

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 13 April 2026 12:01  
**To:** Morgan and Morecambe OWFTA  
**Subject:** Request for information 13th April deadline IP [REDACTED]

Please see my response to the SoS for the Morgan and Morecambe offshore wind farm.

**Interested party reference number** [REDACTED]

The first point I would like to make is the lack of common ground between the applicants and BAe Systems regarding the Bird Strike risk assessment.

**Page 2 and 3 items 4-14.**

It is imperative to note that this risk cannot be fully mitigated no matter what mitigations are put in place, especially to satisfy the needs of what I would describe as a badly designed transmission route that has been designed around minimising cost and having not considered human health, community concerns and public safety. Freckleton has still not recovered or forgot the worst ever military disaster in the country's history, losing a whole generation of our children amongst the 61 killed and must not be expected to have to live in fear of a repeat of this tragedy.

The mass migrating, the feeding grounds, the flight paths and the roosting grounds of these birds which includes thousands upon thousands of large wading birds has been known for hundreds of years, way before the Warton aerodrome was even thought about.

With this prior knowledge the initial risk assessment and the monitoring of these birds made the initial risk assessment fairly straight forward for BAe Systems. Attempts to create a new risk assessment would be impossible in ascertaining the way these birds will react to this application.

This is emphasised in the International Bird Strike Committee's (IBSC25/WP-OS3 by Dr J.R. Allan) protocol for Bird Strike Risk Assessment at Airports in which it states "military airfields use an 8-statute-mile radius from the centre point of runways for statutory safeguarding against developments that might attract birds".

[REDACTED],

"It is probably safest to avoid attempting to assign probabilities to levels of damage and simply to assume that, in general, slower aircraft are less likely to sustain damage than faster moving ones (military jet fighters operating at low level are probably at the greatest risk from bird strike), that turboprop engines are less vulnerable than jets, and that large flocks of large birds are more likely to cause serious damage. 3.3.3 Risks versus hazards Once a risk has been deemed unacceptable, some evaluation of the value of the hazard needs to be made in order to inform the risk management process that follows. For example, if an airport is constructed in the middle of an internationally important wetland the conservation value of the bird life present there may be judged to be so high that any management action to reduce what could be a severe hazard to aircraft is deemed unacceptable."

The Fylde simply cannot accept this risk and the phrase to mitigate for a "REDUCED RISK" to a bird strike should never be considered. When a military aerodrome is surrounded by urbanisation there has to be absolutely no increased risk whatsoever.

You can only introduce new infrastructure that does not put the community's safety into jeopardy otherwise to destroy the community destroys the concept. One of my peers who has knowledge second to none and has studied these birds for the last 45 years, worked at BAe Systems on this very issue, and has said that the way these birds would react to the disturbance would be impossible to ascertain before the project has been completed. The flight paths, feeding grounds and roosting grounds would undoubtedly be greatly affected. A risk assessment could only be carried out post project completion which is unacceptable. The 13km exclusion zone is there for a reason and ultimately this would then require BAe Systems to close down until the new risk has been assessed as not having created an increased risk.

Consideration has also got to given to the latest BAe Systems recent contract to supply 20 Typhoon Jets to Turkey by 2030 which is going to entail numerous test flights in and around the same time as the Applicants projected timescales. Unmitigated bride strike issues may well render this contract unachievable.

There is also another consideration now which is also in dispute with BAe Systems and the Applicants, concerning our national security, the fact the wind turbines are affecting BAe Systems radar systems, this again is another potential risk you would be expecting our community to absorb.

I repeat, destroy the community destroy the concept. For significant infrastructure projects of this magnitude, it should be imperative that you have to take the community with you and look at a different less devastating route that this CAN take, you cannot just accept the cheapest route for the benefit and profiteering of M&M.

**Page 5 item 24.**

Regarding the concerns in relation to the substations visual screening and the adverse impacts of the proposed substations.

My thoughts are that the sheer magnitude of these substations on our last piece of greenbelt in the village, render the possibility of screening impossible. Their idea to screen by planting trees is wholly unacceptable considering the timescale for these trees to grow to a size that could provide or alleviate the views to an acceptable level and certainly not in my lifetime. During the consultation period there was no acceptable photographic evidence provided for the community to scrutinise. The only artist impressions of the substations, about 109 pictures have been submitted to the PI as late as the 28<sup>th</sup> January 2026, this being after the end of the examination period and years after the initial public consultation. This information should surely have been provided at the initial consultation and the only conclusion you can come to is that the consultation was seriously flawed. Another seriously flawed example is that as my family is the nearest receptor to the Morecambe substation, out of the 109 photos and artist impressions not a single photo has been taken from the grounds of my property to highlight what it is going to look like for me, my family and all of the other lower lane receptors. This begs the question, why this set of photographs does not show views from lower lane, which happens to be right next to the substations and is providing the route to the main entrance? M&M have dodged this question on numerous occasions, with their only excuse stating that “they could not take photos from everywhere due to timescale”, even though I pointed out to them they had to drive down lower lane in order to get to some of the other spots they actually had taken photos from. They are simply hiding the truth from the receptors. I live [REDACTED] across from the Morecambe substation and still have no idea what it is going to look like. That cannot be right!

The light, air and noise pollution from these substations is wholly unacceptable to all receptors living on lower lane and the nearby vicinity. The air pollution will have a massive effect on my family, the property and indeed myself and my family will be permanently covered in dust and having to breath it all in. The article 8 of the human rights act 1998 relative to my family have been given zero consideration from the applicants. I have been offered no empathy or compensation from the applicants with regards to the situation they are forcing on me and they have shown no consideration for the mental health and stress their application has caused. I have been in the construction industry for [REDACTED] years and know exactly what is coming down the line from the millions of tons of aggregate being delivered to site right opposite my home.

Which leads on to the next issue.

**Page 7.8. relating to the funding for CA and Blight payments of Morecambe offshore wind farm ltd.**

This is a very disturbing issue that would affect myself and my family. Should approval be granted we are submitting substantial claims of 30fold the estimated total of potential blight payments put forward by the applicants, this will dwarf the £100k per substation estimate in the Applicants costings, and that is just one of the many receptors who find themselves in a similar situation. We require certainty that funds will be made available to satisfy this demand and that CIP have agreed that they will absorb all future claims. It goes without saying that claims cannot be initiated until the final decision on approval has been decided.

**Page 9 item 47 the Wrea Green Equitation Centre.**

My thoughts are that the equality act has not been addressed when considering the potential closure of Wrea Green Equitation Centre. WGEC is a home to many disadvantaged children and up to 5000 horse riding lessons per year for the disadvantaged in our community. I have lived around and owned horses for many years, these are flight animals

and it is inconceivable that they can be housed anywhere near to this proposed development. WGEC will have no option other than to go out of business.

**Comments on item 30 page 6. Fares Farm.**

Having been a neighbour of Fares farm for many years and have had known the family personally for [REDACTED] years, I find it inconceivable that a generational farm, that is recognised throughout the whole country for its expertise, has been put in this situation. They are the backbone of not just the local community but the county's essential dependency on dairy produce. Their farmland has been given little or no consideration when selecting a site location. Other options were available to the applicants and this is emphasised by the Mooir Vannin design. Fares farm should be thanked, appreciated and fully supported by the government to continue serving us with their dairy farm, just as they are now within the Fylde Community.

As the 13<sup>th</sup> of April is the deadline date for submissions to the many outstanding issues you have with numerous stakeholders and interested parties being so soon before the decision date, I find myself bewildered as to how all these issues could be addressed in time, responded to verbally and actually actioned upon to bring to a satisfactory conclusion.

On the issue of items that have supposedly been addressed I would like to submit that I am not happy with the amount of non-disclosure agreements and the fact that objections that initially raised grave safety concerns, i.e. the Sabic TPEP have now withdrawn their objections without explaining the reasons behind them to the Fylde communities.

The destruction this application is about to unleash on Fylde communities is too big a price to pay for what is now less than 25% of the original generation assets and the alternative route to Stanah must surely now become the default location.

In summary, the design to get from the generation assets to Penwortham must be recognised as a **BAD** design based purely on cost with a total disregard to human health and human rights and the many concerns within the Fylde communities. It is doomed to fail and has to be revisited and redesigned around putting the communities first regardless of the extra cost. The Treasury's green book guidance seems to have been totally ignored by the applicants, should they have attempted to implement it, then I believe the transmission assets design would have failed at stage 1.

**Destroy the Community Destroy the Concept.**

As a foot note may I suggest that an acknowledgement of my concerns would be greatly appreciated as to date it appears the Applicants have simply been ignoring them in a manner that gives the impression they have already been granted approval.

Kind regards

David Barlow.

[REDACTED]