



MORGAN AND MORECAMBE OFFSHORE WIND FARMS: TRANSMISSION ASSETS

Applicants' Response to Deadline 4 submissions from People with Interest in Land



Deadline: Deadline 5
Application Reference: EN020028

Document Numbers:
MRCNS-J3303-JVW-19201
MOR001-FLO-CON-ENV-NOT-0067

Document Reference: S_D5_3

22 September 2025
F01

Document status					
Version	Purpose of document	Approved by	Date	Approved by	Date
F01	Deadline 5	GL	September 2025	IM	September 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 IPS' SUBMISSIONS AT DEADLINE 4	1
1.1	Introduction	1
2	APPLICANTS' RESPONSE TO IPS' SUBMISSIONS AT DEADLINE 4	2
2.1	Anne Mason	2
2.2	Colin Bradley	10
2.3	Gordon Ashworth	11
2.4	Hornbies Foundation Charity	13
2.5	J. W. Kirkham and Sons	14
2.6	Paul Hamilton Ellis	20
2.7	Sheila Margaret Hall	21

Tables

Table 2.1: REP4-144 – Anne Mason	2
Table 2.2: RPE4-146 – Colin Bradley	10
Table 2.3: RPE4-153 – Gordon Ashworth	11
Table 2.4: RPE4-135 – Hornbies Foundation Charity	13
Table 2.5: RPE4-155 – J. W. Kirkham and Sons	14
Table 2.6: RPE4-170 – Paul Hamilton Ellis	20
Table 2.7: RPE4-173 – Sheila Margaret Hall	21

1 Applicants' Response to IPs' Submissions at Deadline 4

1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1.1 Following Deadline 4, Morgan Offshore Wind Limited ('Morgan OWL') and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Limited ('Morecambe OWL'), (together, 'the Applicants') have reviewed each of the submissions from Interested Parties.
- 1.1.1.2 Details of the Applicants' response to People with Interest in Land are set out in this document.
- 1.1.1.3 The Applicants have numbered the submissions in line with the Planning Inspectorate's document library, with subsequent paragraph number, e.g. REP4-001.1, REP4-001.2, etc.

2 Applicants' Response to IPs' submissions at Deadline 4

2.1 Anne Mason

Table 2.1: REP4-144 – Anne Mason

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP4-144 144.1	<p>ISH 2 29 & 30/7/2025 for Anne Mason IP 20052505 Items 7d and 9c</p> <p>Anne Mason, dairy farmer impacted by the proposed cable corridor across two land parcels and the proposed permanent loss of a third family land parcel tenanted by us for the proposed Morgan substation.</p> <p>The applicant states 'the temporary disruption to the agricultural land holdings would not affect the overall viability of farms ' ref APP 104 Land Use & Recreationp74 6.11.3.3. This is a bold statement considering my FOI request to the applicant resulted in a representative stating in an email dated 10th July 2025</p> <p>'The assessment of impacts on farm holdings set out in Volume 6 Land Use & Recreation did not include a detailed economic assessment of the viability of individual farms therefore we do not have the information you requested'</p> <p>I find this response deeply concerning considering the same person (applicant's land agent) assured the Ex A following discussions with FBC/EX A during the ISH 1 Part 1 section 8 at 30 mins (Issue specific Hearing) that she would be able to provide this information by Deadline 1. (I provided this person with the relevant references to assist her response yet she still rang me for clarification).</p> <p>How would the land agent or the applicant have any concept how their alleged 'critical national infrastructure proposed project impacts our business, our landholding value or the legacy we intended to pass on to the next generation? Have they seen our business accounts? Have they any concept of the real value of BMV (best and most versatile) productive farmland on the Fylde?</p>	<p>The assessment of impacts on farm holdings (as set out in Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation (APP-104) did include an economic assessment of viability of individual farms. However, assessment was undertaken to the extent possible based on information that was publicly available and information that was disclosed by the landowners or occupiers to the agents acting on behalf of the Applicants through their land referencing work and discussions with individual landowners and interested parties. This included: data on the extent of individual land holdings as far as it was either publicly available or disclosed, information on the nature of farming arrangements including land ownership, farming tenancies, licences or informal agreements and information on the nature and operation of the individual farming businesses affected, as far as it was disclosed to the Applicants.</p> <p>The Property Cost Estimates (APP-009 and APP-010) set out an estimate of the total contingent liability for the acquisition of land and rights in land to be acquired and restrictions imposed by the Transmission Assets for the purpose of delivering the onshore works element. The assessment outlines the likely heads of claim associated if land and rights are acquired via compulsory acquisition and the associated financial figure that may be required as payment to all landowners, tenants, occupiers and third parties affected. These documents have been updated for Deadline 5 (Document Refs D1.3/F03 and D1.4/F03).</p> <p>The Applicants agreed the hearing action points with the Examining Authority as captured within The Applicants' Hearing Summary of the Issue Specific Hearing 1: Day 2 (paragraph 75 ISH1_46) (REP1-035).</p> <p>Since the last Compulsory Acquisition Hearing on the 1st August 2025, the Applicants have engaged further with Mrs Mason and her land agent regarding an independent farm economic assessment report which the Applicants will</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	<p>The information used by the project to estimate the impact on our holding is flawed. Desk Study 6.6.26 Land at Freshfields is not just for grazing livestock or silage, it is also used for crop production.</p> <p>If the project cannot provide an assessment of the economic damage to our currently viable farming enterprise, how can they calculate their Blight budget accurately? Or indeed the cost of the entire project. Or are they intending to use their CPO?</p> <p>We are approaching retirement age. We have worked hard to increase the viability of our dairy unit by investing heavily in farmland to add to the portfolio of land purchased by three generations of the Mason family. As custodians of the land for the next generation, we intended to capitalise on our investments as part of our retirement plan over the next 5 years. This looks increasingly unlikely as are options and our children's options are blighted by the proposed project.</p> <p>The 'temporary construction period of 5 years will seriously impact our ability to farm and we fear that we will be left with a moribund business and less productive farmland to pass on to the next generation who will have limited options.</p>	<p>undertake, resulting from the land take from Mrs Masons farm business for the permanent acquisition of the Morgan substation.</p> <p>Whilst the assessment completed previously by the Applicants is sufficient for the purposes of the property cost estimate and funding statement which aligns with the approach taken by other offshore wind farm developers in the UK and aligns with Planning Act 2008 guidance, this further assessment will aid the Applicants discussions with Mrs Mason by better understanding the potential impacts and mitigations which could be implemented through the Agricultural Liaison Officer appointed under the Code of Construction Practice (Requirement 8 of Schedules 2A and 2B of the draft Development Consent Order (REP4-007).</p>
<p>REP4-144 144.2</p>	<p>I am curious if the Blight claims will be time limited? We or future generations may wish to sell assets. The project claims "nor has any party raised specific concerns that the application has impaired their ability to sell land /property' REP1-012. This is incorrect. We raised specific concerns in our representations dated 23rd January 2025 point 6 of the impact of the proposed project on our diversification projects (housing developments/solar park discussions prior to June 2021 blighted by proposed cable) Objections were also raised a meeting with our land agent and the project's land agents on 11th October 2023 in our farmhouse kitchen (meeting minutes available)). For the avoidance of doubt, I am raising specific concerns that the proposed project has and will impair our ability to sell/rent our dairy farm & land as a direct result of the cable route. This can be evidenced for the applicant.</p>	<p>With regard to time limitation of a blight notice, it would be expected that a landowner would serve a blight notice and submit a claim in advance of any Compulsory Acquisition powers being exercised as the blight process is there to allow claimants to bring claims forward early. Following that timeframe the compensation process would align with the compensation code provisions rather than the blight process.</p> <p>In accordance with the Limitation Act 1990, claims can be bought forward to the Applicants up to six years from the date of entry onto land using compulsory acquisition powers. The Applicants acknowledge the reference to a proposed housing development and solar development on the land and have subsequently requested further information and evidence of the proposals in order that they can be considered. To date the Applicants have not received any further detail regarding the proposed alternative uses.</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
		Compensation for the land rights is based upon diminution in land value will be paid based on the land use at the date of entry unless there is evidence to support otherwise, this payment is made in recognition that the land value is likely to depreciate as a result of the cables being installed in the land.
REP4-144 144.3	<p>ISH3 31st July 2025 IP 20052505</p> <p>Anne Mason dairy farmer impacted significantly by the proposed project.</p> <p>Article 29 temp use of land for carrying out the authorised project</p> <p>R 16 Restoration of land used temporarily for construction</p> <p>I wasn't involved with Agriculture before meeting my husband some 42 years ago at University. As a civil servant's daughter I had little understand of the day to day mixed dairy farm in some of the most productive prime grazing land in the country. In fact, I wouldn't be arrogant enough to claim that the so called temporary disruption to agricultural land holdings would not affect the overall viability of farms ' APP104 Land Use and Recreation 6.11.3.3 especially when I know for a fact and can provide written evidence that an assessment of the economic impact of the cable corridor has not been done despite the promise to EX that it would be submitted by Deadline 1.</p> <p>I'm curious to ascertain if the applicant has any first-hand experience of running a viable dairy farm who has diligently invested in soil management structure to produce the quality of soil that we currently have and which provides us with an abundance of crops with which to feed, bed nourish our dairy cattle 365/24/7 , producing quality products for our every growing nation. Has the applicant ever heard the term food security or are they labouring under the illusion that all food comes from Tesco's?</p> <p>The applicants have provided a veritable forest of documents few of which actually address any of the issues that this project will</p>	<p>The Applicants have considered the availability of agricultural land used for food production, alongside the other policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (and National Policy Statements), when deciding what sites are most appropriate for development. Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives (REP AS-026).</p> <p>The impacts of the Transmission Assets on agricultural land use are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of the Land Use and Recreation chapter (APP-104). This includes consideration of the effects of all elements of the Transmission Assets, including onshore substations on the viability of existing farming businesses. Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8. This includes the preparation of a Code of Construction Practice in general accordance with the Outline Code of Construction Practice (REP4-026) submitted with the application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Code of Construction Practice seek to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.</p> <p>The Applicants acknowledge that farms require flexibility in order to operate and the Agricultural Liaison Officer (ALO) will be the point of contact to ensure impacts can be mitigated where possible for farming businesses. The ALO will continue to work with the Mason family and their representative to minimise and mitigate the impacts on the holding and will discuss the outputs of the economic assessment once available.</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	<p>cause. Even the presence of ALOs on site will not address day to day issues – interestingly when road gates were left open potentially exposing the public to dangers of wandering livestock and when wires were left in our fields by surveyors, there were ALOS on site throughout! ALOS may have practical experience of daily farming practices but they are not experts on our particular farm any more than we would be on a similar dairy farm 5 miles down the lane.</p> <p>The applicant may not be aware that farming requires flexibility- we battle against the vagaries of the English weather which affects land conditions, we have to adhere to strict biosecurity measures to protect our livestock and satisfy the ever-increasing demands of government quangos or processors/supermarkets. This is now part of our job but we simply cannot adhere to a timetable imposed upon us by external agencies who claim to work with us and don't. We cannot simply share the access tracks which we have put in to allow 24/7/ 365 access to our farmland.</p>	
<p>REP4-144 144.4</p>	<p>The applicant will be judged by the quality of the contractors on the ground and all the reassurances in the world that the Outline code of construction will ensure contractors comply with biosecurity risk and this will be monitored by the ALOS and the applicant do not ring true when the applicant has a history of breaches of protocol such as failing to ensure surveyors did not access our land when the project was refused all access on 3 rd April 2024 following their poor behaviour and the precipitous issuing of the Section 172.</p> <p>The claim APP 104 6.11.2.5 'soils and quality of the agricultural land would be restored at the end of the construction period to reduce, as far as possible, any temporary effects on best and most versatile ...' This is total nonsense. A contractor on a digger simply cannot restore the current complex soil structure which has taken thousands of years to create. We can already evidence the projects substandard attempts to 'reinstate 'the soil structure from the trenches dug during investigative work.</p>	<p>The Applicants refer to their response REP1-109 109.6 (REP2-030) in relation to the concerns raised in relation to the intrusive survey campaign in 2024.</p> <p>The Outline Soil Management Plan has been updated at Deadline 4 (REP4-040) to provide clarification on the roles and responsibilities for the implementation of the plan, including the role of the ALO.</p> <p>The restoration of the soils would be carried out in accordance with the detailed soil management plan(s) which includes a period of aftercare during which there would be a review of the development of the physical characteristics of the restored land, including soil structure, where any further requirements for cultivation or other remedial measures would be identified and implemented (Section 1.9 of REP4-040).</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	<p>I do not feel link boxes and the destruction of soil structure nor the creating of irregular shaped land parcels where the cable corridor traverse our beautiful farmlands is temporary at all. Make no mistake, this is permanent damage being described as temporary in order to ensure this project is passed. I thought when you bought land and were registered with the Land registry as the Title owner that it was yours for perpetuity. How naïve was I to invest my hard-earned money into land as part of my retirement pot.</p>	
<p>REP4-144 144.5</p>	<p>CAH2 01/08/2025 Submission for Anne Mason IP 20052505</p> <p>Anne Mason, on behalf of the family dairy farm impacted by the proposed cable corridor and the proposed Morgan substation.</p> <p>In 1995 there were around 35,700 dairy farms in the UK. In 2025 there are an estimated 7000 (ChatGPT Decline in dairy farm numbers in UK in last 30 years). Key drivers include economic pressure, shrinking margins and psychological factors such as the perception of the loss of control/autonomy over operations. Dairy farms are economically vulnerable businesses operating on tight margins. We do not make large income in comparisons with the investments made in infrastructure/land/ ridiculously long working hours. Most other business would find the return on capital laughable. Any slight destabilisation can have catastrophic effects on our economically vulnerable business. This project, if given the green light, will have a massive destabilising effect on our business and I suspect that our business will likely be moribund if it can even survive the construction phases.</p> <p>Promises made to the Examining Authority that impact statement will be provided by deadline 1 (Ref Recording of ISH 1 part 8 2/5/2025 at around 30 minutes FBC/EX A and applicants/DM) to show the economic impact on each farm holding along the route has not been provided nor I understand completed at all. I have written proof of this.</p>	<p>The Applicants refer to their response REP4-144 144.1 above.</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	<p>(from the person who promised to deliver the assessment by deadline 1. DM 10th July 2025 email;</p> <p>'The assessment of impacts on farm holdings (as set out in Volume , Chapter 6: Land Use and Recreation) did not include a detailed economic assessment of viability on individual farms')</p> <p>The applicant claims 'the temporary disruption will not affect the overall viability of farms '6.11.3.9 APP104 Land Use and Recreation. How would they know the impact if they haven't assessed it?</p>	
REP4-144 144.6	<p>Claims that the applicant affirms their commitment to negotiating with affected parties (REP3-057 Applicant's response to the Ex A written question section 5 1.13) yet their behaviour is not that of a negotiator:</p> <p>From the very first meeting in our farmhouse kitchen on 11thOctober, 2023 it was clear the project was comfortable using heavy handed tactics, stating 'We have Compulsory Purchase powers but we don't want to use them' .</p> <p>Family members in their nineties have been bombarded with paperwork requiring even their deceased wife to complete this to assist the project with landownership.</p> <p>Negotiations are not improved by the precipitous serving of Section 172 notices on 20 March 2024 by a project (looking to secure proposed intrusive survey licence agreement for ground investigation works) who claimed ' it has not been possible to agree the terms for voluntary access'.</p> <p>This was at best dishonest as I understand negotiations were still ongoing.</p> <p>Yet the project is 'committed' to negotiating with us...!</p> <p>The latest Voluntary Heads of terms dated May 2025 for which were offered a generous £500 to sign included point 16 feels akin to a gagging order (requiring us to 'withdraw any or all prior representations made to the Transmission DCO Application')</p>	<p>The Applicants' preference from the outset of engagement has been to agree access and rights through voluntary agreements and only use statutory powers as a last resort where access is required to ensure the delivery of the programme. Draft intrusive survey licences were issued to land agents representing landowners in January 2024, with populated versions being issued in February 2024. As a result of limited progress being made on the licence agreements notices were issued on 20th March 2024 to ensure continued access for necessary seasonal surveys. Following the issue of the notice, the Applicants were able to agree a licence agreement with the Mason family and the Applicants took access to the land under the licence agreement rather than the notice demonstrating the Applicants commitment to securing and relying on negotiated agreements with landowners wherever possible.</p> <p>The Applicant is currently progressing both an Option for Freehold Acquisition and an Option for Easement with the Mason Family. Engagement has been ongoing with Mrs Mason's land agent to negotiate the terms of these agreements. A meeting was held between Mrs Mason's agent and representatives from Dalcour Maclaren on 11th August, followed by a further meeting on 12th August between the Applicants and Mrs Mason's agent. Subsequent communications have continued via email and telephone. The heads of terms for an option for Acquisition have now been agreed and are being progressed for legal completion, meanwhile the heads of terms for the option for Easement are still in negotiation nearing agreements.</p> <p>The Applicants are seeking to agree the land rights sought through a voluntary agreement in accordance with the requirement of paragraph 25 of the 'Planning</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	<p>I'm curious if the behaviour by the applicant who claims to be 'committed' to the negotiating process would actually instead prefer to use their powers of compulsory purchase? After all, this would be the cheaper option?</p> <p>Compulsory Acquisition is not a viable option for our land and the project is not a welcome business partner. We have diversification projects underway which have been jeopardised by the project and we therefore refute the project's claims "nor has any party raised specific concerns that the application has impaired their ability to sell land /property' REP1-012 (evidence provided 23rd January 2025 My registration Comments submission pt 6 and 11th October 2023 minutes available. The blight budget is capped REP3-056 Q5 1.9. Is blight time-limited? Our land will be sterilised with the options of ourselves and future generations severely limited.</p> <p>We invested heavily in additional farmland as part of pension plan. I naively thought owning your own land or property meant it was yours. It seems I was wrong. I could talk for hours about how this uninvited project will negatively impact our business, our beautiful farmland, and has brought additional stress affecting our mental health at a time when we had plenty worries enough. However, I'm only allowed 5 minutes and given that I suspect this may be a 'done deal', I'll stop here for my oral submission other than to state that to me, this seems to be about greenwashing' to boost profits for large corporations at the expense of hard-working farmers when we are beleaguered enough by Inheritance Tax changes, supermarkets/dairies/DEFRA and others. I understand the CEOS of some of these large corporations are paid multimillion pound salaries.</p>	<p>Act 2008: Guidance related to procedures for compulsory acquisition'. However, in order to give the Applicants and the Secretary of State certainty that all of the necessary land will be secured within a reasonable timeframe, powers of compulsory acquisition are also sought as a last resort, in case a voluntary agreement is not reached. This approach is endorsed by paragraph 25 of the Guidance.</p> <p>The Applicants refer to their response REP4-144 144.2 above regarding the land value and alternative use of the land.</p>
REP4-144 144.7	<p>The applicant's land tracker REP1-044 p 10/15 clearly shows how our land holding 22 (coloured light yellow) with the main farm buildings and farmhouse located along with some 40 acres to the South of Hillock Lane. The majority of our holding to the North of Hillock Lane. Whilst land to the South is unaffected by</p>	<p>The Applicants acknowledge the impact the Order Limits will have on the farm holding and following the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing on the 1st August, the Applicants have commissioned an independent farm assessment to be completed to better understand the impact on the business. The Applicants are seeking to engage with the Mason family on their current business activities to</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	<p>the cable, the main land parcel to is effectively cut in half by the cable route. The cable then cuts up our farmland to the East of the main holding on Kirkham Road. We also face losing 40 acres of prime grazing land to the permanent siting of the Morgan substation. We simply won't be able to 'just 'find alternative grazing to replace this as local land will be at a premium if it is even available. Stock needs to be kept close to the main farm holding to allow for the daily welfare checks and milking cows need to be able to be walked from pasture to milking parlours.</p> <p>The milking herd is milked in buildings situated on the main farm holding to the South of Hillock Lane and crossed several times a day to and from prime grazing pastures using a farm access track which we have put in to access most of the fields within our holding. Youngstock and milking cows are housed during a few Winter months in sheds based on the main farmholding but are out grazing for welfare reasons between March to October, weather and ground conditions permitting. Cattle are moved across all areas of our holdings to ensure routine veterinary regime such as worming, hoof trimming, TB testing /vaccinations are administered. Daily checks on youngstock are conducted to ensure animal welfare concerns are swiftly addressed.</p> <p>Construction work right across our working farm will have an unquantifiable economic impact upon our business as well as financially damaging the value of our prime grazing land whose soil structure has taken thousands of years in creation and simply cannot be 'reinstated' by some contractor with a digger.</p> <p>We require 24/7 access to our fields and cross cattle four times a day or more across our holding with regular tractor access required 24/7 365 using the network of farm tracks which we have put in place. The project wishes to use our tracks and again this will have a negative effect on our farming business.</p> <p>Additionally, we silage three grass silage crops to feed cattle over the Winter months, relying on a series of farm tracks which we have installed to allow us 24/7/ 365 access to all our farmland. Maintenance work such as fertiliser spreading, hedgerow trimming and routine fencing work all require tractors</p>	<p>understand the likely implications. The Applicants submitted a summary of potential mitigations that could be adopted to reduce the impact on the farming business at Deadline 4 (REP4-111). This summary identifies measures that could be implemented to reduce disruption and mitigate the impact on the holding and address a number of the concerns set out by Mrs Mason.</p> <p>Accommodation works will be discussed and agreed with landowners prior to construction through the Agricultural Liaison Officer appointed under the Code of Construction Practice (REP4-026 and Requirement 8 of Schedule 2A and 2B of the draft Development Consent Order). The ALO works with the landowner and occupier to provide information on construction programme (both overall and for individual landowners) and facilitate coordination. The Applicants are committed to working with landowners to implement reasonable and proportionate measures to mitigate losses to ensure farming business can remain in operation during the construction and operation of the project, however for losses that cannot be mitigated, compensation in accordance with the compensation code will be agreed and settled. The Applicants will continue to engage with the Masons and their land agent on these matters.</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	<p>to use these farm tracks. Some of our land is used to grow crops such as Barley, Winter wheat and maize which provide additional food for our cattle and straw for bedding. This requires tractor access to enable ploughing, weed spaying and harvesting machinery and as with all farm work depends on the vagaries of the English weather rather than adhering to a strict time plan. Farming requires a fine balance of planning ahead on a 3year cycle and the flexibility to adapt to weather and ground conditions. Imposing external demands from an unwelcome project in addition will make the difficult task of producing food for our growing nation impossible eg irregular shaped land parcels, damaged soil structure, damaged drains, inability to spread slurry, potential machinery damage from link box inspection covers.</p>	

2.2 Colin Bradley

Table 2.2: RPE4-146 – Colin Bradley

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP4-146 146.1	<p>We have now received (several) notifications of the applicants intention to amend the DCO plan on our clients land. We have not be issued with or seen published a revised plan but now note that a 32 day consultation period appears to have commenced. When will we be issued with the full information regarding this?</p>	<p>The Applicants issued the Change Request consultation notice to Mr Bradley on 7th August and a copy of the correspondence was issued to Mr Bradley's land agent on 8th August. The notification included an overview plan of the proposed changes and also contained links to the documents on the Applicants' website which includes detailed plans. Until a decision has been made by the Examining Authority as to whether the Change Request is accepted for examination (which is expected the week commencing the 22nd September), the Application proposals and documents remain as submitted. If the Change Request is approved by the Examining Authority, the Applicants will incorporate the changes into the Application documents and the examination will consider the Application as changed. Until such time that a decision is made, the Applicants are still seeking to negotiate the original rights applied for over the plots affected.</p>

2.3 Gordon Ashworth

Table 2.3: RPE4-153 – Gordon Ashworth

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP4-153 153.1	<p>My name is Gordon Ashworth i live with my wife at [redacted] This project is going through part of our land.</p> <p>My first point is over communication there is none !!. We bought this old barn 10 years ago and spent nights and weekends on top of my job to create 2 lovely homes for my wife and me and also for my sister in law and her two young daughters who had unfortunately just lost their Dad. So, when this project was starting up we had a call to say in the next few months they would be coming on our land to do intrusive surveys, which we where not happy about but apparently we couldn't stop them. I told them that it was very important that they let me know the day and time they were coming on the land so i could let my sister in law know as my wife and I would be at work and her daughters [redacted], BUT they didn't let us know they just turned up ! They have no care for anyone on this cable corridor.</p>	<p>The Applicants note Mr Ashworth's comments regarding communication and consultation.</p> <p>The surveys were undertaken with the agreement of the landowner as per the registered title, however we understand there is a discrepancy over the registered title and physical boundaries to the land..</p> <p>The Applicants received confirmation in June 2024 that Mr Ashworth had appointed a land agent to act on his behalf. Since that time, the Applicants have engaged with the appointed agent on all relevant project matters, including the provision of Heads of Terms for a voluntary agreement and arrangements for survey access. Where appropriate, direct correspondence has also been issued to Mr Ashworth.</p> <p>Heads of Terms were initially provided in November 2024, and subsequently reissued in May 2025 following updates to the template agreement, which were informed by negotiations with the Land Agent Group — of which Mr Ashworth's agent was a participating member. During a meeting held on 19 June 2025, the agent advised that Mr and Mrs Ashworth were not willing to engage with the applicants' land agents or to progress discussions on the voluntary agreement at that time.</p> <p>In addition to individual engagement, the Project has hosted a number of landowner engagement events most recently in July and August 2025, with a further event scheduled for the end of September. These events are intended to provide landowners with an opportunity to raise any queries or concerns directly with the Project team. Invitations to attend have been issued to Mr Ashworth, both via letter and through his appointed agent.</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
		The Applicants remain committed to open and constructive engagement and welcome any future opportunity to discuss matters directly with Mr Ashworth, should he wish to do so, or via his appointed land agent.
REP4-153 153.2	My second point is in 6 months [redacted] and hopefully going to retire and looking forward to sitting in my garden with a beer but that wont be the case i will be sat on a building site and being a joiner for [redacted] i am done with building sites !!! If this project is to get the green light it could take up to 7 years and if in that time we were to try and sell it would devalue the price of our property which by the way is our pension pot.	<p>The Applicants refer to their response to Relevant Representations Part 1 - Introduction and thematic responses (PDA-005) regarding property value.</p> <p>The Applicants do not envisage any impact on property prices. If diminution in property prices can be demonstrated to have been caused by the Transmission Assets, the Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code where diminution in property prices can be demonstrated to have been caused by the Transmission Assets. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which may be useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation (Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate) (https://www.gov.uk/guidance/compulsory-purchase-and-compensation-guide-1-procedure, https://www.gov.uk/guidance/compulsory-purchase-and-compensation-guide-4-compensation-to-residential-owners-and-occupiers).</p>
REP4-153 153.3	<p>The third point is to back the Halls , the [redacted], these farms are fantastic dairy farms on the Fylde coast and to lose these farms to this project is absolute disgrace !! and for that point alone this project should be stopped ,</p> <p>I hope the panel can take all of this on board and i hope common sense prevails .</p> <p>thank you for giving me this opportunity to have my say</p>	<p>The Applicants in their response to Issue Specific Hearing Action Point 46 discussed the different types of agricultural and rural business across the Transmission Assets order limits, including dairy, beef, mixed livestock, arable, mixed and equine. 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.</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
		Please see ISH1 46, ISH1 47 and CAH1 5 of The Applicants' response to Hearing Action Points due at Deadline 1 (REP1-037).

2.4 Hornbies Foundation Charity

Table 2.4: RPE4-135 – Hornbies Foundation Charity

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP4-135 135.1	<p>I act on behalf of Hornbies Foundation Charity 20053119 and had not intended to request to attend/speak at ISH2 however having followed ISH2 Part 1 yesterday online I wish to submit this important question to the Applicants for today's ISH2 Part 2 which is of Landscape and Green Belt importance on behalf of Hornbies Foundation Charity as I am unable to attend virtually today.</p> <p>I appreciate there is no protocol for written questions however acting for the only landowner impacted by two substations I would hope to have my submitted question accepted for the ExA to put to the Applicants at today's hearing.</p> <p>There are two parts to my question.</p> <p>Part A is to ask that if there is no gas available or the cost of supply is prohibitive (as there is no gas available certainly in the vicinity of Morecambe Substation) then AIS substation layout will be used which requires approximately double the size of substation footprint.</p> <p>Each substation footprint using GIS layout is proposed to be circa 50% operational infrastructure and 50% mitigation. My question is that if AIS is required rather than GIS then surely the 50% mitigation area will be lost in order to accommodate the additional operational footprint ?</p> <p>This impacts upon Landscape as mitigation areas will be lost and the additional substation infrastructure footprint will require more significant cut and fill into the landscape profile, secondly</p>	<p>The Morecambe project has retained flexibility to use either Air Insulated Switchgear (AIS) or Gas Insulated Switchgear (GIS) for its substation at this stage because both technologies can be suitably accommodated within the assessed maximum design envelope for the substation area. A robust assessment has confirmed that the overall substation footprint is appropriate for either AIS or GIS and, therefore, choosing one technology over the other will not result in a significant difference to the overall land-take or environmental impact.</p> <p>The Applicants confirm that neither of the onshore substations will exceed the maximum design parameters set out in <i>Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description</i> (REP2-008) of the ES. Compliance with these parameters is secured through Requirement 5 of Schedules 2A and 2B of the draft DCO (REP4-007), which restricts the substations to a defined footprint. These spatial extents are illustrated on the <i>B8 Works Plans – Onshore and Intertidal – Part 1 of 2 – Rev F03</i> (REP3-007), specifically Sheet 12 (Morgan substation) and Sheet 13 (Morecambe substation). Accordingly, the Applicants confirm that no designated mitigation areas will be lost to accommodate either an AIS or GIS layout.</p> <p>With respect to potential impacts on the Green Belt, the Applicants refer to Section 1.6 of the Green Belt Technical Note (REP4-092). This sets out the Applicants' assessment of potential harm to openness and relevant purposes of the Green Belt. This document also considers other relevant environmental effects, including landscape and visual impacts, during both the construction and operational phases of the substations.</p> <p>Morecambe's final decision on the switchgear technology will be made during detailed design, once all necessary input, such as detailed grid connection</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	consideration of the Green Belt impact will need to be addressed due to approximately 50 acres within approximately 400 acres of Green Belt will be lost to development with no on site mitigation or landscaping available.	requirements from National Grid and final equipment specifications from the supply chain, are fully available. No external gas pipeline will be required for the supply of the SF6 gas in GIS, see detailed response in REP4-135.2 below.
REP4-135 135.2	<p>Part B of my question is that if gas is to be supplied, what size of supply is required as a gas pipeline easement will be an additional burden for the landowner given that the pipeline route will need to avoid the extensive cable corridor networks within the substation locations ?</p> <p>Part B questioning may not be directly attributable to ISH2 however the Projects, I believe, have been disingenuous as gas pipeline supply requirements have never been suggested to date in discussions/negotiations with the landowner.</p>	<p>Any Gas Insulated Switchgear (GIS) used at the substations will not require any external piped gas supply. The gas used in GIS is Sulphur Hexafluoride (SF6), used because of its excellent insulating properties, which is contained within metal enclosed switchgear with various gas tight seals to ensure the integrity of the SF6 gas. As is standard with GIS, the switchgear will arrive at site degassed and SF6 free, following a factory inspection test, including gas tight testing. The switchgear will then be charged with SF6, from approved SF6 gas cylinders as part of the commissioning process. The personnel involved in this process will be highly trained in the process. This is a common process for the installation of SF6 switchgear.</p> <p>There is no gas to be supplied to the substation site and therefore no requirement for any gas pipeline which is why nothing has been included in the voluntary agreements.</p>

2.5 J. W. Kirkham and Sons

Table 2.5: RPE4-155 – J. W. Kirkham and Sons

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP4-155 155.1	<p>Morgan and Morecambe have failed to put in writing any of our reasonable requests despite many meetings repeating ourselves.</p> <p>These include :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moving the permanent access out of my elderly parents domestic curtilage to their property Eastham Hall Farm on [redacted]. 2. Reducing the construction roads off Ballam Road, Lytham, FY8 4NJ from 2 to 1 construction road when the construction 	<p>The Applicants acknowledge the submission and provides responses to each of the points as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As set out in the Land Rights Tracker which was submitted at Deadline 4 (REP4-087) a meeting with Mr and Mrs Kirkham's appointed land agent was held on 24th July. The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by Mr and Mrs Kirkham regarding the use of the agricultural field which is in close proximity to their registered property title. Access Point A28, as illustrated in the Outline Highways Access Management Plan (REP3-024), indicates that, through the

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	<p>roads are barely 100 metres apart. Further, why not access off Pegs Lane where there is to be premanent access post project completion.</p> <p>3. We have requested the cables are buried a minimum 2.5 metres deep on our land as, to quote LCD Ltd, the designated land drainage consultants, the only way to re-instate the drainage is if the cables are buried to that depth on our land. Otherwise it will be impossible to re-drain the land post project as the land is less than 3 metres above sea-level and very prone to flooding.</p> <p>4. Failure to align any construction tracks in line with ditches and tramlines. This would effectively divide our fields into triangles which would make it impossible to economically grow arable crops.</p>	<p>detailed design process, the need to utilise this plot during construction may be eliminated. Furthermore, discussions are ongoing with the landowner regarding an alternative operational access which may be secured through the voluntary agreement and used as an alternative to the contentious access. pending the confirmation of access requirements which will be available at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>2. The Applicants refer to their previous response on the matter of the requirement for two accesses at (REP1-179 179.11) contained within the Applicants' Response to Written Representations from People with interest in Land (PWILS) (REP2-030). To summarise, the Applicants are jointly seeking a single consent for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Transmission Assets comprising aligned onshore export cable corridors to separate onshore substations, and from these substations an aligned onward connection to the National Grid at Penwortham, Lancashire. Accordingly, two separate accesses are proposed to meet the independent construction requirements of each project.</p> <p>With regard to the suggestion to access from Pegs Lane as opposed to Ballam Road, the Applicants would clarify that the access strategy for the Transmission Assets has sought to prioritise access from the most suitable roads where possible. In contrast to Ballam Road, Pegs Lane is a single lane road and does not permit the two-way movement of vehicles and is signed with a 7.5tonne weight limit, this road is therefore considered to be less suited to accommodating additional traffic than Ballam Road. The Applicants also note that in contrast to the construction phase accesses from Ballam Road, the proposed operational access from Pegs Lane will only be used for monitoring and inspections that are expected to be on an annual basis and typically completed via the use of a light vehicle, such as a 4x4. Further details are provided within Section 3.19.2 of Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description of the Environmental Statement (REP2-008).</p> <p>3. The Applicants note concerns regarding cable burial depth and reinstatement of land drainage. As set out in the Project Description (REP2-008), the target burial depth for the onshore export cables is 1.8m to the bottom of the trench and a target of no less than 1.2m to the top of the protective tile. This depth may be exceeded where the route crosses features such as pipelines and land</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
		<p>drains, with final trench depths confirmed during detailed design based on ground conditions and engineering requirements.</p> <p>The Applicants cannot commit to a burial depth of 2.5m across particular landholdings, as the required depth depends on site-specific ground conditions, cable specifications and electrical safe standards. However, as captured in the outline Onshore Construction Method Statement (REP4-115) though consultation with the NFU, particular care will be taken to ensure that existing land drainage is not compromised as a result of the construction of the cable corridor. A suitably qualified drainage consultant will be engaged during detailed design to develop field drainage plans in consultation with landowners and occupiers. Where engineering design and ground conditions allow, deeper burial may be applied in consultation with the landowner.</p> <p>It is worth highlighting that the project's target burial depths as outlined above accord with the Energy Network Association's (ENA) Engineering Recommendation G57 Issue 2 2019, Cable Laying on Agricultural Land, that "All new cables (except service cables) of any voltage shall be laid with a cover depth of not less than 910 mm when laid across good agricultural land. This depth requirement takes account of the wishes of the National Farmers' Union (NFU), to safeguard farmers and/or employees".</p> <p>4. The Applicants acknowledge that there will be severance of parcels as a result of proposed construction accesses within J W Kirkham's ownership. Where it is practicable to farm the land, the Applicants will facilitate crossing points, the discussions of accommodation works will take place through the ALO secured through the Outline Code of Construction Practice (REP4-026). If through accommodation works, the land is still not economically viable to grow crops, compensation for the loss of crop production on the land will be agreed and settled in accordance with the compensation code.</p>
REP4-155 155.2	General comments : 1. The proposed plans including mitigation area would affect 7 out of 8 fields which we actively farm. We would be left with just one field to farm without major disruption. This would ensure our business inoperable, uneconomic and redundant during	1. The Agricultural Liaison Officer appointed under the Code of Construction Practice (Requirement 8 of Schedule 2A and 2B of the draft Development Consent Order) will work with landholders to provide construction programme information (both project-wide and for individual landowners) and to facilitate coordination. The applicants, and their ALOs will work with the landowner to

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	<p>construction over several years. The compensation for this is inadequate.</p> <p>2. The land will be blighted permanently regarding future development and the compensation levels are totally inadequate to reflect this.</p> <p>For example part of the proposed route runs very close to our holiday park which we hoped to expand in to the land where the cable route is planned. The applicants have not allowed any contingency for this.</p> <p>Further, the noise, dust, mud and heavy traffic will inevitably cause a negative impact on our long established holiday park whose main attraction is peace, tranquility and wildlife. The loss in touring customer and holiday home sales income has not been accounted for in this application and would like a response from the applicant regarding compensation.</p>	<p>maximise the amount of retained land that is able to be farmed economically. Whilst the applicant acknowledges the cable route and working corridor passes through a large proportion of the landowners' fields, such land not required for construction will be made available where possible to allow the farming practices to continue.</p> <p>Crossing Points - Farm access routes between fields within a farm holding will be maintained (where reasonably practicable), or alternative routes agreed with the land holder to enable the continued operation of agricultural land holdings during the construction phase (Requirement 8 of Schedule 2A and 2B of the Development Consent Order, Outline Code of Construction Practice, CoT96, REP4-026)). In accordance with the compensation code, the core principle of equivalence will ensure that Mr Kirkham is financially no better or worse off than he would have been before the acquisition of rights or disturbance as a direct result of the works.</p> <p>2.The Applicants understand that the land is currently used for agriculture and therefore compensation through the voluntary agreements reflect the current land use. Where evidence is provided to the Applicants that supports alternative use or value, this will be considered as part of the heads of terms negotiations.</p> <p>The Applicants note the concerns around the proximity of the cable corridor to the caravan park and will continue to engage with Mr Kirkham to ensure mitigation and accommodation works are identified where possible. While the Applicants do not have the detailed design available at this stage of the project, the design and layout of the construction working areas will seek to reduce impacts of neighbouring businesses and to allow the continued operation of the caravan park. Mitigation measures identified to manage the potential effects of construction noise will be managed through Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan(s), which will be developed from the Outline Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (REP4-032). Noise limits will be enforced with an aim to reduce construction noise levels as far as possible.</p> <p>Regarding the business loss, provision has been made for the business loss to the caravan park within the Property Cost Estimates (updated at Deadline 5, Document Refs D1.3/F03 and D1.4/F03), which forms part of the funding statement (REP4-011). Any attributable and evidenced loss of income as a result of the construction of the Transmission Assets would be payable by the Applicants in accordance with the compensation code.</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP4-155 155.3	<p>3. The environmental assessments, particularly within the planned route are inadequate, incomplete, glossed over and the effect will be severe.</p> <p>For example the applicant plans to fill in a pond near our holiday park which attracts many rare wildfowl - pintail in particular. There is no mention of this in the assessments.</p> <p>Further, there are at least 2 other ponds within the route which are not coloured in on the map and so effectively they have not been assessed and appear not to exist. Will these ponds be filled in also ?</p> <p>I would like the inspectorate to investigate these matters thoroughly.</p> <p>4. The mitigation areas to attract wildfowl and pink footed geese in particular is nonsensical.</p> <p>The geese will go further afield away from the noise.</p> <p>The proposed plan will attract geese directly under the flight path to Blackpool airport.</p> <p>Pink footed geese travel much further to feed than the applicant states in their application.</p> <p>It would be more sensible to feed the pink footed geese 10 miles away from the planned route !</p> <p>In any case, said pink footed geese have only grazed in the planned route area in the last 20 years.</p> <p>Prior to that they grazed between Southport and Liverpool and between Out Rawcliffe and Cockerham between 8 and 30 miles away !</p>	<p>3. The Applicants have undertaken a detailed and robust Environmental Impact Assessment, applying a realistic worst case for each topic that informs reasonable and robust conclusions.</p> <p>With regard to ponds that are encountered during the construction process that were not previously identified, where it is not reasonably practicable or possible to micro-site around a newly identified pond within the Order Limits, the ecological clerk of works will determine the nature conservation value of the pond before agreeing on an appropriate course of action. For example, if it is a newly dug pond with limited aquatic life and marginal vegetation, a commitment to post-construction re-instatement may be sufficient to mitigate any effect. Where higher ecological value ponds are identified (in the professional judgement of the ecological clerk of works) that cannot be avoided, further compensatory pond(s) may be incorporated within the existing mitigation land within the Order Limits. Further pre-construction surveys of the pond(s) may be undertaken as necessary to inform the evaluation of nature conservation value</p> <p>4. The Applicants note that the area at Lytham Moss, underneath the Blackpool Airport flightpath, is widely known as an area where pink-footed geese congregate to feed due to the highly productive reclaimed fenland and the arable crops that are grown on it. This area is actually so important for pink-footed geese that it is mapped as being Functionally Linked Land (FLL) to the nearby Ribble and Alt estuaries SPA.</p> <p>The Applicants also note that they are not the first to suggest feeding of geese in this area, and in fact feeding of pink-footed geese has been undertaken in the field adjacent to that proposed by the Applicants for a number of years now as mitigation for the Queensway housing development and M55 link road updates.</p> <p>The Applicants note that pink-footed geese do indeed travel further than 20km but this is the accepted core range of wintering pink-footed geese, and this distance is a commonly used tool to assess impacts on SPAs (NatureScot, 2016). The Applicants would like to draw attention to Natural England's response</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
		<p>to the Examining Authority's Q6.1.15 in REP3-095 (Natural England Responses to the Examining Authority's written questions):</p> <p><i>"As a general rule, mitigation should be applied as close as possible to the point of impact. We highlight that the fundamental purpose of the mitigation is to address the impacts, which should result in no overall net change in risk within the airport area of concern. The Airport's area of concern is extensive and already overlaps significant areas of Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA Functionally Linked Land (FLL) and the SPA/Ramsar site itself. Therefore, we advise there is more emphasis on maintaining the natural state of the remaining unimpacted areas within the SPA and FLL through avoidance and where that is not possible, making every effort to reduce/minimise impacts. Having to relocate mitigation beyond the Airport's area of concern would likely impose a significant energetic impact on species impacted in the FLL area. Plus, we advise that there is a higher likelihood of the new mitigation area not providing the required ecological functionality of that lost, so would risk not being ecologically appropriate."</i></p> <p>This sets out the general principles that must be adhered to when assigning mitigation. The Applicants note that the provision of food in an area near to where the impacts are predicted to be greatest, and in an area already frequented by high numbers of pink-footed geese fulfils these requirements. The Applicants are also in discussion with Blackpool Airport to ensure that this proposed mitigation does not impact Blackpool Airport's safeguarding responsibilities and are working with the airport to ensure that all of the appropriate measures are in place to allow the airport to continue working at their current risk level.</p> <p>The Applicants note the information regarding the historical foraging patterns of pink-footed geese in the area but also note that this does not impact on their responsibilities to provide mitigation under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017).</p>
REP4-155 155.4	5. The proposed route is basically totally invalid when there is an alternative route which would save £900 million and cause probably 1- 2% of the economic, social and environmental cost.	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).

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). 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). See also the submission from National Grid at Deadline 3 - NGET Responses to ExQ1(103122766.1) (REP3-088)</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 Paul Hamilton Ellis

Table 2.6: RPE4-170 – Paul Hamilton Ellis

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP4-170 170.1	We have now received (several) notifications of the applicants intention to amend the DCO plan on our clients land. We have not be issued with or seen published a revised plan but now note that a 32 day consultation period appears to have commenced. When will we be issued with the full information regarding this?	The Applicants issued the Change Request consultation notice to Mr Ellis on 7 th August and a copy of the correspondence was issued to Mr Ellis' land agent on 8 th August. The notification included an overview plan of the proposed changes and also contained links to the documents on the Applicants website which includes detailed plans. Until a decision has been made by the Examining Authority as to whether the Change Request is accepted for examination, (which is expected the week commencing the 22 nd September) the Application proposals and documents remain as submitted. If the Change Request is approved by the Examining Authority, the Applicants will incorporate the

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
		changes into the Application documents and the examination will consider the Application as changed. Until such time a decision is made, the Applicants are still seeking to negotiate the original rights applied for over the plots affected.

2.7 Sheila Margaret Hall

Table 2.7: RPE4-173 – Sheila Margaret Hall

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
REP4-173 173.1	<p>Sheila Hall, a local farmer representing the family farm.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to speak at this hearing.</p> <p>Sadly, despite the comments made at the first Compulsory Acquisition hearing on 2 May the applicants' agents have not engaged meaningfully with my agent on the heads of terms documents over the intervening months. My agent and I are committed to progressing these discussions with the aim of reaching a voluntary agreement but our ability to do so depends on the project team engaging constructively with us.</p> <p>I would also like to highlight that my agent and I are still struggling to get answers to our questions on the proposed approach on the different areas of my land. Our questions relate to issues that fundamentally impact what the land can and cannot be used for during both the construction phases and in the future, which impacts the plans for the farm and what can and cannot be done long term and short term.</p> <p>My impacted fields are prime grassland that currently produce good quality silage to feed dairy cows. I do not understand how the applicants can state in their documents that we will be able to resume current agricultural practice while they also say that they do not yet know the location of key items such as joint bays and link boxes which are likely to significantly and permanently impact the future activity on the land.</p>	<p>The Applicants acknowledge that the heads of terms negotiations with Sheila Hall are still ongoing. They met with Ms Halls' agent on the 12th August and had a subsequent follow up meeting with Ms Hall on the 12th August at the landowner engagement event. The Applicants believe negotiations are still progressing and hope to have concluded negotiations by the close of examination.</p> <p>During the meeting on 12th August the Applicants provided detail to Ms Hall regarding how the construction and installation of the cables could take place on the land. This included discussion of the principles of crossing points, severance of land, drainage matters and how consultation would be undertaken with Ms Hall and any occupier of the land prior to the construction of the works, this is secured in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (REP4-026) and within the Outline Onshore Construction Method Statement (REP4-115).</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	<p>The lack of meaningful discussions over recent months is deeply disappointing. However, the project team issued a letter last week on 24 July stating their willingness to work with me and my agent on the agreements. I ask that this time the project team live up to that statement over the coming weeks so that we can make progress.</p> <p>And finally, I just want to note it is really good that the project team are holding a further land agent engagement meeting at Myerscough College as unfortunately not all of us landowners had the opportunity to go to the July one due to issues with the mailing for the invitations. So hopefully the project team will be able to engage more meaningfully with a number of us landowners in the coming week</p> <p>Thank you</p>	
REP4-173 173.2	<p>Further points arising from the hearing:</p> <p>Decommissioning</p> <p>The decommissioning plan including requirements need to be in the DCO so it is binding and not left to individual documents with land owners.</p> <p>The decommissioning requirements need to include that any infrastructure that is above or at ground level and to a depth of 0.9m is removed at decommissioning and that the land is then reinstated so that normal agricultural operations can be resumed.</p>	<p>The Applicants firstly refer to Requirement 22 of Schedules 2A and 2B of the draft DCO (REP4-007) which requires that an onshore decommissioning plan must be submitted to the relevant planning authority for approval within six months of the operational lifetime of each project coming to an end. Given it is not yet clear what the surrounding environment will be at this time, and the fact that technology and decommissioning techniques may have progressed substantially, it is standard practice for the details of the decommissioning plan to be provided closer to the time of decommissioning, and the current drafting of Requirement 22 aligns with this.</p> <p>Commitment 36 within the Commitments Register (REP4-018) states that this onshore decommissioning plan will include provisions for the removal of all onshore above ground infrastructure, and the decommissioning of below ground infrastructure (if and where relevant and practicable),</p>
REP4-173 173.3	<p>Impact on farm businesses</p> <p>Is it reasonable that the applicants dismiss considering the request to position link boxes at the edge of fields just because it would increase their construction costs while positioning the link boxes mid field will significantly and permanently damages the ongoing income of the farm businesses?</p>	<p>At this stage, the detailed design of the project is not completed, however during the discussion with Ms Hall on the 12th August, the Applicants explained the process that would be followed prior to construction works commencing as set out in the Agricultural Holdings Indicative Mitigation Plan REP4-111.</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
	<p>The proposed projects will significantly and permanently impact the future use of the land impacted by the cable corridor.</p> <p>The protracted construction periods over both projects will mean the impacted land is out of use for many years from when the work starts, through to when the reinstatement work is completed and the land recovers. For farms the impact on the land drainage, the position of items such as of the many link boxes and joint bays will determine whether it is possible to plough, grow crops including good quality grass or mow in the fields in the future. In addition, there is the devastating impact of the substantial area of farm land permanently lost to the location of the substation. Consequently, the viability of many businesses is fundamentally threatened by the proposed projects and given the current approach proposed by the applicants many farm businesses in the Fylde will probably cease.</p>	
REP4-173 173.4	<p>There is clearly a significant and permanent threat to the viability of a number of businesses as a result of proposals for the transmission assets. So given the compulsory acquisition guidance why is it acceptable for the applicants to not have considered meaningful alternative options? At the CAH2 hearing the applicants argued they had considered alternative sites for the substations but that was only within a very narrow area predicated on the proposed cable routes which have not yet been approved. The requirement to consider alternatives surely applies to the proposed location of the transmission assets as a whole. As has been raised a number of times at the hearings there is a credible alternative route, referred to as the northern route, that the applicants have refused to even consider.</p>	<p>The Applicants have considered the business losses within the property cost estimate as part of the funding statement (REP4-011). In addition to this, the Applicants submitted a summary of potential mitigations that could be considered to reduce the impact on the farming business at Deadline 4 (REP4-111).</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). 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</p>

Reference	IP submission	Applicants' response
		(REP2-035). See also the submission from National Grid at Deadline 3 - NGET Responses to ExQ1(103122766.1) (REP3-088)