

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Morgan and Morecambe OWETA](#)
Subject: 22nd June deadline. IP no [REDACTED] David Barlow
Date: 16 June 2026 13:32:44

Interested party reference number [REDACTED]

Response to 22nd June 2026 deadline.

Having responded to the last two SoS/PI extension notices and also all the deadline dates up to present I find it astonishing that there has not been a single request to the applicants to comment on the effect this is having on human beings within our community.

Noting the last request for information regarding the habitat of the golden plover (items 13/14) within the massive substation site, you will see how this highlights the total lack of concern for the receptors expected to live directly opposite who are unable to fly away from the 11 years of disruption and in the position of not being able to sell their property.

Quote:13. Without prejudice to the conclusions of the Secretary of State's Habitats Regulations Assessment, the Applicants are requested to provide any further information to support their position that habitat loss at the proposed substation sites would not result in an adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA, even if a functional linkage to the SPA cannot be ruled out. The further information should as a minimum: a. quantify land use at the substation sites and how much of specific habitat types, e.g. pasture/arable land etc, will be lost; b. quantify land use in the wider area around the substation site and provide detail on what specific habitats will remain available to impacted features such as golden plover; c. provide information on how these sites are known to be used by golden plover and the potential for these habitats to support birds displaced by the substation site. The Applicants are encouraged to work with Natural England to identify any other information relevant to this assessment.

Quote:14. Applicants are requested to explain if works at the substation sites such as balancing ponds and landscaping works provide opportunities for habitat enhancement works that could benefit golden plover.

Having now lived in limbo for almost the last 4 years, I find it astonishing that this fiasco is still ongoing.

There has been total disregard for human suffering and the empathy shown towards people compared to the Golden Plover simply beggars belief. I have no problem with concerns on wildlife, I love the wildlife, its one of the reasons I live where I live but I would imagine when most people die in my community they would be quite happy coming back as a golden plover.

This application started years ago with the flawed consultation, progressed to the six months examination period to finish on the 29th Oct 2025, then the PI stated three months maximum for the SoS to make a decision and here we are still discussing issues like the Golden Plover. You really couldn't write it.

The applicants have had plenty of time to present the application within the set dates. A decision should have been made on what was put in front of the PI on the final deadline.

It now appears that the government are simply assisting the applicants DCO application, crossing the Ts and dotting the Is, filling in all the missing parts for them and basically marking their own homework. Net Zero will implode, not if but when, and when the country is bankrupt you will walk away into your eutopia with the millions you have accumulated from the green energy scam, oblivious to the mess you have left us all in.

On the request bullet point 39.

Quote: 39. The Applicants are requested to provide any further updates regarding any land right agreements.

Could I ask for clarification on the following regarding the initial land rights tracker and the ongoing situation up to the present time.

As the deadline dates for the application have been constantly extended, has the final agreed uplift been a constant throughout the process. In other words, as the applicant has continually been trying to statistically improve the percentage of agreements made, I am concerned about the protocol that has been implemented.

For instance, have landowners who agreed to sign for an uplift, having been told if they don't sign before a certain deadline date they would lose any further rights to an uplift, been offered new terms once the deadline has been extended.

I know of one landowner who has to date still refused to sign any Heads of Terms agreements, who has been offered three improved uplifts at different stages as the deadlines continue to evolve.

This would then intimate that the original landowners who did sign when pressurised by the first deadline date, should not therefore be held to that agreement. As the deadline dates changed, they should have either been given the option of more time to think about their decision or at the very least given the improved offers offered at a later date to other landowners.

To date there are more than 50% who are refusing to sign Heads of Terms agreements for compulsory purchase uplifts, which speaks volumes for the sentiment in the community behind this badly designed cable corridor and depending on the applicant's response to this, maybe just less than 50% wishing they had not signed Heads of Terms in the first place when pressurised to do so.

On the bird strike issue, item 20. I have this to say.

You are still asking the applicants all sorts of questions on the habitats and effects on the bird population within the 13km exclusion zone around BAe Systems runway, yet in the next breath you are asking BAe Systems to offer you a mitigated risk assessment that they have constantly referred to as "impossible to mitigate".

The simply solution that should have been addressed at the very start of this application is to respect the 13km exclusion zone as it is there for a reason, not just in our country but internationally.

At a time when we can't find the money to defend our country, why are we spending all our money on net zero, what's the point?

We have ONE company that designs builds and test military aircraft to defend our country, BAe Systems.

BAe Systems are not a one trick pony, they are developing all sorts of future military concepts to protect us all and as such are probably the most important company we have.

Their Typhoon jets not only protect us all, they offer you the ability to acquire the F35s from America at a competitive price. Take away our only mass-produced military jet aircraft and you take away any negotiating muscle you have to buy from abroad. At the moment you can say to America if you do not supply the F35 for less than the Typhoon we will order Typhoons for our air force.

This favourable scenario will end should BAe Systems become mothballed due to bird strike issues. If a jet goes down, it will put their operations in jeopardy at a time when the whole country could soon be reliant on them for our national security.

To me this bad cable corridor design has all the hallmarks of a 1st year university graduates project, therefore, there is only one decision available to the SoS and that is to take this nonsensical cable corridor design for what it is, nonsensical, and demand a new design taking it away from BAe Systems or preferably to scrap it altogether and concentrate on the defence of our realm.

Regards

David Barlow