

From: Rosaleen Forsey
Sent: Monday, August 10, 2026 09:15
To: Morgan and Morecambe OWFTA
Cc: Morgan and Morecambe OWFTA
Subject: Fw: Submission from IP: [REDACTED]

Please find attached my submission in respect of part 2, of your 8 July 2026 request for information, re the ongoing Morecambe Offshore Windfarm cable application, by M &M.

Submission deadline 7th August.

Your ref: EN020032

**Sincerely
Ros Forsey
Interested Party Reference
number: [REDACTED]**

Introduction

I am astonished that this application is still being considered, not only because of the seemingly ill thought through claims and expectations that have characterised it from day one, but because of the continuing catalogue of concerns, and unforeseen obstacles that seem to arise week on week. It must surely also be unprecedented for what was initially a shared application from M &M to not only still be on the table and being given serious consideration as a completely new standalone application, with one of the original partner applicants having now withdrawn from the application. The application now being scrutinised is an entirely different one from that which we were consulted on last year and as such should have been refused months ago.

I have submitted many thoughts and comments on this application throughout this process and each time seem to be faced with the same obstacles, concerns and doubts. This is primarily because these obstacles, concerns and doubts have still not been resolved or reduced.

Post consent birdstrike issue

The increased birdstrike risk issue, particularly as regards the potential impact on the high velocity jets being tested at Warton BAE Aerodrome, but also the variety of aircraft using Blackpool Airport, remains high up on the list of local concerns. There does not seem to have been a satisfactory explanation as to why this issue, an issue repeatedly described by reps from BAE Warton as, 'impossible to mitigate', is now being talked about as something that can be dealt with 'post consent'! We are expected to accept that the answer to all our repeated queries about how this ongoing risk to life and limb is to be dealt with is that you will decide after the application has been accepted! Our position up until now has been one where we assumed that you must have little or no understanding of how this ongoing concern and the threat contained within it, impact

on the day to day quality of life, and indeed mental health of local people, but given how many times we have raised it with you both in our written submissions and during the face to face consultations last year, we have to face the fact that it's not about any lack of understanding on your part, but rather a lack of care and concern for the wellbeing of the people who live here. How on earth we are expected to understand and trust in the notion that this application can and may well be accepted with this serious issue still remaining unresolved is mind boggling in the extreme! I'm not alone in saying that given my experience of this whole application consultation process, this is, sadly not something I can or would trust.

The elusive Equality Impact Assessment

As ever my other major concern is the lack of an Equality Impact Assessment having been carried out as regards marginalised groups in the area that will be impacted by the application proposals.

Where is the Equality Impact Assessment for this Application?

As far as I am aware from having attended the hearings and asked many questions, 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 be approved and the project go ahead.

I am not alone in having raised this repeatedly and have received neither an answer to my queries nor an explanation as to why an EqIA has not happened, or, if it in fact has, where the paperwork evidencing it can be found?

The Office for National Statistics figures show 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.

These figures indicate 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. Any reduced access to reliable and timely public transport for example will impact these people's 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, negatively impacting residents who already experience disproportionate levels of social isolation and poverty, and are therefore at increased risk of social disadvantages like loneliness and poor eating habits, resulting in ill health and worsening disability. The closure of St Anne's Beach for up to 3 years, will render many of this older population, particularly those with disabilities, and no access to transport, little choice, but to live as virtual prisoners in their homes on a filthy, noisy building site for 11 years. Make no mistake that for many within this cohort, this 11 years represents the remainder of their lives.

Throughout all of the face to face consultations last year and in my written submissions I have raised this matter re the EqIA. I feel that the above information, particularly the case study and the ONS statistics provide compelling evidence that this application, if given consent, will bring about a differential impact on local people with the protected characteristics of age and disability. I therefore formally request that the inspectorate's Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) team acknowledge their legal obligation under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to show "due regard " for the protected characteristics mentioned.

Formal Request

I hereby formally request that you share any EqIA that has been carried out to date or kindly direct me to where in the paperwork it has been published. If this does not exist then please could I see the justification for the decision not to carry it out .

**Many thanks
Ros Forsey**

7th August 2026