

From: [Rosaleen Forsey](#)
To: [Morgan and Morecambe OWFTA](#)
Subject: Response to letter of 20 May 2026. From IP [REDACTED]
Date: 22 June 2026 21:13:33

Your Ref: EN020032

My Ref: Interested Party Ref number: [REDACTED]

To:

SoS DESNZ c/o John Wheadon
3 - 8 Whitehall Place
LONDON
SW1A 2AW

By email to: morganandmorecambeowfta@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Dear Secretary of State

Response to letter 20th May 2026

Introduction

This is my response to the SOS letter of 20th May 2026 inviting further comments and information regarding the application by Morgan Offshore Wind Limited and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Limited for an Order granting Development Consent for the proposed Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms Transmission Assets

From local resident Ros Forsey, Squires Gate resident and founder member of the, 'Fylde Says No! Campaign', and regular attendee at all related consultation hearings.

Members of, 'Fylde Says No!' including myself have attended all of the consultation hearings related to this application and continue to carry out public information and street consultation events, including, leafleting, encouraging and assisting residents with submissions, information gatherings and street and beach protests. We also continue to meet regularly to monitor the progress of this application and to reach out to local residents, many of whom are still unaware of it or the impact it will have on the Fylde, if approved .

Withdrawal of partner applicant Morgan Offshore Wind Limited

I note the SOS's announcement that the final decision deadline re this application is now extended until 14th September 2026. It is hard to fathom the reason for this, given that the SOS letter of 20 May 2026 clearly demonstrates that the already numerous serious matters still outstanding, including those involving risk to human life, have actually increased rather than decreased following the withdrawal of one of the original partner applicants, Morgan Offshore Wind Limited. This seems an inadequate length of time within which to further scrutinise, interrogate and resolve these matters in a transparent, fair and ethical manner, given that a mere 12 weeks of this 4 month extension now remain.

In addition, since Morgan Offshore withdrew their financial backing and support, and it

was apparent that this was not going to initiate a simple change from one partner investor to another, it's clear that all of the prior agreements that were put in place by that partner with Blackpool Airport for example, and also a variety of independent landowners and various local Councils must all now be null and void.

Even if the seemingly desperate, last minute and somewhat unethical, (given the conflict of interest), invitation from The Crown for new potential partners to tender to fill the application partnership vacancy left by Morgan Offshore were successful, what the SOS would in fact be looking at by this stage would be a completely different application, involving an entirely unknown partner tearing up the Fylde to link up 30, as opposed to the originally proposed 90 wind turbines with the National Grid.

All of these previous agreements then, would therefore surely need to be reexamined, renegotiated and reinstated along side a completely new public and stakeholder consultation process.

ExA Consultation Hearings - unfit for purpose

In the unlikelihood of a new partner applicant emerging from this rubble and seeking to continue with the application then a new consultation process should be embarked upon. With this in mind it's appropriate here to offer some feedback on last year's consultation with M&M, as a full participant in this process and a frequent attendee at the public hearings.

As I, and others raised repeatedly, both in person during the face to face 2025 ExA hearings not least in many of our written submissions, a great many of those who attended found the whole process inadequate and soul destroying in the extreme. This was due to a variety of aspects. Venues were chosen in far flung often inaccessible places, usually in Blackpool, and as such situated nowhere near the suggested locations for the proposed cable transmission work in question. Advertising was minimal and those who did manage to attend largely did so as a result of information that was shared locally by word of mouth.

There were no leaflet drops to local homes and businesses, no signs or billboards in public places, no adverts on local TV or radio, no information or support staff at local community centres and libraries assisting people with the process and related submissions, no minibuses to enable elderly and disabled residents to participate and no loudspeaker vans touring the area sharing information about these hugely important hearings. There was nothing.

Those of us who did manage to find our way along were then repeatedly left with questions unanswered, requests for information ignored and matters of concern repeatedly overridden and on occasion openly laughed at. What we were ultimately being consulted on was an abstract project and all of the knowledge and understanding we developed about it along the way came as a result of our own independent online, in-depth investigations, research and discussions.

In short, all aspects of these consultation hearings were unfit for purpose and in the event of another partner applicant being accepted, the very least that should happen is that we should see an absolute return to the drawing board and an immediate adoption of a much more robust, transparent and user friendly consultation process, one that is fitting to the

supposed democratic and fair country we live in.

In addition to the above and in relation to the letter in question my other comments and key concerns and objections by way of a response are:

Ongoing unmitigated birdstrike risks.

The chosen route for the cables running from the Morecambe Bay offshore windfarm to the National Grid at Penwortham will pass close to both Blackpool Airport and BAE Warton Aerodrome. From day one of the ExA consultations the issue of increased risk of bird strikes on planes and jets using both of these flight centres has been raised by various residents, groups and local representatives. Throughout the process these concerns were routinely dismissed in the most cavalier fashion, even to the point where it was suggested by representatives of the Applicant, M&M, that concerned residents living in the respective flight paths when raising this matter were using, 'overly emotional language', being, 'dramatic', and, 'exaggerating', when sharing their concerns and fears. What an unprecedented and strange way to respond to people asking questions relating to a serious potential risk to their lives. This did however serve to give attendees a flavour, very early on, of the tone the consultations were likely to take when addressing and communicating with local people and stakeholders and we were not wrong in that respect.

Apparently an agreement of some sort was made with Blackpool Airport back then, in relation to this birdstrike risk and this was covered by an NDA. These are both presumably now no longer applicable following the Morgan Offshore Wind Farm Ltd's withdrawal from the application.

As regards Warton Aerodrome, representatives from BAE Warton have repeatedly stated during the consultation and in local media interviews that the substantial risk of birdstrikes on aircraft using Warton Aerodrome cannot be mitigated.

Kier Starmer visited Warton Aerodrome in a hail of publicity on Tuesday 28th October 2025, not to discuss these serious issues as one might imagine, but to announce the signing of an £8 billion deal with Turkey, signed the day before to provide them with 20 Euro fighter Typhoon jets, with the first jets due to be delivered in 2030, with an option for more in the future. The building and testing of these jets will clearly coincide with the proposed cable work, should this project go ahead. In this scenario the existing possibility of a serious birdstrike on a high velocity jet along the Fylde would be further and dramatically increased. I don't need to be an aviation expert to know that such an occurrence would cause a very serious, major 'accident', involving widespread destruction and loss of life. This project can surely not morally, ethically or legally be given approval whilst this stalemate exists?

Lack of Equality Impact Assessment

As far as I am aware from having attended the hearings and asked many questions while there, no EqIA has ever been carried out with regard to this application. I understand that private companies and organisations are not bound by these requirements, but ethically one could be forgiven for thinking they might want to pursue one as evidence of good ethical practice, but The National Inspectorate is a public body and as such I would have expected them to be robustly pursuing this as a legal necessity.

The initial most obvious and blatant omission in this regard is the lack of an EqIA to

determine what the owners anticipate to be a, 'devastating impact', on the considerable numbers of disabled children and adults who currently enjoy horse riding facilities at Wrea Green Equestrian Centre. The owners of the centre, established in 1981 as an accredited Rider Accessibility Mark Centre specialising in tailored lessons for riders of all abilities, particularly those connected to the, 'Riding for the Disabled Association', and, 'Seaside Venture group', are most definite in their verdict that in the event of this application gaining approval Wrea Green would undoubtedly be forced to close.

According to [Riding for the Disabled Association \(RDA\)](#) disabled people enjoy horse riding because it offers a unique combination of physical freedom, emotional connection, and a sense of achievement that is often hard to find in other activities. The RDA testify that 80% of disabled riders see physical improvements within just 12 weeks. What will become of the disabled riders who currently use Wrea Green RC, with the closest alternative being some 55 miles away in Knutsford, Cheshire? As repeatedly suggested, requested and ultimately, in some desperation, demanded during the consultation ... an EqIA should have been carried out with regard to Wrea Green, with the utmost urgency before any decision was made by the ExA re this proposed cable transmission project because what this situation indicates is that disabled people as a protected group, (under the Equality Act 2010), would be disproportionately affected should the application go ahead.

I have raised this repeatedly and have received neither an answer nor an explanation as to why this has not happened.

In addition, we know here from the Office for National Statistics that there are a disproportionate number of older people living along the Fylde coast, particularly within the Borough of Fylde, which has one of the highest median ages in the North West of England. Data indicates that the area has a population structure significantly older than the national average.

As of the 2021 census, 28.4% of Fylde's population (approx. 24,000 people) were aged 65 years or older. This is much higher than the 18.7% average across England. There is a steadily rising average age and between 2011 and 2021, the median age in Fylde increased from 47 to 50 years. By 2024, estimates suggest the median age to have reached 51.9, which is over 11 years older than the UK average. The 65+ population in the district is projected to grow by 56.5% between 2018 and 2043.

An EqIA also needs to be carried out as regards this group because what these figures indicate is that older people as a protected group, (under the Equality Act 2010), will be disproportionately affected in terms of the disruption to Fylde infrastructure, including public transport and public roads and highways. It's clear that this 11 year project, will particularly impact on those within the age groups mentioned here, residents who already experience disproportionate levels of social isolation and poverty, and are therefore at increased risk of loneliness and poor eating habits resulting in ill health and disability. Any reduced access to reliable and timely public transport will impact their access to local amenities including the targeted support services available to them along the Fylde coast. These include healthcare support, social and educational opportunities and shopping and banking options, thus along with the proposed closure of Starr Gate beach for up to 3 years, rendering many older people, particularly those with disabilities, little choice, but to live as virtual prisoners in their homes on a filthy, noisy building site for 11 years, which for many of this cohort would mean for the remainder of their days.

Proposed Substation Location and related 'consultation'

The consultation inadequacy outlined above was not least demonstrated in relation to the location of the proposed substations in Freckleton. These substations are proposed to be built unusually close to residential and other properties and stakeholders have been apparently requesting renderings and/or photomontages since 2023 to evidence the visual impact of them. These have never been provided, despite assurances during the hearings that they would be! It was therefore not possible to assess whether any of the proposed screening mentioned for example, would actually screen the substations from local homes at all. When photographs and mock up models were requested, as they repeatedly were, with local residents even offering their own funds to cover the cost, still nothing appeared. This situation continued until a sudden rushed release of a huge number of inadequate AI photos which were shared with Interested Parties by the applicant a few months ago, (presumably at the request of the SOS, with the absence of these being so blatantly obvious with them having been mentioned so often during the hearings but not having appeared!). These were in the event wholly inadequate, did not represent a real life view of anything useful at all and were of absolutely no help to those living in the vicinity.

Destruction of Sand Dunes @ Starr Gate. Flood Risk

The sand dunes stretching from Starr Gate down to Lytham St Annes are natural, historical formations that have existed for hundreds to thousands of years, it's true they have naturally fluctuated and retreated due to human urban expansion but they remain precious and necessary. While sand dune systems are naturally dynamic and can take thousands of years to build up, Starr Gate's original dunes are centuries old. In fact, the area is historically so defined by these dunes that Starr Gate was originally named after the "Starr grass" that naturally grew in them. Over the years, urban development has consumed some of the dunes which means that what remains at Starr Gate is a crucial natural sea defence.

To reverse past and future erosion, the [Fylde Sand Dunes Project](#) has been actively rebuilding the dunes using natural barriers and marram grass since 2013. Through these ongoing conservation efforts, the dunes have successfully grown up to 100 meters seaward in certain areas along this coastline, helping protect hundreds of local homes from flooding. So, in addition to the well documented and evidenced risk to the rare sand lizards who make their home in these dunes, any further destruction of these precious commodities built and maintained by these Fylde volunteers year on year is to be avoided in order to prevent serious future flooding.

As regards the confident attitude adopted by M&M towards the proposed technique for bringing the wind farm cables through the dunes, a technique known as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD), this attitude seems misplaced and cavalier in the extreme.

Whilst I'm aware that the HDD process has been previously used on occasion to bring wind farm cables underneath sand dunes in the UK, the fact remains that this process has frequently caused problems in other parts of the world. These have included things like, utility strikes, involving the drill striking and severing existing underground infrastructure, (eg: gas lines, water mains, or fiber optics), also there's something known as, 'frac-out', where the excessive pressure of the drilling fluid causes fractures to the surrounding soil and the fluid seeps upward, polluting local waterways, wetlands and private properties. Then there's, 'ground settlement', where the process of boring causes ground loss. If the borehole is not stable or is drilled too close to foundations, it can cause the surface, (or nearby buildings, ie: local homes), to settle, crack or lift. Finally there's also straight forward, 'tool failure', often characterised by something tellingly known as, 'stuck pipe',

where drill heads get permanently jammed or broken off underground when encountering unexpected rock formations or objects. These are not insignificant risks and such problems have occurred in both Denmark and Norway using this process.

HDD is not a carefree, safe process which the UK has huge amounts of experience of using and given that the Applicants have caused flooding and damage to land drains during their preliminary investigations on at least two separate occasions already, their track record and levels of precision and care in this regard when overseeing even simple operations are already in doubt.

In addition, not forgetting that all of this and the hugely increased flood risk resulting from tunnelling under the Sand Dunes at Starr Gate Beach [REDACTED], will undermine any possibility of local residents being able to access adequate affordable flood and building protection insurance cover going forwards thus destining us to live in a state of heightened anxiety for evermore.

Conclusion

All these matters and the ever increasing, ongoing risks which we are repeatedly told are, 'impossible to mitigate', render this application unfit to proceed.

Along with many, I'm at a loss to understand how this highly unusual and chaotic situation can now lend itself to any other realistic outcome than an acceptance that this proposal is dangerous and unviable and that this application has no future and needs to be rejected before any more public money is wasted on the debacle it has now become.

As the situation currently stands I therefore believe the SOS has no option but to reject this application in its entirety.

Sincerely
Ros Forsey
(Fylde Says No)

[REDACTED]

Interested Party Ref number: [REDACTED]