



TLT LLP
20 Gresham Street
London EC2V 7JE
T +44 (0)333 006 0000
tlt.com

Our ref 308S/AW67/124653/000002
Your ref EN020032

SoS DESNZ c/o [REDACTED]
3 Whitehall Place
LONDON
SW1A 2AW

By email

Direct tel [REDACTED]
Direct fax [REDACTED]

Date 19 August 2026
Email [REDACTED]

Dear Secretary of State

**Morgan and Morecambe Onshore Transmission Assets DCO application
Response to fifth (17 August 2026) request for information**

Introduction

1. This is a response to the Secretary of State's fifth (17 August 2026) request for information on behalf of Newton-with-Clifton and Freckleton Parish Councils, for whom TLT acts, once again with a short period to respond.
2. This response covers the requests in paragraphs 9 and 10 of the letter and also comments on submissions made in response to the fourth request for information, which were also published on 17 August 2026.
3. The general points about the application and a decision on it made in the [first](#), [second](#), [part one](#) and [part two](#) third responses and [fourth response](#) still stand.

Paragraph 9 of fifth request for information

4. The Secretary of State asks that the Applicants again comply with the request about working hours made in the first and fourth requests for information, by submitting amended documents that reflect the removal of mobilisation and demobilisation hours.
5. The Parish Councils are grateful for this request as the Applicants continue not to fulfil what was asked of them in the previous requests for information. It is not clear why they are wilfully avoiding doing what is requested of them, but by doing so it makes it more difficult for the Secretary of State to remove the mobilisation and demobilisation periods.

Paragraph 10 of fifth request for information

6. The Parish Councils would wish to know whether BAE Systems (or the Ministry of Defence) has a view on the reduction in secured environmental mitigation that the Outline



Wildlife Hazard Management Plan involves or whether they have focused purely on bird strike risk.

Commentary on responses to fourth request for information

The Applicants (C4-001.1-14)

7. The Applicants' latest submissions consist only of documents relating to their misdirected watering down rather than removal of the mobilisation and demobilisation periods, meaning that their entire submission was futile. It wasted the Applicants' time preparing it and the Secretary of State and third parties' time reading it (as did the previous request to remove the periods in the first request for information).
8. The Parish Councils note that the newly-inserted s96B of the Planning Act 2008 gives a broader power to the Examining Authority to award costs, and the scope of such awards is not limited to events that occurred during the examination stage of the application. The [now out-of-date guidance](#) that applied to the more limited costs powers gives '*Resistance to or lack of cooperation with any other party in providing information, where that behaviour has the effect of extending the duration of the examination*' as a potential ground for a cost award.
9. The Parish Councils further note that there are two errors in the Applicants' covering letter – the document referred to as 'S_SoSQ_69' is actually labelled 'S_D4_22' and the document referred to as 'S_SoSQ_52' is actually labelled 'S_SoSQ_54'.

Yours sincerely




Partner
for TLT LLP