the Fylde for both young families and the older population in particular. This is not a hugely prosperous area and people rely on the local environment particularly Squires Gate (Starr Gate) beach, for leisure and health activities. Venturing further afield for walks, exercise, nature, dog walks and suchlike is not an option for those with young children, limited incomes and time and no independent transport, just as it isn't for elderly and disabled residents. Public transport along the cable route will undoubtedly be diverted, slowed by the increased congestion and at times withdrawn.	<p>The Applicants previously addressed concerns relating to beach access in section 2.5 of The Applicants' Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 - Introduction and thematic responses (PDA-005). Following the discussions at the Hearings and in response to Hearing Action Points, the Applicants provided further detailed technical clarifications in relation to beach access in Annex 5.3 to the Applicants response to Hearing Action Points: ISH1 13, 14, 16, 17 (REP1-040).</p> <p>Further details of the public access to the beach during construction are set out in The Outline Open Space Management Plan which is at Appendix A of the Outline Public Rights of Way (PRoW) Management Plan (AS-048). This sets out the discrete working areas that will be subject to access management during construction works ensuring public access across the majority of the beach remains uninterrupted throughout.</p> <p>To ensure that access via the highway network can be maintained for all road users, including public transport, significant commitments have been made to the use of trenchless installation techniques, such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) to minimise disruption to all A, B and Classified roads) and railways proposed to be crossed by the Transmission Assets (see CoT02, Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments Register (REP3-051)). This commitment to the use of trenchless techniques is secured via Requirement 8 (Code of Construction Practice) of Schedules 2A and 2B of the draft DCO (AS-004).</p> <p>It is generally recognised within the transport planning industry that vehicle movements of less than 30 per hour would create negligible impacts upon highway capacity and the operation of junctions/ highways. The Environmental Statement</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
		Chapter 7 Traffic and Transport (paras. 7.11.2.5 to 7.11.2.41) [APP-108] shows that during the most sensitive periods (network peak hours) movements through the local and strategic network are typically no greater than 30 trips an hour, with a peak of 33. On this basis the impacts upon all road users (including public transport) were assessed to not be significant.
REP3-132 132.5	5. There are many retired people living here, people here who've paid their dues to society and done their bit, these include retired care workers, nurses, teachers, retail workers, paramedics, builders etc ... ie. people who've contributed meaningfully to the enhancement of others lives and wider society. The harsh truth is that some of these people won't actually last for another 11 years and so the request being made of them is that they spend their few remaining years living on a filthy, noisy, dangerous building site, surrounded by health hazards and congestion and with no means of escape. How is such a situation acceptable to anyone?	In relation to overall construction periods, the Applicants have provided consideration of potential construction scenarios and durations in their Rule 9 - ES assessment of Construction Scenarios (AS-070) at Section 1.5. The Applicants further explained their approach to construction scenarios and coordination between Morgan OWL and Morecambe OWL at Issue Specific Hearing 1 (see in particular paragraphs 11 - 34 of The Applicants' Hearing Summary of Issue Specific Hearing 1 – Day 2 (REP1-035)). Following the hearings, the Applicants have also provided further clarification regarding how Morgan OWL and Morecambe OWL will continue to work together post consent to deliver the two projects comprised within the Transmission Assets with a view to minimising impacts on local communities wherever practicable. This is set out in Section 7 of Annex 5.2 to the Applicants response to Hearing Action Points: ISH1 6, 8, 9, 19, 26 & 28 - Rev F01 (REP1-039). The Applicants have also provided further detail regarding their approach to construction of the Transmission Assets in the Agricultural Holdings Indicative Mitigation Plan (S_D4_9.3) submitted at Deadline 4.
REP3-132 132.6	6. What has also become increasingly apparent to many of us as we've watched this unfold and attended the hearings etc, is, that this is a profit, not, 'green', led initiative. The legal representative for M&M has repeatedly mentioned that the key reason the project has now been extended to 11 years is due to the distinct requirements of the two groups of shareholders involved in the two lead partnership companies and that having two distinct companies leading a huge infrastructure project of this nature is unprecedented. So not only are we to be subjected to 11 years of filth and chaos but we are also to be guinea pigs in an experiment involving two groups of shareholders. 7. In addition, anyone with half a brain can see the inevitability of such an unprecedented, controversial and unwieldy project being diverted and stopped at some point within those 11 years. It isn't viable and is a classic case of putting BP profits before people, rather than anything even vaguely green.	

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	'Green' has become nothing more than a smokescreen codeword for 'profit'.	
REP3-132 132.7	8. Our belief is that information from M&M is not being shared in a clear or transparent way and this belief is based on our experience of many important details, some already outlined here, being repeatedly and consistently withheld and obscured, and questions going and remaining continually unanswered. The only explanation for such poor communication is that this is a thinly veiled attempt to mislead the public about the real life consequences of these proposals. Maps covered in red lines tell us nothing and lengthy online documents are as unimaginative as they are inaccessible. If open consultation with the community were a genuine goal we would be witnessing much more varied and creative attempts at information dissemination from the large groups of presumably salaried people showing up to contribute to these hearings on behalf of M&M. What we are experiencing is dry, vague and at times shambolic.	<p>The Applicants have responded to concerns in relation to Consultation in Section 2.2.2 of their Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 – Introduction and thematic responses (PDA-005) in particular noting that the Acceptance Checklist (s55) (PD-003) where the Planning Inspectorate confirms in relation to adequacy of consultant it “is satisfied that the Applicants have complied with their statutory obligations.” The Applicants note this was similarly acknowledged by the Examining Authority (see paragraph 30 of the Applicants' Hearing Summary of the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (REP1-036)).</p> <p>A number of non-statutory consultations, alongside statutory consultations in accordance with the Planning Act 2008. A range of consultation events were held in the vicinity of the proposed Transmission Assets, including online events, exhibitions and pop-up events between November and December 2022, April and June 2023, and October and December 2023. These events were advertised in local newspapers, on local radio, on posters in the local area, through postcards and newsletters distributed through the local area and on social media. Further details can be found in the Consultation Report (APP-170).</p>
REP3-132 132.8	9. Both FACTS and the local council have proposed an alternative route and this is repeatedly met with the response that it's the National Grid who decide which route will be used. This is a ridiculous cop out and sounds highly unlikely, not least, as part of the National Grid was bought back into public ownership last year, (or the year before?), so it is paid for by us, the taxpayer. Why are representatives of the National Grid therefore not at these hearings? Why are they not being interrogated about their unwavering insistence on this particularly destructive cable route? We need a much, much better explanation, not just repeated glib dismissive comments which do nothing but shut down both questions and discussion.	<p>The Applicants refer to their response to REP3-123 123.2 regarding site selection and alternatives considered. As noted in the response, Penwortham, the connection point (Point of Interconnection, POI) for the projects is determined by National Grid.</p> <p>National Grid have provided comment in their response at Deadline 3 – REP3-088.</p>
REP3-132	10. We are to be subjected to 11 years of disruption, noise and misery, and then those we do manage to survive and stagger	The Applicants note this comment.

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
132.9	<p>out the other side will be left with what? In an already impoverished area we'll see our tourist industry decimated, livelihoods wrecked, farmland and sand-dunes torn apart and ruined forever, a hugely increased risk of imminent repeated high level flooding, survival chances for local wildlife reduced to nothing, our nature reserve and sacred burial ground ploughed through and destroyed and two huge ugly buzzing concrete monstrosities on our doorstep. A human rights issue if ever there was one ... and for what? Nothing more than Ed Milliband's profit led vanity project, being pursued on the back of an unevidenced and unachievable, 'Net Zero' ideology and leading to ugly and inhumane outcomes that will undoubtedly cost some local people their lives. This is utter madness. We are already seeing evidence of serious diminishing mental and physical health within our communities and local groups as a consequence of these proposals and these are increasing due to the shady and shoddy manner in which these proposals are being shared with us.</p>	<p>Regarding the construction periods please see the response provided to REP3-132 132.5 above.</p> <p>Regarding the comments raised on communication and consultation, please see Applicants response to REP3-117 117.3.</p>
REP3-132 132.10	<p>11. Myself and my community urge you to listen to these points and to reconsider this dreadful project, a project which can never reach its unrealistic targets and goals. We further urge you to immediately involve the National Grid in these hearings and discussions and give due and measured consideration to the alternative route being proposed.</p> <p>Thank you for this opportunity.</p> <p>Ros Forsey</p> <p>* Squires Gate Residents Group</p>	<p>The Applicants note this response.</p>

2.14 Trevor Bethell

Table 2.14: REP3-133 – Trevor Bethell

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP3-133 133.1	<p>In my Deadline 1 Representation REP1-214 I referred to the St Annes on Sea "Island" replacement sea wall defences and incorrectly stated these works were to be carried out between 2023 and 2025.</p> <p>In fact the Planning Application for these works is still under consideration by Fylde Borough Council and their Planning Application Reference is 23/0082.</p> <p>The works are described as follows:-</p> <p>DEMOLITION OF EXISTING SEA WALL, REVETMENT AND MINATURE RAILWAY SHED, AND REPLACEMENT WITH NEW COASTAL PROTECTION SCHEME CONSISTING OF A STEPPED REVETMENT, INCLUDING PUBLIC REALM IMPROVEMENTS TO PROMENADE, CONSTRUCTION OF TEMPORARY COMPOUND AREAS AT FAIRHAVEN ROAD CAR PARK/ THE ISLAND CAR PARK, TEMPORARY INFILL OF LAKE FOR USE AS TEMPORARY CAR PARK/ TEMPORARY RELOCATION OF BEACH HUTS/ TEMPORARY COMPOUND AREA, TEMPORARY STORAGE CONTAINERS AND TUNNEL FOR MINATURE RAILWAY, THE SITING OF 45 BEACH HUTS, REPLACEMENT RAIL TUNNEL AND ENGINE SHED AND RECONFIGURATION OF PLEASURE ISLAND CAR PARK.</p> <p>Can the Examination Authority please take into consideration that if the above works are passed for approval by Fylde Borough Council there is a high probability that they would coincide with the proposals for the On Shore Transmission Assets with corresponding cumulative effects on both the local</p>	<p>The Applicants note the correction regarding the existing sea wall defences at the St Annes on Sea "Island" site.</p> <p>The Applicants have carried out Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA) screening and refer to Volume 1, Annex 5.5: Cumulative screening matrix and location plan (REP1-020). The Applicants also submitted a Review of Cumulative Effects Assessment and In-Combination Assessment at Deadline 2 (REP2-043).</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	<p>economy and the amenity value of the coastline potentially for a significant period.</p> <p>The planning application documents give further detail on the nature and scope of these proposed works.</p>	
REP3-133 133.2	<p>Open Floor Hearing 2</p> <p>Further to the Open Floor Hearing 2 held on the 24th June 2025 I wish to make further comments regarding both matters discussed at this hearing and in addition to representations previously made by myself (RR-2224, REP1-214, REP1-215 & REP1-216).</p>	The Applicants note this and provide responses to comments raised below.
REP3-133 133.3	<p>1. Public Support</p> <p>It should be apparent from the oral representations made to the Examination Authority (EXA) at both Open Floor Hearings 1 & 2 and from the numerous written representations made to date that there is little or no public support from the local community for the works proposed in this Development Consent Order (DCO). The many disruptive impacts, both direct and indirect, on the local community, agriculture and businesses, stretching over a timescale of up to 10 years, are disproportionate to the alleged public interest benefit from the proposed installation of these Onshore Transmission Assets.</p> <p>The EXA should take this demonstrable lack of public support as a material consideration when making their final recommendation.</p>	The Applicants note this response.
REP3-133 133.4	<p>2. Public Visibility</p> <p>It is extremely unfortunate that the Planning Inspectorate considered that the Applicant's Public Consultation was sufficient and met the Statutory Requirements. Again it should be apparent to the EXA from both oral and written representations that at the time this consultation was carried</p>	The Applicants have responded to concerns in relation to Consultation in Section 2.2.2 of their Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 – Introduction and thematic responses (PDA-005) in particular noting that the Acceptance Checklist (s55) (PD-003) where the Planning Inspectorate confirms in relation to adequacy of consultant it “is satisfied that the Applicants have complied with their statutory obligations.” The Applicants note this was similarly acknowledged by the

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	<p>out in the Autumn of 2023 the Applicants provided such a broad brush, high level of information that the many members of the public and businesses who attended the Consultation events were basically left none the wiser when they left because their detailed queries could not be answered. Instead of continuing with an iterative process once the Applicant's consultation closed on 23rd November 2023 there was no further communication to the General Public until letters were sent in December 2024 advising that their Application for a DCO had been accepted for Examination.</p> <p>The Applicants response to this has been that the Public may access their documentation either directly using their own devices or by using digital access which is available to the Public at specified locations e.g St Annes Library.</p> <p>As of the time of writing these further comments there are, in the EXA Document Library some:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 240 separate documents under the Category "Application Documents" (APP 001 to 240) • 15 separate documents under the Category "Adequacy of Consultation Responses" (AoC 001 to 015) • 2303 separate Representations under the Category "Relevant Representations" (RR 0001 to 2303) • 9 separate documents under the Category "Procedural Decisions and Notifications from the Examining Authority" (PD 001 to 009) • 71 separate documents under the Category "Additional Submissions" (AS 001 to 071) • 49 separate documents under the Category "Events" (EV1 001 to 003, EV2 001 to 005, EV3 001 to 005, EV4 001 to 018, EV5 001 to 006 and EV6 001 to 003) 	<p>Examining Authority (see paragraph 30 of the Applicants' Hearing Summary of the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (REP1-036)).</p> <p>A number of non-statutory consultations, alongside statutory consultations in accordance with the Planning Act 2008. A range of consultation events were held in the vicinity of the proposed Transmission Assets, including online events, exhibitions and pop-up events between November and December 2022, April and June 2023, and October and December 2023. These events were advertised in local newspapers, on local radio, on posters in the local area, through postcards and newsletters distributed through the local area and on social media. Further details can be found in the Consultation Report (APP-170).</p> <p>The Applicants recognise the significant level of information submitted as part of the Transmission Assets application and provided assistance to those who requested support.</p> <p>The Applicant provided a comparison of the size of the onshore substations against the size of onshore substations which form part of other offshore wind farms infrastructure, this can be found in Annex 5.5 to the Applicants response to Hearing Action Points ISH1 20 Comparable Onshore Substation Platform Footprints (REP1-042).</p> <p>The Applicants do not intend to produce a scaled-down model of the onshore substations, as visualisations of the onshore substations for the Transmission Assets are available within Volume 3, Figures – Part 6 of 7 (APP-136) which provide appropriate representations of the proposals and a technical note regarding landscape and design matters was submitted at Deadline 3 (REP3-064).</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 55 separate documents under the Category "Procedural Deadline A" (PDA 001 to 055) • 227 separate documents under the Category "Deadline 1" (REP1 001 to 227) • 70 separate documents under the Category "Deadline 2" (REP2 001 to 070) • 14 separate documents under the Category "Other Documents" (OD 001 to 014) <p>So in total some 3053 separate items of information, much of which is detailed and highly technical, which the Applicants seem to feel is an adequate approach for a member of the General Public to access digitally in order to understand the scale and impact of these proposals.</p> <p>I have argued in a previous representation that for civil engineering projects of this nature, extending over a multi year period and causing disruption to the local community, disturbance and damage to the marine, costal and agricultural environments, the Applicants should have (and still could) stage a public exhibition of their proposals with scale models showing the impact of the above ground assets and full details of the proposed trenching and trenchless methodology, the types of heavy equipment involved, typical samples of the offshore and onshore cables that will be used, the scale of the proposed coffer dams and cable landing equipment and large scale photographs and videos showing how offshore cables are landed, how trenchless and open trenching excavation is done and what the proposed substations will look like in their proposed positions.</p> <p>In other words, provide to the General Public, an open and honest depiction of the reality of their proposals and not expect them to access a multitude of digital documents to understand how this is going to impact their community for years to come.</p>	

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	<p>Given the hundreds, if not thousands, of million pounds investment in the offshore and onshore assets involved this seems an entirely reasonable proposition and I would ask the EXA to consider carefully when making their final recommendation whether they can say in all honesty that the General Public have been openly and fully informed of the detail of this Application in a reasonable and accessible manner.</p> <p>Fundamentally I believe the General Public, including many business owners, in the local community have little or no appreciation or understanding of the Applicants proposals due to the limited visibility and accessibility of the specific details of this Application for a Development Consent Order.</p>	
REP3-133 133.5	<p>3. The Landfall Works</p> <p>I have made previous representations regarding these and note the Applicants response. However, the Applicants have not proposed any contingency or alternative methodology should their proposed trenchless approach prove not to be feasible. They have themselves admitted that further geological and feasibility studies need to be carried out to determine that the trenchless methodology to bore up to six separate bore holes from Blackpool Airport under the Golf Course, the Railway Line, the Nature Reserve and SSSI, Clifton Drive North and the Sand Dunes is feasible. They have also admitted that open excavation will not, and in any case cannot, be used as an alternative.</p> <p>So with no alternative open trenching methodology available what is their position if their geological or other feasibility studies show that the proposed trenchless method, now understood to be the Direct Pipe method, is not possible or fails in practice when attempted on site?</p>	<p>The Applicants note that trenchless installation across this distance is an established engineering solution and has been successfully used across Offshore Wind Projects within the UK. While trenchless installation works can present "challenges", detailed ground investigation surveys will be conducted post consent to inform detail engineering design. These surveys will ensure the feasibility and effective installation of the offshore export cable circuits.</p> <p>The commitment to trenchless installation techniques is set out in the CoT44 (Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments Register of the ES (REP3-013)) and is secured by Requirement 8 of Schedules 2A and 2B of the draft Development Consent Order (REP3-009).</p>
REP3-133	4. Alternative Route	The Applicants note this response.

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
133.6	<p>It is in the Public Interest that the National Electricity Systems Operator and National Grid Electricity Transmission, as an Electricity Transmission Licensee, carry out a full technical appraisal of providing a connection to Pentwortham via an intermediate connection at Stanah. It is not for the Applicants to determine, as they state in REP1-089.2 of EXA Document Reference REP2-031:-</p> <p><i>“that it is not necessary nor appropriate to consider or assess during this Examination different projects with alternative Pols (or “terminating point[s]”</i></p> <p>Both NESO and NGET should be acting in the overall Public Interest with regard to justifying any Connection Offers they make to Applicants and should be held to account with regard to these. These Connection Offers should not be made without taking into account the impact of any connections on the environment and the local economy especially where a viable alternative exists for which, in the case of the Hillside Technology Site and the Stanah intermediate connection point, there has been no evidence to show that this is not possible from a technical perspective irrespective of any cost advantages which may also be realised.</p> <p>Failure to show robust reasons why the alternative suggested by various parties cannot be implemented is yet another reason why any recommendation for approval of the DCO could be subject to a subsequent challenge.</p>	
REP3-133 133.7	<p>5. Judicial Review</p> <p>Given the representations and objections made to date from Statutory and non-Statutory bodies, agricultural, rural and other businesses, local Politicians and the General Public I believe there will be adequate and convincing grounds for a full Judicial Review should this Application for a DCO be</p>	The Applicants note this response.

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	<p>recommended and subsequently approved by the relevant Secretary of State.</p> <p>Such a review would, I believe, command the support of the vast majority of the local community, residents and businesses alike.</p>	

2.15 Colette Watson

Table 2.15: REP3-135 – Colette Watson

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP3-135 135.1	<p>Both villages will be destroyed</p> <p>This will destroy the villages. It's a huge area and the constant humming noise will drive people insane</p> <p>Will destroy so much countryside</p> <p>Destroy so many peoples livelihood</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to developing the Transmission Assets in a way that is sensitive to the environment, avoiding or minimising potential effects wherever possible. Impacts which have the potential to give rise to likely significant effects have been carefully assessed and appropriate mitigation identified throughout the Environmental Statement. Those measures are secured through the Requirements set out in Schedules 2A and 2B of the draft DCO (REP3-009). Mitigations are also set out in the updated Commitments Register (Annex 5.3: Volume 1 (REP3-013)) submitted at Deadline 3.</p>

2.16 David Ashton

Table 2.16: REP3-136 – David Ashton

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP3-136 136.1	This has been unanimously rejected by all local authorities and people, with a better alternative at Wyre proposed.	<p>The Applicants note this response.</p> <p>The Applicants provided an initial response on site selection and the assessment of alternatives at section 2.31.1 of The Applicants' Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 - Introduction and thematic responses (PDA-005). Following discussions relating to site selection and alternatives at Issue Specific Hearing 1 and in response to a number of the Examining Authority's Hearing Action Points, the Applicants provided a detailed technical response on these matters including explaining why the proposed alternative connection to Stanah or via an alternative route or Point of Interconnection for the Transmission Assets is not feasible. This was provided at Deadline 1 in Annex 5.2 to the Applicants response to Hearing Action Points: ISH1 6, 8, 9, 19, 26 & 28 - Rev F01 (REP1-039).</p>

2.17 Georgina Smith

Table 2.17: REP3-137 – Georgina Smith

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP3-137 137.1	I object wholly to these monstrous eye sores being built in our beautiful village.	The Applicants note this response.

2.18 John Thomas Plant

Table 2.18: REP3-138 – John Thomas Plant

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP3-138 138.1	I have been a resident of Freckleton for over 40 years, during which time I have worked away from home during the week, and home to my family at the weekends. The feeling of peace I get when I get back to the village is immense. Working on industrial sites all over the UK has made me appreciate the green belt, and our need for it. I have worked on many projects, but I have never worked on one which would be so catastrophic to village life. The detrimental effect on so many levels is profound. The huge substations are totally unsuitable for the area, and ridiculous when there is another much more suitable location. These substations are planned to be sited absurdly close to 2 schools, and the 24/7 noise which will emanate from them is not conducive to a learning environment.	<p>The Applicants refer to Volume 1, Annex 4.3: Site Selection and Refinement of the Onshore Infrastructure (APP-033). This document demonstrates the robust process of site selection and refinement undertaken by the Applicants in determining the routeing and placement of the Transmission Assets onshore infrastructure through from inception to DCO submission. The Applicants refer to Annex 5.4 to the Applicants report to Hearing Action Points: ISH1 6, 8, 9, 19, 26 & 28 (REP1-039), which provides clarity on the need for two onshore substations as the projects must be electronically independent.</p> <p>The Applicants acknowledge noise and vibration resulting from the construction of the Projects may lead to adverse impacts and effects, as reported in APP-117 and indicated in the Applicants response to REP1-214.17. However, with the implementation of mitigation measures to be detailed within the Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan(s) for the Projects, noise and vibration will be suitably controlled to minimise adverse impacts and effects, which is secured by Requirement 8 of the draft DCO (REP3-009). Operational noise from the substations will be controlled by Requirement 18 (Control of noise during operational stage) of the DCO.</p>
REP3-138 138.2	The list of my objections is lengthy: the destruction of our greenbelt; the destruction of our wildlife and their habitat; the years and years of disruption to our inadequate roads; the pollution from all the heavy traffic; the decimation of our farmland; the list could go on and on.	<p>The Applicants note this response.</p> <p>The Applicants are committed to developing the Transmission Assets in a way that is sensitive to the environment, avoiding or minimising potential effects wherever possible. Impacts which have the potential to give rise to likely significant effects have been carefully assessed and appropriate mitigation identified throughout the Environmental Statement. Those measures are secured through the Requirements set out in Schedules 2A and 2B of the draft DCO (REP3-009). Mitigations are also set out in the updated Commitments Register (Annex 5.3: Volume 1 (REP3-013)) submitted at Deadline 3.</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP3-138 138.3	This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense. There is an alternative and Morgan and Morecambe seem hell bent on dismissing it.	The Applicants provided an initial response on site selection and the assessment of alternatives at section 2.31.1 of The Applicants' Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 - Introduction and thematic responses (PDA-005). Following discussions relating to site selection and alternatives at Issue Specific Hearing 1 and in response to a number of the Examining Authority's Hearing Action Points, the Applicants provided a detailed technical response on these matters including explaining why the proposed alternative connection to Stanah or via an alternative route or Point of Interconnection for the Transmission Assets is not feasible. This was provided at Deadline 1 in Annex 5.2 to the Applicants response to Hearing Action Points: ISH1 6, 8, 9, 19, 26 & 28 - Rev F01 (REP1-039).

2.19 Naomi June Fox

Table 2.19: REP3-139 – Naomi June Fox

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP3-139 139.1	I wish to voice my objection to the proposed Morgan & Morgan wind farms. This is my first submission because I have received very little information about it from the applicants, and what I have received has not been easy to understand.	<p>The Applicants have responded to concerns in relation to Consultation in Section 2.2.2 of their Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 – Introduction and thematic responses (PDA-005) in particular noting that the Acceptance Checklist (s55) (PD-003) where the Planning Inspectorate confirms in relation to adequacy of consultant it “is satisfied that the Applicants have complied with their statutory obligations.” The Applicants note this was similarly acknowledged by the Examining Authority (see paragraph 30 of the Applicants' Hearing Summary of the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (REP1-036)).</p> <p>A number of non-statutory consultations, alongside statutory consultations in accordance with the Planning Act 2008. A range of consultation events were held in the vicinity of the proposed Transmission Assets, including online events, exhibitions and pop-up events between November and December 2022, April and June 2023, and October and December 2023. These events were advertised in</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
		local newspapers, on local radio, on posters in the local area, through postcards and newsletters distributed through the local area and on social media. Further details can be found in the Consultation Report (APP-170).
REP3-139 139.2	The enormity of the devastation to be caused was only brought home to me when my Aunty put a video on social media, demonstrating the length of just one of the proposed substations. It is beyond my comprehension that anyone could deem these huge structures appropriate in a village setting, near to two schools.	The Applicants refer to Volume 1, Annex 4.3: Site Selection and Refinement of the Onshore Infrastructure (APP-033). This document demonstrates the robust process of site selection and refinement undertaken by the Applicants in determining the routeing and placement of the Transmission Assets onshore infrastructure through from inception to DCO submission.
REP3-139 139.3	Apparently there is already a much more suitable route for the cabling and a more appropriate site for the substations, please instruct the applicants to utilise these.	The Applicants provided an initial response on site selection and the assessment of alternatives at section 2.31.1 of The Applicants' Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 - Introduction and thematic responses (PDA-005). Following discussions relating to site selection and alternatives at Issue Specific Hearing 1 and in response to a number of the Examining Authority's Hearing Action Points, the Applicants provided a detailed technical response on these matters including explaining why the proposed alternative connection to Stanah or via an alternative route or Point of Interconnection for the Transmission Assets is not feasible. This was provided at Deadline 1 in Annex 5.2 to the Applicants response to Hearing Action Points: ISH1 6, 8, 9, 19, 26 & 28 - Rev F01 (REP1-039).

2.20 Sally Louise Fiddler

Table 2.20: REP3-140 – Sally Louise Fiddler

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP3-140 140.1	I am objecting to the proposal of the Morgan & Morecambe wind farms. As a former resident of Freckleton and current	The Applicants refer to Volume 1, Annex 4.3: Site Selection and Refinement of the Onshore Infrastructure (APP-033). This document demonstrates the robust

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	<p>resident of Warton, I am quite disgusted at the lack of information I have received from the applicants. There appears to be a lack of transparency in the little information they have given. Maps with different coloured lines and shaded in areas are not an adequate source of information for the lay person. Had I been given the opportunity to actually visualise the substation structures, by means of a 3D model, I would have involved myself more actively in the groups set up by members of the affected villages. The reality was only demonstrated through a video posted to social media by a resident. I feel that we have been hoodwinked into complacency by Morgan and Morecambe. They have not demonstrated care or transparency in their drive to get this proposal passed.</p>	<p>process of site selection and refinement undertaken by the Applicants in determining the routing and placement of the Transmission Assets onshore infrastructure through from inception to DCO submission.</p> <p>The Applicant provided a comparison of the size of the onshore substations against the size of onshore substations which form part of other offshore wind farms infrastructure, this can be found in Annex 5.5 to the Applicants response to Hearing Action Points ISH1 20 Comparable Onshore Substation Platform Footprints (REP1-042).</p> <p>The Applicants do not intend to produce a scaled-down model of the onshore substations, as visualisations of the onshore substations for the Transmission Assets are available within Volume 3, Figures – Part 6 of 7 (APP-136) which provide appropriate representations of the proposals and a technical note regarding landscape and design matters was submitted at Deadline 3 (REP3-064).</p> <p>The Applicants have responded to concerns in relation to Consultation in Section 2.2.2 of their Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 – Introduction and thematic responses (PDA-005) in particular noting that the Acceptance Checklist (s55) (PD-003) where the Planning Inspectorate confirms in relation to adequacy of consultant it “is satisfied that the Applicants have complied with their statutory obligations.” The Applicants note this was similarly acknowledged by the Examining Authority (see paragraph 30 of the Applicants’ Hearing Summary of the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (REP1-036)).</p> <p>A number of non-statutory consultations, alongside statutory consultations in accordance with the Planning Act 2008. A range of consultation events were held in the vicinity of the proposed Transmission Assets, including online events, exhibitions and pop-up events between November and December 2022, April and June 2023, and October and December 2023. These events were advertised in local newspapers, on local radio, on posters in the local area, through postcards and newsletters distributed through the local area and on social media. Further details can be found in the Consultation Report (APP-170).</p>
REP3-140 140.2	<p>The consequences of their disregard will cost our villages dearly, unless you can agree that the alternative and cheaper routes are a more viable option ... please.</p>	<p>The Applicants provided an initial response on site selection and the assessment of alternatives at section 2.31.1 of The Applicants' Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 - Introduction and thematic responses (PDA-005).</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
		<p>Following discussions relating to site selection and alternatives at Issue Specific Hearing 1 and in response to a number of the Examining Authority's Hearing Action Points, the Applicants provided a detailed technical response on these matters including explaining why the proposed alternative connection to Stanah or via an alternative route or Point of Interconnection for the Transmission Assets is not feasible. This was provided at Deadline 1 in Annex 5.2 to the Applicants response to Hearing Action Points: ISH1 6, 8, 9, 19, 26 & 28 - Rev F01 (REP1-039).</p>