

Following yesterday's final meeting, it was announced that the Morecambe project owners do not have any monetary assets in respect of possible Blight claims.

As an interested party from [REDACTED], where the proposed substation will be opposite our house in full view and will be subjected to all the noise and upheaval of years of construction which will affect our physical and mental health, I would like to advise of our intent to claim.

We should have brought this up at the meeting as it was mentioned in the event of Blight Claims, there is a current grey area of who would take responsibility for the compensation claims. It is a fact our house would be deemed worthless and we have spent 20 years investing and renovating our home for our retirement so we would definitely be claiming at least a million pound for our losses and ruined life. There seemed to be an impression from the Applicants that no one will be claiming Blight, but I can assure them if this project is given the go ahead, it will be the first thing we will be applying for and therefore this matter needs to be addressed before any decision is made.

Deadline 5 Applicants response: REP5-130 Q2:1.3.1

The first thing I would like to submit is the applicant's response to the EXA for deadline 5 to the action point on the accumulative effects on [REDACTED]

The EXA very kindly asked the applicants for comment and I have to put on record that I was astonished at their reply. In fact, my wife could not speak for days as she was so upset at the lack of effort and humanity shown by the applicant's response.

The reply produced was simply a five minutes copy and paste exercise taken from previous copy and paste dialogue and I would imagine the EXA are as equally astonished.

A simple copy and paste of the already existing receptor charts with all the boxes nicely ticked off, perfectly described to suit their narrative and then dismissed. Surely the panel are not prepared to accept the applicant merely stating quotes like "there is limited potential for significant public health effects" to dismiss my claims.

On top of that they quote other people's opinions regarding other people's situations, again because it happens to fit their narrative. These are quotes from people whose interest it is to gain approval for other projects. They are not relevant to my situation which was the whole purpose of you asking the question in the first place.

When you put together the Mental and Human Health issues, Noise, Vibration, Air Pollution (from probably a million tons of aggregate to be dropped), EMFs issues, views from greenbelt to Substation, Highway safety issues on a road deemed dangerous by both Parish and Fylde council experts to clearly state I am not allowed to use the farm for any business or commercial purposes, and the fact my house is now deemed worthless. When you put all these together it does not equate to "Limited potential for significant public health effects".

Well it's definitely significant to me and my family and obviously totally insignificant to the applicants.

On visual amenities alone the applicant states: page 21

"No occupiers of residential properties within the study area were considered likely to experience a degree of harm beyond that defined as 'substantial' to make considering private views a public interest matter."

They then add the substantial to all the other scenarios of noise, vibration, air pollution, highway safety, EMFs human health, mental health, etc. and come up with "limited potential for significant public health". Honestly, you could not write it. Bulldozing their way through my Human Rights because the NSIP allows them to do so is not just immoral it is downright disgusting. Instead of wrapping their arms around all those affected, they are throwing us under a bus. The applicants are well aware that I will be subject to noise and vibration etc. and will be living in permanent daylight covered in dust. Taking away someone's human rights does not mean you have the right to treat someone like something stuck to the bottom of your shoe.

The applicants have said we are not entitled to a view and no compensation as they are not needing to use my land. Well I was entitled to a view when I bought the property as I was surrounded by greenbelt and all the restrictions from local councils that came with it and I am surely entitled to compensation.

Could the panel honestly say they agree with the applicants and could they look me in the eye and tell me they would want to swap places with me. I am confident and have faith that the EXA know exactly what is coming down the line for me and my family and will act accordingly.

The applicant's deplorable behaviour needs to be called out.

So far I have been ignored, barefaced lied to and given less consideration than a sand worm.

And so it continues with them.

Bird Strike issue:

When the applicants first mooted this idea, did they not look at the vicinity of the airports in particular Bae Systems Warton Aerodrome. It beggars belief that the idea was not immediately stopped in its tracks. Did they not look at the history of my Village having suffered the worst ever military air disaster in 1944 when we lost 58 people including, teachers and a whole generation of 38 of our children. They are not forgotten and never will be, go and have a look at the graveside memorial and how well it is kept, always manicured and dressed with beautiful flower arrangements. Come and see the annual memorial service attended by the American Air Force personnel who sadly lost 3 of their pilots on the test flight and the memorial they gather around in a special memorial garden to remember all those who lost their lives. Well, we have numerous test flights flying above our heads every day, and we pray to God that we never have to go through that experience again. Freckleton does not want or deserve to have this risk hanging over us.

So this brings me to the BAe objection regarding the Bird Strike increased probability issue.

It breaks my heart to hear things discussed at the meetings like, BAe are in none disclosure commercial agreement talks with applicants and "could be impossible to mitigate" and "looking at reducing the risk to an agreed acceptable level".

Really! Freckleton does not want a reduced acceptable level of risk, we want no risk at all, at the very worst we will accept the level of risk we have now.

BAe have spent years monitoring the birds, their habitats, their sanctuaries and their flight paths and feeding grounds. At present we cope with the dangers that we face, we do not want that risk increased in any way, shape or form. Nobody knows how those thousands of geese that fly over my house every day, going to their feeding grounds, are going to react until the project begins, so it is impossible to mitigate.

Please copy and paste this link on you tube <https://youtu.be/2eUeLp9ONwg> showing the Geese at a feeding ground directly on the cable corridor within one mile of the runway.

I cannot change this link to a file in order to upload onto my submission.

These are just a small percentage of the population, the majority are, as I write this submission, feeding and roosting around the substation sites.

This should give you a reality check and perspective of the numbers involved and the issues that are facing BAe Systems regarding the safety of the general public.

The project must therefore either not be approved or at the very least taken away from the 13km safeguarding zone of Warton Aerodrome.

None Disclosure Agreements:

I would also like to state that none disclosure agreements should never be allowed when it involves the safety of the public

and they have every right to know everything that increases their risk to life especially with BAe Systems. This also goes for the SABIC high pressure ethylene pipeline NDA that was mentioned at the last meeting. SABIC agreed to drop all objections, but because of the NDA, the public do not know why, this surely cannot be right.

When a fractured pipeline can release one of the worst carcinogens known to man then my community deserves to know whether they are 100% safe and not subject to a behind closed doors NDA financial agreement.

There appears to be many private sector heads of terms agreements that been executed throughout this process under NDA's, whereby they have withdrawn objections. Unless the reasons are disclosed to the Fylde residents then they will always appear to be tantamount to bribes or even blackmail. We need to know why these have been subjected to a NDA agreement and why they want the public to be impervious to these arrangements.

NDA's are extremely worrying for the general public.

Highways:

On the issue of Lower Lane in Freckleton, I am sure the EXA know my views on this by now.

However, on the issue of the main entrance being on Lower lane you will note the Applicants state on the REP5:130 page 21 & 22, that the main entrance off Lower Lane will only be used when the unmanned substation is operational. Therefore, can I ask the EXA to insist that this entrance is NOT used until the substation is operational and introduced into the conditions of the application to only be constructed shortly before the substation is operational.

Any further traffic on, or disruption to, Lower Lane will inevitably lead to more traffic on Kirkham Rd, I know the EXA are aware of the traffic situation on Kirkham Rd, especially near to the Strike Lane primary school.

Please also note my concerns that satellite navigation systems will not recognise the temporary road access and will automatically direct them to Lower Lane. If this main entrance is available, it will be utilized and will eventually become the norm.

Flotation Energy:

So it now appears that Flotation Energy have no assets! therefore can I please put on record that I will be applying for blight compensation, £1.3m house value now deemed worthless and an even more substantial amount for the misery they have put my family through for three years and going forward for another 11 years should they get approval.

Because of this application my [REDACTED] which are having a serious adverse effect on her [REDACTED]. I am suffering [REDACTED] also and trying to protect and look after my wife [REDACTED].

My claim will definitely be substantial which is a word the applicant appears to not have got to grips with yet. Can I please ask the EXA to insist funds are in place to cover not just mine but all the other claims that are likely to be on hold pending judgement.

Equality Rights:

There is a big issue with equality rights that the applicant appears to be ignorant to.

For instance, I recently revisited the Wrea Green equestrian centre where my daughter learnt to ride between the ages of 7 and 11 and went on to become an accomplished showjumper. It is a fantastic contribution to our community, especially kids, but more importantly to our disabled community. A disabled community who rely on us to look after them. The joy and excitement on their faces was a joy to behold, it reminded me of the great times I used to have when taking my daughter Geena for lessons, however my eyes were always drawn to the look on the faces of the disabled riders. Our community is full of appreciation for [REDACTED] who is so proud to be making their lives more enjoyable, her life is so full of fulfilment and has been for the last 40 years. These are the moments you realise the most important things in life.

There surely must be something within the Equality Act to protect our disabled, disadvantaged and elderly citizens. I have not seen any form of engagement yet from the applicants which I find disgraceful. It looks blatantly obvious to me that the applicants have not shown "due regard" to certain groups that are protected by the equality act. I sincerely hope that none disclosure agreements have not been used to disguise their commitment.

We live in an area that has probably the highest elderly population in the country, many of these people have no internet or don't know how to use the internet. They have all been ignored and forgotten, yet their lives like ours are about to be greatly affected. If the applicant is not bothered about these people and are not legally bound by legislation, then this is wrong and needs correcting. Surely the Examining Authority has some sort of duty of care to them. We cannot simply discard them and take advantage of them because they are not able to stand up for themselves.

Tourism:

For the applicants to totally dismiss the effects on tourism is an absolute nonsense, I am sure the EXA are fully aware of the ongoing effects on tourism and will not be going along with the applicant's position.

Tourism has already been affected by all the recent press coverage and the Fylde are waking up to the dangers they will all now face.

Lytham St Anne's and Blackpool rely heavily on tourism. Hotels, Restaurants and Public Houses etc. are all now gradually becoming aware of the dire situation they will find themselves in as this application moves from a "never going to happen project" to the reality that is has moved to a "likely it is going to happen project".

The many long lasting problematic highway issues and numerous eyesores will stop people coming to the Fylde.

They will be stuck in traffic once, never to return and will instead be heading up north to other attractions for a day out.

Star Gate is of great concern to the community, many people come from miles away to walk their dogs there on a daily basis, also bringing much needed income to the area. It even attracts horse riders to the beach. This is the gateway to Blackpool Promenade and any disruption will be devastating.

Hotels will suffer greatly and they will struggle to survive, this will have a huge effect on all the business's in the area. Staff will be laid off and struggle to find alternative work as restaurants and pubs and shops will close.

Blackpool will suffer immensely as they wholly rely on tourism. This is an area that needs to have arms wrapped around them and not simply be forgotten as they have been in the past.

They are already in a battle for survival and they would see this as maybe the last nail in their coffin.

The knock on effect of all this will be plummeting house prices. The people of Lytham St Anne's have invested heavily in their houses, all at inflated prices but an investment that gives them access to a vibrant town centre full of great restaurants, public houses and shops.

Take all that away and many of those with mortgages will be in negative equity with little to look forward to and unable to move elsewhere.

The effects on tourism will be beyond devastating for these towns and has to be a consideration regarding approval decisions.

To summarize, there are far too many negative objections regarding this application. This may have seemed a good idea many years ago, however, as it has evolved over the recent years and especially this recent 6 months, the devastating effects that are constantly coming to light, reiterate the need for common sense to prevail.

Getting from A to B maybe yes, but the destruction of this route in the middle bit is beyond comprehension and must therefore surely be REFUSED.

Kind regards

David Barlow