From: Annette
To: Morgan and Morecambe OWFTA
Subject: Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Transmission Assets Project Updates - Right to Respond for IPs [redacted]
Date: 22 June 2026 12:21:42

Interested Party Numbers [redacted] Mr P Sharkey & [redacted] Mrs A Sharkey

Dear Secretary of State,

It is irrational to ask further questions rather than reject this DCO application. The application has too many unresolved issues, financial uncertainty and a clearly better material alternative. The benefits do not outweigh the harm.

Below are the issues we raised last time. None of these issues have been resolved. The ongoing process outside of the public hearings format does not feel equitable, rather being biased towards getting the application over the line without proper scrutiny.

Regards Annette & Pete Sharkey

Begin forwarded message:

From: Annette
Subject: Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Transmission Assets Project Updates - Right to Respond for IPs [redacted] and [redacted]
Date: 9 April 2026 at 14:02:32 BST
To: morganandmorecambeowfta@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Dear Secretary of State,

We wrote to the Planning Inspectorate on 4/2/26 regarding the project update that had been provided by the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms Transmission Assets (M&M). Our Interested Party numbers are [redacted] and [redacted] respectively for Pete & Annette Sharkey. We note that there has now been a request for information on the two project updates (provided by the applicants) from the Secretary of State (SoS)on the 12th of March to a list that includes interested parties. This is our response.

From our personal viewpoints the key points are:

- Landscape and Visual.

Despite raising this at the hearings and repeated requests in writing regarding the visual impact, and lack of renderings. We still do not know if the substations will be dug in or raised up in the landscape to achieve the flat base that will be required. In the last information that we saw provided by M&M the contours around the Morgan substation had been changed but there was nothing around Morecambe. As both substations are on sloped ground this appears to be incorrect. It is therefore not possible to know how effective any proposed screening would be.

- Historic Environment

We are the owners of one of the Heritage assets (listed Building [redacted]) whose setting will be affected my the Morecambe substation. Only one Heritage Asset was mentioned under paragraph 32 by the SoS there are many others.

- Noise - We are no further forward in understanding the expected noise levels that would impact us from the substations.

Regarding the whole Development Consent Order application the other key points appear to be:

- Lack of financial security

In their 30/1/2026 project update the Applicants state regarding Morgan that " it is considered reasonably foreseeable that the project will be developed". No evidence whatsoever is presented to support this position. According to press reports the TCE lease for Morgan has been "lapsed" This was granted through open competition in Round 4. The re-auctioning of this lease has no guarantee of succeeding. Other press reports point to significant doubt as to whether Morgan will now be developed.

The SoS questions still show concerns regarding funding for both Morgan & Morecambe.

- Harm v benefits balance

Assuming Morecambe is accepted to go ahead alone, no mention is made about the lowering of the megawatt contribution to supply. The project, it was acknowledged at the Enquiry, leads to significant harms as well as benefits. Without Morgan, if that proves to be the case, then Morecambe only delivers 25% of the megawatt capacity (benefits), but the harms remain high.

- Biodiversity Net Gain v Bird Strike risk to aviation

This is a crucial conflict which does not have any resolution. The bird strike risk to BAE Warton (and the threat to safety, investment and our defence capability) versus the biodiversity net gain which has to be introduced.

- Site Selection

If Morecambe is accepted to go ahead alone, there will be a lowering of the megawatt contribution to supply. The project, it was acknowledged at the Enquiry, leads to significant harms as well as benefits. Without Morgan, if that proves to be the case, then Morecambe only delivers 25% of the megawatt capacity (benefits), but the harms remain high. This balance has altered if only Morecambe goes ahead. This is a consideration not mentioned by the Applicants. If the Morecambe substation goes ahead on its own the smaller site may well have been placed elsewhere.

- Viable Alternative connections to the National Grid

The evidence regarding the alternative connection at Stanah & Hillhouse mounts. The failure to consider the Green Book exercise promoted by Lancashire CC, Fylde BC and Wyre BC.
Plus the Mona off shore Windfarm has now been allowed to pursue the Stanah alternative connection.

These are not the only the only adverse impacts that are still unresolved or unmitigated. There are many that will be covered in other representations. The sheer volume of unresolved issues at this stage of the process demonstrates the need for rejection or withdrawal.

Regards
Mr & Mrs Sharkey