



MORGAN AND MORECAMBE OFFSHORE WIND FARMS: TRANSMISSION ASSETS

Consultation Report Annex

Annex E1.16: Statutory consultation summary of responses and Applicants' regard (Part 1 of 2)



September 2024
Rev: F01

MOR001-FLO-CON-ENV-RPT-0151
MRCNS-J3303-RPS-10159

PINS Reference: EN020028
APFP Regulations: 5(2)(q)
Document reference: E1.16 (Part 1 of 2)

Document status					
Version	Purpose of document	Approved by	Date	Approved by	Date
F01	For issue	AS	September 2024	IM	September 2024

The report has been prepared for the exclusive use and benefit of the Applicants and solely for the purpose for which it is provided. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by RPS Group Plc, any of its subsidiaries, or a related entity (collectively 'RPS') no part of this report should be reproduced, distributed or communicated to any third party. RPS does not accept any liability if this report is used for an alternative purpose from which it is intended, nor to any third party in respect of this report. The report does not account for any changes relating to the subject matter of the report, or any legislative or regulatory changes that have occurred since the report was produced and that may affect the report.

The report has been prepared using the information provided to RPS by its client, or others on behalf of its client. To the fullest extent permitted by law, RPS shall not be liable for any loss or damage suffered by the client arising from fraud, misrepresentation, withholding of information material relevant to the report or required by RPS, or other default relating to such information, whether on the client's part or that of the other information sources, unless such fraud, misrepresentation, withholding or such other default is evident to RPS without further enquiry. It is expressly stated that no independent verification of any documents or information supplied by the client or others on behalf of the client has been made. The report shall be used for general information only.

Prepared by:

RPS

Prepared for:

**Morgan Offshore Wind Limited
Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Ltd**

Contents

E1.16 STATUTORY CONSULTATION SUMMARY OF RESPONSES AND APPLICANTS' REGARD

(PART 1 OF 2)	1
E1.16.1 Section 47 consultee response themes	2
E1.16.2 Overarching consultation process and non-technical comment table of responses	51
E1.16.2.1 Overarching consultation process and non-technical comments table of responses (via feedback form)	52
E1.16.2.2 Overarching consultation process and non-technical comments table of responses (via all other methods)	127
E1.16.3 Policy and legislation table of responses	230
E1.16.3.1 Policy and legislation table of responses (via feedback form)	231
E1.16.3.2 Policy and legislation table of responses (via all other methods)	250
E1.16.4 Project description table of responses	281
E1.16.4.1 Project description table of responses (via feedback form)	282
E1.16.4.2 Project description table of responses (via all other methods)	294
E1.16.5 Site selection and consideration of alternatives table of responses	331
E1.16.5.1 Site selection and consideration of alternatives table of responses (via feedback form)	332
E1.16.5.2 Site selection and consideration of alternatives table of responses (via all other methods)	400
E1.16.6 Environmental Impact Assessment methodology (via all methods)	474
E1.16.7 Physical processes table of responses	494
E1.16.7.1 Physical processes table of responses (via feedback form)	495
E1.16.7.2 Physical processes table of responses (via all other methods)	498
E1.16.8 Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology table of responses	514
E1.16.8.1 Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology table of responses (via feedback form)	515
E1.16.8.2 Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology table of responses (via all other methods)	521
E1.16.9 Fish and shellfish ecology tables of responses	539
E1.16.9.1 Fish and shellfish ecology table of responses (via feedback form)	540
E1.16.9.2 Fish and shellfish ecology table of responses (via all other methods)	545
E1.16.10 Marine mammals table of responses	561
E1.16.10.1 Marine mammals table of responses (via feedback form)	562
E1.16.10.2 Marine mammals table of responses (via all other methods)	567
E1.16.11 Offshore ornithology table of responses	589
E1.16.11.1 Offshore ornithology table of responses (via feedback form)	590
E1.16.11.2 Offshore ornithology table of responses (via all other methods)	593
E1.16.12 Commercial fisheries table of responses	598
E1.16.12.1 Commercial fisheries table of responses (via feedback form)	599
E1.16.12.2 Commercial fisheries table of responses (via all other methods)	602
E1.16.13 Shipping and navigation table of responses	607
E1.16.13.1 Shipping and navigation tables of responses (via feedback form)	608
E1.16.13.2 Shipping and navigation tables of responses (via all other methods)	610
E1.16.14 Marine archaeology table of responses	613
E1.16.14.1 Marine archaeology table of responses (via feedback form)	614
E1.16.14.2 Marine archaeology table of responses (via all other methods)	616
E1.16.15 Other sea users table of responses	621
E1.16.15.1 Other sea users table of responses (via feedback form)	622
E1.16.15.2 Other sea users table of responses (via all other methods)	625

E1.16 Statutory consultation summary of responses and Applicants' regard (Part 1 of 2)

E1.16.1 Section 47 consultee response themes

E1.16.1 Section 47 consultee response themes

- 1.1.1.1 Table 4.12 of section 4.7.3 of the Consultation Report (document reference E1) has been reproduced below, summarising the key project changes following statutory consultation and the reason for the change.
- 1.1.1.2 Following this, **Table 2** of this Annex (E1.16.1, document reference E1.16) illustrates the themes raised by section 47 consultees during the statutory consultation, Allocated via topic, and outlines the Applicants' response to this feedback.

Table 1: Reproduction of Table 4.12 of section 4.7.3 of the Consultation Report (document reference E1)

Change	Description	Justification
Removal of the Morgan offshore booster station	At PEIR a search area for a Morgan offshore booster station was included. This has been removed from the Morgan Offshore Wind Project. No offshore booster station is contained with the Morgan Generation Assets either.	The Morgan offshore booster station is no longer required and therefore this has been removed from the PDE.
Removal of the OSPs and interconnector cables	At PEIR this infrastructure was proposed to be included the Generation Assets applications, as well as the Transmission Assets proposals. Since PEIR the OSPs and interconnectors have been removed from the Transmission Assets. The OSPs and interconnectors are now only included in each respective Generation Assets applications	To simplify the assessments and to avoid the 'double-counting' of the assessment of this offshore infrastructure in the EIA between the Generation Assets and Transmission Assets assessments, within the Transmission Assets cumulative effects assessments. The removal of the infrastructure from Transmission Assets application also sought to simplify and provide clearer separation between the Generation Assets and Transmission Assets applications for key stakeholders and decision-makers.
Refinement of the offshore export cable corridor parameters	The maximum sandwave clearance width along the offshore export cable corridor has been reduced from 60% to 9% for the Morgan export cables and from 30% to 9% for the Morecambe export cables. With a commitment to a maximum of 5% sandwave clearance within the Fylde Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) (CoT47). Cable protection has been reduced from 20% to 10% for the Morgan offshore export cables and from 15% to 10% for the Morecambe offshore export cables. Within the Fylde MCZ, there is a commitment to limit this allowance to a maximum of	In response to pre-PEIR, statutory consultation and post-statutory consultation engagement, particularly, but not exclusively in relation to potential impacts to the designated benthic features of the Fylde MCZ.

	3% in the MCZ (excluding cable crossings), if required.	
Reduction of the Order Limits at landfall	<p>Substantial reductions to the Order Limits have been made to the north of the PEIR boundary at landfall, including removal of the Order Limits from part of the dunes, south of Squires Gate Lane, between the beach and Clifton Drive North. Temporary beach access has been retained from Squires Gate Lane, and part of the Lytham St Annes dunes remain within the Order Limits, with a commitment to direct pipe trenchless technique installation of the offshore export cables (CoT44).</p> <p>A large area within and adjacent to Blackpool Airport has also been removed, with the retention of an operational access off Squires Gate Lane (A5230). South of the PEIR red line boundary a section of the dunes, north of the St Annes North Beach car park have been removed, along with a large section of the adjacent beach.</p> <p>A central section within the Order Limits has been removed in order to maintain greater distance from residential receptors in the area, and to remove as much of the Lytham St Annes dunes SSSI as possible. East of this, much of the St Annes Old Links Golf Club has been removed.</p>	<p>Reductions the boundaries have been made as a result of ongoing design process as well as in response to statutory consultation and post-statutory consultation engagement, particularly, but not exclusively, regarding concerns over the potential impacts on the Lytham St Annes dunes SSSI and Blackpool Airport.</p> <p>HDD is no longer proposed for the construction at the landfall, to mitigation potential impacts to ornithology (Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology) and beach users as direct pipe installation would result in significantly reduced active construction durations on the beach.</p>
<p>Refinement of the onshore export cable corridor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of the option to install the onshore export cables within or along (as opposed to across or under) roads. • Reduction in overall temporary and permanent widths of the onshore export cable corridor 	<p>At PEIR proposals included the installation of the onshore export cables within Blackpool Road North, Leach Lane, Kilnhouse Lane, and part of Queensway (B5261). These proposals have now been removed from the final application. The project will not be installing onshore export cables within the roads, however, the option to install the onshore export cables across a northern</p>	<p>In response to statutory consultation and post-statutory consultation engagement, particularly, but not exclusively, to avoid potential effects and disruption to nearby residents (i.e. by removal the option to install the onshore export cables with the roads south of Blackpool Airport). The overall width of the temporary and permanent cable corridors have been reduced to minimise potential impacts to landowners and other receptors (for example, ecological receptors). The onshore export cable corridor Option 2 (south) was removed in response to feedback at section 42, to mitigate potential effects on</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal of the southern onshore export cable option (Option 2, south) 	<p>section of Leach Lane using open cut techniques has been retained.</p> <p>The temporary working onshore export cable corridor has been reduced since PEIR from 120m to 100m and the permanent onshore export cable corridor reduced from 80m to 70m.</p> <p>At PEIR two options were included in the Lytham Moss and Higher Balham area, the southern option (Option 2) which passed through to the south of Higher Balham has been removed.</p>	<p>ornithological receptors, related to the presence of functionally linked land in the area.</p>
<p>Refinement of the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor</p>	<p>At PEIR a wide corridor 'search area' for the 400kV grid connection cable corridor was included because of the uncertainties around the final proposed onshore substation sites and location at which the River Ribble would be crossed.</p> <p>The 400kV grid connection cable corridor has been significantly refined:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in the temporary 400kV grid connection cable corridor width (not including the River Ribble crossing) from 96 m at PEIR to 76 m at application. Increase in the permanent 400kV grid connection cable corridor width (not including the River Ribble crossing) from 46 m at PEIR to 50 m at application. Identification of the River Ribble crossing area with a commitment to direct pipe, micro-tunnel trenchless installation techniques. 	<p>The 76m wide 400kV grid connection cable corridor was established as a part of the ongoing design evolution and route planning and site selection process. The refinement of the temporary and permanent widths also took place as part of the ongoing evolution of the design.</p> <p>The reduction in the overall temporary width for the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor have been made to minimise potential impacts to landowners and other receptors (for example, ecological receptors).</p>
<p>Single onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option 2 (south) being taken forward Refinement of footprint and height 	<p>At PEIR two potential options were presented for the Morecambe onshore substation, Option 1 (north) and Option 2 (south). Option 2 (South) is the preferred location for Morecambe onshore substation. The total permanent footprint has reduced from 60,000 m² at PEIR to 59,500 m² at</p>	<p>In response to statutory consultation and post-statutory consultation engagement, alongside environmental and engineering considerations.</p> <p>Option 2 (south) is further away from a greater number of sensitive receptors than Option 1 (north) and allows the use of a construction access from the A584 Preston New Road, splitting the construction traffic with the Morgan substation compared to Option 1 (north). Option 2 (south) also results in a</p>

	<p>application, including landscape planting, access, flood attenuation and drainage. The maximum building height has been reduced from 20m and PEIR to 13m at application.</p>	<p>significant reduction in cable length for both the onshore export cable and the grid connection cable corridors, and avoid the need to cross the Morgan onshore export cable and grid connection cable corridors, and its greater distance from the Morgan substation will lead to greater overall construction efficiency.</p>
<p>Refinement of the onshore substation for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Transmission Assets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refinement of location and maximum height • Selection of gas insulated switchgear (GIS) • Increased footprint 	<p>At PEIR the Morgan preferred onshore substation site was presented within the in the largest 'onshore substation consultation area'. The chosen location has moved east. The maximum building height has been reduced from 20m and PEIR to 15m at application. A commitment to gas insulated switchgear (GIS) technology only. Air insulated switchgear (AIS) will no longer be used. The total permanent footprint has increased from 125 000 m2 to 164 000 m2. -An area has also been included in the total permanent area for the substation, to the east (adjacent to Dow Brook), to provide space for landscaping, environmental mitigation and biodiversity benefit. The additional area included since the PEIR was published are predominantly for the provision of landscaping and mitigation, including areas for drainage and water attenuation.</p>	<p>In response to statutory consultation and post-statutory consultation engagement, particularly, but not exclusively, to create a greater separation from residential receptors closest to the Morgan onshore substation site proposed at PEIR as well as creating greater distance from Hall Cross and Freckleton. The selection of GIS only technology, has been made to reduce the overall area required for permanent electrical infrastructure at the Morgan onshore substation site. The overall permanent area for the Morgan onshore has increased to provide additional space for landscaping, environment mitigation (including drainage and water attenuation) and areas for providing biodiversity benefit. -</p>
<p>Refinement of crossing technologies</p>	<p>At PEIR the project design envelope allowed for the installation of up to 6 circuits within Blackpool Road Recreation Ground, including via open cut trenching techniques. Installation of onshore export cables within/along Leach Lane was also proposed, as part of plans to install the export cables with the roads south of Blackpool Airport. HDD (or other trenchless installation techniques), not including direct pipe, were proposed for the trenchless crossing under the Lytham St Annes</p>	<p>A commitment to undertaking most major crossings using trenchless installation techniques has been made to avoid direct impacts to the features or obstacles. Equally, trenchless installation of the onshore export cables within Blackpool Road recreation ground has been made to mitigation potential effects of open cut installation HDD is no longer proposed for the construction at the landfall, to mitigation potential impacts to ornithology (Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology) and beach users as direct pipe installation would result in significantly reduced active construction durations on the beach.</p>

	<p>dunes SSSI, and the St. Annes Old Links Golf Club. For the application the Applicants have committed to all major crossings, such as major roads, river and rail crossings will be undertaken using trenchless technologies, where practicable, with the exception of Leach Lane, which may be open cut (CoT02). HDD (or other trenchless techniques) installation) including direct pipe will be used for up to 4 circuits within Blackpool Road Recreation Ground (CoT123). HDD is no longer proposed for the construction at the landfall with direct pipe to be used to minimise the duration of disturbance on the beach.</p>	
<p>Refinement of biodiversity benefit and mitigation areas</p>	<p>At PEIR a number of areas were identified for potential mitigation and biodiversity benefit areas. Substantial reductions have been made within the application and are categorised as environmental mitigation and/or biodiversity benefit areas.</p>	<p>In response to statutory consultation and post-statutory consultation engagement on ecological mitigation and biodiversity benefit. These areas and the proposals for mitigation have been discussed and refined as part of ongoing EIA and evidence plan process, which includes the relevant nature conservation bodies and local authorities. These areas have been reduced and refined substantially to ensure that areas being sought are proportionate to the potential effects associated with the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning of the Transmission Assets.</p>

Table 2: Themes raised by section 47 consultees, Applicants' regard and relevant design changes

Overarching consultation process and non-technical responses			
Theme raised in feedback	Key points raised	Applicants' responses	Relevant design changes
Confirmation of general support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For both the Transmission Asset and offshore wind generation more generally 	<p>The Applicants note and welcome these responses.</p> <p>The purpose of the Transmission Assets is to connect the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm to the National Grid, contributing to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the UK Government's ambition to deliver 50 gigawatts of offshore wind by 2030; delivering much needed investment and securing construction and operations jobs in the UK; securing our energy supply; and the UK's response to the climate change crisis. 	N/A
Lack of notice of project and consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Received no invitations to consultation events. Not everyone received mailshot. Mailshot looked like 'junk/spam mail' Not enough notice given to allow people to attend events. 	<p>The Applicants sent a newsletter to all known 52,587 residential and business addresses in the consultation zone, following diligent enquiry and 22,814 homes on the Isle of Man. The newsletter provided a summary of our latest proposals and included details of the consultation and how to take part.</p> <p>The Applicants issued the consultation newsletter using a compostable bio-wrap. This packaging was selected for sustainability and practicality reasons. The finish to the wrap was clear, without being transparent with the intention that the recipients could see enough to understand that the information inside related to the Project and its associated consultation.</p> <p>A consultation brochure was also created. This provided more in-depth information of the latest proposals and details of the consultation. It was held at publicly accessible deposit locations, distributed at consultation events and available for download via the Project website. Hard copies of the brochure were also available upon request.</p> <p>Posters were produced promoting participation in the consultation and copies were supplied to all deposit locations listed in the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC), as well as other community venues in the local area.</p>	N/A

	<p>Two media releases were issued to local media during the consultation in line with the Applicants' SoCC commitments, one at the start of consultation and a further press release before the close of consultation, encouraging people to take part.</p> <p>Newspaper advertising, online advertising, social media posts, direct email and statutory notices, including site notices placed in the vicinity of our proposals, also promoted the consultation and invited people to take part.</p> <p>See section 4 of the main Consultation Report (document reference E1) for detailed information regarding the statutory consultation, including published materials, advertising and the consultation mailing zone.</p>	
<p>Lack of consultation with the MP</p>	<p>Throughout the development of the Project, the Applicants have aimed to be open and transparent with all stakeholders, including Mark Menzies as the MP for the constituency at the time.</p> <p>Representatives of the Applicants first met with Mark Menzies MP in July 2022. The Applicants subsequently launched its first round of non-statutory consultation on the 2 November 2022 and information regarding the proposals, including the proposed onshore substations, was presented in the consultation information shared with Mark Menzies and other stakeholders. A member of Mr Menzies' team attended the Applicants' non-statutory consultation event at Lytham Assembly Rooms on 21 November 2022 and the Applicants subsequently met with Mr Menzies via an online meeting on 18 December 2022 to discuss the proposals further. An update meeting took place with a representative from Mr Menzies' office on 1 March 2023. This was subsequently followed by an email update on 28 March 2023 summarising responses to outstanding queries.</p> <p>The Applicants launched the second round of non-statutory consultation in April 2023. Mark Menzies was notified of the launch of this consultation by email on 19 April 2023. The notification email directed Mr Menzies to the consultation materials, which included updated information on the latest proposals including the four onshore substation search areas and the proposed onshore export cable route corridor. A further email was sent to Mr Menzies on 22 May 2023, including a reminder that the consultation would be closing soon, links to consultation information and a request to submit feedback ahead of the closure of consultation on 4 June 2023. Mr Menzies did not provide written feedback to either the first or second round of non-statutory consultation.</p> <p>Preceding the launch of statutory consultation, Mr Menzies was invited to, and attended, a preview event at Lytham Assembly Rooms on 8 September 2023. This gave Mr Menzies and his team early sight of the information that was to be presented</p>	<p>N/A</p>

		<p>during the statutory consultation, to ensure that they would be able to answer questions from constituents during this time.</p> <p>Mr Menzies was notified of the launch of the statutory consultation by the Applicants and invited to take part. Mr Menzies attended the consultation event held at St Anne's Cricket Club on 3 November 2023.</p> <p>See sections 3.4 and 4.1 of the Consultation report for further details of engagement with stakeholders.</p>	
Lack of consultation with schools		<p>The Applicants can confirm none of the schools listed were identified as a Person with an Interest in Land (PWILs) within the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) Red Line Boundary, nor within its subsequent amendments, and therefore were not identified or consulted with under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>In line with its duty to consult the local community as required by section 47 of the Planning Act 2008, the Applicants were careful to engage with schools in the area local to the proposed scheme, recognising their importance as community organisations.</p> <p>The Applicants therefore reviewed their section 47 database before each stage of consultation and added any organisations that had either been flagged as relevant or were affected by updates to proposals. This included Carr Hill High School, Strike Lane Primary School, Newton Bluecoat Church of England Primary School and Freckleton Church of England Primary School</p> <p>We can confirm these schools received email updates (14 September 2023), advance notice of the consultation (06 October 2023), notification of the launch of consultation (12 October 2023), a reminder that the consultation was ending soon, and a newsletter was also posted summarising the statutory consultation engagement. Tracking of the emails shows no bounce back and they were received.</p>	N/A
Lack of information available	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough detail in consultation materials • No visual representation on the dimensions of the substation • No-one at the consultation event 	<p>A consultation brochure was created that provided a summary of the latest proposals and details of the consultation. The brochure was available at publicly accessible deposit locations, distributed at consultation events and available for download via the Project website. Hard copies of the brochure were also available upon request.</p> <p>The PEIR and the PEIR Non-Technical Summary (NTS) were both widely available. The PEIR and the PEIR NTS were published online and available to view at all consultation events and at deposit locations on USB.</p> <p>The PEIR NTS is intended to act as a stand-alone document that provides an overview of the Project and its likely significant effects in non-technical language.</p>	

	<p>could provide detailed answers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough information showing exactly where the cables are proposed • Some information given to landowners and not to the general public. 	<p>It is the Applicants' position that the amount and type of consultation materials provided both met and exceeded the requirements of an adequate consultation. The consultation was delivered in accordance with the SoCC.</p> <p>A significant number of subject matter experts staffed all consultation events and were able to answer a wide variety of questions from visitors to the events.</p> <p>Wireline visualisations were made available at statutory consultation, showing the maximum parameters from various viewpoints. Visualisations are presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage.</p> <p>Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants engaged with landowners during the consultation and throughout the application process about their land holding including impacts the Project may have on their holding and the land rights that would be sought should they be affected. The landowners were provided plans showing the impact of their holding and the PEIR boundary to help aid conversations. The discussions only included information that was available within the PEIR. During this engagement, the Applicants had to ensure they respected the privacy of landowners within the order limits.</p>	
Lack of 'proper' consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perception that the consultation was a paper exercise, and it is a fait accompli • Consultation period was too short • The public were not consulted on search zones adequately. 	<p>The statutory consultation ran for a total of 43 days, from 12 October 2023 until 23 November 2023. This provided consultees with a significantly longer period than the minimum of 28 days in which to consider the proposals and provide their feedback.</p> <p>Consultees were invited to provide comments relating to project boundaries / search areas during three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023).</p> <p>Feedback received at each stage of consultation, has been taken into consideration by the Applicants to further develop our proposals.</p>	N/A
Materials were hard to read	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maps were too small to provide sufficient detail. • Language in materials was not accessible. 	<p>In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Project team to find out more information.</p>	N/A

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much jargon used, and materials not written in simple terms. • Website difficult to navigate and therefore information difficult to access. • PEIR too long and overcomplicated for non-technical stakeholders to access. 	<p>The maps within the consultation brochure represented a high level view of the proposed cable route and substation locations, due to the nature of the document and the extent of the red line boundary. Further information, with more detail on specific areas, could be found within the PEIR and other documents, made available at events and online, during consultation.</p> <p>The PEIR and the PEIR NTS were both widely available. The PEIR was published online and available to view at all consultation events. The PEIR NTS was also available online, at events and at deposit locations.</p> <p>A newsletter and consultation brochure were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR.</p> <p>Consultees were encouraged to contact the Project team for requests for alternative format to any of our materials.</p> <p>It is the Applicants' position that language used in materials was appropriate for the audiences being addressed. A range of materials were provided – both online and offline - offering varying levels of complexity / detail, allowing consultees to access the level of detail that best suited their needs.</p> <p>The Project website was presented with clear sub-headings to help consultees navigate their way around the website. Contact details for the project team were also made available for anyone requiring additional support.</p> <p>It is the Applicants' position that both the variety of consultation materials produced and the effectiveness with which they were delivered to potential consultees both met and exceeded the requirements of an adequate consultation. The consultation was delivered in accordance with the SoCC.</p> <p>The PEIR is, by its nature, a technical document meeting requirements of the Environmental Impact Regulations. Conscious of this the Applicants ensured contact details were provided in all consultation materials and statutory notices for use by those who needed to ask the Applicants for assistance in finding information relating to specific subjects. In addition, the PEIR NTS is intended to act as a stand-alone document that provides an overview of the Project and its likely significant effects using non-technical language.</p>	
Impact on house prices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of properties • It will be more difficult to secure a mortgage. 	<p>The Applicants are not aware of other similar projects resulting in a diminution on value of properties but are committed to complying with the compensation code, where a valid claim is made. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value, and in what circumstances this scenario occurs.</p>	

		The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation - Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/compulsory-purchase-system-guidance) with guides1 and 4 being the most appropriate.	
--	--	--	--

Introduction (PEIR Volume 1, Chapter 1)

Theme raised in feedback	Key points raised	Applicants' responses	Relevant design changes
No comments received with regard to this chapter.			

Policy and legislation context (PEIR Volume 1, Chapter 2)

Theme raised in feedback	Key points raised	Applicants' responses	Relevant design changes
Suggestions that the project does not comply with 'planning policy'	Suggestion that proposals contravene National Policy Statement (NPS) and / or Fylde Council planning policy, particularly with regards to green belt and the area of separation.	<p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES) (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded the preferred route and location for the cable and the onshore substations.</p> <p>Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. Please refer to Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) for more information.</p> <p>An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.</p>	<p>A number of key project changes have been made since PEIR which can be summarised as the below. Further details are provided in this Annex and section 4.7 of the Consultation Report.</p> <p>Single onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets</p>

		The assessment also considers matters such as visual amenity impact and landscape character which relate to the openness of the Green Belt.	Refinement of the onshore substation for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Transmission Assets.
--	--	---	---

Project description (PEIR Volume 1, Chapter 3)

Theme raised in feedback	Key points raised	Applicant's responses	Relevant design changes
Chosen location for the Project	Why the Fylde Coast?	<p>The Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm were scoped into the Pathway to 2030 workstream of the UK Government's Offshore Transmission Network Review (OTNR). As part of the OTNR, the Electricity System Operator's (ESO) assessed options to improve the coordination of offshore wind farm connections and associated transmission networks. In July 2022, the UK Government published the Pathway to 2030 Holistic Network Design (HNDR) Report which set out the results of the OTNR.</p> <p>The connection location for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm was determined by the ESO as part of the HNDR process.</p> <p>The HNDR assessed potential connection locations and associated transmission network reinforcements for all The Crown Estate (TCE) Round 4 offshore wind lease areas. The HND assessment considered potential interface points on the National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) network and selected Middleton, Penwortham, Bodelwyddan and Pentir substations as suitable for further consideration in the North West area. The connection points were assessed according to ESO's published methodology and considered, Cost to Consumer, Deliverability and Operability, Impact on Environment and Impact on Local Communities.</p> <p>Under the OTNR, the National Grid Electricity System Operator (NGESO) is responsible for assessing options to improve the coordination of offshore wind generation connections and transmission networks and has undertaken a Holistic Network Design Review (HNDR). A key output of the HNDR process was the recommendation that the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe</p>	<p>A number of key project changes have been made since PEIR which can be summarised as the below. Further details are provided in this Annex and section 4.7 of the Consultation Report.</p> <p>Removal of the Morgan offshore booster station</p> <p>Removal of the Offshore Substation Platforms and interconnector cables</p> <p>Refinement of the offshore export cable corridor parameters</p>

		<p>Offshore Windfarm should work collaboratively in connecting the two offshore wind farms to the National Grid electricity transmission network at Penwortham in Lancashire.</p> <p>The transmission assets associated with both the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm were directed by the NGENSO to connect into Penwortham.</p> <p>Consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES) (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4). The site selection process for the onshore substations considered areas beyond a 150m buffer from residential properties, those at lower flood risk, and areas with fewer or absence of protected habitats.</p> <p>In addition to the feedback received, this decision was also made based on factors such as topography, proximity to other developments or utilities, road access, community, ecology / biodiversity, landscape, flood risk, quality of agricultural land and potential impacts on landowners/occupiers.</p> <p>A further site selection exercise was undertaken to identify appropriate parcels of land within the onshore substation statutory consultation area that could potentially accommodate the onshore substations.</p>	<p>Reduction of the Order Limits at landfall</p> <p>Refinement of the onshore export cable corridor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of the option to install the onshore export cables within or along (as opposed to across or under) roads. • Reduction in overall temporary and permanent widths of the onshore export cable corridor • Removal of the southern onshore export cable option (Option 2, south) <p>Refinement of the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor</p> <p>Single onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 2 (south) being taken forward • Refinement of footprint and height
--	--	--	--

			<p>Refinement of the onshore substation for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Transmission Assets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refinement of location and maximum height • Selection of gas insulated switchgear (GIS) • Increased footprint <p>Refinement of crossing technologies</p> <p>Refinement of biodiversity benefit and mitigation areas</p>
Purpose of the onshore substations	Questioning the need for the onshore substations	To connect to the national grid, two new onshore substations are required, one for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and one for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm. The proposed onshore substations are needed to transform the power supplied through the onshore export cables into an appropriate voltage to allow a connection to the National Grid substation at Penwortham. The offshore cables come ashore at a lower voltage (either 220 kV or 275 kV); the proposed substations contain the components for transforming the power supplied via the onshore export cables up to 400 kV for connection into Penwortham. Further details are contained in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description (document reference F1.3) of the Environmental Statement (ES).	N/A
Programme	Concerns over the construction timescales and the disruption caused.	Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).	N/A

Site selection and consideration of alternatives (PEIR Volume 1, Chapter 4)

Theme	Key points raised	Applicants' responses	Relevant design changes
The location of the sites that have been proposed for the development of the Project's onshore substations.	<p>Location of substations</p> <p>Proximity to primary schools</p> <p>Substations will cause boundaries of villages to merge</p> <p>Concerns over industrialisation of the countryside</p> <p>Suggestions Heysham power station site should be used instead</p>	<p>The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the onshore substations.</p> <p>At statutory consultation, the chosen site for the Morgan onshore substation was presented. As a result of ongoing assessments, landowner and stakeholder engagement, the location of the substation within this area has been moved to the east, and the temporary and permanent accesses refined.</p> <p>This refinement results in a greater separation from residential receptors closest to the Morgan onshore substation site proposed at PEIR as well as creating greater distance from Hall Cross and Freckleton.</p> <p>The maximum building height has been reduced from 20m and PEIR to 15m at application and a commitment to gas insulated switchgear (GIS) technology only has been made to reduce the overall area required for permanent electrical infrastructure. Air insulated switchgear (AIS) will no longer be used.</p> <p>The overall permanent footprint has increased from 125 000 m² to 164 000 m². An area has also been included in the total permanent area for the substation, to the east (adjacent to Dow Brook), to provide space for landscaping, environmental mitigation and biodiversity benefit. The additional area included since the PEIR was published are predominantly for the provision of landscaping and mitigation, including areas for drainage and water attenuation.</p> <p>At statutory consultation, two proposed sites were presented for the Morecambe onshore substation. Option 1 (North) and Option 2 (South). Following the consultation any feedback received was analysed. This considered feedback from statutory stakeholders, landowners, nearby residents and members of the public. This feedback was then considered alongside a range of other factors including potential environmental constraints and engineering considerations, including the consideration of the amendments made to the Morgan substation and its associated cable corridors.</p> <p>The decision was then taken that Option 2 (South) was the preferred location for the Morecambe onshore substation.</p>	<p>A number of key project changes have been made since PEIR which can be summarised as the below. Further details are provided in this Annex and section 4.7 of the Consultation Report.</p> <p>Single onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 2 (South) being taken forward • Refinement of footprint and height. <p>Refinement of the onshore substation for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Transmission Assets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refinement of location and maximum height • Selection of gas insulated switchgear (GIS), reducing the overall area required for permanent

	<p>Option 2 (south) is further away from a greater number of sensitive receptors than Option 1 (north) and allows the use of a construction access from the A584 Preston New Road, splitting the construction traffic with the Morgan substation compared to Option 1 (north). Option 2 (south) also results in a significant reduction in cable length for both the onshore export cable and the grid connection cable corridors, and avoid the need to cross the Morgan onshore export cable and grid connection cable corridors, and its greater distance from the Morgan substation will lead to greater overall construction efficiency.</p> <p>Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. The Planning Statement (document reference J28) sets out an assessment on the impact on the countryside and location of the substations.</p> <p>Justification for the location of the Project, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3).</p> <p>Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). The baseline for these assessments include existing and committed development in the locality. As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Project are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>The connection location for the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Windfarms was determined by the Electricity System Operator's (ESO) Holistic Network Design (HND) process. The HND report was published in July 2022 and assessed potential connection locations and associated transmission network reinforcements for all The Crown Estate (TCE) Round 4 offshore wind lease areas. The Applicants do not have the detailed assessments that ESO produced, however the Heysham and Middleton Substations already connect a number of existing offshore windfarm and additional cabling would likely be difficult to this area.</p>	<p>electrical infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased footprint to provide additional space for landscaping, environment mitigation (including drainage and water attenuation) and areas for providing biodiversity benefit
--	---	--

<p>Use of the Ribble estuary for the onshore cable route.</p>	<p>Suggestions to use the river to lay the onshore cables, not the land</p>	<p>The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological designations protected by national and international legislation. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt Estuary Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in extremely long construction timeframes and risk extensive, and potentially long-term damage to sensitive and protected habitats that support smelt and protected bird species, whilst also presenting unsafe working conditions during construction. The approach to site selection has been based on avoiding damage to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F1.4).</p> <p>Since PEIR, the 400KV grid connection corridor has been refined including identification of the River Ribble crossing area with a commitment to direct pipe, micro-tunnel trenchless installation techniques.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Predetermined site selection</p>	<p>Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) shows evidence of predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1</p> <p>Red, Amber Green (RAG) assessment is flawed</p>	<p>The RAG process identifies the environmental, engineering, land related constraints available at the time, for each element of the project. The constraints are then categorised based on their potential to constrain development. This includes factors which have the potential to impact on the development, as well as those factors which have the potential to be impacted by the development. The constraints identified are then assessed in relation to the criterion in order to identify an outcome which takes consideration of the full range of factors identified on balance. Since PEIR the site selection process has been developed further and has been presented in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F1.4) as well as in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Annexes 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3.</p> <p>Justification for the location of the Project, including a description of the design and/ or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Maximum parameters for the substation have been refined following statutory consultation. At statutory consultation, the chosen site for the Morgan onshore substation was presented. As a result of ongoing assessments and stakeholder engagement, the location of the</p>	<p>A number of key project changes have been made since PEIR which can be summarised as the below. Further details are provided in this Annex and section 4.7 of the Consultation Report.</p> <p>Removal of the Morgan offshore booster station</p> <p>Removal of the Offshore Substation Platforms and interconnector cables</p>

		<p>substation within this area has been moved to the east, and the temporary and permanent accesses refined.</p> <p>At statutory consultation, two proposed sites were presented for the Morecambe onshore substation. Option 1 (North) and Option 2 (South). Following the consultation any feedback received was analysed. This considered feedback from statutory stakeholders, landowners, nearby residents and members of the public. This feedback was then considered alongside a range of other factors including potential environmental constraints and engineering considerations, including the consideration of the amendments made to the Morgan substation and its associated cable corridors. The decision was then taken that Option 2 (South) was the preferred location for the Morecambe onshore substation.</p>	<p>Refinement of the offshore export cable corridor parameters</p> <p>Reduction of the Order Limits at landfall</p> <p>Refinement of the onshore export cable corridor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of the option to install the onshore export cables within or along (as opposed to across or under) roads. • Reduction in overall temporary and permanent widths of the onshore export cable corridor • Removal of the southern onshore export cable option (Option 2, south) <p>Refinement of the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor</p> <p>Single onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets</p>
--	--	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option 2 (south) being taken forward Refinement of footprint and height <p>Refinement of the onshore substation for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Transmission Assets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refinement of location and maximum height Selection of gas insulated switchgear (GIS) Increased footprint <p>Refinement of crossing technologies</p> <p>Refinement of biodiversity benefit and mitigation areas</p>
--	--	--	---

Environmental assessment methodology (PEIR Volume 1, Chapter 5)

Theme raised in feedback	Key points raised	Applicants' responses	Relevant design changes
Potential cumulative impact with both the associated Generation Assets and	The need to properly and fully assess cumulative impact including any potential in combination effects	A series of scenarios have been examined which cover whole project impacts and cumulative impacts of projects and plans selected as relevant based upon the results of a screening exercise. These scenarios are set out below and cover the full range of potential cumulative impacts.	N/A

adjacent operational and proposed offshore wind farms	Inclusion of Moor Vannin Offshore Wind Farm in the Cumulative Impact Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transmission Assets together with Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Generation Assets only. • Transmission Assets together with Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets only. • Transmission Assets together with Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Generation Assets. • Transmission Assets together with Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Generation Assets together with Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 projects, plans and activities. <p>The Applicants can confirm that the Moir Vannin Offshore Wind Farm (scoping boundary) is considered in the more detailed cumulative effects assessment as a Tier 2 project, using the information provided in the associated Scoping Report. Moir Vannin UK Project are considered in the cumulative effects assessment as a Tier 3 project. The Cumulative Effects Assessment methodology is described further in Volume 1, Chapter 5: EIA methodology of the Environmental Statement (ES) (Document Reference F1.5). All schemes considered in the cumulative assessment are set out in Volume 1, Annex 5.5: Cumulative screening matrix and location plan of the ES (document reference F1.5.5).</p>	
Potential cumulative impact (onshore) with other developments in the locality	Cumulative impact with other developments, particularly Bluefield Renewable Developments Ltd's proposals for a solar farm on land to the west of Parrox Lane	<p>The Applicants can confirm that the solar farm, known as Bluefield solar, has been considered as part of the cumulative assessment for the onshore elements of the Project, including cumulative visual impacts.</p> <p>All schemes considered in the cumulative assessment are set out in Volume 1, Annex 5.5: Cumulative screening matrix and location plan of the ES (document reference F1.5.5).</p>	
Physical processes (PEIR Volume 2, Chapter 1)			
Issue raised in feedback	Key points raised		Relevant design changes
Some consultees were unclear on what this feedback	Against feedback form question 1.1 members of the public were unclear what this topic related to and/or inserted a	The feedback form included an overarching question (1) for the offshore elements of the Project, which read "Do you have any comments / feedback on the offshore elements of the Project generally? You may choose to comment on the specific topics listed (see numbered topics 1.1 to 1.9 below). 1.1 then read "Physical	N/A

<p>form question asked</p>	<p>response relevant to another topic.</p>	<p>Processes (see volume 2, chapter 1 of our PEIR).” giving an opportunity to comment specifically on Physical processes should the consultee have wanted to.</p> <p>Physical processes in the marine environment refer to the various processes that occur in the ocean and coastal areas. These processes include coastal erosion, ocean currents, tides, and wave patterns.</p>	
<p>Technical aspects of physical processes</p>	<p>Sandwave clearance and use of cable protection and secondary scour</p>	<p>The Applicants have responded to these technical aspects fully within the main Consultation report at section 4.7.11 and the associated chapters of the Environmental Statement (ES).</p> <p>Prior to installation of offshore cables, it is sometimes necessary to undertake seabed preparation to allow the cables to be buried beneath seabed sediments to target burial depths and minimise the risk of cables becoming exposed due to mobile sediments. One such method is sandwave clearance, where a section of mobile sandwaves is levelled/reduced to allow the cables to be effectively buried beneath them. The sandwaves then recover/infill into the areas affected following cable installation.</p> <p>With respect to comments relating to sandwave clearance, a number of Project Design Envelope (PDE) refinements have been made between the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) and final application. These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for sandwave clearance and cable protection, particularly within the Fylde Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ).</p>	<p>The Morgan offshore booster station, is no longer required and therefore this has been removed from the Project Design Envelope. The Offshore Substation Platforms and interconnector cables are now only in each respective Generation Assets application, removing any associated impacts.</p> <p>The maximum sandwave clearance width along the offshore export cable corridor has been reduced from 60% to 9% for the Morgan export cables, with a commitment to a maximum of 5% sandwave clearance within the Fylde Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) and from 30% to 9% for the Morecambe export cables, with a commitment to a maximum of 5% sandwave clearance within the Fylde MCZ.</p>

			<p>Cable protection has been reduced from 20% to 10% for the Morgan export cables, with a commitment to limit this allowance to a maximum of 3% in the Fylde MCZ (excluding cable crossings) and from 15% to 10% for the Morecambe export cables, with a commitment to limit this allowance to a maximum of 3% in the Fylde MCZ (excluding cable crossings).</p>
--	--	--	--

**Offshore Ecology Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology (PEIR Volume 2, Chapter 2)
 Fish and shellfish ecology (PEIR Volume 2, Chapter 3)
 Marine mammals (PEIR Volume 2, Chapter 4)
 Offshore ornithology (PEIR Volume 2, Chapter 5)**

Theme raised in feedback	Key points raised	Applicant's responses	Relevant design changes
Potential impacts on seabirds and marine life	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Birds colliding with wind turbines Construction of offshore structures disturbing fish General concerns over potential impact to marine mammals 	<p>Concerns about potential bird collision appears to relate to the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and/or the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (the generation assets), which are subject to separate applications for development consent.</p> <p>In terms of temporary and long term habitat loss or disturbance to fish and shellfish, the proportion of habitat lost, including spawning and nursery grounds, associated with the Project is predicted to be small in the context of available habitats in the wider area. Natural behaviours are expected to return, following short term habitat disturbance, as a result of the temporary nature of the construction.</p> <p>With the removal of both the Morgan offshore booster station, there are no sea surface piercing structures associated with the Transmission Assets, removing associated impacts.</p>	<p>The Morgan offshore booster station, is no longer required and therefore this has been removed from the Project Design Envelope. The Offshore Substation Platforms and interconnector cables are now only in each respective Generation</p>

		<p>As set out above, the maximum sandwave clearance width and cable protection along the offshore export cable corridor has been reduced.</p> <p>As set out in every Environmental Statement (ES) chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. This includes the development of an Offshore Environmental Management Plan, to include measures to minimise disturbance to marine mammals, fish and shellfish from vessels, as well as action proposed to minimise invasive species.</p> <p>An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Project has been undertaken for the offshore topics of the Project Application and is presented in Volume 2 of the ES (document reference F2). Specific examples relevant to marine life are listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2). • Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3). • Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4). • Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5). 	<p>Assets, removing any associated impacts.</p> <p>The maximum sandwave clearance width along the offshore export cable corridor has been reduced from 60% to 9% for the Morgan export cables, with a commitment to a maximum of 5% sandwave clearance within the Fylde Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) and from 30% to 9% for the Morecambe export cables, with a commitment to a maximum of 5% sandwave clearance within the Fylde MCZ.</p> <p>Cable protection has been reduced from 20% to 10% for the Morgan export cables, with a commitment to limit this allowance to a maximum of 3% in the Fylde MCZ (excluding cable crossings) and from 15% to 10% for the Morecambe export cables, with a commitment to limit this allowance to a maximum of 3% in the Fylde MCZ</p>
--	--	---	--

			(excluding cable crossings).
Pollution	Polluting the sea	<p>An Offshore Environmental Management Plan(s) (EMPs) will be developed and will include details of a marine pollution contingency plan to address the risks, methods and procedures to deal with any spills and collision incidents during construction and operation of the authorised scheme for activities carried out below MHWS. This is detailed in CoT65 (Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the Environmental Statement (ES)).</p> <p>Detailed Pollution Prevention Plan(s) will be prepared in accordance with the Outline Pollution Prevention Plan submitted with the application for development consent (document reference J1.4). This will include details of emergency spill procedures and control measures based on the latest available guidance.</p>	N/A
Potential impacts on the Fylde Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ)	Potential impacts of cable protection and crossings associated with long term habitat loss	<p>Refinement of the Project design parameters has been undertaken since submission of the PEIR. These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for cable protection (and associated long term habitat loss) within the Fylde Marine Conservation Zone.</p> <p>The aim is to bury all cables in the first instance and only where this is unsuccessful would cable protection be required. Cable protection within the Marine Conservation Zone will very much be a contingency measure.</p> <p>An Outline Cable Burial Risk Assessment (document reference J14) and Burial Assessment Study has been developed, which forms part of the outline CSIP (document reference J15)</p>	Cable protection has been reduced from 20% to 10% for the Morgan export cables, with a commitment to limit this allowance to a maximum of 3% in the Fylde MCZ (excluding cable crossings) and from 15% to 10% for the Morecambe export cables, with a commitment to limit this allowance to a maximum of 3% in the Fylde MCZ (excluding cable crossings).

Commercial fisheries (PEIR Volume 2, Chapter 6)

Theme raised in feedback	Key points raised	Applicants' responses	Relevant design changes
<p>Concern over impact to fisheries and sea users</p>	<p>Disruption to fishing industry and loss of revenue</p>	<p>Following the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), the Project have subsequently made design changes resulting in the removal of the Morgan offshore booster station entirely, resulting in reduced construction and operation and maintenance traffic.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets Offshore Order Limits have been aligned with the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Generation Assets order limits to remove the western portion of the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Generation Assets. There has also been a reduction of the north west corner of the Transmission Assets Order Limits to mitigate potential shipping and navigation impacts.</p> <p>The Applicants are working to facilitate co-existence with commercial fishing stakeholders and minimise disruption as far as is practicably possible. Early engagement was established with fisheries stakeholders in June 2021 and is anticipated to continue throughout the lifetime of the project. A Fisheries Liaison and Coexistence Plan will be developed post-consent by the Applicants with input from commercial fisheries stakeholders. An outline of this plan has been included with the Application (document reference J13).</p> <p>The plans will seek to minimise the duration for which the offshore export cable corridors will be closed to vessels during construction, to limit disruption to commercial fishing activities, if and where practicable. This will include the appointment of a company fisheries liaison officer.</p> <p>The Applicants have made a commitment to minimise the duration for which the offshore export cable corridors will be closed to vessels during construction to limit disruption to commercial fishing activities, if and where practicable.</p>	<p>The Morgan offshore booster station, is no longer required and therefore this has been removed from the Project Design Envelope. The Offshore Substation Platforms and interconnector cables are now only in each respective Generation Assets applications, removing any associated impacts.</p> <p>Reduction in the north west corner of the Order Limits has taken place.</p>

Shipping and navigation (PEIR Volume 2, Chapter 7)

Theme raised in feedback	Key points raised	Applicants' responses	Relevant design changes
Potential impact on commercial shipping.	Concerns over the impact to commercial shipping and routes, including to lifeboats.	<p>Following the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), the Project have subsequently made design changes resulting in the removal of the Morgan offshore booster station entirely, resulting in reduced construction and operation and maintenance traffic.</p> <p>Additionally, the Mona Offshore Wind Project, Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Generation Assets have also committed to modifications to their respective boundaries to increase navigable sea room, thereby minimising impacts to shipping and navigation stakeholders. A Cumulative Regional Navigation Risk Assessment (CRNRA) was undertaken collaboratively between the developers, which has been used in the assessment of the cumulative impacts. The ferry companies and other key stakeholders had been involved in the CRNRA process through attendance at navigation simulations and a hazard workshop. The findings of this process are reflected in the CRNRA, an appendix to the updated (Navigation Risk Assessment) NRA, (Volume 2, annex 7.1: Navigation Risk Assessment of the Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F2.7.1)) and Shipping and Navigation chapter (Volume 2, chapter 7 of the ES (document reference F2.7)) submitted as part of the Application, which concluded that cable laying operations alone would not have a significant effect on regular shipping routes.</p>	<p>The Morgan offshore booster station, is no longer required and therefore this has been removed from the Project Design Envelope. The Offshore Substation Platforms and interconnector cables are now only in each respective Generation Assets applications, removing any associated impacts.</p> <p>Reduction in the north west corner of the Order Limits has taken place.</p>
Concerns with impacts on travel to and from the Isle of Man.	Disruption to ferry services to and from the Isle of Man.	<p>The Project has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE) which no longer includes any sea surface piercing structures. This includes the removal of the Morgan offshore booster station.</p> <p>The impact to commercial shipping during the three phases of the Project has been assessed within the updated NRA and Shipping and Navigation chapter of the ES, which concluded that cable laying operations alone would not have a significant effect on regular shipping routes.</p>	<p>The Morgan offshore booster station, is no longer required and therefore this has been removed from the Project Design Envelope. The Offshore Substation Platforms and interconnector cables are now only in each respective Generation Assets,</p>

			removing any associated impacts.
Marine archaeology (PEIR Volume 2, Chapter 8)			
Theme raised in feedback	Key points raised	Applicants' responses	Relevant design changes
Very limited feedback was received which related to marine archaeology		The measures adopted as part of the Project include mitigation to minimise impacts to any archaeological material that may be encountered during the course of construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning. This includes impacts to previously unknown archaeology receptors. Further details are provided in the Outline Offshore Written Scheme of Investigation for Archaeology (document reference J17).	N/A
Other sea users (PEIR Volume 2, Chapter 9)			
Theme raised in feedback	Key points raised	Applicants' responses	Relevant design changes
Potential impact on recreational sea users	Disruption to recreational sea users.	<p>Substantial reductions to the Order Limits have been made to the north of the PEIR boundary at landfall, including removal of the Order Limits from part of the dunes, south of Squires Gate Lane, between the beach and Clifton Drive North. Temporary beach access has been retained from Squires Gate Lane, and part of the Lytham St Annes dunes remain within the Order Limits, with a commitment to direct pipe trenchless technique installation of the offshore export cables (CoT44).</p> <p>A large area within and adjacent to Blackpool Airport has also been removed, with the retention of an operational access off Squires Gate Lane (A5230).</p> <p>South of the PEIR red line boundary a section of the dunes, north of the St Annes North Beach car park have been removed, along with a large section of the adjacent beach.</p> <p>A central section within the Order Limits has been removed in order to maintain greater distance from residential receptors in the area, and to remove as much of the Lytham St Annes dunes SSSI as possible. East of this, much of the St Annes Old Links Golf Club has been removed.</p>	The Morgan offshore booster station, is no longer required and therefore this has been removed from the Project Design Envelope. The Offshore Substation Platforms and interconnector cables are now only in each respective Generation Assets applications , removing any associated impacts.

		<p>The areas of beach subject to construction works, including landfall compounds will not be available for public access during this period. The areas of beach subject to construction works, including landfall compounds will not be available for public access during this period.</p> <p>However, the Applicants have committed to ensure public access to the east of the works areas will be maintained during construction. This will ensure that, areas to the north and south of the works area would remain accessible for beach-based activities. The Applicants have sought to minimise the duration of beach works by committing to a direct pipe trenchless installation technique in order to limit potential disruption to users of the beach and an Outline Open Space Management Plan has been appended to the Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (document reference B13), which includes measures to minimise potential impacts.</p> <p>Potential indirect impacts on tourism associated with potential changes to visual amenity of local areas has been assessed within Volume 4 Chapter 2: Socio-economics of the ES (document reference F4.2). Other potential impacts on local amenity and indirect impacts on residents and visitors have been assessed in Volume 1, Annex 5.1: Human health of the ES (document reference F1.5.1), Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8) and Volume 3, Chapter 9: Air quality of the ES (document reference F3.9).</p> <p>A full impact assessment on other sea users is presented in Volume 2, Chapter 9: Other sea users of the Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F2.9).</p>	<p>Reduction in the north west corner of the Order Limits have taken place.</p> <p>Substantial reductions to the Order Limits have been made to the north of the PEIR boundary at landfall.</p>
--	--	--	---

Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions (PEIR Volume 3, Chapter 1)

Theme raised in feedback	Key points raised	Applicants' responses	Relevant design changes
Concerns over land movements considering local experience of fracking	Will construction works cause geological events similar to those experienced in the area during fracking works	The target trench depth for cable installation is approximately 1.8m. Trenchless, drilling methodologies are to be used locally where crossings are required (e.g. beneath roads/rivers). The installation depths will generally be within shallower geological deposits rather than deep within the consolidated bedrock. The drilling methodologies to be used are designed to minimise the displacement of surrounding materials (therefore minimising instability) and do not involve the injection of significant volumes of liquid into fractured bedrock at depth under the high-pressures that are often attributed to inducing tremors. The installation depths are shallower than those required for fracking. Further detail is provided in Volume 3, Chapter 1:	Commitment to the use of trenchless techniques, where practicable with the exception of Leach Lane, which may be open cut (CoT02). HDD (or other trenchless techniques) installation)

	<p>Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions (document reference F3.1) of the Environmental Statement (ES).</p> <p>The onshore export cable corridor will cross existing infrastructure and obstacles such as roads, railways and rivers. All major crossings, such as major roads, river and rail crossings will be undertaken using trenchless technologies where practicable. All trenchless crossings will be undertaken by non-impact methods such as horizontal directional drilling (or other trenchless techniques), excluding preparatory works, in order to minimise construction noise and vibration beyond the immediate location of works.</p>	<p>including direct pipe will be used for up to 4 circuits within Blackpool Road Recreation Ground (CoT123).</p>
--	---	--

Hydrology and flood risk (PEIR Volume 3, Chapter 2)

Theme raised in feedback	Key points raised	Applicants' responses	Relevant design changes
<p>Creating or increasing the risk of flooding</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing flooding issues will be exacerbated. Construction activity could make flooding worse. Run off from the new substation will cause flooding. 	<p>The Flood Risk Assessment undertaken demonstrates that the onshore elements of the Transmission Assets meet the requirements of relevant local and national planning policy, including the requirement to ensure that the Transmission Assets would not result in any increase in flood risk elsewhere (Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the Environmental Statement ES (document reference F3.2)).</p> <p>An Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase. In order to manage impacts to field drainage, the Outline CoCP stipulates field drainage plans will be developed in consultation with the relevant landowners. If required, additional field drainage will be installed to ensure the existing drainage of the land is maintained during and after construction.</p> <p>An Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan (document reference J10) for the substation site(s) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Operational Drainage Management Plan will be developed in line with the latest relevant drainage guidance notes in consultation with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority (Lancashire County Council). It will include measures to ensure that existing land drainage is reinstated and/or maintained. This will include measures to limit discharge rates and attenuate flows to maintain greenfield runoff rates at the onshore substations. It will also include</p>	<p>N/A</p>

	<p>measures to control surface water runoff, including measures to prevent flooding of the working areas or offsite and to ensure any runoff is treated appropriately.</p> <p>Detailed Operational Drainage Management Plan(s) will be prepared for the onshore substation sites in accordance with the Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan submitted with the application for development consent (document reference J10). The Plan(s) will include measures to limit discharge rates and attenuate flows to maintain greenfield runoff rates at the onshore substations. It will also include measures to control surface water runoff, including measures to prevent flooding of the working areas or offsite and to ensure any runoff is treated appropriately.</p>	
--	---	--

Onshore ecology and nature conservation (PEIR Volume 3, Chapter 3)

Issue raised in feedback	Key points raised	Applicant's responses	Relevant design changes
<p>Potential impact to the local environment, including wildlife</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential damage to local wildlife habitats. • Concerns that wildlife surveys have not been adequately completed. • Potential damage to hedgerows, trees, flora and fauna. • No benefits. 	<p>The site selection process has avoided of designated sites (including Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Lancashire Wildlife Trust Reserves and Ancient Woodland) during the site selection process, where practicable. Where possible, unprotected areas of woodland, mature and protected trees (i.e., veteran trees) have been avoided.</p> <p>Trenchless techniques will be used to install cables beneath all Environment Agency main rivers. In particular, the crossing beneath the River Ribble will be undertaken using trenchless installation techniques.</p> <p>As set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11), the Project is not subject to a mandatory net gain requirement under the Environment Act 2021. Nevertheless, the Applicants have worked with statutory consultees to discuss the approach, and to develop the design, to allow the maximum benefit to biodiversity within the parameters of the project.</p> <p>The biodiversity benefit, mitigation and enhancement areas that were presented at statutory consultation have been refined throughout the onshore export cable corridor and substation areas. For the Project, biodiversity benefit will be delivered within identified biodiversity benefit areas within the Transmission Assets Order Limits: Onshore.</p> <p>A number of areas have been identified as having potential for biodiversity benefit, including provision of new habitat and opportunities for enhancement of habitats including waterbodies, hedgerows, and grassland. This will result in some long term beneficial effects on ecology and nature conservation</p>	<p>A number of key project changes have been made since PEIR which can be summarised as the below. Further details are provided in this Annex and section 4.7 of the Consultation Report.</p> <p>Refinement of the onshore export cable corridor</p> <p>Refinement of crossing technologies</p> <p>Refinement of biodiversity benefit areas within the onshore Order Limits</p>

		Further details of the approach to biodiversity benefit are provided in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11)	
Potential ecological impact of the construction phase of the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ecological impacts at substation sites and export cable corridor. Exhaust emissions from machinery and vehicles impacting the local environment. 	<p>An assessment of the potential impact on key receptors, including qualifying features of the Special Protection Areas (SPAs) (e.g. Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA) as identified in section 4.6.2, is presented within section 4.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F3.4).</p> <p>Measures adopted as part of the Project to mitigate potential impacts on onshore ecology and nature conservation include the commitment to utilise trenchless techniques, where required, to avoid potential impacts on statutory designated sites during construction of the Transmission Assets.</p> <p>Detailed Code(s) of Construction Practice (CoCP(s)) will be prepared in accordance with the Outline CoCP submitted with the application for development consent (document reference J1). The CoCP will include measures to maintain and address ecology and nature conservation.</p> <p>The Code of Construction Practice will contain measures to mitigate potential impacts of dust, noise, and light disturbance on sensitive ecological receptors, including statutory designated sites during construction. In addition, the Code of Construction Practice will create 50 m buffer zones around sensitive ecological areas to reduce the impact of air pollution arising from construction activities.</p> <p>Detailed Ecological Management Plan(s) will be developed in accordance with the Outline Ecological Management Plan submitted as part of the application for development consent (document reference J6). This will include measures relating to habitats and protected or notable species, species mitigation licences and the role of the Ecological Clerk of Works where relevant.</p> <p>An assessment of dust generated during the construction phase has been undertaken in the ES and mitigation measures recommended to ensure the effects are not significant (Volume 3, Chapter 9 of the ES, document reference F3.9)</p>	<p>Refinement of the onshore export cable corridor</p> <p>Refinement of crossing technologies</p> <p>Refinement of biodiversity benefit areas within the onshore Order Limits</p>
Onshore and intertidal ornithology (PEIR Volume 3, Chapter 4)			
Theme raised in feedback	Key points raised	Applicants' responses	Relevant design changes

<p>Potential impact on birdlife</p>	<p>General impacts on birds including migration and nesting, including but not exhaustively on Lytham Moss, the Ribble Estuary, Newton Marsh Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</p>	<p>The site selection process has avoided designated sites (Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Lancashire Wildlife Trust Reserves, Ancient Woodland and Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) Reserves), where practicable. Where possible, unprotected areas of woodland, mature and protected trees (i.e., veteran trees) have been avoided.</p> <p>Detailed Ecological Management Plan(s) will be developed in accordance with the Outline Ecological Management Plan submitted as part of the application for development consent (document reference J6). This will include a Breeding Bird Protection Plan.</p> <p>To mitigate for potential permanent habitat loss associated with each of the onshore substations, mitigation areas south of Newton-with-Scales will be provided for waders and farmland birds. Measures within these areas may include measures, such as, the creation of scrapes and thickening of hedgerows.</p> <p>Where construction activities are undertaken along the onshore export cable corridor in proximity to Higher Ballam and Lower Ballam, a mitigation area will be provided for supplementary feeding of pink-footed goose and whooper swan during the core wintering bird period (November to March, inclusive).</p> <p>A patch of arable farmland contained within Lytham Moss and adjacent to the Farmland Conservation Area has been identified as the location for supplementary feeding of pink-footed goose and whooper swan.</p>	<p>A number of key project changes have been made since PEIR which can be summarised as the below. Further details are provided in this Annex and section 4.7 of the Consultation Report.</p> <p>Reduction of the Order Limits at landfall</p> <p>Refinement of the onshore export cable corridor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of the option to install the onshore export cables within or along (as opposed to across or under) roads. • Reduction in overall temporary and permanent widths of the onshore export cable corridor • Removal of the southern onshore export cable option (Option 2, south) <p>Refinement of the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor</p>
-------------------------------------	--	--	---

			Refinement of crossing technologies Refinement of biodiversity benefit and mitigation areas
Historic environment (PEIR Volume 3, Chapter 5)			
Issue raised in feedback	Key points raised	Applicant's responses	Relevant design changes
Concerned about impact to Roman and other heritage sites e.g., fort in Kirkham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that historic sites will be impacted, such as Fort in Kirkham and Quakers' Wood Concerns about impacts to listed buildings and heritage sites. 	<p>A range of sensitive historical areas have been avoided where possible during the site selection process, including listed buildings, scheduled monuments, registered parks and gardens conservation areas and non-designated built heritage assets.</p> <p>The Project team has worked closely with the Historic Environment Team at Lancashire County Council and with Historic England to ensure that adverse effects on the historic environment have been avoided, reduced or offset wherever possible. The assessment of residual effects is set out within section 5.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 5: Historic environment of the Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F3.5).</p>	N/A
Concerned about the lack of archaeological investigations		<p>No designated heritage asset would be directly physically impacted by the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning phases of the Transmission Assets</p> <p>A phased programme of archaeological evaluation is being undertaken in accordance with best practice and with methodologies approved in advance by relevant stakeholders including the Historic Environment Team at Lancashire County Council. Further archaeological fieldwork will be undertaken ahead of and during construction to reduce or offset any impacts on buried archaeological remains.</p> <p>The measures adopted as part of the Project include mitigation to minimise impacts to any archaeological material that may be encountered during the course of Project construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning. This includes impacts to previously unknown archaeology receptors. Further details are provided in</p>	N/A

		<p>the Outline Offshore Written Scheme of Investigation for Archaeology (document reference J17).</p> <p>The historic area around Quakers Wood has been subject to further review following comments received as part of the statutory consultation. This information is presented within in Volume 3, Annex 5.1: Historic environment desk-based assessment of the ES (document reference F3.5.1). The nature of the proposed works in this area are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). No physical impacts would occur within any land identified as a potential burial ground.</p>	
Land use and recreation (PEIR Volume 3, Chapter 6)			
Theme raised in feedback	Key points raised	Applicants' responses	Relevant design changes

<p>Potential construction impacts to farming / agricultural businesses</p> <p>Concerns over land take of farming / agricultural land</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Including substation sites and export cable corridor. • Farmers facing restricted access to their land. • Farmers being impacted by road closures. • Including substation sites and export cable corridor. • Reduction in farmable land will make farms unviable. • Concerns regarding the impact on the local economy of multiple farms closing. 	<p>As already established, a number of key project changes have been made since PEIR, including but not exclusively the reduction in overall temporary and permanent widths of the onshore export cable corridor, the removal of the southern onshore export cable option (Option 2, south), which passed to the south of Higher Ballam and the refinement of the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor. These refinements have reduced the land within the Order Limits.</p> <p>The potential impacts of the Project with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F3.6).</p> <p>Measures adopted as part of the Project to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings. This includes appointment of an Agricultural Liaison Officer (ALO) to be appointed in time for commencement of pre-construction activities and to be the dedicated point of contact for ongoing engagement about practical matters with landowners, occupiers and their agents during the pre-construction and construction phases.</p> <p>The Applicants' appointed land agents will continue to engage with landowners identified within the Onshore Order Limits, as appropriate.</p> <p>Temporary access points from the public highway will be installed to facilitate vehicular access into the onshore export cable corridor, 400 kV grid connection cable corridor and onshore substations, during construction, in accordance with the indicative outline highway access designs set out within Outline Highways Access Management Plan, prepared and submitted with the application for development consent (document reference J8). The Applicants have committed that there will be no open-cut trenching activities or road closures to any public A, B and Classified unnumbered roads, save for Leach Lane. It is expected that open cut trenching of Leach Lane could be undertaken without a road closure</p> <p>Further details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), with measures to control</p>	<p>A number of key project changes have been made since PEIR which can be summarised as the below. Further details are provided in this Annex and section 4.7 of the Consultation Report.</p> <p>Refinement of the onshore export cable corridor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of the option to install the onshore export cables within or along (as opposed to across or under) roads. • Reduction in overall temporary and permanent widths of the onshore export cable corridor • Removal of the southern onshore export cable option (Option 2, south) <p>Refinement of the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor</p> <p>Single onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8).</p>	<p>Windfarm: Transmission Assets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 2 (south) being taken forward • Refinement of footprint and height <p>Refinement of the onshore substation for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Transmission Assets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refinement of location and maximum height • Selection of gas insulated switchgear (GIS) • Increased footprint
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		
<p>Disruption to bridleways and Public Right of Way (PROW)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Including substation sites and export cable corridor. • Access for recreational walking will be reduced. • Access for horse riding and dog walking will be reduced. 	<p>Measures adopted as part of the Project to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of this chapter of the ES. This includes preparation of a PRow Management Strategy in general accordance with the Outline PRow Management Strategy (document reference J1.5) submitted with the Development Consent Order (DCO) application.</p> <p>The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g. National Cycle Routes (NCRs), Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project, during construction of the Transmission Assets, via the implementation of temporary managed crossings and temporary diversions. Once operational, there is no requirement for the permanent stopping up or diversion of existing PRow.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Traffic and transport (PEIR Volume 3, Chapter 7)			
Theme raised in feedback	Key points raised	Applicant's responses	Relevant design changes
Onshore construction will cause disruption to traffic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Including substation sites and export cable corridor. Increased traffic will be dangerous to pedestrians. Construction traffic will make current traffic issues worse. Road closures and road works will cause local disruption. Construction will negatively affect emergency services. 	<p>At statutory consultation, two proposed sites were presented for the Morecambe onshore substation. Having considered a range of factors the decision has been made to progress onshore substation site option 2 (south). This option provides a direct access route from the A584 Preston New Road during construction, ensuring the construction accesses for both onshore substations are from separate roads.</p> <p>Further details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F3.7), with measures to control impacts on the environment and the local community set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8). This will include measures to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> managing the numbers and routing of Heavy Goods Vehicles during the construction phase; managing the movement of construction worker traffic during the construction phase; details of measures to manage the safe passage of Heavy Goods Vehicle traffic via the local highway network; and details of localised road improvements if and where these may be necessary to facilitate safe use of the existing road network. <p>The Applicants have committed that there will be no open-cut trenching activities or road closures to any public A, B and Classified unnumbered roads, save for Leach Lane. It is expected that open cut trenching of Leach Lane could be undertaken without a road closure.</p> <p>Where practicable, during construction, access routes within the onshore export cable corridor and 400 kV grid connection corridor (i.e., for example, the use of haul roads) will be used, to minimise potential impacts to the local road network.</p>	<p>The option to install the onshore export cables along the residential roads of Leach Lane, Blackpool Road North and Kilnhouse Lane has been removed from the Applicants' proposals.</p> <p>Single onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal of the southern onshore export cable option (Option 2, south)

	<p>The Applicants consulted the emergency services as section 42 consultees; no feedback was received. Notwithstanding this, the key consideration in terms of emergency services is maintaining access. In such an event, with their blue lights and emergency situations, they are considered differently to other road users, however, the proposed works would not restrict access and measures to control impacts are set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8). This will ensure vehicles are not waiting on the public highway (i.e. they would not block parts of the highway).</p>	
--	---	--

Noise and Vibration (PEIR Volume 3, Chapter 8)

Theme raised in feedback	Key points raised	Applicants' responses	Relevant design changes
<p>Concerns about noise, light and vibrations created by project</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns of 'constant' noise from substations. Noise and light pollution from construction. Concerns about light pollution from substation. 	<p>As already established, a number of key project changes have been made since PEIR, including but not exclusively the selection of onshore substation option 2 (south) for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets and refinements to the location of the onshore substation for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Transmission Assets. This has resulted in the onshore substations being further away from noise sensitive receptors.</p> <p>Due to the continuous, 24-hour operation of the onshore substations, the assessment of noise impacts has been undertaken relative to the night-time background sound levels at the nearest and most exposed residential receptors. Mitigation measures have been specified where required and are included in Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8).</p> <p>An assessment of noise and vibration impacts – along with proposed mitigation - during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Project is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.2: Construction Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F3.8.2). This includes an assessment of all construction activities required, as well as noise impacts due to construction traffic on the local highway network.</p> <p>Examples of the mitigation measures are set out in the Outline Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (document reference J1.3). The Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan will be agreed with the relevant planning authority prior to construction.</p>	<p>Single onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets</p> <p>Refinement of the onshore substation for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Transmission Assets.</p>

		<p>Within the assessment of operational noise impacts (Volume 3, Annex 8.3 of the ES) particular consideration is given to the tonal components at low frequency which are present in the noise emission spectra of high voltage electricity transmission equipment such as transformers and shunt reactors.</p> <p>An operational noise limit will be secured as a requirement of the Development Consent Order (DCO) resulting in significant adverse effects being avoided and adverse impacts minimised at all times.</p> <p>Construction site lighting will only operate when required and will be positioned and directed to avoid unnecessary illumination to residential properties, sensitive ecological receptors and footpath users, and minimise glare to users of adjoining public highways. Operational lighting will be low level and directional.</p> <p>Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1). This includes an outline version of the Outline Construction Artificial Light Emissions Management Plan is included as part of the DCO application (document reference J1.11).</p>	
--	--	---	--

Air quality (PEIR Volume 3, Chapter 9)

Theme raised in feedback	Key points raised	Applicants' responses	Relevant design changes
Emissions to air	Potential impacts from construction activities, particularly dust.	<p>An assessment of dust generated during the construction phase has been undertaken taking consideration of both human and ecological receptors. Mitigation measures have been included in the Outline Dust Management Plan (document reference J25).</p> <p>An assessment on human health in relation to air quality impacts, including emissions associated with construction and decommissioning activities, has been undertaken (refer to Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1)). Any potential effects would be mitigated by best practice measures within the Dust Management Plan.</p> <p>Operational air quality effects (e.g., maintenance vehicle emissions) are not anticipated to be of a scale, even accounting for non-threshold effects, that could affect population health.</p>	N/A

Seascape, landscape and visual resources (PEIR Volume 4, Chapter 1)

Theme raised in feedback	Key points raised	Applicant's responses	Relevant design changes
Potential visual impact of the wind farm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of turbines Height of turbines 	<p>These responses appear to relate to the generation assets for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and/or the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm, which are subject to separate applications for development consent.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets no longer has any offshore structures that are above sea-level, and therefore no sea-piercing permanent infrastructure.</p>	N/A
Potential visual impact of onshore transmission assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact of construction activities on the landscape. Visual impact of the new onshore substations. Visual impact on the landfall area. Lack of visualisations presented at Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR). 	<p>An iterative Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design of the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2).</p> <p>At PEIR the Morgan preferred onshore substation site was presented within the in the largest 'onshore substation consultation area'. The chosen location has moved east. The maximum building height has been reduced from 20m and PEIR to 15m at application. However, the permanent footprint has been increased, from 125,000m² to 164,000m² due to the changes in the location of the site and factors, such as potential ground conditions. This area includes landscape planting, access, flood attenuation and drainage</p> <p>A commitment to gas insulated switchgear (GIS) technology only has been made to reduce the overall area required for permanent electrical infrastructure at the Morgan onshore substation site.</p> <p>At PEIR two potential options were presented for the Morecambe onshore substation, Option 1 (north) and Option 2 (south). Option 2 (South) is the preferred location for Morecambe onshore substation. The total permanent footprint has reduced from 60,000 m² at PEIR to 59,500 m² at application, including landscape planting, access, flood attenuation and drainage. The maximum building height has been reduced from 20m and PEIR to 13m at application.</p> <p>These refinements, which increase the distance from the substations and residential receptors, alongside the development of an Outline Landscape Management Plan will reduce visual impacts of the buildings.</p> <p>Wireline visualisations were included within the PEIR, showing the maximum parameters from various viewpoints Following the decisions with regard to the</p>	<p>A number of key project changes have been made since PEIR which can be summarised as the below. Further details are provided in this Annex and section 4.7 of the Consultation Report.</p> <p>Single onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option 2 (south) being taken forward Refinement of footprint and height <p>Refinement of the onshore substation for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Transmission Assets.</p>

	<p>onshore substations, visualisations have been presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). The representative viewpoints have been selected to represent a broad range of locations and sensitive visual receptors across the study area. Fieldwork was undertaken to verify the visual receptors and representative viewpoint locations and photography captured.</p> <p>Photomontages have been produced for each of the publicly accessible representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures)., with representative viewpoints being selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees.</p> <p>Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F3.10) describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refinement of location and maximum height • Selection of gas insulated switchgear (GIS) • Increased footprint
--	--	---

Aviation and radar (PEIR Volume 4, Chapter 2)

Theme raised in feedback	Key points raised	Applicant's responses	Relevant design changes
<p>Electro-magnetic fields (EMF) impacts on aviation (BAE Warton and Blackpool Airport)</p>	<p>Potential impacts from EMF to systems and training, as well as to prototype aircrafts, at Warton Aerodrome and Blackpool Airport.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential impact from EMF to active military test flights. • Potential interference from EMF navigation 	<p>Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used.</p> <p>EMF interference effects arising from the operations and maintenance phases of the Project have been assessed in section 11.11 of Volume 3 Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F3.11). Due to the location of the Aerodrome and the Onshore Order Limits of the Project, the Aerodrome has been scoped out of the assessment as there is no potential for effect.</p> <p>With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing. Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public</p>	<p>N/A</p>

	and communication systems / RADAR	<p>health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex</p> <p>Detailed design works including sensitive export cable routing and micro-siting and appropriate construction techniques (cable depth and sheathing in particular) will continue regarding any potential effects, if any, to the Blackpool Airport CNS infrastructure. Construction works mitigation will be addressed in, and be in line with, the CAAs regulatory expectation (CAP 791 process and procedures).</p> <p>The Applicants have submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4).</p>	
Operational impact on BAE Warton and Blackpool Airport (separate to EMF)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact to operations of aerodrome / airports caused by the construction and / or operation of the Project. 	<p>Since PEIR, Substantial reductions to the Order Limits have been made to the north of the PEIR boundary at landfall, including the removal of a large area within and adjacent to Blackpool Airport, with the retention of an operational access off Squires Gate Lane (A5230).</p> <p>The Applicants are working closely with Blackpool Airport and the Enterprise Zone . Planning and works programmes on the Airport are being agreed by the Applicants and Blackpool Airport Operations Ltd (BAOL) to mitigate any effects to the Airport's flight operations. These plans are also considered within Aviation and Radar Volume 3, Chapter 11 of the ES (document reference F3.11).</p> <p>Impacts arising from the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning phases of the Project have been assessed. BAE Systems Warton (Aerodrome) has been scoped out as there is no potential for effect. The Onshore Order Limits lay beyond the CNS safeguarded areas and beyond the runway safeguarded area. The Onshore Order Limits lie below the Aerodrome Obstacle Limitation Surfaces Inner Horizontal Surface, however, construction equipment (during the construction phase) and remaining above surface infrastructure (during the operation and maintenance phase) will not penetrate the surface ceiling.</p>	N/A
Climate change (PEIR Volume 4, Chapter 3)			
Theme raised in feedback	Key points raised	Applicant's responses	Relevant design changes

<p>Environmental impact of wind farm construction does not offset energy generated</p>	<p>Carbon footprint of wind farms is too great</p>	<p>An assessment of carbon emissions associated with construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the project has been set out within Volume 4, Chapter 1: Climate change of the Environmental Statement (ES), which includes an assessment of whole life effects and of cumulative effects (considering the Project alongside lifetime emissions associated with Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Generation Assets, and Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets).</p> <p>The cumulative impact assessment presents a range of whole life avoided emissions. Such a range is presented given the complexities of predicting the future composition of the UK electricity Grid and amount of fossil fuel the generation assets displaced as a result of the Project.</p> <p>To provide further context, electricity generation emissions intensities have been calculated within the cumulative effects assessment, which show that electricity emissions intensities arising from the Project alongside the Generation Assets are lower than those for the current grid, fossil fuel generation, and UK target emissions intensities, thereby demonstrating that the electricity generated by the Generation Assets and enabled by the Project enables and aids UK Grid decarbonisation.</p> <p>A Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Strategy (document reference J4) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The GHG Reduction Strategy outlines options to reduce construction-related emissions, enabling reduced whole life emissions.</p>	
Socio-economics (PEIR Volume 4, Chapter 4)			
Theme raised in feedback	Key points raised	Applicant's responses	Relevant design changes
<p>Impact on local economy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disruption to the tourism industry in the area. • Loss of revenue for local businesses. • Concern about job losses due to construction disruption. 	<p>Substantial reductions to the Order Limits have been made to the north of the PEIR boundary at landfall. including removal of the Order Limits from part of the dunes, south of Squires Gate Lane, between the beach and Clifton Drive North.</p> <p>Temporary beach access has been retained from Squires Gate Lane, and part of the Lytham St Annes dunes remain within the Order Limits, with a commitment to direct pipe trenchless technique installation of the offshore export cables (CoT44).</p> <p>A large area within and adjacent to Blackpool Airport has also been removed, with the retention of an operational access off Squires Gate Lane (A5230).</p> <p>South of the PEIR red line boundary a section of the dunes, north of the St Annes North Beach car park have been removed, along with a large section of the adjacent</p>	<p>N/A</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern large employers will have difficulties attracting new employees. • 	<p>beach. A central section within the Order Limits has been removed in order to maintain greater distance from residential receptors in the area, and to remove as much of the Lytham St Annes dunes SSSI as possible. East of this, much of the St Annes Old Links Golf Club has been removed.</p> <p>The areas of beach subject to construction works, including landfall compounds will not be available for public access during this period.</p> <p>However, the Applicants have committed to ensure public access to the east of the works areas will be maintained during construction. This will ensure that, areas to the north and south of the works area would remain accessible for beach-based activities. The Applicants have sought to minimise the duration of beach works by committing to a direct pipe trenchless installation technique in order to limit potential disruption to users of the beach and an Outline Open Space Management Plan has been appended to the Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (document reference B13), which includes measures to minimise potential impacts.</p> <p>Potential indirect impacts on tourism associated with potential changes to visual amenity of local areas has been assessed within Volume 4 Chapter 2: Socio-economics of the ES (document reference F4.2). Potential tourism effects in North West England are assessed as negligible. Given this is not significant in EIA terms, further mitigation is not required.</p> <p>The Applicants have considered impacts of the associated expenditure of Transmission Assets on the economies of the socio-economic study areas, measured through receptors of employment, Gross Value Added (GVA) and increased employment opportunities for local residents.</p> <p>Potential economic effects in North West England are assessed as beneficial. Given the beneficial nature of potential economic effects</p> <p>An Outline Employment and Skills Plan has been prepared and submitted as part of the application for development consent (document reference J31). This will be developed further post-consent to detail how the Applicants will engage with local workers and training providers for anticipated employment opportunities associated with the Project. This process will involve engagement and consultation with relevant employment and skills stakeholders (stakeholders are likely to include local councils, key educational providers, skills partnerships, and other developments in the pipeline)</p> <p>The Project is fully committed to delivering a community benefits scheme in line with UK Government guidance, which is due to be published later this year. Ahead of the guidance being published we have been engaging with local people, businesses and</p>	
--	---	---	--

		<p>organisations to identify key themes and projects that will deliver strategic benefits and directly support the local community and local priorities. The Applicants welcome further input from the local community on this aspect.</p> <p>The Applicants have committed that there will be no open-cut trenching activities or road closures to any public A, B and Classified unnumbered roads, save for Leach Lane. It is expected that open cut trenching of Leach Lane could be undertaken without a road closure. It is not anticipated that there will be any traffic related impact on businesses as a result of construction .</p> <p>Measures to control impacts on the environment and the local community set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8). This will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> managing the numbers and routing of Heavy Goods Vehicles during the construction phase; managing the movement of construction worker traffic during the construction phase; details of measures to manage the safe passage of Heavy Goods Vehicle traffic via the local highway network; and details of localised road improvements if and where these may be necessary to facilitate safe use of the existing road network. 	
Impact on schools / children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceived danger to children due to disruption from construction. Health concerns surrounding children and construction work. Concerns around school access and general disruption. 	<p>Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1). The Code of Construction Practice will contain measures to mitigate potential impacts of dust, noise, and light disturbance on sensitive ecological receptors, including non-statutory designated sites during construction. In addition, the Code of Construction Practice will create 50 m buffer zones around sensitive ecological areas to reduce the impact of air pollution arising from construction activities.</p> <p>As set out above, there are no road closures proposed during construction works, no impact on school access is therefore anticipated.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 7 of the ES (document reference F3.7) assess both the impact on fear and intimidation caused by construction works or traffic</p>	N/A

as well as road safety. The assessment show that there is no step change anticipated over the baseline in the level of fear and intimidation as a result of the proposed works. Using existing injury accident records, national statistics and the type and quantity of traffic generated It is possible to estimate the impact of increased traffic on road safety. The construction vehicles would not result in significant increases in traffic and the composition of traffic and thus considered to have any significant impact on road safety.

An assessment on human health has been undertaken (refer to Volume 1, Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1)). Further details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8). Construction dust is set out in the Human Health section below.

Human health

Theme raised in feedback	Key points raised	Applicants' responses	Relevant design changes
Concerns that Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) will impact local people's health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns of increased cancer risk for local people. Uncertainty around the impacts of EMFs and general apprehension. Concern over impact of EMFs on local wildlife. 	<p>EMFs are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used.</p> <p>The UK Government has adopted the 1998 Guidelines for Limiting Exposure to time-varying electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields (up to 300 GHz) produced by the International Commission on Non-ionising Radiation Protection (ICNIRP). The ICNIRP guidance provides occupational and public exposure limits for EMF.</p> <p>All the electrical infrastructure associated with the offshore and onshore elements of the Project would be designed to comply with current guidelines on levels of public exposure and design of electrical infrastructure. On this basis, it was agreed with the Planning Inspectorate that effects associated with EMFs would not be significant and would be scoped out of the EIA process.</p> <p>With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing. Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing</p>	N/A

		<p>and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 of the Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Project on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex.</p> <p>Please refer to the EMF Compliance Statement for further information (Volume 1 Annex 3.4 of the ES, (document reference F1.3.4).</p>	
Concern of general health impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns of decline in health and wellbeing in the area due to disruption. Concerns of increased breathing problems due to construction dust. 	<p>An assessment considering how the Project affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the World Health Organisation definition of health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing. Any effects are assessed to be not significant and can be appropriately addressed through the sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards</p> <p>An assessment of effects on human health in relation to air quality impacts, including emissions associated with construction and decommissioning activities, has been undertaken (refer to Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1)). Operational air quality effects (e.g., maintenance vehicle emissions) are not anticipated to be of a scale, even accounting for non-threshold effects, that could affect population health.</p>	N/A
Concern of impact on mental health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substation construction will reduce access to green spaces, impacting mental health of residents. Disruption due to construction will cause stress and anxiety for residents. Lack of certainty around proposals has caused anxiety for residents. 	<p>An assessment considering how the Project affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the World Health Organisation definition of health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing.</p> <p>Any effects that have been identified relate to public concerns about the project. In planning terms, the level of these impacts have been assessed to be 'not significant'. This level of impact can be appropriately addressed through the sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards.</p> <p>The Applicants have aimed to be open and transparent with all stakeholders. A brochure was created that provided a summary of the latest proposals and details of the consultation. It was held at deposit locations, distributed at consultation events and available for download via the Project website.</p>	N/A

	<p>The PEIR and the PEIR NTS were both widely available. The PEIR was published online and available for review at all consultation events and as deposit locations on USB.</p> <p>The PEIR NTS is intended to act as a stand-alone document that provides an overview of the Project and its likely significant effects in non-technical language. The ES NTS submitted as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application is document reference F1).</p> <p>Measures adopted as part of the Project to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of this chapter of the ES. This includes preparation of a PRow Management Strategy in general accordance with the Outline PRow Management Strategy (document reference J1.5) submitted with the Development Consent Order (DCO) application.</p> <p>The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g. National Cycle Routes (NCRs), Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Project, during construction of the Transmission Assets, via the implementation of temporary managed crossings and temporary diversions. Once operational, there is no requirement for the permanent stopping up or diversion of existing PRow.</p> <p>Further details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8).</p>	
--	--	--

E1.16.2 Overarching consultation process and non-technical comment table of responses

E1.16.2.1 Overarching consultation process and non-technical comments table of responses (via feedback form)

Table E1.16.2.1: Consultation process/non-technical/not topic specific

As set out in section 4.7.4 of the Consultation report (document reference E1). Responses have been allocated to the most appropriate topic(s). If a consultee didn't provide a response for a question/sub-question this is not recorded. If a consultee included 'N/A', 'none', 'no comment', 'Nil', 'No', in response to a question, this has also not been recorded. Where a consultee provided a response which stated 'see response above' or similar, the response has been replicated in brackets and italics.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0050_011_231123	S42	Online Feedback Form	14		What's the timescales? Is this consultation of any real benefit?	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Table 3.4 presented within Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3) details the overall construction programme durations. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.
TA_0051_005_211123	S44	Online Feedback Form	3	3.5	Please see 3.3 above <i>(I strongly object to the proposals to route the transmission cable adjacent to land and properties on REDACTED, Blackpool. The suggested 100+ metre wide corridor, which it has been proposed would be necessary to lay the transmission cable, seems unduly large, and would have a negative effect on the land bordering our properties, with an impact on the already over-stretched natural drainage systems, disturbance during construction with traffic and noise pollution, and a permanent destruction of the natural habitat of the many animals and birds whose home is in the wooded areas surrounding our land.)</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets design has resulted in a reduced construction corridor width, as set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Details of the factors considered during the design evolution are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0051_006_211123	S44	Online Feedback Form	3	3.6	See 3.1 above <i>(I strongly object to the proposals to route the transmission cable adjacent to land and properties on REDACTED, Blackpool. The suggested 100+ metre wide corridor, which it has been proposed would be necessary to lay the transmission cable, seems unduly large, and would have a negative effect on the land bordering our properties, with an impact on the already over-stretched natural drainage systems, disturbance during construction with traffic and noise pollution, and a permanent destruction of the natural habitat of the many animals and birds whose home is in the wooded areas surrounding our land.)</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets design has resulted in a reduced construction corridor width, as set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Details of the factors considered during the design evolution are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0051_008_211123	S44	Online Feedback Form	3	3.8	See 3. above <i>(I strongly object to the proposals to route the transmission cable adjacent to land and properties on REDACTED,</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets design has resulted in a reduced construction corridor width, as set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<i>Blackpool. The suggested 100+ metre wide corridor, which it has been proposed would be necessary to lay the transmission cable, seems unduly large, and would have a negative effect on the land bordering our properties, with an impact on the already over-stretched natural drainage systems, disturbance during construction with traffic and noise pollution, and a permanent destruction of the natural habitat of the many animals and birds whose home is in the wooded areas surrounding our land.)</i>	(document reference F1.3). Details of the factors considered during the design evolution are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0051_009_211123	S44	Online Feedback Form	3	3.9	See 3. above <i>(I strongly object to the proposals to route the transmission cable adjacent to land and properties on REDACTED, Blackpool. The suggested 100+ metre wide corridor, which it has been proposed would be necessary to lay the transmission cable, seems unduly large, and would have a negative effect on the land bordering our properties, with an impact on the already over-stretched natural drainage systems, disturbance during construction with traffic and noise pollution, and a permanent destruction of the natural habitat of the many animals and birds whose home is in the wooded areas surrounding our land.)</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets design has resulted in a reduced construction corridor width, as set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Details of the factors considered during the design evolution are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0051_010_211123	S44	Online Feedback Form	12		Please see previous comments <i>(I strongly object to the proposals to route the transmission cable adjacent to land and properties on REDACTED, Blackpool. The suggested 100+ metre wide corridor, which it has been proposed would be necessary to lay the transmission cable, seems unduly large, and would have a negative effect on the land bordering our properties, with an impact on the already over-stretched natural drainage systems, disturbance during construction with traffic and noise pollution, and a permanent destruction of the natural habitat of the many animals and birds whose home is in the wooded areas surrounding our land.)</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets design has resulted in a reduced construction corridor width, as set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Details of the factors considered during the design evolution are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0051_012_211123	S44	Online Feedback Form	15		The long-term disruption and permanent impact of the routing of transmission cable would far outweigh any short-term benefit to the support of local communities.	A full impact assessment on socio-economics is presented in Volume 4 Chapter 2 of the ES (document reference F4.2). An Outline Employment and Skills Plan has been prepared and submitted as part of the application for development consent (document reference J31). This will be developed further post-consent to detail how the Applicants will engage with local workers and training providers for anticipated employment opportunities associated with the Transmission Assets.
TA_0053_002_171123	S44	Online Feedback Form	1	1.1	Totally unacceptable in every aspect	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0053_013_171123	S44	Online Feedback Form	6		As previously stated <i>("Totally unacceptable for surrounding areas. As a leisure business owner (caravan and camping field) this</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<i>will mean the closure of a life long ambition and a very successful business. Substations proposed position within 200 yards of camp site Will lose views, sunlight and livelihood")</i>	Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0053_015_171123	S44	Online Feedback Form	8		Not acceptable	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0053_018_171123	S44	Online Feedback Form	12		Will not minimize enough	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0053_019_171123	S44	Online Feedback Form	15		Keep all updates with full information	The Applicants are committed to ongoing engagement with local communities throughout the development of the Transmission Assets. Local communities and key stakeholders have been kept informed of key developments through regular updates to the Transmission Assets website and direct emails and letters to affected parties, where required.
TA_0053_020_171123	S44	Online Feedback Form	16		Should not be allowed at any of proposals. Will be the eventual closure of my business and greatly affect property values.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1). The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.
TA_0054_002_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	2		drawing does not out line events	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0054_003_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	5		yes how does this effect me	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0055_005_051123	S44	Online Feedback Form	4		There is a concern about the management of information. There has been considerable expense already incurred in this project with respect to planning, but the information being	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<p>communicated is not crisp in setting out material implications. The information is high on features of the farm and promotion, but the actual onshore implications, although set out, are to some degree buried in a mass of other information.</p> <p>In short summary the onshore implications are a major power transmission trench of up to 25km together with a substation. This is not crisply set out and is almost in the margins of the material being communicated.</p> <p>It is also being communicated there is no preferred location as yet for on shore trench system. This is a challenge to believable given all the planning and effort that has gone into this project. There are an astonishing number of very lengthy & detailed reports on other features - it is almost inconceivable that there has not been effort to identify cable locations given these are central to the project</p>	<p>November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information.</p> <p>The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor and onshore substations, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets - refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received. <p>Details of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3).</p>
TA_0055_007_051123	S44	Online Feedback Form	4	4.4	<p>Linked to the EMC radiation concerns, there are several studies setting out the impact to property values of transmission systems, all negative in respect of the values. This is due to well researched concerns regarding the impact upon health. House prices can drop up to 30% if 250 metres from transmission systems. This is irrefutable and, before a sod of earth has been turned, demonstrable. In our small social group, we know of a house sale has fallen through as a result of this impending project. Another house has been sold quickly as a result of the sellers concerns over the impending project and expected impacts to values.</p> <p>Drops are exponentially greater the closer the properties are to transmission systems.</p>	<p>Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used.</p> <p>With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing. Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex.</p> <p>See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4).</p> <p>The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens.</p> <p>The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>
TA_0056_001_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	1		<p>This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means.</p> <p>Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information.</p> <p>The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate,</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_002_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	1	1.1	As stated above. <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_003_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	1	1.2	ASAP previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_004_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	1	1.3	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_005_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	1	1.4	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_006_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	1	1.5	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_007_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	1	1.6	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_008_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	1	1.7	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_009_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	1	1.8	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<i>Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property."</i>	website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_010_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	1	1.9	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_011_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	2		Correspondence that you send out needs to be sent in plain English.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0056_012_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	3		As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate,

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_013_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	3	3.1	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_014_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	3	3.2	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_015_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	3	3.3	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_016_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	3	3.4	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_017_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	3	3.5	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_018_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	3	3.6	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_019_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	3	3.7	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_020_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	3	3.8	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<i>Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property."</i>	website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_021_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	3	3.9	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_022_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	4		As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_023_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	4	4.1	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate,

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_024_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	4	4.2	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_025_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	4	4.3	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_026_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	4	4.4	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_027_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	4	4.5	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_028_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	5		As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_029_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	6		As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_030_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	7		As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_031_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	8		As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<i>Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property."</i>	website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_032_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	9		As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_033_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	10		As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_034_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	11		As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate,

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_035_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	12		As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_036_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	13		As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_037_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	14		As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_038_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	15		As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0056_039_141123	S44	Online Feedback Form	16		As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0057_001_231123	S44	Online Feedback Form	2		I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's. This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0057_002_231123	S44	Online Feedback Form	5		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.</p>
TA_0057_003_231123	S44	Online Feedback Form	6		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>(12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.</p>
TA_0057_004_231123	S44	Online Feedback Form	8		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						<p>provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.</p>
TA_0057_005_231123	S44	Online Feedback Form	9		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0057_006_231123	S44	Online Feedback Form	10		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0057_007_231123	S44	Online Feedback Form	11		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.</p>
TA_0057_008_231123	S44	Online Feedback Form	12		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						<p>Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.</p>
TA_0057_009_231123	S44	Online Feedback Form	14		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						<p>the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.</p>
TA_0057_010_231123	S44	Online Feedback Form	16		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0058_001_201123	S44	Online Feedback Form	3		<p>I attended one of the consultation meetings where I was informed that option 1 was your preferred choice and that meant no cables would be required to be laid along Blackpool road north. I live on REDACTED and having read a lot of the information I feel that we were misinformed. In short the cables will be laid down our road no matter which option is chosen. On this basis we fully object to the scheme coming through to st Anne's, it would create far to much disruption and I am agains it due to foundational problems that will be created, health issues that you are unable to give clear evidence that residents will not be affected.</p> <p>Overall there has to be an easier route in which you can connect to the national grid, have you explored other options?</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0058_002_201123	S44	Online Feedback Form	4		<p>The information provided is far too technical for me to understand. I've attended a session at the fylde rugby club but was unable to get any clear understanding of what actually is going to happen and for how long ,outside of my property and the effects it would have on myself and my family, as well as my property.</p>	<p>The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).</p>
TA_0060_001_151123	S44	Online Feedback Form	1		<p>Insufficient information being given and it's being drip fed to various other people rather than given everyone the same details at the same time.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information.</p> <p>Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents.</p> <p>The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included, but not limited to, local media advertising (online and offline), social media and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers.</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p>
TA_0060_002_151123	S44	Online Feedback Form	2		<p>At the consultations the information was help back and fluffed over. Very unprofessional.</p> <p>Exactly where are these being placed?</p> <p>What sizes are these to be?</p>	<p>Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Maximum parameters for the substation have been refined following statutory consultation.</p> <p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<p>What are their noise levels?</p> <p>Is it green belt land that you are using if so I wish to state my disproof and I wish it recorded that this is to be disallowed to take place.</p>	<p>avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.</p>
TA_0060_019_151123	S44	Online Feedback Form	14		<p>Why is the information you are currently providing so limited in exact areas of developing this project.</p> <p>Why was not everyone in the Fylde not notified until now even though this has been in planning for several years?</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information.</p> <p>Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents.</p> <p>The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included, but not limited to, local media advertising (online and offline), social media and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers.</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p>
TA_0060_020_151123	S44	Online Feedback Form	15		<p>Don't do it.</p> <p>The effect of this taking place will cause disruption throughout the Fylde so communities will be affected and need much more support in the future which outweighs the benefits from doing it here.</p>	<p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0060_021_151123	S44	Online Feedback Form	16		<p>Despite all the handouts and photos shown at the consultations it is still very restricted on facts. I'm sure more is known by you. So I'm baffled why you are so vague and this makes me and others feel like it's a cover up on what you're actually trying to do.</p> <p>Why can you not just be open, up front and honest. Tell us the true facts in full so that we can give you full answers.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						<p>possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information.</p> <p>Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents.</p> <p>The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included, but not limited to, local media advertising (online and offline), social media and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers.</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p>
TA_251_002_231123	S44	Consult Online	NULL		What are the two highlighted areas around the former Shell garage and Kilmhouse green as they are in very close proximity to highly trafficked road and residential area.	Effects in relation to any changes in traffic are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 7 of the ES (document reference F3.7). It is noted that the option presented at PEIR (placement of cables in trenches within the highways) near Blackpool Airport is no longer required. Details of the current design are provided in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).
TA_0062_001_221123	S44	Online Feedback Form	1		<p>I Live on REDACTED, this is the single track road you intend to build your horrendous monstrosities.</p> <p>I have worked all my life to invest into my home for the future of my family and myself, like many other families on REDACTED.</p> <p>I have been assured that my investment would be safe, and under no circumstances would any development on our precious greenbelt ever be agreed to by the Fylde Borough Council.</p> <p>However the FBC supposedly now have no say in the matter. Well that's not good enough, you cannot simply change decisions that have been lawfully processed by our council and influenced the decisions that people have then made.</p> <p>There are other options available so I urge you to look at them rather than simply looking at maximising profits for already cash rich company's like BP.</p> <p>Your pathetic consultations are an insult to our intelligence.</p> <p>You have spent millions on investigating this project yet spent nothing on 3D cad artist impressions of what its going to like. Instead you feed us pathetic air brushed photos from miles away, showing absolutely nothing, because you don't want the local people to know what it is going to look like.</p> <p>It's a disgrace and your company is a disgrace.</p> <p>Wreck my life and my families life's and there will be consequences.</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.</p> <p>Host local authorities are all considered to be statutory consultees under the Planning Act 2008. As such, the Applicants consulted all local planning authorities including Fylde Council during the pre-application process.</p> <p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information.</p> <p>Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents.</p> <p>Wireline visualisations were made available at statutory consultation, showing the maximum parameters from various viewpoints. Visualisations are presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0062_002_221123	S44	Online Feedback Form	1		<p>I purchased my property back in August 2012, and have spent the last 11 years renovating the house and the grounds. My house will be almost directly opposite the Morecambe option 2 substation. Should option 2 go ahead this will totally devastate our lives. I will, object and campaign to exhaustion against this development ruining our lives.</p> <p>I am REDACTED this month, I had no intensions of moving again and have designed, together with my wife, the property to fulfil our needs for the rest our lives through retirement. I am too old to start all over again and all this is giving me mental health issues making me extremely ill.</p> <p>There is no other property I want to move to, this property is unique to us and there is no other property to replace it with in an area that I have spent my last 60 years, I do not want to move from my village.</p> <p>From the time I considered buying the property and right through to the present I have been assured by Fylde Borough Council that no development would ever be allowed on this greenbelt land, all my outbuildings have been developed from existing footprints of the previous farm, everything I have done has been allowed under the provision it is for private use only, I was not even allowed to rent out a stable as they said lower lane cannot sustain any more traffic so how can a development like this even be considered.</p> <p>We are not prepared to live next to a substation housed in what looks like one the biggest buildings ever constructed, I certainly have never come across a building of this magnitude, and all the noise, disruption, and EMF health issues that come with it.</p> <p>Another grave concern, even if option 1 goes ahead is the drainage problem. The back of my barn becomes flooded in heavy rain, with the dykes not being able to move the water fast enough through to the river. The erection of these two substations would be even more instrumental to this as they are taking over acres of arable land that acts as a soakaway during heavy rain.</p> <p>Another issue you may well have is the sand underneath the land, my single story side extension had to be piled to 10 metres for the footings.</p> <p>All of the money I have spent, the hard work and pain will have been in vain if this projects goes ahead and all my future plans are now on hold until a decision has been made between option 1 and option 2.</p> <p>I have now had to put on hold the final phase of my side extension, therefore cancelling the builders, plumbers, joiners, and bathroom fitters until further notice and it took a years planning to get them all together at the same time. I believe that I am of the same frame of mind as my local councillor and my MP Mark Menzies whom both assure me they are absolutely against this project being sited on our</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.</p> <p>Host local authorities are all considered to be statutory consultees under the Planning Act 2008. As such, the Applicants consulted all local planning authorities including Fylde Council during the pre-application process.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.</p> <p>With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing. Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex.</p> <p>See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4).</p> <p>An assessment on human health is provided at Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) of the ES.</p> <p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>An Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan for the substation site(s) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Operational Drainage Management Plan will include measures to ensure that existing land drainage is reinstated and/or maintained. This will include measures to limit discharge rates and attenuate flows to maintain greenfield runoff rates at the onshore substations It will also include measures to control surface water runoff, including measures to prevent flooding of the working areas or offsite and to ensure any runoff is treated appropriately.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<p>greenbelt. I would also like to comment on the mock photos asked for by Mark Menzies that when offered for viewing at the first consultation meeting did not show any views from Lower Lane itself, which tells its own story, and the lame excuse by your representative at the consultation, and I quote, "we cannot be expected to take Photos from everywhere". This was a diabolical excuse and evidence of a complete lack of concern for the local residents, as well as a cover up, as both substations are going on the edge of Lower Lane and it was blatantly obvious that the photographer would have had to travel down Lower Lane in order to gain access to dirt tracks and fields in order to take some of the other photographs. One photo was taken from Hillock Lane looking over fields, a house, a large housing estate, and showing the Morgan substation slightly peering over the top on the horizon, this was a disgrace and an insult to us all. I would like a response please asap with regards to the choice of option 1 or option 2, and going forward I will be seeking advice from a solicitor and land agent.</p>	
TA_0062_003_221123	S44	Online Feedback Form	3	3.7	<p>Fylde Borough Council have stated on a planning application I have submitted that Lower Lane cannot handle any more traffic. It is a country lane in greenbelt and should be treated as such.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.</p>
TA_0062_005_221123	S44	Online Feedback Form	4	4.2	<p>I would be surprised if BAE Systems have no objections to this project.</p>	<p>Impacts arising from the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning phases of the Transmission Assets have been assessed. BAE Systems Warton (Aerodrome) has been scoped out as there is no potential effect. . The Onshore Order Limits lay beyond the CNS safeguarded areas and beyond the runway safeguarded area. The Onshore Order Limits lie below the Aerodrome OLS Inner Horizontal Surface, however, construction equipment (during the construction phase) and remaining above surface infrastructure (during the operation and maintenance phase) will not penetrate the surface ceiling.</p>
TA_0062_007_221123	S44	Online Feedback Form	9		<p>Should not be allowed on this greenbelt land.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.</p>
TA_0062_009_221123	S44	Online Feedback Form	15		<p>No because we do not want your project.</p>	<p>The Applicants note your response.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0063_001_221123	S44	Hard Copy Feedback Form	1		Completely in favour. You need a medal/to be thanked and admired for your enterprise and commitment! Just get on with it!	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0064_001_221123	S44	Consult Online	NULL		The onshore map is meaningless - it is unrepresentative of the type of infrastructure and seems to just be following street edges Please provide a more detailed onshore map.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). All maps provided captured the detail of the proposals in relation to settlements, roads and other geographic features.
TA_0064_002_221123	S44	Online Feedback Form	1		Your onshore map is meaningless - it is not fit for purpose. You need to extend the time limitation for consulting on the project until you are able to generate a representative onshore map.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). All maps provided captured the detail of the proposals in relation to settlements, roads and other geographic features.
TA_0064_004_221123	S44	Online Feedback Form	3		Your map is appalling, unrepresentative and clearly designed to mislead.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). All maps provided captured the detail of the proposals in relation to settlements, roads and other geographic features.
TA_0064_008_221123	S44	Online Feedback Form	3	3.8	You need to communicate the extent of this in advance - unless you are sensible and skirt the northern edge of the airport	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents. The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included, but not limited to, local media advertising (online and offline), social media and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers. Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.
TA_0064_009_221123	S44	Online Feedback Form	3	3.9	Again you need to identify and communicate potential risks in this area.	Commitments in relation to air quality are set out in Table 9.15 of Volume 3, Chapter 9: Air Quality of the ES (document reference F3.9). These include measures to control dust through a Dust Management Plan (DMP). IAQM guidance indicates that implementation of these measures is effective. The assessment indicates that there would be no significant effects arising from air quality emissions from traffic during the construction or decommissioning phases. Effects during the operational phases are not likely and have been scoped out in agreement with the Planning Inspectorate.
TA_0064_011_221123	S44	Online Feedback Form	4	4.1	Digging up the area and disrupting the local topography and wildlife will have a detrimental effect on quality of life in the area.	The scheme design has been developed through an iterative process. The evolution of mitigation measures since publication of the PEIR has formed part of this process. An Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2) and Onshore Biodiversity Benefits Statement (document reference J11) have been prepared as part of the ES to include measures to mitigate effects on landscape and visual, and ecological receptors during construction and operation and maintenance phases of the Transmission Assets.
TA_0064_013_221123	S44	Online Feedback Form	6		Yes - again these need to be identified and their dimensions provided.	Details of the design of the Transmission Assets, including dimensions, are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).
TA_0064_015_221123	S44	Online Feedback Form	8		Have not received sufficient information. Please supply	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents. The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included, but not limited to, local media advertising (online and offline), social media and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers. Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.
TA_0065_001_211123	S44	Online Feedback Form	4		I oppose this project completely.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0066_003_171023	S44	Online Feedback Form	3		If the project is a success, it is possible that future off-shore fields may be opened. It is essential that the proposed project work works not only for the present but so that construction work in the future is minimised. The project should be completed with urgency and not allowed to drag on. There	Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1). Further details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), with

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					are too many instances of cones being laid out or roads being closed with no work taking place.	measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8).
TA_0066_008_171023	S44	Online Feedback Form	4	4.5	The project documentation is too technical for most members of the public to cope with and it might help to offer a simplified version for general distribution.	The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0066_010_171023	S44	Online Feedback Form	15		Public updates on progress towards the completion date will be important as will stressing the benefits to local residents.	Detailed assessments are provided within all onshore chapters within Volumes 3 and of the ES. (document reference F2 and F3). The Transmission Assets is fully committed to delivering a community benefits scheme in line with UK Government guidance, which is due to be published later this year. Ahead of the guidance being published we have been engaging with local people, businesses and organisations to identify key themes and projects that will deliver strategic benefits and directly support the local community and local priorities. We welcome further input from the local community and encourage you to reach out to the project team in due course. The socio-economics assessment is set out in Volume 4, Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement (document reference F4.2). The Applicants have provided an Outline Skills and Employment Plan (document reference J31). This document sets out the principles that will be secured for the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms: Transmission Assets. This process will involve engagement and consultation with relevant employment and skills stakeholders and will secure the economic benefits associated with the Transmission Assets in relation to skills and employment.
TA_0067_001_221123	S44	Online Feedback Form	1		I have read all the documents and attended one of the meetings. I am totally in favour of renewable energy but totally opposed to this project. How can I can comment all the various aspects when there is little detail available and the the stock answer from advisors is 'We don't know yet'. The documentation is probably the worst I have ever seen and my perception is that it is deliberately designed to confuse residents and hide all the unsavoury bits deep in the detail which consists of techno jargon and, at worst, gobbledegook. The choice of location where the cables are shown as coming ashore is probable the worst it could possibly be (though again I was told 'no-one really knows yet) as it would damage the fragile dune ecology, the nature reserve containing rare species part of a breeding program to try and save them, the environmental corridor behind my house (which no advisors knew existed) and wildlife area which is part of the runway approach to Blackpool airport. None of your advisors even knew the area, had never visited the site or had any knowledge of the environmental issues involved. It's difficult to comment on the level of detail you seen to require when you are not able to answer questions. A total disaster from start to finish!	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Maximum parameters for the substation have been refined following statutory consultation. As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents.
TA_0067_006_221123	S44	Online Feedback Form	4		A PR disaster from start to finish, worse it would seem that the most complicated and disruptive route has been selected with scant real information available from the plans or the consultants. A total re-think is necessary.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.
TA_0067_007_221123	S44	Online Feedback Form	5		The worst possible site selected with major disruption, land values affected, serious environmental issues. There are many other less disruptive alternatives available but my impression was that this was a done deed and the consultation was a required formality to appease affected groups.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.
TA_0067_008_221123	S44	Online Feedback Form	8		Unightly, enormous and again detail hidden deep in the documentation. An environmental disaster.	An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects. Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0011_006_181023	S42	Online Feedback Form	3		This response is based on the information provided within the PEIR (October 2023). Whilst very detailed, it is also by necessity suitably vague with regards to the specifics of the scheme, its actual on and off shore locations/landfall, and any proposed infrastructure. Comments therefore are restricted to relatively high level comments on subjects which would presumably be covered at later stages of the process in much more details.	The Applicants note your response.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0068_001_231123	S44	Hard Copy Feedback Form	3		I am concerned about the access to my property and the impact it will have on my land. In the information pack you mention that some land maybe compulsory purchased. Can you inform me where this is planned to be. The temporary acquisition of land, will you rebuild any boundary brickwalls that you may have to remove with like for like? How long will the project run, when it reaches REDACTED? How will this affect public transport and access to public footpaths? Have you considered how the project will effect people with disabilities?	The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.
TA_0068_002_231123	S44	Hard Copy Feedback Form	3	3.5	Lots of properties are around 100 year old, boundary walls are built with brick (possible Accrington bricks). How will you ensure that you return everything back?	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The project team has worked closely with the HET at Lancashire County Council and with Historic England to ensure that adverse effects on the historic environment have been avoided, reduced or offset wherever possible. The assessment of residual effects is set out within section 5.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 5: Historic Environment of the ES (document reference F3.5).
TA_0070_007_231123	S44	Online Feedback Form	4		Lack of integration between projects or with National Grid. Lack of use of existing overhead lines. Small field of 35 turbines should be cancelled. Too small. Only one windfarm.	Under the Offshore Transmission Network Review, the National Grid Electricity System Operator (NGESO) is responsible for assessing options to improve the coordination offshore wind generation connections and transmission networks and has undertaken a Holistic Network Design Review (HNDR). A key output of the HNDR process was the recommendation that the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm should work collaboratively in connecting the two offshore wind farms to the National Grid electricity transmission network at Penwortham in Lancashire. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0070_002_231123	S44	Online Feedback Form	8		The Ribble route would be best but more expensive. Need more information about routes considered.	The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0070_003_231123	S44	Online Feedback Form	9		area sizes needed appear excessive.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).
TA_0070_006_231123	S44	Online Feedback Form	15		The Project will not be adding to local communities only to its own profits. No reports received yet on the specific land of ours that has been surveyed. Request has been sent in. Small venue difficult to access for event in Kirkham,also shorter than other ones.	The Applicants are working with affected parties to fully understand the impact that the project will have on them and their businesses and identify way to mitigate these. Amendments have been made to the routing following feedback gathered over the course of our landowner engagement meetings, as well as from feedback received throughout the pre- application stage. The Applicants will continue to engage with landowners as the Transmission Assets develops, as appropriate. Survey information is not available on a land holding basis however details can be found in the ES

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					junior staff at event with poor identification.	
TA_0072_001_231123	S44	Consult Online	NULL		Terrible map, secretive, and you are crossing our land in a ziz zag manner, at REDACTED. You have taken no notice of our requests to either route in our land on the north side , or at least keep to a straight line and on our boundary. Your route will take out 40 acres, and render 20 acres unusable for grazing. Why are wildlife(which may or may not be there) be more important than our 270 dairy cows and youngstock, which are definitely here, and need our land to both graze, and produce their winter feed. Your attitude of putting several dairy farms in the area out of business is not acceptable. Our cows produce milk for Tesco. More of a neccessity than wild life. Take issue with Natural England and route up the south side of the Ribble.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Specifically, the potential impact of the Transmission Assets on the viability and operations of existing farming businesses has been considered in Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference: F3.6).
TA_0073_008_151123	S44	Online Feedback Form	14		Until we have a clearer indication of what is proposed with the development, how can we comment?	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0074_001_211123	S44	Online Feedback Form	1		I'm very happy to have offshore wind farms and support green energy	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0074_002_211123	S44	Online Feedback Form	2		Not enough details given so I am totally against until full details given	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0074_012_211123	S44	Online Feedback Form	4	4.4	The effect on my house price will be disastrous and I strongly object to the cables coming ashore anywhere near my property	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.
TA_0074_015_211123	S44	Online Feedback Form	12		I think they are useless in light of the size of this project and the huge negative impact it will have	Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).
TA_0074_016_211123	S44	Online Feedback Form	16		I totally object to the project proposed landfall area and also think the lack of detail given has been deceitful.	Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Maximum parameters for the substation have been refined following statutory consultation.
TA_0075_006_071123	S44	Online Feedback Form	6		Employees using compound areas should be held accountable to drive in a safe, considerate manner.	Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1). Further details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8).
TA_0075_009_071123	S44	Online Feedback Form	12		As I mentioned previously, the uncertainty about exactly where onshore cables will be laid. After laying the cables, priority must be given to land reinstatement.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0075_010_071123	S44	Online Feedback Form	14		I realise that many factors have to be taken into account, but I feel the process appears to be very long winded.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0075_012_071123	S44	Online Feedback Form	16		In these volatile energy times we live in, this Wind Farm Project is vital for an affordable, sustainable energy future for the UK. Many European countries have lots of established wind farms, so the UK has a lot of catching up to do. Going forward I'd like to see uncomplicated, straightforward, easy to understand communications from Morgan and Morecambe Wind Project. Thank you for reading my comments.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0076_005_091123	S44	Online Feedback Form	3	3.6	Not to damage any of the sand dunes with the nice walks and the wild life	Direct pipe trenchless installation is proposed beneath the sand dunes. This technology will ensure there is no open trenching through the dunes. This will avoid any direct loss of vegetation and habitats. Instead, the drill will pass beneath the dunes at depth. Where necessary consideration of any indirect effects on the habitat and measures to avoid, minimise or mitigate these is provided in section 3.11 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0077_001_211123	S44	Online Feedback Form	5		This area has been a building site for the last 8 years and is currently being landscaped ready for a final handing over of the site back to the residents managing contractor and the council. If this proposal goes ahead we face many more years of disruption and possible damage to our properties and property valuations.	Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).
TA_0078_006_051123	S44	Online Feedback Form	3	3.8	Clearly this is going to create much noise, vibration and disturbance to all residents. We bought this house to enjoy a peaceful retirement.	An assessment of noise and vibration impacts during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Transmission Assets is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.2: Construction Noise and Vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.2). This includes an assessment of all construction activities required, as well as noise impacts due to construction traffic on the local highway network. The assessment of operational noise impacts is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3) and includes an assessment of noise impacts due to the plant equipment forming the electrical strategy for the onshore substations.
TA_0078_007_051123	S44	Online Feedback Form	4		The project, to date, has been poorly communicated to local people until now. we have recently purchased our property and were given no information about this on our searches. We have recently discovered that our MP and many other people were aware of the project back in the summer of 2022	The Applicant notes the response.
TA_0078_013_051123	S44	Online Feedback Form	12		I don't think there is really much regard at all for the residents and communities this will effect. This is disguised using ecological constraints as an excuse! People matter!!!	The measures proposed to control effects on the environment and communities are set out in the ES (document reference F1 to F4).
TA_0078_015_051123	S44	Online Feedback Form	15		This project is unlikely to gain support from any of the local residents or communities. WE DO NOT WANT IT IN OUR AREA! There are more suitable areas of coastline which are less populated.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0078_016_051123	S44	Online Feedback Form	16		We are feeling very angry! We have recently purchased our home on REDACTED with our life savings for our retirement. We were not made aware of these proposals on our searches or we would not have bought the house. We did not sign up for years of upset and disruption in our retirement. If this development goes ahead it will almost certainly devalue all our homes and make them unsaleable for many years to come. There is also concern over the health risks associated with close proximity of the electro magnetic fields from the cables. There is little evidence to prove that this is not a valid concern. Perhaps you would like to compulsory purchase all our homes ?!!! If not - are you going to compensate for the loss in value?	Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used. With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing. Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex. See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4). The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.
TA_0079_001_131123	S44	Online Feedback Form	3		I am concerned about the laying of the cables and how much damage it will do to the local area where they are to come ashore .The maps were very vague as to exactly where these cables are to be laid, so it is unfair to expect local residents to be able to make a considered opinion about how it will affect their properties. For example, the edge of the shaded area marking the area of interest for digging appears to run along the pavement outside my garden wall, along REDACTED? My daughter and husband both have long term health issues, I am the person mainly responsible for taking them to health appointments, doing shopping and taking my grandson to school each day (by car as it is not within walking distance). Any major works along REDACTED would create even more problems for my family.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. Details of the selected cable routes and the landfall, where the cables would come onshore, are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Effects in relation to any changes in traffic are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 7 of the ES (document reference F3.7). It is noted that the option presented at PEIR (placement of cables in trenches within the highways) near Blackpool Airport is no longer required. Details of the current design are provided in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).
TA_0079_005_131123	S44	Online Feedback Form	10		Neither is suitable.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0080_002_201123	S44	Online Feedback Form	2		Where will the booster station be?	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE) which no longer includes any surface piercing structures. This includes the removal of the Morgan Booster Station and associated search areas. The OSPs are to be classed as part of the Generation Assets applications only.
TA_0080_006_201123	S44	Online Feedback Form	4		I have concerns about Electromagnetic interference disrupting the performance of electronic devices and communication networks in our property.	The effects of EMF on navigation aids are assessed in Volume 3, Chapter 11: Aviation and radar of the ES (document reference F3.11).
TA_0080_009_201123	S44	Online Feedback Form	5		Sand dunes opposite us are a natural sea defence. I am concerned about the installation of the underground cables compromising sea defences and causing flooding to our properties. I am also concerned about the size and the location of the transition joint boxes. I would like more information please. I'm also concerned about the impact on the habitats of the nature reserve bordering our estate . Also we have concerns about the windfarm development causing radar disruption at Blackpool airport and safety issues.	The location of formal flood defences was informed by Environment Agency Spatial flood defences (including attributes), and not the North West Regional Land Drainage Byelaws. The sand dunes are classified as flood defences within the ES. Impacts and effects in relation to flood risk are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 3: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Details of the design of the Transmission Assets are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The Applicants have engaged with Blackpool Airport throughout the EIA process. Impacts and effects in relation to Blackpool Airport are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 11: Aviation and radar of the ES (document reference F3.11).
TA_0081_001_201123	S44	Online feedback form	1		Absolutely opposed to this. No clear information on the project. Done by stealth as usual. Very angry and we will oppose this to the hilt. It will hit the area and us personally as a family. Our property will lose value and the disruption will be terrible.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0081_002_201123	S44	Online feedback form	2		Absolutely opposed to this. The feedback procedure is purposely complicated and planning is vague. No real transparency - quite a common approach by construction companies.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The feedback form enabled respondents to provide feedback on specific aspects of the proposals. It was structured to allow the Transmission Assets team to accurately categorise and assess feedback in the design process.
TA_0081_003_201123	S44	Online feedback form	3		As mentioned, local residents including my family are totally opposed to this project. The damage and disruption to a local community is unacceptable. Our property values will plummet. A beautiful area will be destroyed. Lay your cables in a region where people's lives are not affected. Will fight this to the hilt!	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0081_004_201123	S44	Online feedback form	5		See previous comments. <i>("As mentioned, local residents including my family are totally opposed to this project. The damage and disruption to a local community is unacceptable. Our property values will plummet. A beautiful area will be destroyed. Lay your cables in a region where people's lives are not affected. Will fight this to the hilt!")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0081_005_201123	S44	Online feedback form	9		See previous comments. <i>("As mentioned, local residents including my family are totally opposed to this project. The damage and disruption to a local community is unacceptable. Our property values will plummet. A beautiful area will be destroyed. Lay your cables in a region where people's lives are not affected. Will fight this to the hilt!")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0083_001_221123	S44	Online feedback form	1		I do not want this project to go ahead in my local community	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_002_221123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.1	I do not agree to this project going ahead	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_003_221123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.2	I do not want this project to go ahead in my local community	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_004_221123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.5	I do not want this offshore project to go ahead	The Applicants note your response.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0083_005_221123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.7	I d not want this project to go ahead	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_006_221123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.8	I do not want this project to go ahead	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_007_221123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.9	I do not want this project to go ahead	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_009_221123	S44	Online feedback form	3		I do not want or agree to this project going ahead in my community	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_010_221123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.1	I do not want this project to go ahead I resist planning permission	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_010_221123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.3	I do not want this project to go ahead I do not agree to planning permission	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_011_221123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.4	I do not agree to planning permission I do not want project to go ahead	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_012_221123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.6	Do not allow planning permission	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_013_221123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.7	Do not allow planning permission to go ahead	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_014_221123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.8	I do not agree to planning permission	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_015_221123	S44	Online feedback form	4		I do not agree with this project I do not agree to planning permission as I live in this community	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_016_221123	S44	Online feedback form	4	4.1	I do not agree I do not give planning permission for project to go ahead	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_017_221123	S44	Online feedback form	4	4.4	I do not argot (sic) this project I do not agree to planning permission	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_018_221123	S44	Online feedback form	4	4.5	I do not agree to planning permission	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_019_221123	S44	Online feedback form	5		I do NOT agree to planning permission on this project	The Applicants note your response.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0083_020_221123	S44	Online feedback form	6		I do Not agree to planning permission	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_021_221123	S44	Online feedback form	7		I do not agree to planning permission	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_022_221123	S44	Online feedback form	8		I Do Not agree to planning permission scrap this project	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_023_221123	S44	Online feedback form	9		I DO NOT agree to this project I Do NOT agree to planning permission	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_025_221123	S44	Online feedback form	11		Do Not go ahead with project	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_026_221123	S44	Online feedback form	12		Do Not go ahead with project I do not agree	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_027_221123	S44	Online feedback form	13		Do not agree with this project do not let it go ahead	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_028_221123	S44	Online feedback form	14		I Do not give my permission for this project I live in area please do not go ahead	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_029_221123	S44	Online feedback form	15		I do not agree with project I live in community I do not want this to go ahead	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_030_221123	S44	Online feedback form	16		Do not go ahead I live in community I do not agree	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0084_002_091123	S44	Online feedback form	2		Unsure what this will be? The size and position?	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE) which no longer includes any surface piercing structures. This includes the removal of the Morgan Booster Station and associated search areas. The OSPs are to be classed as part of the Generation Assets applications only.
TA_0084_003_091123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.2	Yes a big worry	The assessment of the impact of increased flood risk arising from additional surface water runoff is presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2) An Outline CoCP (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase. An Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan for the substation site(s) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Operational Drainage Management Plan will include measures to ensure that existing land drainage is reinstated and/or maintained. This will include measures to limit discharge rates and attenuate flows to maintain greenfield runoff rates at the onshore substations It will also include measures to control surface water runoff, including measures to prevent flooding of the working areas or offsite and to ensure any runoff is treated appropriately. The Operational Drainage Management Plan will be developed in line with the latest relevant

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						drainage guidance notes in consultation with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority (Lancashire County Council).
TA_0084_004_091123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.8	Very concerned about noise pollution	The impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets in terms of noise are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 8 : Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8).
TA_0084_005_091123	S44	Online feedback form	4		My area has often got the Gas people out as there are regular gas leaks. I am concerned if digging (road infrastructure) goes ahead this will get worse.	The site selection process associated with the onshore infrastructure considers proximity to existing infrastructure, including utility assets. Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). The Applicants are and will continue to engage with asset owners, in relation to where existing infrastructure may need to be crossed. Many assets are expected to be crossing using trenchless techniques, including direct pipe and micro-tunnel which will avoid potential direct impacts. Where necessary crossing agreements, and potentially protective provisions would be agreed with assets owners, to ensure the protection of their assets.
TA_0085_001_191123	S44	Online feedback form	3		I have strong objections to the Onshore corridor element of the project as I live immediately where you are looking at corridor options by Blackpool airport on REDACTED. My objections include: Concerns about the following: 1) The impact of the wide corridor immediately next to our properties, but also will it go under our land? Questions asked at your webinars and meetings re compulsory purchase, have not been ruled out, inferring this may be an option. So we are unclear as you haven't decided! 2) Lack of clarity even at the end of the consultation period that you can't say where the corridor will run - by/under the airport and Division Lane, or under neighbouring roads in St Annes - indeed given it's width the same as a 6 lane motorway, I'd suggest it will impact Division Lane whichever you choose. 3) Impact of the corridor activity on dykes and flood risk - dykes at front and rear of our properties (the rear one is by the fields you are looking at using) - activity could cause flooding and or blockages. Also potential rise in the water table which is already a concern in the area. 4) Vermin - we know from other local digging, drilling that this has driven vermin into our homes! 5) Noise from the amount of electricity being transmitted right by our homes. 6) Impact on the local wildlife in the area 7) Bridle paths - there are a number of local bridle paths for horse owners and these will be disrupted and cause concerns for animals and owners alike 8) Noise disruption during construction - your Code of Construction Practice not only refers to work 07:00 to 19:00 Mon to Fri and 08:00 to 13:00 Sat, including 1 hour before and 1 hour after for mobilisation and demobilisation activities, which is bad enough, you also talk about circumstances where you will have specifics works on a continuous basis 24/7, including running of generators, (which everyone know are noisy), emergency back up supplies and trenchless technology operations which require 24 hour machinery. Paras 1.4.3 refer. 9) What access will be required to land involving access down Division Lane - this question has not been adequately	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The assessment of the impact of increased flood risk arising from additional surface water runoff is presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<p>answered at consultation meetings.</p> <p>10) Disruptive lighting at the bottom of our gardens/land during works</p> <p>11) Major concerns re traffic disruption to the local area during construction as follows:</p> <p>11.1 - Divisional Lane has limited access and currently Blackpool council are proposing reclosing the Midgeland Road access again, which leaves us only 1 access to Queensway that even during no roadworks is very difficult to get out of Division Lane throughout most of the day. Major disruption will not only cause bottle necks on Queensway, Common Edge Road and School Road again (as seen during Blackpool Council EZ leisure village roadworks - taking 4 months to slightly widen a very short stretch of a few yards) it will severely impact us as residents. We therefore know what chaos is caused. Note Queensway is 1 of only 2 roads to get to and from between St Annes and Blackpool.</p> <p>11.2 - Traffic and works disruption impact to neighbouring roads in St Annes using these routes to join up with land by Division Lane</p>	
TA_0085_014_191123	S44	Online feedback form	14		<p>I strongly object that you expect residents to adequately comment with an impending deadline in a matter of 4 days on closure of the consultation period, yet you are unable to even tell us the exact route of the corridor! It was not long ago you were indicating it was going under Blackpool Airport, now it may be under roads in north St Annes. You also have shaded patches by Division Lane but your maps are so high level in the main, it makes it impossible as a resident to tell if my property is impacted or not.</p> <p>You also cannot answer questions to say whether you will or will not need to compulsory purchase and where. You say decisions will be made after the consultation period has closed .</p> <p>This is all totally unsatisfactory and grossly unreasonable to the residents that you are trying to get on side.</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.</p> <p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p>
TA_0085_015_191123	S44	Online feedback form	16		<p>I strongly object that you expect residents to adequately comment with an impending deadline in a matter of 4 days on closure of the consultation period, yet you are unable to even tell us the exact route of the corridor! It was not long ago you were indicating it was going under Blackpool Airport, now it may be under roads in north St Annes. You also have shaded patches by Division Lane but your maps are so high level in the main, it makes it impossible as a resident to tell if my property is impacted or not.</p> <p>You also cannot answer questions to say whether you will or will not need to compulsory purchase and where. You say decisions will be made after the consultation period has closed .</p> <p>This is all totally unsatisfactory and grossly unreasonable to the residents that you are trying to get on side.</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.</p> <p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p>
TA_0087_001_191123	S44	Online feedback form	1		<p>Feedback on Transmission Assets Project</p> <p>I wish to object to the proposals for the following reasons</p> <p>- There is no explanation as to why zone 1 and zone 2 have</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response	
					<p>been favoured and why they were chosen in the first place. There is no information about why any other areas might have been considered and discounted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It feels like someone has just looked at a map and decided these are the easiest places, with little other consideration. - Your website is hard to navigate and does not provide large scale detailed maps. It is difficult to determine exact proposed areas. - There has been little consideration of potential flood risks and lack of information to local residents about how this would be managed. - There is no information about why any Fylde or Blackpool Council enterprise zones or brown field sites have not been considered. - It is still unclear where any sub station would actually be sited, and what it might look like. Surely artists impressions and scale models should have been provided for consultation too. There is no information about any screening, or how long the area would take to recover from any works. There is a lack of consideration of the visual impact and no transparency of information provided to local residents about this. - There is no information about how any access to the sites would be obtained, and no assessment about impact on local traffic and roads. - There is no easy to understand information about impact of noise and light. It is also not clear if there would be any disruption to the village during construction. All the professional reports are complicated and difficult to understand with no easy read or summary information. - This is an area of quite countryside and would involve significant loss of a local amenity and change to the local environment. - Potential loss of value to local property. - Two large sub stations are proposed quite near to each other, making a significant impact on the local amenity. - No consideration given about the impact of the Blue solar farm for the same area. Why has there been no discussion between the two projects - I have attended public consultation meetings which have been poorly presented with representatives being poorly prepared and unable to answer most questions 		<p>Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3)The Transmission Assets website included all consultation materials and maps to the level of details that was available at the time. This included a dedicated information hub for ease of access to specific consultation materials.</p> <p>The solar farm has been considered as part of the cumulative assessment for the onshore elements of the Transmission Assets. All schemes considered in the cumulative assessment are set out in Volume 1, Annex 5.5: Cumulative screening matrix and location plan of the ES (document reference F1.5.5). Bluefield solar farm has also been considered as a part of route planning and site selection process, documented in Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the ES: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4), with further detailed provided in Volume 1, Annex 4.3: Selection and Refinement of the Onshore Infrastructure (document reference F1.4.3).</p> <p>All schemes considered in the cumulative assessment are set out in Volume 1, Annex 5.5: Cumulative screening matrix and location plan of the ES (document reference F1.5.5). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>The assessment of the impact of increased flood risk arising from additional surface water runoff is presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2).</p> <p>Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2).</p> <p>An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase.</p>
TA_0091_001_111123	S44	Online feedback form	1		More specific information about exact locations and size of wind turbines is needed.. Artistic impressions and images are needed.	This response appears to relate to the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and/or the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (the generation assets), which are subject to separate applications for development consent.	
TA_0091_004_111123	S44	Online feedback form	2		Need more exact details of the location and the size. Artistic impressions are needed.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE) which no longer includes any surface piercing structures. This includes the removal of the Morgan Booster Station and associated search areas. The OSPs are to be classed as part of the Generation Assets applications only.	
TA_0091_005_111123	S44	Online feedback form	3		What is lacking, is examples of the impact on local communities. Where exactly the corridors will be, what construction would involve, where storage facilities are going	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site	

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					to be located, for how long, the noise element. All of this is missing in the documentation.	selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0091_006_111123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.2	Without specifying the actual corridor route, how can an assessment be made to flood risk?	<p>The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor and onshore substations, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets - refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received. <p>The assessment of the impact of increased flood risk arising from additional surface water runoff is presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase.</p>
TA_0091_007_111123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.3	What is needed is an understanding of the specific route before this question can be answered.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0091_008_111123	S44	Online feedback form	4		I'm concerned about the impact on my property and my local communities. The corridor area is far too vague which has led to speculation of where and what might happen. Artistic impressions are vital as much of the material provided doesn't address key concerns. By now, the routes must be known but are simply not being shared. Also, the project material is hard to understand for many people leading to lethargy or avoidance which means feedback will not be watered down. The consultations need to be based on realistic outcomes so that people can properly understand the direct impact on them, their lifestyles and their health as well as their property prices.	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Design changes have included refinements of the location and design of the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor and onshore substations, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets - refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received. <p>The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.
TA_0091_010_111123	S44	Online feedback form	6		Where is it? I can't see it in the document	This information was available in volume 1 of our PEIR, chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Our PEIR was available to read at consultation events and on our websites.
TA_0091_011_111123	S44	Online feedback form	8		The size is a major concern. I had no idea that they would be on the scale that they are until I read a report from my MP. I feel that we have all been misled about this aspect, which makes me suspicious of the project in its entirety.	The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Maximum parameters for the substation have been refined following statutory consultation. As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0091_012_111123	S44	Online feedback form	9		The size is a major concern. The lack of clarity about it in the consultations too. It was only after reading an article from my MP that I got to completely understand the size and scope of these stations. Why is this not made more clear in the documentation?	The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Maximum parameters for the substation have been refined following statutory consultation. As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0091_013_111123	S44	Online feedback form	12		The specifics need to be known before this can be answered. I live next door to the airport so I'm concerned about public open spaces and whether these will be sacrificed as work takes place. Nowhere in the documentation can I see where and what construction will look like.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						<p>simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).</p> <p>Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Maximum parameters for the substation have been refined following statutory consultation.</p> <p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage.</p>
TA_0091_014_111123	S44	Online feedback form	15		I would like to see far more consultations and presentations. The window for feedback is too narrow and the lack of specifics is alarming.	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information.</p> <p>Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents.</p> <p>The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included, but not limited to, local media advertising (online and offline), social media and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers.</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p>
TA_0091_015_111123	S44	Online feedback form	16		I'd like to understand how this is going to impact on me personally. My home, community and my life in general. I attended the consultation and asked lots of questions, most of which were answered vaguely. This is due to the lack of specific details about the corridor route. This must be known by now.	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Applicants are working with affected parties to fully understand the impact that the Transmission Assets will have on them and their businesses and identify way to mitigate these. Amendments have been made to the routing following feedback gathered over the course of our landowner engagement meetings, as well as from feedback received throughout the pre- application stage. The Applicants will continue to engage with landowners as the Transmission Assets develops, as appropriate.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0092__003_151123	S44	Online feedback form	8		Need to ensure that this remains sympathetic to the environment and the least impact possible on the community. Continue to work closely with the community on significant decisions, the local authority and Historic England.	Under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008, local planning authorities and Historic England are considered statutory consultees and the Applicants consulted them as such. The project team has worked closely with the HET at Lancashire County Council and with Historic England to ensure that adverse effects on the historic environment have been avoided, reduced or offset wherever possible. The assessment of residual effects is set out within section 5.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 5: Historic environment of the ES (document reference F3.5). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets and will continue to work closely with all stakeholders.
TA_0092__005_151123	S44	Online feedback form	12		The project team need to ensure that they remain close to their commitment to mitigate negative impacts on the community as outlined in your documents. Communication with the local community is key here and ensuring that specific negative impacts are discussed closely with those affected so that the project can progress in the most sympathetic way possible. Ongoing consultation is necessary to achieve this.	Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets and will continue to work closely with all stakeholders.
TA_0092__006_151123	S44	Online feedback form	13		This needs to be very clear in terms of what the net gain is - currently we do not feel that this is very clear at all.	As set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11), the Transmission Assets are not subject to a mandatory net gain requirement under the Environment Act 2021. Nevertheless, the Applicants have worked with statutory consultees to discuss the approach, and to develop the design, to allow the maximum benefit to biodiversity within the parameters of the Transmission Assets. For the Transmission Assets, biodiversity benefit will be delivered within identified biodiversity benefit areas within the Transmission Assets Order Limits: Onshore (referred to as the Onshore Order Limits). Further qualitative benefits to biodiversity are proposed via potential collaboration with stakeholders and local groups, contributing to existing plans and programmes, both within and outside the Onshore Order Limits. Further details of the approach to biodiversity benefit are provided in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11). The calculation undertaken for the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11) utilises the latest biodiversity metric published by Defra (4.0).
TA_0092__007_151123	S44	Online feedback form	15		As previous comments - need to ensure local communities remain included and involved in this project throughout. <i>(The project team need to ensure that they remain close to their commitment to mitigate negative impacts on the community as outlined in your documents. Communication with the local community is key here and ensuring that specific negative impacts are discussed closely with those affected so that the project can progress in the most sympathetic way possible. Ongoing consultation is necessary to achieve this.)</i>	The Applicants note your response. Detailed assessments are provided within all onshore chapters within Volumes 3 and of the ES. (document reference F2 and F3). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The socio-economics assessment is set out in Volume 4, Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement (document reference F4.2). The Applicants have provided an Outline Skills and Employment Plan (document reference J31). This document sets out the principles that will be secured for the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms: Transmission Assets. This process will involve engagement and consultation with relevant employment and skills stakeholders and will secure the economic benefits associated with the Transmission Assets in relation to skills and employment.
TA_0092__029_151123	S44	Online feedback form	4	4.4	Are there opportunities for local (business) groups to be involved through Social Value - eg. Schools, Colleges, Community Groups etc. Similarly in terms of local labour force etc and training.	An Outline Employment and Skills Plan has been prepared and submitted as part of the application for development consent (document reference J31). This will be developed further post-consent to detail how the Applicants will engage with local workers and training providers for anticipated employment opportunities associated with the Transmission Assets.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						The Transmission Assets is fully committed to delivering a community benefits scheme in line with UK Government guidance, which is due to be published later this year. Ahead of the guidance being published we have been engaging with local people, businesses and organisations to identify key themes and projects that will deliver strategic benefits and directly support the local community and local priorities. We welcome further input from the local community and encourage you to reach out to the project team in due course.
TA_0092__030_151123	S44	Online feedback form	4	4.5	Need to ensure that the project remains fully focused on supporting the community throughout and maintaining relevant relationships and being mindful of the community and expectations. Are there ongoing community events being planned other than the initial consultation sessions?	The Applicants note your response. Detailed assessments are provided within all onshore chapters within Volumes 3 and of the ES. (document reference F2 and F3). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The socio-economics assessment is set out in Volume 4, Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement (document reference F4.2). The Applicants have provided an Outline Skills and Employment Plan (document reference J31). This document sets out the principles that will be secured for the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms: Transmission Assets. This process will involve engagement and consultation with relevant employment and skills stakeholders and will secure the economic benefits associated with the Transmission Assets in relation to skills and employment.
TA_0093_003_211123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.7	As a resident on REDACTED, REDACTED my house is on the main road opposite the beach. When lorries drive past today the houses sometimes shake. The drains under the road regularly (a few times per year) need clearing out when sand build ups are too high, this work normally lasts around 1 week and causes enormous traffic jams, noise pollution, CO2 fumes into our gardens and houses and often continues until after bed time on work / school nights making it difficult for residents to sleep. A project of the size and scale of the Wind Farm would cause traffic jams of immense proportions and severe disruption. Do not underestimate how quickly any roadworks, no matter how small, on Clifton Drive can impact the entire Blackpool and Lytham St Annes area, they quickly cause gridlock and hours of queues especially in summer when tourists also visit.	Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Effects in relation to any changes in traffic are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 7 of the ES (document reference F3.7). It is noted that the option presented at PEIR (placement of cables in trenches within the highways) near Blackpool Airport is no longer required. Details of the current design are provided in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Construction traffic associated with works near the beach will be controlled through a Construction Traffic Management plan. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan is provided as part of the application (document reference J8).
TA_0093_008_211123	S44	Online feedback form	15		Yes, for the Lytham St Annes zone on Clifton Drive, where any tiny disruption on the road leads to almost gridlock. Have a permanent project role for someone to monitor traffic flow and adjust plans, traffic lights (permanent and temporary) and construction activity to ensure the least possible amount of disruption to residents and passing traffic. It is not simply enough to have traffic surveys completed in advance and use that data, it needs to be real time, every day for the duration of the activity. Also ensure the project team understand how disruptive the wind can be on the seafront, all equipment and temporary supplies, cones, barriers etc must be carefully tied down during high winds or it will end up damaging houses or gardens.	Traffic and transport impacts arising during the construction phase of the Transmission Assets have been fully assessed at section 7.11 Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference E3.7). Details of the operation and maintenance phases are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Onshore maintenance would be limited to essential maintenance and/or emergency works. Further details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8).
TA_0094_001_061123	S44	Online feedback form	1		None. All OK.	The Applicants note your response.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0094_002_061123	S44	Online feedback form	2		Again, no issues.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0094_003_061123	S44	Online feedback form	3		Too much impact on local communities	The measures proposed to control effects on the environment and communities are set out in the ES (document reference F1 to F4).
TA_0094_009_061123	S44	Online feedback form	7		Not our area of residence, but I would have if I did!	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0094_010_061123	S44	Online feedback form	9		Not our area of residence, but I would have if I did!	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0094_011_061123	S44	Online feedback form	13		Whilst I don't know the costings I find it hard to believe the cost benefit ratio is favourable for all the disruption arising	The site selection process undertaken by the Applicants aims to avoid and reduce impacts. As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0094_013_061123	S44	Online feedback form	16		I am concerned that the development will devalue properties in the area	The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.
TA_0095_001_221123	S44	Online feedback form	1		<p>We have been to the Consultation Meetings and quite frankly, the situation is disgraceful and we are no wiser. There are no mock photographs to give any indication of the scale of the operation or any idea what the finished substations will look like, and therefore how do you expect constructive feedback for something so vague. We have requested this information to no avail.</p> <p>Our personal situation is with regard to the devaluation of our house if option 2 is chosen, and again no information can be given at present so we are all in limbo. Our house will be opposite the substation and all the building work, and our main objections are the proximity to our house, the loss of Greenbelt and the state of the lane with all the extra traffic that will be involved for such a huge operation on a one track road. Above all, we would have to endure years of stress living next to an enormous building sight and the possible health consequences of a magnetic field. We don't even know if we will receive any compensation for the devaluation of our property so we can escape the ensuing nightmare.</p> <p>To cause such upheaval to everyone's lives in this community will be devastating and unnecessary, as there must be other options. This will be a total disaster for the residents, wildlife, farmland, loss of countryside and we urge you to find alternative sites that will not cause as much harm to the environment, which we thought was the whole point of this project in the first place.</p>	<p>The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor and onshore substations, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets - refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received. <p>The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0170_001_151023	S44	Online feedback form	1		<p>We are horrified at the prospect of the three Morecambe proposed onshore substation sites especially option2 (south), as this is the first time we have heard of this project to build these substations and realised the impact this will have on our lives.</p> <p>Our house will be directly opposite the substation, and we are currently renovating the property, which has been ongoing over 10 years, to be our retirement property, which we thought was a safe undertaking on green belt land.</p> <p>If this project goes ahead you will ruin us in one full swoop, not only will our property not be worth a penny, but our health will be impacted living in this kind of environment.</p> <p>We are appalled we have not been consulted and just sent a brochure as if the impact on us is going to be the same as any other residents in surrounding villages! This is huge and we want to be contacted immediately to discuss the implications and options we face.</p> <p>It is just not true to state in your brochure you have looked at environmental sensitivities such as proximity to residential properties! Our house will be in the middle of years of building works and how will we cope with that. We will see the huge building from our front window and be impacted by possible cancer risks, and we cannot escape as nobody will ever buy our house with all that going on. Please contact us immediately.</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0170_002_151023	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.6	<p>As already advised <i>(We are horrified at the prospect of the three Morecambe proposed onshore substation sites especially option2 (south), as this is the first time we have heard of this project to build these substations and realised the impact this will have on our lives.</i></p> <p><i>Our house will be directly opposite the substation, and we are currently renovating the property, which has been ongoing over 10 years, to be our retirement property, which we thought was a safe undertaking on green belt land.</i></p> <p><i>If this project goes ahead you will ruin us in one full swoop, not only will our property not be worth a penny, but our health will be impacted living in this kind of environment.</i></p> <p><i>We are appalled we have not been consulted and just sent a brochure as if the impact on us is going to be the same as any other residents in surrounding villages! This is huge and we want to be contacted immediately to discuss the implications and options we face.</i></p> <p><i>It is just not true to state in your brochure you have looked at environmental sensitivities such as proximity to residential properties! Our house will be in the middle of years of building works and how will we cope with that. We will see the huge building from our front window and be impacted by possible cancer risks, and we cannot escape as nobody will</i></p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens.</p> <p>The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<i>ever buy our house with all that going on. Please contact us immediately.)</i>	
TA_0170_003_151023	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.7	<p>As already advised <i>(We are horrified at the prospect of the three Morecambe proposed onshore substation sites especially option2 (south), as this is the first time we have heard of this project to build these substations and realised the impact this will have on our lives.</i></p> <p><i>Our house will be directly opposite the substation, and we are currently renovating the property, which has been ongoing over 10 years, to be our retirement property, which we thought was a safe undertaking on green belt land.</i></p> <p><i>If this project goes ahead you will ruin us in one full swoop, not only will our property not be worth a penny, but our health will be impacted living in this kind of environment.</i></p> <p><i>We are appalled we have not been consulted and just sent a brochure as if the impact on us is going to be the same as any other residents in surrounding villages! This is huge and we want to be contacted immediately to discuss the implications and options we face.</i></p> <p><i>It is just not true to state in your brochure you have looked at environmental sensitivities such as proximity to residential properties! Our house will be in the middle of years of building works and how will we cope with that. We will see the huge building from our front window and be impacted by possible cancer risks, and we cannot escape as nobody will ever buy our house with all that going on. Please contact us immediately.)</i></p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens.</p> <p>The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>
TA_0170_004_151023	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.8	<p>As already advised <i>(We are horrified at the prospect of the three Morecambe proposed onshore substation sites especially option2 (south), as this is the first time we have heard of this project to build these substations and realised the impact this will have on our lives.</i></p> <p><i>Our house will be directly opposite the substation, and we are currently renovating the property, which has been ongoing over 10 years, to be our retirement property, which we thought was a safe undertaking on green belt land.</i></p> <p><i>If this project goes ahead you will ruin us in one full swoop, not only will our property not be worth a penny, but our health will be impacted living in this kind of environment.</i></p> <p><i>We are appalled we have not been consulted and just sent a brochure as if the impact on us is going to be the same as any other residents in surrounding villages! This is huge and we want to be contacted immediately to discuss the implications and options we face.</i></p> <p><i>It is just not true to state in your brochure you have looked at environmental sensitivities such as proximity to residential</i></p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens.</p> <p>The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<i>properties! Our house will be in the middle of years of building works and how will we cope with that. We will see the huge building from our front window and be impacted by possible cancer risks, and we cannot escape as nobody will ever buy our house with all that going on. Please contact us immediately.)</i>	
TA_0170_005_151023	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.9	<p>As already advised <i>(We are horrified at the prospect of the three Morecambe proposed onshore substation sites especially option2 (south), as this is the first time we have heard of this project to build these substations and realised the impact this will have on our lives.</i></p> <p><i>Our house will be directly opposite the substation, and we are currently renovating the property, which has been ongoing over 10 years, to be our retirement property, which we thought was a safe undertaking on green belt land.</i></p> <p><i>If this project goes ahead you will ruin us in one full swoop, not only will our property not be worth a penny, but our health will be impacted living in this kind of environment.</i></p> <p><i>We are appalled we have not been consulted and just sent a brochure as if the impact on us is going to be the same as any other residents in surrounding villages! This is huge and we want to be contacted immediately to discuss the implications and options we face.</i></p> <p><i>It is just not true to state in your brochure you have looked at environmental sensitivities such as proximity to residential properties! Our house will be in the middle of years of building works and how will we cope with that. We will see the huge building from our front window and be impacted by possible cancer risks, and we cannot escape as nobody will ever buy our house with all that going on. Please contact us immediately.)</i></p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens.</p> <p>The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>
TA_0170_007_151023	S44	Online feedback form	9		<p>We are horrified at the prospect of the three Morecambe proposed onshore substation sites especially option2 (south), as this is the first time we have heard of this project to build these substations and realised the impact this will have on our lives.</p> <p>Our house will be directly opposite the substation, and we are currently renovating the property, which has been ongoing over 10 years, to be our retirement property, which we thought was a safe undertaking on green belt land.</p> <p>If this project goes ahead you will ruin us in one full swoop, not only will our property not be worth a penny, but our health will be impacted living in this kind of environment.</p> <p>We are appalled we have not been consulted and just sent a brochure as if the impact on us is going to be the same as any other residents in surrounding villages! This is huge and we want to be contacted immediately to discuss the implications and options we face.</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					It is just not true to state in your brochure you have looked at environmental sensitivities such as proximity to residential properties! Our house will be in the middle of years of building works and how will we cope with that. We will see the huge building from our front window and be impacted by possible cancer risks, and we cannot escape as nobody will ever buy our house with all that going on. Please contact us immediately.	
TA_0170_008_151023	S44	Online feedback form	10		<p>As already advised <i>(We are horrified at the prospect of the three Morecambe proposed onshore substation sites especially option2 (south), as this is the first time we have heard of this project to build these substations and realised the impact this will have on our lives.</i></p> <p><i>Our house will be directly opposite the substation, and we are currently renovating the property, which has been ongoing over 10 years, to be our retirement property, which we thought was a safe undertaking on green belt land.</i></p> <p><i>If this project goes ahead you will ruin us in one full swoop, not only will our property not be worth a penny, but our health will be impacted living in this kind of environment.</i></p> <p><i>We are appalled we have not been consulted and just sent a brochure as if the impact on us is going to be the same as any other residents in surrounding villages! This is huge and we want to be contacted immediately to discuss the implications and options we face.</i></p> <p><i>It is just not true to state in your brochure you have looked at environmental sensitivities such as proximity to residential properties! Our house will be in the middle of years of building works and how will we cope with that. We will see the huge building from our front window and be impacted by possible cancer risks, and we cannot escape as nobody will ever buy our house with all that going on. Please contact us immediately.)</i></p>	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0096_001_131123	S44	Online feedback form	1		I object on the basis of local children growing up with Electromagnetic Radiation all around them, the buzzing noise from the electricity which they will hear more than us and the noise of the construction and the destruction of our peace and quiet. It will be a total eyesore. The value of our houses will plummet. We could easily become a target for a terrorist attack, and so close to the village will be lethal. Also, if you pave 36 acres of good farmland (which can grow crops), you destroy our food security. In addition the Fylde is very flat, so the flooding, which is already bad, will get worse as the runoff from tarmac is far faster than the soil and plants that absorb the rain and take up the moisture in their roots. In the projected area there are endangered and protected species such as bats redshanks, oystercatchers, great crested newts and owls (Tawney and Barn Owls) and buzzards, kestrels, long tailed tits, bar tailed godwits amongst many others. The consultation has not explained to us what we will actually see	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Visualisations have been presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used. With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					and experience as residents situated closest to the monstrous constructions being proposed	ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing. Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex. See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4).
TA_0096_002_131123	S44	Online feedback form	3		I object on the basis of local children growing up with Electromagnetic Radiation all around them, the buzzing noise from the electricity which they will hear more than us and the noise of the construction and the destruction of our peace and quiet. It will be a total eyesore. The value of our houses will plummet. We could easily become a target for a terrorist attack, and so close to the village will be lethal. Also, if you pave 36 acres of good farmland (which can grow crops), you destroy our food security. In addition the Fylde is very flat, so the flooding, which is already bad, will get worse as the runoff from tarmac is far faster than the soil and plants that absorb the rain and take up the moisture in their roots. In the projected area there are endangered and protected species such as bats redshanks, oystercatchers, great crested newts and owls (Tawney and Barn Owls) and buzzards, kestrels, long tailed tits, bar tailed godwits amongst many others. The consultation has not explained to us what we will actually see and experience as residents situated closest to the monstrous constructions being proposed	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Visualisations have been presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used. With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing. Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex. See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4).
TA_0096_003_131123	S44	Online feedback form	7		I object on the basis of local children growing up with Electromagnetic Radiation all around them, the buzzing noise from the electricity which they will hear more than us and the noise of the construction and the destruction of our peace and quiet. It will be a total eyesore. The value of our houses will plummet. We could easily become a target for a terrorist attack, and so close to the village will be lethal. Also, if you pave 36 acres of good farmland (which can grow crops), you destroy our food security. In addition the Fylde is very flat, so the flooding, which is already bad, will get worse as the runoff from tarmac is far faster than the soil and plants that absorb the rain and take up the moisture in their roots. In the projected area there are endangered and protected species such as bats redshanks, oystercatchers, great crested newts and owls (Tawney and Barn Owls) and buzzards, kestrels, long tailed tits, bar tailed godwits amongst many others. The consultation has not explained to us what we will actually see	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Visualisations have been presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used. With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					and experience as residents situated closest to the monstrous constructions being proposed	ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing. Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex. See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4).
TA_0096_004_131123	S44	Online feedback form	8		I object on the basis of local children growing up with Electromagnetic Radiation all around them, the buzzing noise from the electricity which they will hear more than us and the noise of the construction and the destruction of our peace and quiet. It will be a total eyesore. The value of our houses will plummet. We could easily become a target for a terrorist attack, and so close to the village will be lethal. Also, if you pave 36 acres of good farmland (which can grow crops), you destroy our food security. In addition the Fylde is very flat, so the flooding, which is already bad, will get worse as the runoff from tarmac is far faster than the soil and plants that absorb the rain and take up the moisture in their roots. In the projected area there are endangered and protected species such as bats redshanks, oystercatchers, great crested newts and owls (Tawney and Barn Owls) and buzzards, kestrels, long tailed tits, bar tailed godwits amongst many others. The consultation has not explained to us what we will actually see and experience as residents situated closest to the monstrous constructions being proposed	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Visualisations have been presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used. With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing. Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex. See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4).
TA_0096_005_131123	S44	Online feedback form	9		I object on the basis of local children growing up with Electromagnetic Radiation all around them, the buzzing noise from the electricity which they will hear more than us and the noise of the construction and the destruction of our peace and quiet. It will be a total eyesore. The value of our houses will plummet. We could easily become a target for a terrorist attack, and so close to the village will be lethal. Also, if you pave 36 acres of good farmland (which can grow crops), you destroy our food security. In addition the Fylde is very flat, so the flooding, which is already bad, will get worse as the runoff from tarmac is far faster than the soil and plants that absorb the rain and take up the moisture in their roots. In the projected area there are endangered and protected species such as bats redshanks, oystercatchers, great crested newts and owls (Tawney and Barn Owls) and buzzards, kestrels, long tailed tits, bar tailed godwits amongst many others. The consultation has not explained to us what we will actually see	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Visualisations have been presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used. With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					and experience as residents situated closest to the monstrous constructions being proposed	ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing. Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex. See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4).
TA_0097_001_171123	S44	Online feedback form	1		I am not happy about the collaboration of the off shore and on shore project.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0097_011_171123	S44	Online feedback form	5		I don't think this much power should be near where people live	Detailed assessments are provided within all onshore chapters within Volumes 3 and 4 of the ES (document reference F3 and F4). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets and will continue to work closely with all stakeholders.
TA_0097_012_171123	S44	Online feedback form	6		Don't want it	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0097_018_171123	S44	Online feedback form	14		I really don't want the on shore project to go ahead.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0097_019_171123	S44	Online feedback form	15		The community don't want this to happen	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0097_020_171123	S44	Online feedback form	16		I object to this project	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0098_001_081123	S44	Online feedback form	3		It is not fair to dig up roads and fields from Blackpool all the way to Penwortham , disturbing residents lives and natural habitation of these areas .	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0098_011_081123	S44	Online feedback form	4		You have been very secretive about the building of the substations. Even our local MP Mark Menzies has been kept in the dark about it . There is no reason why you cant take the cables through the sea and along the River Ribble . You could build substations on the land close to the river if	Throughout the development of the Project, the Applicants have aimed to be open and transparent with all stakeholders, including Mark Menzies as the MP for the constituency at the time. Please see section 3 of the Consultation report (document reference E1) for information on the early engagement undertaken by the Applicants from Spring/summer 2021 in regards to the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Mona Offshore Wind Project, which included notifying Mark Menzies MP; a member of his team attended the consultation event at Lytham Assembly Rooms on 21 November 2022. A subsequent meeting took place with Mr Menzies on 18 December 2022. Section 3 of the Consultation report also provides details on follow up meetings with

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					necessary. Nobody lives down there and the excuse of harming plants and fish is not good enough, when you think of all the wildlife and plants you will kill going through the land.	elected representatives, including Mark Menzies MP, between 2022 and 2023. A further meeting with a representative of Mr Menzies' office took place on 1 March 2023 which was subsequently followed up with an email update on 28 March 2023. As a section 47 consultee, Mark Menzies MP received notification of the launch of statutory consultation and also attended stakeholders briefings in September and October 2023. See section 4 of the Consultation report for further details. The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0098_014_081123	S44	Online feedback form	4	4.4	Will reduce the price of all our houses and probably put farmers out of business. Other local businesses will also be affected.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.
TA_0098_020_081123	S44	Online feedback form	15		I think you might struggle with that one.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0098_021_081123	S44	Online feedback form	16		You all seem to be sure that this is a done deal before we were all even made aware of it. This doesnt give us much time to argue our case and this isnt fair.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The consultation mailing zone increased in size between the non-statutory and statutory phases of consultation with all properties included in the first consultation also being included at the statutory stage.
TA_0099_001_081123	S44	Online feedback form	3		I am a landowner bordering the edge of your transmission cable corridor. I have tried to digest some of the assets / volumes provided but find them terribly long and complicated. I have tried to attend one of your public consultations but was in a queue for 30 minutes and never reached the front so have not been able to get to ask a real person to summarise. I was unable to make the online webinar and have not seen a recording link posted, which would be very beneficial. I do not support your proposals for the onshore elements because I cannot understand what I am supporting and with the REDACTED areas bordering my land, being already underwater most of the winter months, I cannot understand if and how your project may impact this - I can only seeing it having a negative impact.	The statutory consultation ran for over six weeks, exceeding the 28 day statutory minimum requirement. Respondents could provide feedback at any time throughout this period. During this consultation, the Application held eight events both online and in-person. The online event was recorded and made available to view on the Transmission Assets website. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					When I originally spoke to one of your representatives on the phone to ask why we were sent so much paperwork, he told me that the transmission line would be buried under our road - the plans only a few months later look very different - I am not happy supporting anything that feels so fluid.	the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0099_002_081123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.1	I have grave concerns over the already sodden / waterlogged nature of the ground in area REDACTED that I cannot support your proposal.	The assessment of the impact of increased flood risk arising from additional surface water runoff is presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase. The Applicants through Dalcour Maclaren and appointed drainage specialists will engage with landowners regarding pre-construction and post-construction drainage, tying into existing infrastructure where possible. The Outline CoCP and outline surface water and groundwater management plan (document reference J1.9) includes measures in relation to drainage.
TA_0099_004_081123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.7	We have already suffered massive traffic disruption over the last 12 months due to the Blackpool Airport Enterprise Zone and I believe your project will bring yet more disruption, which I cannot support.	Traffic and transport impacts arising during the construction phase of the Transmission Assets have been fully assessed at section 7.11 Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference E3.7). Details of the operation and maintenance phases are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Onshore maintenance would be limited to essential maintenance and/or emergency works. Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).
TA_0099_005_081123	S44	Online feedback form	4		There is too much information and when I have tried to hear you present / summarise it, I have not been able to.	The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0099_006_081123	S44	Online feedback form	5		My comments on this matter have been made in previous sections. I border the transmission line corridor and cannot support your proposed route as I do not feel adequately informed to do so.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0099_007_081123	S44	Online feedback form	15		Make your plans and information more digestible - hundreds of pages of very dry text is not suitable.	The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0252_006_221123	S44	Online feedback form	16		I feel this form is purposefully difficult to complete. Many comments will probably be discounted because they have been added to the wrong comment box and so not directly answering that specific question. I feel the whole consultation process has been rushed; not giving much time for comments from the local communities and offering giving important information out relatively late in	The feedback form enabled respondents to provide feedback on specific aspects of the proposals. It was structured to allow the Transmission Assets team to accurately categorise and assess feedback in the design process.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					the day with the likelihood of obtaining less feedback/ objections.	
TA_0100_009_241023	S44	Online feedback form	14		Consent should only be given with full permission of local residents it affects	We welcome further input from the local community and encourage you to reach out to the project team <i>in due course</i> .
TA_0101_002_121123	S44	Online feedback form	2		Yes - I don't have a clue where its going as your information is filled to confuse people and is not helpful at all.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents.
TA_0101_003_121123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.6	I reject that the green land around Kilnhouse Lane be used for storing of machinery as a dog walker I use this land daily and will have a huge impact.	The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets on recreational resources, including PRoW are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES. Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of this chapter of the ES. This includes preparation of a PRoW Management Strategy in general accordance with the Outline PRoW Management Strategy (document reference J1.5) submitted with the DCO application. The measures to be implemented as part of the PRoW Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g. National Cycle Routes (NCRs), Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Transmission Assets.
TA_0101_004_121123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.7	Kilnhouse and queensway are both main roads in and out of St annes and will have a huge impact on this.	Traffic and transport impacts arising during the construction phase of the Transmission Assets have been fully assessed at section 7.11 Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference E3.7). Details of the operation and maintenance phases are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Onshore maintenance would be limited to essential maintenance and/or emergency works. Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).
TA_0101_006_121123	S44	Online feedback form	4		Not one peice of information has been sent to explain in detail where, what and how this will be done. You have hidden behind jargon to confuse, we do not get an answer straight out You are making decisions which will affect us without informing us fully. This feels very cloak and dagger. Give the community an answer as to what is to be expected how I will be affected and guarantees that our home will be safe.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents.
TA_0101_007_121123	S44	Online feedback form	5		You have not informed us of where this will happen wr (sic) have maps with no street names, we have not had one document stating this will impact you because of xyz... tell us what to expect or we will fully reject.	The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). Detailed assessments are provided within all onshore chapters within Volumes 3 and 4 of the ES (document reference F3 and F4). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets and will continue to work closely with all stakeholders.
TA_0102_011_211123	S44	Online feedback form	8		we attended the meeting at newton and to be honest the information was limited and useless, the people there couldn't even point out parrox lane on any of the maps	The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0102_014_211123	S44	Online feedback form	15		i very much doubt you will get any local support	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0102_015_211123	S44	Online feedback form	16		the information and feedback has been pretty sketchy really. we (along with other land owners) were told multiple surveys would be carried out on our land on REDACTED and i can only name 1 survey that happened on our land	Surveys have been completed on land along the order limits to better understand the ecology and landscape of the area. The frequency of surveys is dependant on the initial findings.
TA_0103_002_051123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.6	Will the recreational park at the end of Blackpool Road north be affected?	Impacts and effects on public open space are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). This includes effects on Blackpool Road Playing Fields.
TA_0104_001_101123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.3	Cable route option 1 in lytham moss (north of higher ballam) passes through green belt land and should be re routed or pass through option 2 (south of higher ballam)	It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0104_002_101123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.6	Damaging to the environment and negative visual impact on protected green belt farm land.	It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0104_004_101123	S44	Online feedback form	16		I feel this is an extremely poorly thought out project, especially the onshore cable routing, having a grossly negative and damaging environmental impact on protected green belt farm land in essential areas for businesses and residents, also a poorly executed consultation period that expires long before the projects planning and routing is decided, this is a questionable way of using a feedback system on the most badly effected by this process, leaving A community who unequivocally objects to the project.	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Maximum parameters for the substation have been refined following statutory consultation.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.</p>
TA_0105_001_231123	S44	Online feedback form	1		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the proposed siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0105_002_231123	S44	Online feedback form	2		I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>(November 2023 to October 2024). Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0105_003_231123	S44	Online feedback form	5		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0105_004_231123	S44	Online feedback form	6		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0105_005_231123	S44	Online feedback form	7		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0105_006_231123	S44	Online feedback form	8		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0105_007_231123	S44	Online feedback form	9		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0105_008_231123	S44	Online feedback form	10		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0105_009_231123	S44	Online feedback form	11		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.	regard to all the feedback submitted. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0105_010_231123	S44	Online feedback form	14		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0105_011_231123	S44	Online feedback form	16		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0106_001_281023	S44	Online feedback form	1		<p>This feedback (in this section) is more on shore related. Generally the proposed project has been high on promotional material for the project but oblique when it comes to meaningful information with respect to the community. Information is scattered in a number of volumes of material, as are figures. Maps are so generally represented as to almost be of no use.</p> <p>It is very clear that there will be major trench works or up to 25Km and either one or a number of sub stations. With the effort that has gone in to planning such a project, there is clearly contractor planned routes for the trench and the substation(s). You are kindly requested to be crisp in the provision of you information, noting the these underground cables will emit as much radiation as overhead power lines which are well known to have health impacts. Generally lines should be at least 250 metres away from residential housing, ideally far more. And there are drops of up to 30% in house values for properties within 500 metres. There has already been an incident of a house sale falling through as a result of the (unclear) plans demonstrating this impact.</p> <p>In addition, a proposed depth of under 2 metres is woefully inadequate for power lines of the voltage being set out. Electric radiation is inhibited to a degree by physical barrier but magnetic radiation much less so. Both of these radiations are perilous, it might be fine in a field full of cows that can go back to a barn but not permanently adjacent to residential properties.</p> <p>Further St Annes only has two main exit/entry roads and the councils & contractors have proven to be inept when it comes to traffic management (for even the smallest of changes), with significant impacts upon business and welfare (people have struggled when needing to get to the hospital sited in Blackpool)</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Further details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8).</p> <p>Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used.</p> <p>With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing. Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex.</p> <p>See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4).</p>
TA_0106_002_281023	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.1	Generally intimates there is considerable planning being underway but this is not reflected don the information that is being made available publicly. This needs to be remedied.	The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0106_003_281023	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.2	In summary, the project cannot be expected to be neutral to this aspect and will have only negative consequences. This applies to the following sections.	<p>An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken for the offshore topics of the Transmission Assets Application and is presented in Volume 2 of the ES (document reference F2). Specific examples relevant to marine life are listed below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2). - Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3). - Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4). - Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5).
TA_0106_004_281023	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.5	The project cannot be expected to be neutral to this aspect and will have only negative consequences. This applies to the following sections. These types of projects are renowned for being "bird killers".	An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken for the offshore topics of the Transmission Assets Application and is presented in Volume 2 of the ES (document reference F2). Specific examples relevant to marine life are listed below.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2). - Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3). - Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4). - Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5).
TA_0106_005_281023	S44	Online feedback form	2		it is clear that Lytham St Annes is the preferred routing and the RAG rating appears to be crafted to support this. promoting issues at other sites whilst downplaying challenges at Lytham St Annes. Whilst I am being informed no decision has been taken, this is disingenuous. Decisions have been taken to promote Lytham St Annes as the ideal site and the material is being gamed to support this.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0106_009_281023	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.7	So this is a large volume again almost not interrogable but setting out good words about visions and ambitions. History has informed us that the councils and contractors are inept at traffic management for capital/construction projects, triggering delays that can go over 60 minutes for the community quite easily. This is unacceptable. As one example (amongst many) look that the delays to the new St Annes access road on land very similar in character to that which might be planned for.	Traffic and transport impacts arising during the construction phase of the Transmission Assets have been fully assessed at section 7.11 Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference E3.7). Details of the operation and maintenance phases are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Onshore maintenance would be limited to essential maintenance and/or emergency works. Further details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8). Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).
TA_0106_013_281023	S44	Online feedback form	8		It appears the information is geared to promote Lytham St Annes and downplay other sites. Accordingly there appear bias in the evaluation. Lytham St Annes is a high occupancy residential zone and such developments are not considered suitable. There will be a number of impacts - traffic, noise, health and economic (dropping house prices)	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0106_015_281023	S44	Online feedback form	10		There is no information on the size and scale of the substation. Is it a green box or the size of a house?	Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage.
TA_0106_016_281023	S44	Online feedback form	16		Generally the proposed project has been high on promotional material for the project but oblique when it comes to meaningful information with respect to the community. Information is scattered in a number of volumes of material, as are figures. Maps are so generally represented as to almost be of no use. It is very clear that there will be major trench works or up to 25Km and either one or a number of sub stations. With the effort that has gone in to planning such a project, there is clearly contractor planned routes for the trench and the substation(s). You are kindly requested to be crisp in the provision of you information, noting the these underground cables will emit as much radiation as overhead power lines which are well known to have health impacts. Generally lines	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). An assessment on human health in relation to air quality impacts, including emissions associated with construction and decommissioning activities, has been undertaken (refer to

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<p>should be at least 250 metres away from residential housing, ideally far more. And there are drops of up to 30% in house values for properties within 500 metres. There has already been an incident of a house sale falling through as a result of the (unclear) plans demonstrating this impact.</p> <p>In addition, a proposed depth of under 2 metres is woefully inadequate for power lines of the voltage being set out. Electric radiation is inhibited to a degree by physical barrier but magnetic radiation much less so. Both of these radiations are perilous, it might be fine in a field full of cows that can go back to a barn but not permanently adjacent to residential properties.</p> <p>Further St Annes only has two main exit/entry roads and the councils & contractors have proven to be inept when it comes to traffic management (for even the smallest of changes), with significant impacts upon business and welfare (people have struggled when needing to get to the hospital sited in Blackpool)</p>	<p>Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1)). Operational air quality effects (e.g., maintenance vehicle emissions) are not anticipated to be of a scale, even accounting for non-threshold effects, that could affect population health.</p> <p>Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used.</p> <p>With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing. Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex.</p> <p>See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4).</p> <p>Details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8).</p>
TA_0107_004_221123	S44	Online feedback form	4		<p>I am not convinced that this project takes into consideration residents of REDACTED, who have been misled on many elements of the development and are now faced with this - which does have huge health and financial consequences for residents.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the World Health Organisation definition of health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing.</p> <p>Any effects are assessed to be not significant and appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards.</p>
TA_0108_001_231123	S44	Online feedback form	1		<p>The plans are do not include any images or drawings of the planned proposals. Why not?</p> <p>The proposed cable corridor will render acres of farmland redundant, making families & livelihoods defunct.</p> <p>The plans go against all the green belt land restrictions, areas of separation and Grade A agricultural land. It will cause complete disruption and chaos to many families and businesses as well as have a huge impact on the value of these properties.</p>	<p>Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.</p> <p>The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6).</p> <p>Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.
TA_0108_012_231123	S44	Online feedback form	5		As before <i>(This should be located in a more appropriate area ie the land around Penwortham where there is an existing substation.)</i>	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES. A flood risk assessment assessing all sources of flooding, including sewers is presented within Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3). The proposed permanent infrastructure associated with the Morgan and Morecambe substations are located within Flood Zone 1 and has a low risk of flooding from all other assessed sources.
TA_0109_001_221123	S44	Consult Online	NULL		There is insufficient information available on the transmission cables. I emailed the information hub with a request on October 16th. No response has been provided. Specifically, regarding Human Health, the Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report of October 2022. In Part 2: Transmission Assets, section 10.2.1.18, states: "Underground cables do not produce an external electric field at ground level that would be of concern to public health due to the shielding of the cable sheath and burial material". I cannot find a reference to the magnetic fields from the underground cables so this is a misleading statement as magnetic fields emanate from underground cables. Further, section 10.2.1.10 refers to the human health appendix of the Environmental Statement. Is this available? If so, could you please direct me to it.	Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used. With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing. Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex. See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4). The Applicants did not respond to the email request from 16 October but the relevant information was publicly available on human health in Chapters 1, 8 and 9, Volume 3 and Chapter 4, Volume 4 of the Applicants' PEIR in hard copy at consultation events and on the Transmission Assets website. Further information will also be available in the Applicants' environmental statement, which will be published as part of this planning application.
TA_0110_004_221123	S44	Online feedback form	4		The PEIR and other documents are enormous and realistically the majority of impacted residents will have difficult reviewing the detail. The Project needs to be more upfront and provide clear and readily digestible information about the EMF and other environmental impacts from the onshore assets (cables and substations).	Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used. With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing. Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4).
TA_0110_008_221123	S44	Online feedback form	16		The sheer volume of information issued makes it difficult for any lay person to understand the key risks and impacts. A lot of the material relates to environmental issues, which whilst important, are not immediately relevant to the local communities. The human health section impacts assessed are not accompanied by any mitigation measures, nor assurance as to the monitoring of adherence to regulations.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. A full impact assessment on health is presented in Volume 1 Annex 5.1 Human health of the ES (document reference F1.5.1).
TA_0111_001_131123	S44	Hardcopy feedback form	3		This is the wrong site for landfall. The proposal to go across the Nature Reserve which is an important SSSI is wrong and should not proceed. The impact on the Nature Reserve and the properties nearby is too damaging.	The approach to site selection has been based on avoiding damage to Important Ecological Features where practicable, as is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). In addition, during an iterative process of EIA, locations where trenchless techniques will be used to avoid impacts on IEFs. have been identified. Where temporary habitat loss is unavoidable, such as where construction accesses need to cross hedges, this will be rectified by reinstating habitats in accordance with the specifications provided in the Ecological Management Plan. An Outline Ecological Management Plan (document reference J6) is provided as part of the application for development consent. Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3) assesses the impacts on Lytham St. Anne's Dunes SSSI. Direct pipe trenchless installation is proposed in this location as it's the most appropriate for use in sensitive settings, in part because it reduces the risk of collapse that is associated with cable installation using horizontal directional drilling (HDD).
TA_0111_013_131123	S44	Hardcopy feedback form	5		This project should not use the proposed landfall site. It will disturb the habitat of the Nature Reserve (SSSI), the properties along the railway line (Kilgrimol Gardens) will have major cable (sic) at the end of their gardens with risk to health, property values and saleability will be badly affected.	Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3) assesses the impacts on Lytham St. Anne's Dunes SSSI. Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used. With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing. Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex. See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4). The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0111_014_131123	S44	Hardcopy feedback form	6		Compound areas, both temporary and permanent, will cause problems for local (sic) residents. This Project is in the wrong area. The Ribble Estuary should be used direct to Penwortham Substation.	The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0111_016_131123	S44	Hardcopy feedback form	13		Too much damage will be done during construction.	Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). As set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11), the Transmission Assets are not subject to a mandatory net gain requirement under the Environment Act 2021. Nevertheless, the Applicants have worked with statutory consultees to discuss the approach, and to develop the design, to allow the maximum benefit to biodiversity within the parameters of the Transmission Assets. For the Transmission Assets, biodiversity benefit will be delivered within identified biodiversity benefit areas within the Transmission Assets Order Limits: Onshore (referred to as the Onshore Order Limits). Further qualitative benefits to biodiversity are proposed via potential collaboration with stakeholders and local groups, contributing to existing plans and programmes, both within and outside the Onshore Order Limits. Further details of the approach to biodiversity benefit are provided in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11). The calculation undertaken for the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11) utilises the latest biodiversity metric published by Defra (4.0).
TA_0111_017_131123	S44	Hardcopy feedback form	16		The SSSI of Lytham St Annes Nature Reserve should NOT be involved in this Project. An alternative route should be used. The cabling proposed along the Railway line in Kilgrimol Gardens should not proceed. There are obvious health issues and a devaluation of property worth is inevitable. The Project should NOT go ahead using the proposed landfall site and route. Alternatives should once again be considered.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). The impact on Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI is considered within section 1.11.9 of Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1) and in section 3.11 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).
TA_0112_001_231123	S44	Online feedback form	3		It's a lot to try and digest and can make it a little unclear as to what the impact will be to residents. I am not in favour of drilling near to my home in Lytham St Annes. There is little real detail about disruption, the increase in flood risks, the effect activity will have on the value or aspect of my property.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					It makes more sense to work at the airport which minimises disruption to local residents and has less built on land which can be more easily accessed if needed. Also what would be the impact on disabled people who struggle with disruption such as those with Autism etc. Frankly I don't trust that it won't have a detrimental effect on those who own houses around REDACTED.	(November 2023 to October 2024). A full impact assessment on health is presented in Volume 1 Annex 5.1 Human health of the ES (document reference F1.5.1) and a full impact assessment on socio-economics is presented in Volume 4 Chapter 2 of the ES (document reference F4.2). Detailed information on the Transmission Assets including an outline construction programme is provided within Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Views of the substations are assessed from publicly accessible viewpoints and are assessed in Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES (document reference F3.10) and visualisations are presented within Volume 3, Figures of the ES (Figure 10.5, Parts 1 to 5) (document reference F3.12). The assessment of the impact of increased flood risk arising from additional surface water runoff is presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase.
TA_0112_002_231123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.2	I am concerned about the risk to damage to the sea defences and dunes referred to in the report. There is some risk that I deem is unacceptable, but the report is vague and doesn't give enough information.	The location of formal flood defences was informed by Environment Agency Spatial flood defences (including attributes), and not the North West Regional Land Drainage Byelaws. The sand dunes are classified as flood defences within the ES. Impacts and effects in relation to flood risk are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 3: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2).
TA_0112_010_231123	S44	Online feedback form	15		You need to be very very clear as to what it means and not just provide a bunch of reports that are relatively meaningless in real terms	The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC) for simplicity and accessibility. Multiple consultation events were held across the Transmission Assets area, both in-person and online, to ensure those wishing to attend could so and ask questions of the Applicant's Transmission Assets team.
TA_0113_002_151123	S44	Online feedback form	4		During the non statutory consultation phase I raised the issue about the lack of consultation events in Freckleton particularly as the area is adversely affected by the cable corridor and the potential siting of the substations. I was told to put my concerns on the feedback form and that this would be rectified during the statutory consultation phase. I was therefore extremely annoyed that when you launched the statutory consultation with proposals for the cable corridor and two potential substation sites in Freckleton that yet again there were no consultation events in Freckleton. I therefore had to travel to Lytham again to an event and pointed this out and was told to include this in my feedback form and that it would be rectified in the next stage . Same story as last time and no action taken. I was also told that they were aware that there wasn't one in Freckleton and it was because the village hall wasn't available on the day that they wanted to use it . I was also asked to send in details of other potential venues! Considering you have a Communications team - isn't that their job !! Couldn't they have liaised with Fylde Parish	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants attempted to hold an event in Freckleton during the statutory consultation period. However, this was no possible due to availability of the venue. The Transmission Assets held events nearby in Kirkham and Newton-with-Scales, both less than two miles from Freckleton.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<p>Council to find a location?</p> <p>My list (as requested) is below *There is Community Centre on Lower Lane opposite the proposed site of the huge Morgan sub station *There are 2 primary schools in the village with halls - one of which Strike Lane is very close to the south option for the Morecambe substation *There is the village library *Freckleton Sports and Social club *There are 3 pubs in the village *There is the Rawstorne sports club *There is a health centre with a large reception area *Freckleton Bowling club</p> <p>I also want to highlight the inappropriate use of jargon in your consultation documentation. No one knows what a 'Transmission Asset' is ! The flyers headed - 'Morecambe and Morgan offshore wind farms' is totally misleading . This states nothing about the impact on the Fylde countryside and most local residents are still unaware of the scale of the impact on their local community.</p> <p>I doubt that you will get much feedback from Freckleton residents as you have not consulted appropriately either through the written documentation or consultant events.I therefore consider that the consultation is flawed.</p>	
TA_0113_003_151123	S44	Online feedback form	6		<p>The siting of a compound off Hillock Lane / Kirkham Road is not appropriate due to the road traffic issues I have highlighted in point 7 below.</p> <p>The compound will also have an impact in terms of light, noise and visual impact . There has also been no detail of what will be in a compound, what the operating hours will be, security issues, lighting, noise etc.</p>	<p>Traffic and transport impacts arising during the construction phase of the Transmission Assets have been fully assessed at section 7.11 Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference E3.7). Details of the operation and maintenance phases are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Onshore maintenance would be limited to essential maintenance and/or emergency works. Further details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8). The impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets in terms of noise are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 8 : Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8). Visual effects, including effects arising from lighting, are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES (document reference F3.10).</p>
TA_0113_007_151123	S44	Online feedback form	12		<p>There has been no visual representation of what the proposed sub stations will look like but the size and scale are alarming for local communities. I raised this at a local consultation event and was told they couldn't show any images and to google pictures of substations linked to other wind farms . This is unacceptable if you are asking people for comments on how to mitigate the impact when we have no idea what they will look like! Obviously we want to keep our rural areas as unspoilt as possible so mature natural landscaping from the beginning of the project is imperative .</p>	<p>Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures of the ES). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0113_008_151123	S44	Online feedback form	16		<p>See my comments in section 4 regarding Consultation events and literature <i>(During the non statutory consultation phase I raised the issue about the lack of consultation events in Freckleton particularly as the area is adversely affected by the cable corridor and the potential siting of the substations. I was told to put my concerns on the feedback form and that this would be rectified during the statutory consultation phase.</i></p> <p><i>I was therefore extremely annoyed that when you launched the statutory consultation with proposals for the cable corridor and two potential substation sites in Freckleton that yet again there were no consultation events in Freckleton.</i></p> <p><i>I therefore had to travel to Lytham again to an event and pointed this out and was told to include this in my feedback form and that it would be rectified in the next stage . Same story as last time and no action taken.</i></p> <p><i>I was also told that they were aware that there wasn't one in Freckleton and it was because the village hall wasn't available on the day that they wanted to use it . I was also asked to send in details of other potential venues! Considering you have a Communications team - isn't that their job !! Couldn't they have liaised with Fylde Parish Council to find a location?</i></p> <p><i>My list (as requested) is below</i> <i>*There is Community Centre on Lower Lane opposite the proposed site of the huge Morgan sub station</i> <i>*There are 2 primary schools in the village with halls - one of which Strike Lane is very close to the south option for the Morecambe substation</i> <i>*There is the village library</i> <i>*Freckleton Sports and Social club</i> <i>*There are 3 pubs in the village</i> <i>*There is the Rawstorne sports club</i> <i>*There is a health centre with a large reception area</i> <i>*Freckleton Bowling club</i></p> <p><i>I also want to highlight the inappropriate use of jargon in your consultation documentation. No one knows what a 'Transmission Asset' is !</i> <i>The flyers headed - 'Morecambe and Morgan offshore wind farms' is totally misleading . This states nothing about the impact on the Fylde countryside and most local residents are still unaware of the scale of the impact on their local community.</i></p> <p><i>I doubt that you will get much feedback from Freckleton residents as you have not consulted appropriately either through the written documentation or consultant events. I therefore consider that the consultation is flawed.)</i></p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to September 2024).</p> <p>The Applicants attempted to hold an event in Freckleton during the statutory consultation period. However, this was no possible due to availability of the venue. The Transmission Assets held events nearby in Kirkham and newton-with-Scales, both less than two miles from Freckleton.</p>
TA_0115_002_051123	S44	Online feedback form	2		Honestly can't figure out where the proposed area is...	The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0115_006_051123	S44	Online feedback form	15		The first and immediate thing should be a better way of communicating what is going on rather than sending packs of jargon to residents who cannot interpret the information. The next is actually listening to the residents, we live here, understand the area etc	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Multiple consultation events were held across the Transmission Assets area, both in-person and online, to ensure those wishing to attend could so and ask questions of the Applicant's Transmission Assets team.

E1.16.2.2 Overarching consultation process and non-technical comments table of responses (via all other methods)

Table E1.16.2.2: Overarching consultation process and non-technical comments table of responses (via all other methods)

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0001_007_231123	S42	Email	1.6 N/A The figures have been included as separate pdf's throughout the PEIR. This disrupts the flow of reading for the user. If possible, we advise figures are included and embedded within the Chapters for the ES submission (similar to how they were presented in the Morgan Generation Assets PEIR). We suggest figures are embedded within the Chapters for the ES.	This has been considered and reviewed. To retain the A3 figure layout and allow the cable route to show fully on figures (and accommodate those who prefer to have these presented separately/be able to view on a separate screen), a separate figures volume has been retained.
TA_0001_273_231123	S42	Email	Thank you for your consultation dated 12 October 2023 requesting our advice on the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) submitted in support of the Morgan and Morecambe Transmission Assets Offshore Wind Farm Project. Natural England are content to provide comments on the PEIR, however this is without prejudice to any comments we may wish to make in light of further submissions or on the presentation of additional information. The following documents have been reviewed:• Volume 1: Introductory Chapters• Volume 2: Offshore Chapters• Volume 3: Onshore Chapters• Volume 4, Chapter 1: Seascape, landscape and visual resources• PEIR Non-Technical Summary• Statutory Consultation Materials1. Overview CommentsNatural England's RemitNatural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. Natural England's remit extends out to 12nm. Pursuant to an authorisation made on the 9th December 2013 by the JNCC under paragraph 17(c) of Schedule 4 to the NERC Act 2006, Natural England is also authorised to exercise the JNCC's functions as a statutory consultee in respect of applications for offshore renewable energy installations in offshore waters (12- 200nm) adjacent to England.Evidence Plan ProcessNatural England recognises the importance of the pre-application stage of the consenting regime, and we welcome the opportunity to engage at this stage. As such we seek to make this process as effective as possible. We have provided advice previously in our response to the Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report (14 July 2022). Since Scoping, Natural England has been engaging in the Applicant's Evidence Plan Process (EPP) and Natural England has attended the majority of the Expert Working Group (EWG) meetings.We recommend that a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) is started by the Applicant early within the EPP, to accurately catalogue all areas of agreement for the project and highlight any areas of disagreement. ETG consultation/agreement logs have been successfully used by other projects as the foundation for the SoCG.Due to the high quantity of large documents submitted as part of the PEIR and due to the limited consultation period we have reviewed the documents as fully as possible, however there have been instances where we have had to prioritise which documents to review. We have summarised which documents have been reviewed in relation to each of the relevant thematic annexes. We therefore reserve the right to provide further advice and highlight that agreement is not to be assumed where no comment is made.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0001_274_231123	S42	Email	Best Practice Advice for Offshore Wind Natural England has produced a series of documents to provide Environmental Assessments: Best Practice Advice for Evidence and Data Standards for offshore wind farm development in English inshore and offshore waters. The advice is provided in a series of documents which range from baseline characterisation surveys and pre-application engagement, through to expectations at application and post-consent monitoring.The project is divided into four phases:• Baseline characterisation surveys• Pre-application engagement and the evidence plan process• Data and evidence expectations at examination• Post-consent monitoring and other environmental requirements.The above link also provides access the Nature Conservation Considerations and Environmental Best Practice for Subsea Cables for English Inshore and UK Offshore Waters. This project provides Natural England and JNCCs joint environmental best practice advice for subsea cable projects in English inshore and UK offshore waters.It is the expectation that developers follow our Best Practice through the application and consenting process. As such our advice and recommendations to the PEIR are framed around this advice.If you have any issues using SharePoint Online, please contact the site owners or contact: NEOffshoreWindStrategicSolutions@naturalengland.org.uk.Natural England has also produced terrestrial guidance 'Developers: get environmental advice on your planning proposals' which is also	The Applicants note your response.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			relevant to the onshore transmission assets for offshore windfarms please follow the links to our standard advice.	
TA_0001_277_231123	S42	Email	Impacts on the Natural Environment – Natural England's Key Concerns Generic Comments Natural England highlights that for several receptors, the PEIR is based on incomplete data or refers to additional data collection that is not presented or still to be carried out. Natural England cannot therefore make any conclusive judgements based on this PEIR, including the cumulative/in-combination assessments and the HRA. Accordingly, our advice focuses on the methodology used. We emphasise the need to base the submitted ES on robust datasets that meet (and where appropriate exceed) minimum standards.	As detailed in Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3) and Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4), Further surveys have been carried out since the publication of the PEIR in order to provide a more complete baseline. It is considered that this provides a sufficiently robust basis for assessment.
TA_0001_278_231123	S42	Email	We also highlight the risks associated with further data processing to validate the conclusions and having sufficient time to consult pre-application and sufficiently resolve matters prior to submission. We reserve the right to change our comments and position during the ES consultation, subject to the outcome of further data analysis. Furthermore, Natural England seeks confirmation that the timetable set out for DCO submission allows for evidence standards to be met.	As detailed in Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3) and Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4), Further surveys have been carried out since the publication of the PEIR in order to provide a more complete baseline. It is considered that this provides a sufficiently robust basis for assessment.
TA_0001_279_231123	S42	Email	On a general note for how the PEIR has been presented, throughout the PEIR, the figures have been included as separate pdfs. This disrupts the flow of reading for the user. If possible, we advise figures are included and embedded within the Chapters for the ES submission (similar to how they were presented in the Morgan Generation Assets PEIR).	This has been considered and reviewed. To retain the A3 figure layout and allow the cable route to show fully on figures (and accommodate those who prefer to have these presented separately/be able to view on a separate screen), a separate figures volume has been retained.
TA_0001_283_231123	S42	Email	All efforts to avoid areas of boulders or minimise the need for boulder clearance by micro-siting should be explored through a boulder clearance methodology and stated within the Application, and the potential impacts of boulder placement on sediment movement carefully assessed.	The description of potential impacts relating to seabed preparation including boulder clearance has been refined with respect to further project definition as presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Micrositing of cables around boulders would be onerous and impractical. Boulders pose a risk of damage and exposure to cables as well as an obstruction risk to the cable installation equipment. Therefore, any boulders identified as likely to impact installation will need to be moved to the side (side cast), away from the immediate location of the cable infrastructure. There are two key methods of clearing boulders, boulder plough and boulder grab. Where a high density of boulders is seen, the expectation is that a plough will be required to clear the cable installation corridor. Where medium and low densities of boulders are present, a subsea grab is expected to be employed. Boulder clearance will occur within the footprint of other site preparation activities. All boulders will remain in the vicinity (i.e. sidecast only) of the area they were cleared from. The impact is fully assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2).
TA_0002_002_171123	S42	Email	Introduction: Prior to the Statutory Consultation phase, the initial engagement was poorly thought through and badly executed. The current Statutory Consultation has again been accompanied by errors in distribution of key documents, despite pleas for addresses to be corrected.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0002_003_171123	S42	Email	The interest from the Community is intense, despite this. However, the consultation events have been overcrowded, with entry being closed for periods, supported by contract staff who were frequently unable to provide adequate explanation and display material that could be difficult to interpret, even with staff assistance. Issues raised seem to have been poorly recorded as brief notes, failing to capture with sufficient clarity to permit adequate interpretation after these engagement events.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>to October 2024). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). At particularly busy events, people were asked to wait outside to ensure the safety of members of the public, no one was turned away from any events.</p>
TA_0002_004_171123	S42	Email	The Parish Council will try to ensure that all who are affected by this development make their input, as requested.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0002_009_171123	S42	Email	<p>5. Consultation Process The non-statutory consultations prior to the current phase were inadequate. Generic postcards were sent to many but not all residents. These were included with junk mail flyers, so many may have been discarded resulting in many people being unaware. Worse, key landowners, whose properties and/or livelihoods are and will be adversely affected, were not uniformly covered by more detail briefs. Addresses were mixed up and the relevant people not identified, despite being provided with correct information at the outset. Some improvement has taken place, but only after threat of action under Data Protection Regulations. Access requests for survey work have been patchy, as has the process of providing the agreed payments for these access visits. The briefing packs that have been produced were inadequate, in terms of the necessary detail to permit informed reactions or counter proposals. This also applies to the consultation events, where the detail was not provided to the forum as information on the presentation material, or even in response to detailed questions from the affected landowners to the project representatives. Some of the proposed buildings required as sub-stations appear gargantuan in scale, perhaps because the technologies to be applied have yet to be chosen, but this would also imply that the project is not adequately mature to be progressing to the formal consultation stage prior to submission to the Secretary of State.</p>	<p>The Applicants issued a consultation newsletter to the consultation mailing zone using translucent envelopes during statutory consultation. These envelopes were selected for sustainability and practicality reasons, with the intention of allowing the recipients to see that the information inside related to the Transmission Assets and associated consultation. The consultation mailing zone was consistently reviewed throughout the pre-application process and was expanded between the non-statutory and statutory periods of consultation to ensure the local community were made aware of upcoming consultation activity. Full details of the consultation mailing zone can be found in the Consultation report (document reference E1); for the statutory consultation a total of 52,587 properties and businesses we sent a newsletter to advertise the consultation. This was also sent to 22,814 properties and businesses on the Isle of Man. The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included local media advertising (online and offline) and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).</p>
TA_0002_010_171123	S42	Email	<p>6. Provided Information – Inadequacy As noted, the information provided was lacking in detail such that the landowners affected by the development could not fully appreciate the implications on their own businesses. The team responsible appeared to have little knowledge as to where the landowners are located, in relation to the proposed works on their properties, as reflected in the mess made of establishing the contacts and their addresses properly. Experience garnered from those exposed to other developments of a similar nature highlights some of the dangers that have yet to be considered. For example, the proposed underground cable conduits are likely to require access manholes or inspection chambers along the route. In other examples, these have resulted in raised mounds as the disturbed land gradually sinks. This can result in damage to very expensive farm machinery that may be engaged in crop cutting, whether for silage or for arable crops. No definition of such obstacles has been provided as it is considered "premature at this stage". The implication is that the overall design of the whole system has not yet achieved an adequate level of</p>	<p>Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the applicants, obtained landowner information and addresses through HMLR searches, in accordance with the land referencing methodology. Following the identification of landowners, meetings were offered and held where requested (as set on the Consultation Report document reference E1). The design of the Transmission Assets is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This includes details of the required joint bays and link boxes. Joint bays will be completely buried, with the land above reinstated. An inspection cover will be provided at the surface for link boxes for access during the operation and maintenance phase. The precise location of these will be identified during the detailed design phase. Flood risk, including allowances for sea level rise, has</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			maturity to enable meaningful assessment of associated risks and costs of installation, ownership, and finally retirement of the system. Yet in other areas, the progress seems bogged down in unnecessary details, for examples challenges relating to ownership of small parcels of land identified on maps, which are gateways to the fields and properties where the actual gate may be set back from a road to allow a vehicle to stop and gain access to the field in question without blocking the roadway! This appears to be being used to obfuscate the real issues where decent design information is sadly lacking. A further example is the lack of forethought that relates to the predicted changes in sea levels that is the driver for the need for green energy. The Fylde and Ribble estuary are naturally low lying with the EA having provided forecasts of the changes in flood risk in the recent past. This does not appear to have been considered, to date.	been considered in Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3).
TA_0002_015_171123	S42	Email	9. ConclusionsThe overall conclusion that the Parish Council has reached is that, with the evidence and status presented, we must object to the proposals. The following reasons support this objection: 1) The consultation process has been flawed in its execution.2) Insufficient information has been provided to enable a proper assessment of the impact of the design on the total environment of the Fylde.3) Consequently, the proposed plan does not have a level of maturity commensurate with presentation for approval.4) The impact on individual landowners has not been determined, relating to both the development and implementation phase and the subsequent in-service life cycle of the system.5) Costs associated with levels of compensation appear to have been underestimated.6) The impression has been created that the programme is underfunded and that any additional costs would have to be sought by access to the public purse, a similar situation to that occurring with the HS2 project.7) The impact of the loss of amenity, for both residents and visitors, is considered too high a price to pay for the proposed development, when all possible alternatives have been summarily dismissed for reasons that are unclear.	The Applicant notes your response. Responses to detailed comments provided in turn associated to each topic raised (see unique reference TA_0002).
TA_0002_016_171123	S42	Email	10. Attachments - Map of Freckleton & Newton with Clifton highlighting the key elements of the proposal in relation to existing developments and population areas 2) Environment Agency Prediction of Flood Risk Forecast for 2050 for the Ribble Estuary	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0003_001_221123	S42/S44	Email	Introduction Fylde Council is supportive of the overall approach to delivering low carbon energy, however, this should not come at a cost to other important matters and impacts on local communities. Having reviewed the pre submission documents, Fylde Council has concerns regarding the project which it considers must be addresses prior to the submission of an application to the Secretary of State. Fylde Council's response to the consultation has been drafted to concentrate on the elements of the project it considers it can add value to the decision-making process. The absence of comments on detailed ecological impacts or flood risk, for example, should not be taken as a lack of concern, but that these matters would be better addressed by other parties such as Natural England and the Environment Agency. General approach to consultation. The council has reviewed the submission documents and has significant concerns regarding the consultation documentation.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0003_002_221123	S42/S44	Email	Firstly, there is repeated reference in the consultation documentation to details of various elements of the proposal not having been finalised. This includes, but is not limited to, the route of the proposed cabling, the design and technology to be used in the construction of the proposed sub stations and the provision of compensatory habitat required to address Biodiversity Net Gain. Whilst it is appreciated that such matters may not have been available during the non-statutory consultation when the views of the local community were sought to help inform the design parameters of the project, it is considered that the design of the scheme should have reached a much more advanced stage. As matters stand, there are many questions on which the local authority and community are unable to provide meaningful responses and so the pre-application has taken place prematurely. The Planning Inspectorate advise that "The length of time taken to prepare and consult on a project will vary depending upon its scale and complexity." The Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Windfarms: Transmission Assets is a significant project, and many conflicting interests will need to be balanced during the decision-making process. Fylde Council considers that there should be further community and stakeholder engagement ahead of the formal submission of the proposal to the Planning Inspectorate to allow the views of the local community to be obtained and any matters more fully assessed at a time when the project is further developed.	The design of the Transmission Assets has been developed further since the statutory consultation (PEIR). This design evolution has taken into account the findings of the iterative EIA process and feedback from stakeholders. As such the location of key elements of the Transmission Assets and the Order Limits have been refined, as reflected in the application for development consent. This has included development of the approach to biodiversity benefit, as set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11). Engagement through the Evidence Plan Process has continued throughout the EIA process, including Expert Working Groups attended by Fylde Council. Further targeted consultation has been undertaken, for example, for landowners where additional land interests have been identified.
TA_0003_003_221123	S42/S44	Email	In addition to the lack of certainty regarding the scheme that is being consulted upon, the council is concerned that the consultation material has not contained sufficient detail to allow an assessment of	The design of the Transmission Assets has been developed further since the statutory consultation (PEIR). This design evolution has taken into account the

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			potential impacts to be considered. In particular, based on the summary documents that have been produced it is difficult to understand the siting of infrastructure and cable routing. Whilst additional detail is contained in the on-line documentation, many members of the community have not been able to locate this information amongst the extensive documentation contained in the PIER.	findings of the iterative EIA process and feedback from stakeholders. As such the location of key elements of the Transmission Assets and the Order Limits have been refined, as reflected in the application for development consent. Further targeted consultation has been undertaken, for example, for landowners where additional land interests have been identified. At the PEIR and ES stages, a non-technical summary has been provided to summarise the findings of the EIA process in non-technical language.
TA_0003_017_221123	S42/S44	Email	If ultimately it is considered that wider national and global benefits of the scheme outweigh the concerns expressed by the council and the local community, it is considered that there should be some recognition for the impact that this national project will have on the local area. To this end Fylde Council would wish to discuss the potential for the green energy produced by the project to more directly benefit local communities, for example by providing cheap green energy to local schools and other community facilities and/or through supporting the provision of community facilities that would benefit the local community.	As the project continues to progress, the Applicants are committed to ongoing engagement with Fylde Council. The Transmission Assets is fully committed to delivering a community benefits scheme in line with UK Government guidance, which is due to be published later this year. Ahead of the guidance being published we have been engaging with local people, businesses and organisations to identify key themes and projects that will deliver strategic benefits and directly support the local community and local priorities. We welcome further input from the local community and encourage you to reach out to the project team in due course.
TA_0005_002_231123	S42	Email	As a result the programme design is considered to remain inadequately immature, the consultation is therefore premature and the programme, therefore, proposes unacceptable risk at this point. This Parish Council also shares the conclusions of its Ward partner of Newton with Clifton Parish Council as they have currently presented in their web-site. The programme issues raised need to be addressed with urgency. A reconsultation then needs to take place and any further feedback fully acted upon, before the development should progress any further. This Parish Council is most willing to be contacted should the developer wish further clarification, otherwise it will be assumed that these matters will be fully acted upon. Please email : parishclerk@trw-parishcouncil.org.uk If developer representatives do not engage with the Parish Council it will be assumed that revised designs will be developed, published and presented to fully address the issues raised in this feedback. If that is an incorrect assumption then the Parish Council would request that it is engaged to explain why that is not correct.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0005_004_231123	S42	Email	2The proposed programme remains inadequately immature. There are claimed to be no designs for 18 hectares of converter stations and a swathe of cable route corridors that still cover most of the south east Fylde. As a result the impacts can neither be presented, nor mitigated. It is therefore, an inadequate and premature consultation. The baseline programme & options need to be matured and a re-consultation needs to be taken. It can only be speculation that presumably the lack of acceptable consultation information is an attempt to try to maintain a schedule for interests other than to the benefit of local ones.	The design of the Transmission Assets has been developed further since the statutory consultation (PEIR). This design evolution has taken into account the findings of the iterative EIA process and feedback from stakeholders. As such the location of key elements of the Transmission Assets and the Order Limits have been refined, as reflected in the application for development consent.
TA_0005_006_231123	S42	Email	4. There does not appear to be any evidence presented of active engagement with the Local Planning Authorities, National Grid, environmental regulators, as well as best practice practitioners. If this is the case, through engagement, they could potentially assist in determining what is needed to be done to provide advice, including on: locating converter substations on land already approved for industrial development; how less impactful methods & routes could be followed; and in particular continuing the use of the sea & coast to a landfall nearer to National Grid's choice of connection using best practice techniques and equipments. This needs to be corrected. All regulators need to be evidenced as being engaged to reduce adverse impacts & realise benefits. Otherwise there is considerable scope to consider that developers are not engaging with such bodies, because the adverse impacts are already known to be much greater than is being alluded to. If so, this would be a fundamental misrepresentation of the adverse impacts of their approaches on local communities, their economies and their environments.	Engagement through the Evidence Plan Process has continued throughout the EIA process, including Expert Working Groups attended by local planning authorities and regulatory bodies. Details are provided in Volume 1, Chapter 5: Environmental assessment methodology of the ES (document reference F1.5).
TA_0005_112_231123	S42	Email	Consultation IssuesThe consultation phase was flawed for a number of reasons -1. It is considered that insufficient notice given to the Fylde communities. Awareness in the population only grew when the local and town councils were involved.	The Applicants issued a consultation newsletter to the consultation mailing zone using translucent envelopes during statutory consultation. These envelopes were selected for sustainability and practicality reasons, with the intention of allowing the recipients to see that the information inside related to the Transmission Assets and associated consultation. The consultation mailing zone was consistently reviewed throughout the pre-application process and was expanded between the non-statutory and statutory periods of consultation

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				to ensure the local community were made aware of upcoming consultation activity. Full details of the consultation mailing zone can be found in the Consultation report (document reference E1); for the statutory consultation a total of 52,587 properties and businesses we sent a newsletter to advertise the consultation. This was also sent to 22,814 properties and businesses on the Isle of Man. The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included local media advertising (online and offline) and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers.
TA_0005_114_231123	S42	Email	3. Scope of the consultation was unclear. The brochures and information provided leads one to believe that the cable routing and general location of the converter stations is a "done deal".	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Transmission Assets is fully committed to delivering a community benefits scheme in line with UK Government guidance, which is due to be published later this year. Ahead of the guidance being published we have been engaging with local people, businesses and organisations to identify key themes and projects that will deliver strategic benefits and directly support the local community and local priorities. We welcome further input from the local community and encourage you to reach out to the project team in due course.
TA_0005_115_231123	S42	Email	4. Staff and representatives at the various community meetings were friendly but not helpful, they had no more knowledge or information than that presented in the brochures, there was no targeted information specific to the community/ location of the meeting.	The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The staff at each consultation event covered various work streams and were able to answer questions in line with the latest information available at the time of statutory consultation.
TA_0005_116_231123	S42	Email	5. Insufficient information available on key aspects of the development and lifecycle that are likely to have been of most concern to Fylde communities ie no designs or images of the converter stations, no visuals showing impact from nearest residences, no forecast traffic profiles or volumes, no preferred traffic routes identified, results in the consultation cannot be considered in any way meaningful.	The PEIR provided at the statutory consultation stage provided details of the information available at that time, including details of the design and an assessment of effects. The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the onshore substations, including - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets- refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received.
TA_0005_117_231123	S42	Email	6. The feedback form was unnecessarily long and complex and seemed specifically designed to deter people from providing feedback on the proposals.	The feedback form enabled respondents to provide feedback on specific aspects of the proposals. It was structured to allow the Transmission Assets team to accurately categorise and assess feedback in the design process.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0009_001_231123	S44	Email	Cushman & Wakefield, on behalf of Ministry of Justice (MoJ), is instructed to respond to the statutory consultation exercise for the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms: Transmission Project ("the Project"). We note that consent to operate, maintain and decommission the Project will be sought via the Development Consent Order (DCO) process and that this consultation exercise will be followed by submission of the DCO application in due course. The MoJ does not object to the principle of the Project and supports the development of renewable energy schemes and their important contribution towards the UK being Net Zero by 2050	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0009_004_231123	S44	Email	Conclusion This letter identifies, based on the information available at this time, the potential impacts on the MoJ and the operation of HMP Kirkham. We would welcome further discussions with the project team so each party can best understand the potential impacts and how these are best avoided and/or mitigated. I trust that the above is clear, however, should you have any questions or wish to discuss in more detail please do not hesitate to contact me. We have registered to be kept informed on the Project.	The Applicants note your response. Responses provided to detailed points in turn above.
TA_0010_001_221123	S42	Email	Marine Licensing, Wildlife Licences and other permissions Dear Sir/Madam, Please be aware that any works within the Marine area require a licence from the Marine Management Organisation. It is down to the applicant themselves to take the necessary steps to ascertain whether their works will fall below the Mean High Water Springs mark	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0010_002_221123	S42	Email	Response to your consultation The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) is a non-departmental public body responsible for the management of England's marine area on behalf of the UK government. The MMO's delivery functions are; marine planning, marine licensing, wildlife licensing and enforcement, marine protected area management, marine emergencies, fisheries management and issuing European grants.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0010_004_221123	S42	Email	The MMO is a signatory to the coastal concordat and operates in accordance with its principles. Should the activities subject to planning permission meet the above criteria then the applicant should be directed to the follow pages: check if you need a marine licence and asked to quote the following information on any resultant marine licence application: • local planning authority name, • planning officer name and contact details, • planning application reference. Following submission of a marine licence application a case team will be in touch with the relevant planning officer to discuss next steps.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0010_005_221123	S42	Email	Environmental Impact Assessment With respect to projects that require a marine licence the EIA Directive (codified in Directive 2011/92/EU) is transposed into UK law by the Marine Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2007 (the MWR), as amended. Before a marine licence can be granted for projects that require EIA, MMO must ensure that applications for a marine licence are compliant with the MWR. In cases where a project requires both a marine licence and terrestrial planning permission, both the MWR and The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uk/si/2017/571/contents/made may be applicable. If this consultation request relates to a project capable of falling within either set of EIA regulations, then it is advised that the applicant submit a request directly to the MMO to ensure any requirements under the MWR are considered adequately at the following link https://www.gov.uk/guidance/make-a-marine-licence-application	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0010_006_221123	S42	Email	Marine Planning Under the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 ch.4, 58, public authorities must make decisions in accordance with marine policy documents and if it takes a decision that is against these policies it must state its reasons. MMO as such are responsible for implementing the relevant Marine Plans for their area, through existing regulatory and decision-making processes. Marine plans will inform and guide decision makers on development in marine and coastal areas. Proposals should conform with all relevant policies, taking account of economic, environmental and social considerations. Marine plans are a statutory consideration for public authorities with decision making functions. At its landward extent, a marine plan will apply up to the mean high water springs mark, which includes the tidal extent of any rivers. As marine plan boundaries extend up to the level of the mean high water spring tides mark, there will be an overlap with terrestrial plans which generally extend to the mean low water springs mark. A map showing how England's waters have been split into 6 marine plan areas is available on our website. For further information on how to apply the marine plans please visit our Explore Marine Plans service. Planning documents for areas with a	The Applicants note your response.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			coastal influence may wish to make reference to the MMO's licensing requirements and any relevant marine plans to ensure that necessary regulations are adhered to. All public authorities taking authorisation or enforcement decisions that affect or might affect the UK marine area must do so in accordance with the Marine and Coastal Access Act and the UK Marine Policy Statement unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise. Local authorities may also wish to refer to our online guidance and the Planning Advisory Service soundness self-assessment checklist. If you wish to contact your local marine planning officer you can find their details on our gov.uk page.	
TA_0010_007_221123	S42	Email	Minerals and waste plans and local aggregate assessments If you are consulting on a mineral/waste plan or local aggregate assessment, the MMO recommend reference to marine aggregates is included and reference to be made to the documents below;• The Marine Policy Statement (MPS), section 3.5 which highlights the importance of marine aggregates and its supply to England's (and the UK) construction industry. • The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which sets out policies for national (England) construction minerals supply. • The Managed Aggregate Supply System (MASS) which includes specific references to the role of marine aggregates in the wider portfolio of supply. • The National and regional guidelines for aggregates provision in England 2005-2020 predict likely aggregate demand over this period including marine supply. The NPPF informed MASS guidance requires local mineral planning authorities to prepare Local Aggregate Assessments, these assessments have to consider the opportunities and constraints of all mineral supplies into their planning regions – including marine. This means that even land-locked counties, may have to consider the role that marine sourced supplies (delivered by rail or river) play – particularly where land based resources are becoming increasingly constrained. If you require further guidance on the Marine Licencing process, please follow the link https://www.gov.uk/topic/planning-development/marine-licences	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0011_001_261123	S42	Email	I attended the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms consultation event on Friday 13th October at Lytham Assembly Rooms. The lady I spoke to indicated that it would be possible to arrange a presentation regarding the project for Councillors at South Ribble. She indicated that there had already been a presentation to Councillors at Fylde. Having discussed the scheme with our Portfolio Holder, he feels it would be beneficial for Councillors to have a full understanding of the potential impacts on the Borough. Please could you advise if it would be possible to give a presentation to Members either in person or via Teams. Realistically we would be looking for an evening meeting as many of our Councillors work. I have copied in REDACTED, our Democratic & Member Services Officer who will be pleased to liaise with you to arrange a suitable time.	The Applicants received a request from South Ribble Council for a presentation to councillors on the proposed scheme. A briefing was organised and held on the evening of 24 January 2024.
TA_0012_001_221123	S42	Email	St. Annes on the Sea Town Council are fully supportive of offshore wind generators and the need to decarbonise our economy both at a local and national level.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0012_002_221123	S42	Email	The proposals by Morgan and Morecambe however would have a serious and damaging impact upon the local communities in St Anne's and the surrounding environment, both in our town, but also in the wider Fylde.	The Applicants note your response. Effects on the environment and community receptors are set out in Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4).
TA_0012_008_221123	S42	Email	It is suggested that further thought should be given to alternative routes and how following the estuary seems to make sense to many in St. Annes	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0012_009_221123	S42	Email	In conclusion, St. Annes on the Sea Town Council are against these proposals as they stand. Further detail on the impact on individual residents and the town as a whole will also need be provided at some point in the future.	The Applicants note your response. Further details are provided in the application for development consent, including Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4).
TA_0013_001_141123	S42	Email	Thank you for consulting St Helens Council as the Local Planning Authority ("LPA") as part of the pre application consultation process in relation to the project at Morgan Offshore Wind Farm. The LPA's understanding is that the current consultation process is being undertaken prior to the applicant formally submitting a Development Consent Order (DCO) to the Planning Inspectorate and Secretary of State for the Department of Energy Security and Net Zero for the following development (in summary): • Offshore infrastructure including offshore export cables, offshore substation platform(s), interconnector cables and a Morgan offshore booster station. • Landfall works (where the offshore	The Applicants note your response.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			cables reach the shore) between Mean Low Water Springs and the transition joint bays including the offshore and onshore cables, intertidal working area and landfall construction compound(s), and temporary and permanent access. • Onshore infrastructure from the transition joint bays to the electricity transmission network connection. This includes onshore export cables to the two new substations, temporary construction compounds, temporary and permanent access, and onward connections to the existing National Grid substation at Penwortham, Lancashire. • Areas for biodiversity net gain, enhancement and / or mitigation, including permanent access for operation and maintenance of those areas. Having undertaken a review of the information provided by the applicant as part of this consultation It is the assessment of St Helens LPA that the development would not have a material impact on the borough of St Helens or its residents. Therefore, at this stage in the process, the LPA does not have any comments to make, beyond a general support for the proposal and desire to see more renewable electricity generation in the region. The LPA does reserve the right to comment further on any formal submission that will be made to the Planning Inspectorate at a later stage if you need to discuss the matter further, please do not hesitate to contact me.	
TA_0014_032_231123	S42	Email	The TSC acknowledges that multiple responses to proposed UK offshore windfarm projects have been provided in recent months, and would encourage developers to ensure coordinated consideration and sharing of these responses. For example, there are fundamental associations between the Morgan, Mona and Morgan/Morecambe Transmission projects and enhanced benefits and better regional outcomes may be achieved by maximising cooperation between project parties. The TSC would welcome the opportunity for continued involvement in the process.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0015_001_301023	S42	Email	Thank you for consulting JNCC on the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms: Transmission Assets consultation which we received on 06/10/2023. Natural England is now authorised to exercise the JNCC's functions as a statutory consultee in respect of certain applications for offshore and offshore waters (0-200nm) adjacent to England. Therefore, Natural England should provide a full response. Where required Natural England will contact JNCC directly if any additional input is required. As such JNCC have not reviewed this application and will not be providing further comment.	The Applicants note your response. We can confirm a full response was received and considered.
TA_0017_012_231123	S42/S44	Email	Consultees The Planning application should demonstrate that issues raised by consultees have been addressed. This includes (but is not limited to): • Natural England • The Environment Agency • Marine Management Organisation • Local Planning Authorities	Meetings were held on the scope, methodology and findings of surveys. Details were discussed and agreed with stakeholders via regular Expert Working Group (EWG) meetings. Refer to the Technical Engagement Plan (document reference E5) for all details of technical stakeholder consultation..
TA_0019_001_231123	S42/S44	Email	Thank you for the letter dated 9th October 2023 regarding the above consultation. The above project has been a standing agenda item for some months and council made representations as part of the earlier non-statutory consultation. However, the previously expressed concerns of members remain and have now determined council cannot support the project. The following points indicate the areas of concern;	The Applicants note your response. Detailed comments responded to in turn, see unique reference TA_0019.
TA_0019_002_231123	S42/S44	Email	A) Statutory and non-statutory consultation. The Morgan and Morecambe offshore windfarm generation assets and offshore windfarms transmission assets consultation commenced circa November/December 2022 and postcards were sent to some property addresses in Newton-with-Scales. These postcards did not indicate the potential impact of the proposals. Similarly a non-statutory consultation commenced in April 2023 and again postcards were sent to some property addresses in Newton-with-Scales with no indication of impact. On the 25th May 2023 council corresponded with Fylde borough council as the host authority (FBC) and Lancashire county council (LCC) with regard to its concerns in respect of renewable and low carbon energy generation development proposals and the singular or cumulative effects on the countryside, the character of the landscape, townscape, visual amenity, and the adverse impact on local residents arising from noise and other public nuisance issues with consequential loss of amenity.	The Applicants note your response. Detailed comments responded to in turn, see unique reference TA_0019.
TA_0019_003_231123	S42/S44	Email	It was anticipated both authorities would be demonstrably involved in this matter and participate in an informative consultation event and presentation including parish and town council representatives, FBC planning members and officers, LCC planning members and officers, local MPs, external planning consultants specialising in Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP) projects, land agents with expertise in these matters and representatives from Morecambe OWL and Morgan	The Applicants held consultation events at venues across the consultation zone including twelve at non-statutory and seven at statutory consultation. These venues were selected to cover a broad geographic area and give as many people across the consultation zone an opportunity to provide feedback on proposals. Webinars were also held during each consultation for those who

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			OWL. During the non statutory consultation phase the council was denied a requested a consultation event in the parish. The cumulative impact within the parish, the wider Fylde area and across the boundary in Blackpool, Wyre and Preston was already a cause of concern being expressed by members and parishioners and concerns remain notwithstanding the information presented at a meeting on Thursday 1st June 2023 by the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm project team. A subsequent Transmission Assets project consultation dropin event was arranged at Newton, Clifton & Salwick Village Hall, on Thursday 26th October 2023. The statutory planning authorities did not engage in the consultation and have not provided any indication of ongoing communication with the developer(s)	couldn't access the in-person venues. The Applicant used to the feedback received during its non-statutory consultation to refine the venues it used during its statutory consultation.
TA_0019_004_231123	S42/S44	Email	At the consultation events the project team were unable to provide definitive answers to residents questions and in the absence of representation from the statutory planning authorities attendees did not receive requested advice and technical information that would be transparently independent without any perception of bias, predisposition, or predetermination with information regarding the proposal, land reinstatement and developer contributions towards mitigating the impact of what might be considered unacceptable developments to make them acceptable in planning terms.	The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR.
TA_0019_005_231123	S42/S44	Email	Members remain perplexed that both FBC, as the local planning and host authority, and LCC county planning authority have been conspicuously absent in taking a pro-active role in consulting with its constituent parish and town councils, particularly those significantly affected by the proposals relating to the indicative onshore substation search areas and the indicative 70 metre wide (extended to 180 metres in specific locations) permanent onshore export cable corridor and grid connection area. The designation of areas suitable for wind energy development requires community support and there is a perception that to date the consultation process has been flawed and inadequate i.e. it is asserted that the initial notification by postcards and subsequent information packs were not distributed effectively in the parish and did not indicate the potential significant impact on the village of Newton-with-Scales and the wider parish area. Information, particularly regarding substations has been imprecise, vague, and therefore potentially misleading. The requirement for onshore substations was only obtained by attending consultation events in other areas	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The consultation mailing zone was consistently reviewed throughout the pre-application process and was expanded between the non-statutory and statutory periods of consultation to ensure the local community were made aware of upcoming consultation activity. Full details of the consultation mailing zone can be found in the Consultation report (document reference E1); for the statutory consultation a total of 52,587 properties and businesses we sent a newsletter to advertise the consultation. This was also sent to 22,814 properties and businesses on the Isle of Man. All host local authorities and parish councils are considered statutory consultees under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 and play a critical role in the pre-application process. How each local authority or parish council interacts with one another during the pre-application stage of the Project is within their own remits and discretion.
TA_0019_006_231123	S42/S44	Email	The location of the substations initially proposed was only obtained by attending consultation events in other areas, not from documentation, postcards, or any on-line content. As a consequence of a perceived lack of information members and parishioners considered it difficult to substantively influence policy in both the statutory and non-statutory consultation phases relating to the proposals and based on information made available to date the parish council certainly cannot support the indicative onshore substation search area	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Consultation information, including on substation locations was available on the information hub on the Transmission Assets website.
TA_0019_007_231123	S42/S44	Email	There are several proposed energy projects, solar and wind, at various pre-application stages of consideration that combine to significantly impact on Newton-with-Clifton parish, the Rural East ward of Fylde and the Lancashire county council Fylde East division. The singular or cumulative effects on the countryside, the character of the landscape, townscape, visual amenity, and the adverse impact on local residents arising from noise and other public nuisance issues result in a loss of amenity. It is recognised that while each application must be assessed on its own merits, and that none have been	Other proposed developments, including allocated development sites, have been considered in the cumulative assessment of each onshore topic chapter (see Volume 3 of the ES, document reference F3).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			implemented to date it is unclear whether implementation of one affects whether other proposals will receive necessary development consents and permissions	
TA_0019_008_231123	S42/S44	Email	Therefore it is considered both the statutory and non-statutory consultations have not been conducted to the required standard necessary for the host authority to issue an adequacy of consultation (AOC) representation to facilitate a Development Consent Order application being progressed by the planning inspectorate. Members, parishioners, and other members of the public have raised concerns or issues about the quality of the developer's consultation during the pre-application stage. It is understood that the process requires that these concerns be raised with the local planning authority as the host authority. The host authority is required to submit an AOC representation and will be requested to append any correspondence received about the developer's consultation from members of the public or others to the AOC representation if they consider it could be useful to the Secretary of State for Energy and Net Zero (SoS) in determining whether to accept the application for examination. The following specific points are submitted to indicate the concerns expressed relating to a consultation process that is widely perceived as flawed.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The statutory consultation ran for over six weeks, exceeding the 28 day statutory minimum requirement. Respondents could provide feedback at any time throughout this period. During this consultation, the Application held eight events both online and in-person. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0019_010_231123	S42/S44	Email	The maps provided to landowners by land agents (bearing the Morgan & Morecambe and Dalcour Maclaren markings) were of a higher level of granularity than those provided to the general public. This level of detail was necessary to assess the impact and it is considered the maps should have been available to the general public, as previously requested by parish representatives, as it facilitates better identification of sight lines when compared to the map shared on the website. All parties should have been given the same consultation information. At the public consultation event held on Thursday 26th October 2023 a representative of the developer directed enquiries towards a consultation map on display, however, to access this requires personal registration, it has been contended that the map has been off-line for periods and when available is very difficult to navigate.	The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR.
TA_0019_011_231123	S42/S44	Email	The visual receptor photographs are inadequate and fail to give residents a perspective on what the visual impact of the substations will be. A significant concern of members is visual impact; therefore an artist impressions or scale diagrams should have been available, as previously requested by parish council representatives, to illustrate the extent, and the likely impact, upon visual amenity, leisure, recreational, biodiversity value, tree cover; and the scope for effective mitigation measures. In response to related enquiries the developer has indicated that it is not yet known whether the substations are to be air cooled or gas cooled. The two options affect the scale and size of the substations and illustrations of the two options should have been available. It is unclear what the coloured lines on the photographs signify in terms of the colour, height, and scale. Internet searches fail to provide examples of substations in close proximity to residential property, population density, and schools. Parishioners, school staff and pupils will be subjected to noise and disruption which in some cases could be unfavourable to their health and education	Information was available at the statutory consultation, including the PEIR, providing details of the viewpoints agreed with stakeholders at that time, including details of the options available regarding the design of the Transmission Assets. The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the onshore substations, including - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets- refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received. Details of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed designs will be developed post-consent. Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). Details of the landscape and visual impacts and effects are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES (document reference F3.10). This includes photography from viewpoints agreed with statutory consultees, as well as landscape visualisations of the proposed substations (Volume 3, Figure 10.5).
TA_0019_013_231123	S42/S44	Email	Members and parishioners considered the non-statutory consultation contained information that was vague regarding the substations, as was information distributed to residents. The parish council had	The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			to insist on a presentation to residents given the potential importance and impact on Newton-with-Scales as a small rural village. The leaflets delivered to the public to inform them of both the non-statutory and the statutory consultations have all been in a format that could easily be perceived as "junk mail" to be readily discarded and did not give residents adequate indication of the scale of the proposed infrastructure coming to the area. All materials delivered to the public are the same from Isle of Man to Penwortham with no communications material targeted at the impact on specific communities, and no meaningful information on noise, vibration, electromagnetic radiation, and light pollution for residents of local communities.	the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the EIA process. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR non-technical summary were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation). The Applicants issued a consultation newsletter to the consultation mailing zone using opaque envelopes during statutory consultation. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Applicants have undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to April 2024).
TA_0019_015_231123	S42/S44	Email	The On-line and printed feedback form for the consultation is, to say the least, onerous, so vast as to be overwhelming and generally considered inaccessible for most people. Linking feedback to all the various elements of the PEIR is designed in such a way that it may make things easier for the project, but works as a disincentive for the general public to give their feedback and obtain the detailed information that of interest locally e.g. potential access points to the construction sites	The feedback form enabled respondents to provide feedback on specific aspects of the proposals. It was structured to allow the Applicants to accurately categorise and assess feedback in the design process.
TA_0019_023_231123	S42/S44	Email	Mitigation measures to make what is considered an unacceptable development acceptable in planning terms - items below are potential conditions for considerations in the event of a development consent order (DCO) being granted.	The Applicants note your response. Detailed comments responded to in turn, see unique reference TA_0019.
TA_0019_024_231123	S42/S44	Email	If an application is eventually progressed and the SoS is ultimately minded to grant the proposal a DCO the consequential harms must be mitigated to best practice standards to make what is considered an unacceptable development acceptable in planning terms. Moreover, there must also be effective timely enforcement action if any of those standards are breached. However, some may well influence the investment decision time-lined for 2026. For example the future cost saving option of moving to overhead pylons rather than underground cables. Therefore such significant changes must be guarded against and it should be specified that such proposals will require a whole new application	If consented, the development consent order will limit the works to those consented (which do not include overhead lines). Requirements will be used to secure the commitments set out.
TA_0019_029_231123	S42/S44	Email	Assurances are required should a DCO be granted that future cost saving measures will not mean that the cables no longer go underground but are changed for overhead pylons?	If consented, the development consent order will limit the works to those consented (which do not include overhead lines). Requirements will be used to secure the commitments set out.
TA_0019_030_231123	S42/S44	Email	Planning agreement. i) FBC host authority, LCC, Blackpool council, a neighbouring unitary authority and the parish council are consultees in their own right, and the local community is encouraged to participate in the consultation. It is anticipated FBC will give proper consideration to the parish community comments and observation and provide explanations for any decisions inconsistent with parish viewpoint(s). It is important that FBC uses the pre-application process to inform themselves about the application and gather information that will assist in the production of the AOC, Local Impact Report (LIR), written representations and any Statement of Common Ground (SoCG). The planning inspectorate recognises that proactive approach adopted by FBC at this stage is likely to reduce the demand on its resources during the set timescales of the examination stage, e.g. early legal advice could prove helpful during the pre-application stage and could reduce the need for it later in the process. It is anticipated that FBC will be required to liaise with Blackpool council unitary authority and LCC. It is also recommended FBC should consider a planning performance agreement (PPA) with the developer(s), justified by the impact on the resources of the host authority. It is understood that the Planning Inspectorate is, in principle, supportive of a legal agreement between the respective parties. The duration that any PPA is in effect and the scale of support at different stages is a matter for negotiation and is likely to be driven, in part, by the commitments in the DCO, should one be granted by the SoS, in terms of the scale of the ongoing role of the local authority.	Fylde Borough Council has been included within Expert Working Groups as part of the pre-application process.
TA_0021_001_211123	S42	Email	Statutory Consultation under section 42 of the planning Act 2008 ('the Act') and Regulations 11 and 13 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 ('the 2017 Regulations'). Thank you for consulting National Highways in relation to the EIA Scoping note for a proposed Morgan and Morecombe offshore windfarms project. National Highways note that consultation is currently taking place and there is a commitment to engage with National Highways.	The Applicants note your response. National Highways have been invited to form part of the Traffic and Transport Expert Working Group meetings for the Transmission Assets.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>We welcome the opportunity for this engagement, including discussion around any transport impact and / or traffic management proposals which might affect the Strategic Road Network (SRN). National Highways are looking to review documents associated with the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Windfarms Transmission Assets application. This review will consider the proposed route of the transmission asset and whether it directly impacts on the SRN during its construction, operation, maintenance, or decommissioning. It is noted that there are two others separate DCO applications relating to the off-shore windfarms themselves.</p>	
TA_0025_001_231123	S42	Email	<p>Subject: Representations to the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms: Transmission Assets Consultation We act for BAE Systems and would like to take the opportunity to submit the following important representations to the consultation. BAE Systems also requests that the Applicants continue to involve the company as the project is developed. The representations relate to the potential for impacts on the operations of BAE Systems at Warton Aerodrome. The impacts could arise at the operational and construction stages of the project when there is potential to affect air safety. They could also arise following incidental aspects of the project such as changes to habitats near to the Aerodrome. Before explaining the potential for impacts on the operation of the Aerodrome it is important to understand the significance of the facility. Warton Aerodrome is a UK strategic asset supporting the UK and international partners with national and international defence. The Aerodrome is licensed by both the CAA and MAA. Under the terms of the license the Aerodrome must be regulatory compliant. The aerodrome complies with the following CAA publications: CAP 168, 772, 738. These are specific in relation to planning in and around the Aerodrome and the management of habitat and wildlife. In addition to these (and other regulatory articles), the Aerodrome is technically safeguarded by the MOD, Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO). The MOD/ DIO are governed by statute with regards to the technical safeguarding of Warton Aerodrome and are a mandatory consultee for any matters that may affect the safe operation of flying aircraft/platforms. Statutory and Offshore Team Considerations MOD safeguarding involves the MOD as a statutory consultee in the UK planning system to ensure designated zones around key operational defence sites such as aerodromes, explosive storage sites, air weapon ranges, technical sites and meteorological radar sites are not adversely affected by development outside of the MOD estate. The MOD is also a consultee for the licensing of marine developments and the extraction of hydrocarbon resources in the UK continental shelf area, to ensure that offshore developments and activities do not affect strategic defence interests or inhibit the use of designated danger and exercise areas supporting military training and weapon trials. The statutory and offshore team assesses development proposals in consultation with relevant defence stakeholders and formulates the MOD's position. Wherever impacts on defence interests are identified, the team seeks mitigation measures to overcome them so that the development can proceed. The statutory and offshore team also engage in the preparation of development plans governing both onshore and offshore development to ensure MOD safeguarding interests are appropriately recognised and taken into account.</p>	<p>The Applicants welcome BAE Systems' engagement and proactive approach to the Transmission Assets planning and development. Impacts arising from the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning phases of the Transmission Assets have been assessed. BAE Systems Warton (Aerodrome) has been scoped out. The Onshore Order Limits lay beyond the CNS safeguarded areas and beyond the runway safeguarded area. The Onshore Order Limits lie below the Aerodrome OLS Inner Horizontal Surface, however, construction equipment (during the construction phase) and remaining above surface infrastructure (during the operation and maintenance phase) will not penetrate the surface ceiling.</p>
TA_0026_001_231123	S42/S44	Email	<p>Consultation on Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms: Transmission Assets Introduction We act on behalf of Blackpool Airport Enterprise Zone and Blackpool Council (the owners of Blackpool Airport) and have been instructed to provide a formal response to the Consultation on Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms: Transmission Assets. In doing so we have reviewed the consultation documents provided to us. In making these comments it should be noted that the Airport and all of its safety assurance processes must take priority in any decisions made in respect to a proposed route across the site. In this respect, this includes but is not limited to an understanding that the airport cannot be closed for any period of time to accommodate the transmission assets of the windfarm development. Background to the Enterprise Zone In November 2015, Enterprise Zone status was approved for the wider Airport site, coming into force from April 2016. The Enterprise Zone status is valid for 25 years and in line with national policy on Enterprise Zones, business incentives are available. Following operational commencement of the Enterprise Zone, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was agreed between the then Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, Blackpool Borough Council, Fylde Borough Council and the Lancashire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). The MoU states that with respect to capital expenditure which can be funded by retained business rates growth this will include: •Relocation of critical Operational Airport Infrastructure – including control tower, apron, fire station, taxiway, fuel farm facilities and radar The Enterprise Zone is also looking to target a wide range of sectors, including: food and drink manufacturers, energy, aviation, creative and digital,</p>	<p>The Applicants welcome Blackpool Airport's engagement. The Project will continue to engage with Blackpool Airport, in relation to potential impacts which may arise from the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Transmission Assets. Including where they may arise in relation to the Masterplan.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>advanced manufacturing and professional services. It is envisaged within the Enterprise Zone Delivery Plan that the Enterprise Zone status will attract over 280 no. new businesses and create circa. 5,000 no. new jobs over its lifespan, in addition to the existing businesses and employees already based on the site. 55% of the Enterprise Zone is located within Fylde and 45% in Blackpool. Blackpool Council is the major freehold landowner at the Airport and Enterprise Zone following the purchase of the Airport in September 2017. In total, the Enterprise Zone extends to 144 hectares of land. Over its lifetime, it is expected that it will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support 5,000 no. new jobs; • Attract £300m + of private sector investment; • Generate a cumulative Gross Value Added total over the first five years of £232m and £2.08bn over the Enterprise Zone's lifetime; • Assist in the diversification of the local economy, which relies heavily upon tourism and the public sector; • Seek a sustainable future for Blackpool Airport 	
TA_0029_012_231123	S42/S44	Email	<p>CONSULTATION ON THE PROPOSED MORECAMBE AND MORGAN WIND FARM AND ASSOCIATED ONSHORE INFRASTRUCTURE We write in relation to the current consultation and the feedback sought in relation to the proposed scheme. We are the charity who look after and bring to life 2000 miles of canals & rivers. Our waterways contribute to the health and wellbeing of local communities and economies, creating attractive and connected places to live, work, volunteer and spend leisure time. These historic, natural and cultural assets form part of the strategic and local green-blue infrastructure network, linking urban and rural communities as well as habitats. By caring for our waterways and promoting their use we believe we can improve the wellbeing of our nation. The Trust is a prescribed consultee in relation to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs). This is a statutory consultation for the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farm, the majority of the proposed works would have no impact on our interests, with the wind farm being out in the Irish Sea. It is understood that the wind farm will generate upto 2GW of electricity. Our interest with the scheme relates to where the on-land cabling routes would interface with our interests enroute to the Penwortham substation. Based on the available details this cabling route would result in at least one interface with the Ribble Link/Savick Brook which is owned and managed by the Canal & River Trust (the Trust). The Trust lease Savick Brook to enable navigation and connectivity to the Lancaster Canal (starting in Preston). The Trust own and manage a number of assets within the boundary of the potential cabling corridor, this includes Tidal Stop Gate Lock 9; Lock 8; a mess office and bridges. The Trust also have a right of navigation along the Ribble Link (River Ribble) which provides connectivity to Savick Brook from our waterways to the south (which are outside the application boundary). The Ribble Link is a County Wildlife Site. The Ribble and Alt Estuaries are Special Protection Areas (SPA's), the Ribble Estuary is also a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and RAMSAR site. Our interest with the proposal therefore relates to the landfall elements of the scheme and how a connection would be made to the national grid at Penwortham.</p>	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0029_013_231123	S42/S44	Email	<p>Underground Cabling Based on the consultation brochure the cables would appear to be being installed via Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). The details describe that the corridor width will be 70m, with up to 18 cables. The trench depth would be 1.8m in depth (1.2m to top of the ducting). Given this suggested depth of 1.8m, this would not be suitable for the canal/brook crossings. In accordance with the Trust's Third Part\:) Works Code of Practice (CoP) Part 2 https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/business-and-trade/undertaking-works-on-our-property-and-our-code-of-practice we would expect any waterway crossing {pipes, cables etc} to be installed under the waterway and cross perpendicular to the waterway. We would normally expect such crossings to be constructed via trenchless techniques and the crown of the crossing would need to be at least 3.5m below hard bed level of the waterway to ensure any settlement does not impact the waterway. However, this could crossing require a greater depth, depending on the results of the borehole / geotechnical information provided. This would mean that the launch and reception pits would be set well away from the waterway to allow the Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) to achieve the required depth. The route and depth of any such crossing, method statements, construction techniques and associated ground investigations will need to be approved by the Trust's geotechnical specialists, all via the CoP process. We would welcome further discussion in relation to this matter.</p>	Waterways belonging to the Canal and River Trust located within the Onshore Order Limits include the River Ribble and Ribble Link. As described in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES, several trenchless techniques remain under consideration for the 400 kV grid connection cable crossing of the River Ribble. In addition, trenchless techniques would also be utilised where the onshore export cable corridor and 400 kV grid connection cable corridor are required to cross watercourses, including Ribble Link. The commitment to utilise trenchless techniques during construction of the Transmission Assets would avoid potential impacts to the recreational usage of the River Ribble and Ribble Link (see CoT90 in Table 6.17 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6)).
TA_0029_016_231123	S42/S44	Email	<p>Pollution prevention The canal/brook should be considered as a sensitive receptor as a watercourse. A robust and comprehensive Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) would be required to include aspects of how materials, fuels, chemicals and wastes will be stored and where; measures for the prevention of dust generation and windblown litter and debris; measures to prevent</p>	An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures to maintain and address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • flood protection and control measures; • drainage; • pollution prevention; • geology and ground

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			run off into the canal and culverts (e.g. of silt water, contaminated water, fuels and chemicals); pollution response emergency procedures and details of any planned water abstractions and /or discharges from or which may impact upon our waterways. Stockpiles must be kept away from the waterway and drainage Systems to reduce potential sediment laden runoff entering the waterways. Silt curtains should also be used to stop surface water runoff. Where the works require stripping topsoil and removing vegetation, such as grass, silt curtains should be kept in place to protect against surface water runoff until sufficient vegetation has grown back on the reinstated topsoil to stabilise the soil and to act as a natural buffer. Site excavations will likely need to be dewatered, these cannot be discharged to the canal/brook without our consent. Discharges to land will need to be kept away from waterways. We note that a pollution prevention plan is being drafted, this will need reviewing after it is issued.	conditions;• ecology and nature conservation (including protected species and invasive species);• historic environment;• soil management;• traffic and transport;• noise management measures;• air quality and dust management;• landscape and visual; and• bentonite breakout plan.
TA_0029_019_231123	S42/S44	Email	The Trust as Landowner The Trust has a duty under the Trusts Agreement with the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (28 June 2012) to operate and manage the waterway and towpaths for public use and enjoyment. Additionally, the Trust has a duty under SI05 of the Transport Act 1968 to maintain commercial and cruising waterways in a suitable condition for use by the public. At this stage it is unclear which land parcels might be required in relation to the works and whether these are within the ownership of the Trust, or where we have land interests and rights. The Trust is a statutory undertaker which has specific duties to protect the waterways. Accordingly, we have a duty to resist the use of compulsory purchase powers which may negatively affect our land or undertakings. Alternatively, should any compulsory acquisition powers over the Trust's land be sought, such acquisition should only be with the voluntary consent of the Trust. The separate consent/agreement of the Trust would be required for the cable crossings. Separate discussions would need to take place between the Trust and the promoter, especially on the waterway undergrounding detailing, design, engineering and agreements to access/enter our land as necessary. We would require the Development Consent Order to include protective provisions for the Canal & River Trust and we would be happy to provide a draft of the provisions that we would likely require to be included. The above comments are based on the consultation materials. We would wish to provide more comments once the route has been finalised and the potential impact on our waterway at each crossing can be determined. The above comments do not prejudice any further matters that may be raised during the consenting process or by other parts of the organisation.	Any works that affect Canal and River Trust waterways or land will comply with the Canal & River Trust 'Code of Practice for Works affecting the Canal & River Trust'. This will be implemented through CoT87.
TA_0030_001_231123	S42	Email	Section 42 Consultation under Town and Country Planning Act 2008 Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms: Transmission Assets Project Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Proposal. It is noted that this consultation relates specifically to the development of permanent and temporary infrastructure for the transmission of electricity from two offshore wind farms, Morgan and Morecambe to the National Grid at Penwortham Lancashire. And that the development involves the provision of both offshore and onshore infrastructure. The former including the installation of substation/s and a booster station on platforms, interconnector and export cables and the latter two new substations, export cables, construction compounds, access and associated development. From the perspective of Cumberland Council, it is the potential impact of the proposal on West Cumbria that we are most interested in.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0030_002_231123	S42	Email	Having examined the consultation documents and in particular the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) it is our view, given the scale and extent of the proposal, and in particular its location in relation to West Cumbria (and former South Copeland area), that it is unlikely to have any significant detrimental impact. That said however, it is requested that the potential wider ecological impacts (for example on migratory birds and Haverigg Haws sand dunes which are of national and international nature conservation importance) of the proposal be assessed in the Environmental Statement (ES) accompanying the DCO application with reference to the sensitive ecological designations of the Duddon Estuary SSSI, SPA and RAMSAR and Morecambe Bay SAC.	The Applicants note your response. Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5) includes assessments for all impacts associated with the project on all relevant offshore ornithological receptors.
TA_0032_001_251023	S44	Email	Many thanks for including Northern Powergrid UK Holdings in your consultations. I have reviewed the information provided and can confirm that this is outside of our operational area and therefore we have no comments to make. I wish you well in delivering your project.	The Applicants note your response.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0033_001_251023	S42	Email	I write with regard to your consultation on the Morgan Offshore Wind Project, a proposed offshore wind farm located in the east Irish Sea, and can confirm that the Local Planning Authority has no comments to make in this instance.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0034_001_171023	S42	Email	You recently wrote to the Cheshire & Merseyside Health Protection Team at the UK Health Security Agency re the above, and included a consultation pack. Please note that your local health protection is Cumbria & Lancashire Health Protection Team, and not Cheshire & Merseyside. I would be grateful if you could update your records, and send any future correspondence directly to our colleagues at the Cumbria & Lancashire Health Protection Team.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0030_001_251123	S42	Email	It is noted that this consultation relates specifically to the development of permanent and temporary infrastructure for the transmission of electricity from two offshore wind farms, Morgan and Morecambe to the National Grid at Penwortham Lancashire. And that the development involves the provision of both offshore and onshore infrastructure. The former including the installation of substation/s and a booster station on platforms, interconnector and export cables and the latter two new substations, export cables, construction compounds, access and associated development. From the perspective of Cumberland Council, it is the potential impact of the proposal on West Cumbria that we are most interested in.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0030_002_251123	S42	Email	Having examined the consultation documents and in particular the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) it is our view, given the scale and extent of the proposal, and in particular its location in relation to West Cumbria (and former South Copeland area), that it is unlikely to have any significant detrimental impact. That said however, it is requested that the potential wider ecological impacts (for example on migratory birds and Haverigg Haws sand dunes which are of national and international nature conservation importance) of the proposal be assessed in the Environmental Statement (ES) accompanying the DCO application with reference to the sensitive ecological designations of the Duddon Estuary SSSI, SPA and RAMSAR and Morecambe Bay SAC.	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5) includes assessments for all impacts associated with the project on all relevant offshore ornithological receptors.
TA_0035_001_171023	S42/S44	Email	Previously, during the second non-statutory consultation earlier this autumn I discussed with REDACTED that it would be really useful for us to have the shapefiles to enable us to accurately screen against our constraints maps etc. We agreed that these could be shared once the statutory consultation was underway and the information was in the public domain. Please could you arrange for us to receive a copy of the set of shapefiles as listed in the map key in your consultation brochure page 16. Of particular importance to us would be: • Transmission assets PEIR Red Line Boundary • Indicative onshore export cable corridor and option • Landfall and intertidal area • Substations statutory consultation area • The 3 preferred substation sites • The grid connection cable corridor search area • Indicative temporary work compounds • Potential BNG area. This information as shapefiles would be very useful as we prepare a response to the consultation. I note that REDACTED & REDACTED may be out of the office at present, but I hope someone can respond to this request in their absence.	The Applicants responded to this request on Wednesday 25 October 2023 by providing the Environment Agency with the requested shapefiles as well as offering a Teams meeting to answer any further queries they may have.
TA_0035_002_191023	S42/S44	Email	This email confirms that we have received consultation as a prescribed consultee, and we will be responding within the required deadline.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0035_003_191023	S42/S44	Email	The hard-copy letter of consultation was sent to our National Customer Contact Centre, scanned and forwarded on. I understand that if you are required to consult via hard-copy then this is the best address, and I will ensure we have an internal system that can manage this efficiently.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0035_004_221123	S42/S44	Email	Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms, Transmission Assets project.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0035_005_221123	S42/S44	Email	Our views are in response to the materials that have been provided as part of the consultation. In reviewing these documents, it is acknowledged that this is a pre-application consultation and we have responded accordingly. (Appendix E details the documents we have reviewed under this consultation).	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0035_006_221123	S42/S44	Email	We look forward to continuing to work with you as the detailed proposals continue to develop, and to reviewing and providing advice on relevant supporting documents as these are generated. If you have any questions regarding any of our comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.	The Applicants note your response. The Environment Agency has been included in relevant Expert Working Groups throughout the EIA process.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0035_007_221123	S42/S44	Email	We note that many design details have been committed to in the Commitments Register but are yet to be appropriately secured as Requirements. Please see Appendix B for our comments regarding this. Our headline comments are listed below – our detailed comments are listed in Appendix A. General Informatives can be found in Appendix D.	A Commitments Register is provided as part of the application for development consent (see Volume 1, Annex 5.3 of the ES, document reference F1.5.3). This includes details of how commitments are secured. Details are also provided in each relevant ES chapter.
TA_0035_008_221123	S42/S44	Email	Key issues at this time:1. Submission of information: More information is required in order for the Environment Agency to provide a definitive response on relevant environmental impacts. This is important so we can provide the best possible advice to the Planning Inspectorate. It is strongly recommended that any further reports, statements or surveys that require our review and / or agreement are submitted as soon as possible in order to resolve any issues, before the Development Control Order is submitted.	The ES includes updated information where appropriate, including the findings of surveys undertaken since PEIR.
TA_0035_014_221123	S42/S44	Email	Outline Code of Construction Practice (OCoCP): A number of the supporting Outline Management Plans have yet to be developed. Please submit these documents as soon as possible in order to resolve any issues before the DCO is submitted.	The Outline Code of Construction Practice submitted as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1) includes all supporting management plans.
TA_0035_015_221123	S42/S44	Email	Where required the OCoCP also needs to be applicable to the marine environment. In the intertidal zone provision for regulation through MMO and LPA is required.	The Outline Code of Construction Practice submitted as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1) relates to onshore impacts. Offshore control measures will be set out in the Offshore Environmental Management Plan, which will be provided post-consent and secured through CoT65.
TA_0035_018_221123	S42/S44	Email	Please note this response does not represent our final view in relation to any future planning application, or any environmental permit applications made to us. Our final views will be based on all relevant information including applications and guidance available at the time of submission.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0035_074_221123	S42/S44	Email	CoT26A Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) will be developed in accordance with the Outline Code of Construction Practice, with consideration of the latest relevant available guidance. Issue Measures required to manage wastes generated during the construction phase of the project have yet to be fully addressed. Impact Risk of mis-management of waste and adverse impact on environment Solution Outline Site Waste Management Plan to be to be appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission.	An Outline Site Waste Management Plan has been prepared as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1.6).
TA_0035_101_221123	S42/S44	Email	Appendix D – Informatives regarding Waste Management Advice to applicant The Environmental Protection (Duty of Care) Regulations 1991 for dealing with waste materials are applicable to any off-site movements of wastes. The code of practice applies to you if you produce, carry, keep, dispose of, treat, import or have control of waste in England or Wales. The law requires anyone dealing with waste to keep it safe and make sure it's dealt with responsibly and only given to businesses authorised to take it. The code of practice can be found here: https://www.gov.uk/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/waste-duty-care-code-practice-2016.pdf	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0035_102_221123	S42/S44	Email	If you need to register as a carrier of waste, please follow the instructions here: https://www.gov.uk/register-as-a-waste-carrier-broker-or-dealer-wales	The Applicants note your response. Construction waste generated will only be transported by companies registered with the Environment Agency and with valid waste carrier licences as required by the 'Waste Duty of Care Code of Practice' and legislation (i.e., Environmental Protection Act section 34 and the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011).
TA_0035_103_221123	S42/S44	Email	Advice to applicant The developer must apply the waste hierarchy as a priority order of prevention, re-use, recycling before considering other recovery or disposal options. Government guidance on the waste hierarchy in England can be found here: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/69403/pb13530-waste-hierarchy-guidance.pdf	Details of the waste hierarchy will be applied are provided in the Outline Site Waste Management Plan has been provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1.6).
TA_0035_104_221123	S42/S44	Email	Site Waste Management Plans (SWMP) are no longer a legal requirement, however, in terms of meeting the objectives of the waste hierarchy and your duty of care, they are a useful tool and considered to be best practice. Advice to applicant If materials that are potentially waste are to be used on-site, the applicant will need to ensure they can comply with the exclusion from the Waste Framework Directive (WFD) (article 2(1) (c)) for the use of, 'uncontaminated soil and other naturally occurring material excavated in the course of construction activities, etc...' in order for the material	Noted. An Outline Site Waste Management Plan has been provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1.6).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			not to be considered as waste. Meeting these criteria will mean waste permitting requirements do not apply. Where the applicant cannot meet the criteria, they will be required to obtain the appropriate waste permit or exemption from us. A deposit of waste to land will either be a disposal or a recovery activity. The legal test for recovery is set out in Article 3(15) of WFD as:	
TA_0035_105_221123	S42/S44	Email	-any operation the principal result of which is waste serving a useful purpose by replacing other materials which would otherwise have been used to fulfil a particular function, or waste being prepared to fulfil that function, in the plant or in the wider economy. We have produced guidance on the recovery test which can be viewed at https://www.gov.uk/guidance/waste-recovery-plans-and-permits#waste-recovery-activities .	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0035_106_221123	S42/S44	Email	You can find more information on the Waste Framework Directive here: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/environmental-permitting-guidance-the-waste-framework-directive	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0035_107_221123	S42/S44	Email	More information on the definition of waste can be found here: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/legal-definition-of-waste-guidance	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0035_108_221123	S42/S44	Email	More information on the use of waste in exempt activities can be found here: https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/waste-exemptions-using-waste	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0035_109_221123	S42/S44	Email	Non-waste activities are not regulated by us (i.e. activities carried out under the CL:ARE Code of Practice), however you will need to decide if materials meet End of Waste or By-products criteria (as defined by the WFD). The 'Is it waste' tool, allows you to make an assessment and can be found here: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/isitwaste-tool-for-advice-on-the-by-products-and-end-of-waste-tests	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0037_001_271023	S44	Email	We attended the drop-in event at Newton Village Hall yesterday, and I am afraid to say it was a total waste of time and energy and any feedback you are going to achieve will all be negative, divided between the residents affected by option 1 or option 2. Therefore we can only assume you have already chosen the site for the substation and this is just a tick box exercise. The most important reason for us attending the meeting was to see how the impact of option 2 would affect our property. The photographs of the sites gave us no real indication of the visual effects the substation would have on the closest residents. In fact there was no mock photograph of the site directly opposite our house at all. When we queried this, we were told the photographer could not take photographs of every possible view, but to omit the closest and most obtrusive view of option 2 seems very strange to us. Especially when some of the photographs would have had to be taken by walking across fields with no road access or dwellings nearby, whereas our house is on a lane with easy access. The substation option 2 and the Morgan substation are both adjacent to Lower Lane, yet no photographs are taken from lower lane. Photographs have been taken from Kirkham road at ground level looking over fields and a housing estate with the substation in the distance beyond. This is totally unacceptable and dishonest to say the least. Nobody wants these substations, so to pretend the feedback is going to assist with your decision is just prolonging the agony for everyone. We need to know as soon as possible which option it is going to be so we can defend our rights, and there is nothing you can say or do to convince us this undertaking is anything other than disastrous for the whole area, and you will be wrecking people's lives and livelihoods with this decision. We had assurances from Fylde Borough Council during a building application process that made clear no development on the greenbelt land we live on would ever be accepted. I was informed my stables could only be used for domestic pleasure and could not be rented out commercially because Lower Lane could not handle any more traffic, and that my development was limited to existing footprints, yet here you are proposing to build some of the biggest building structures in the country. We will be in contact with our MP Mark Menzies regarding this intrusion of our greenbelt land and not least the photographic cover up that was on display at the statutory consultation in Newton on the 25th Oct. Option 2 would destroy 12 years of work to our property and land, destroy the final phase for completion of our house, destroy our dreams and wreck our lives. Has any of the initial development process considered the hurt and misery it will cause to human life, least of all the health impacts, I doubt it very much as we have not been part of any of the consultation process. There must surely have been other options on brown belt land that does not affect residential areas and one can only assume this was the cheapest option. You don't need residents to give you their reasons for the unsuitability of these sites, or you would not have gone this far with the project already, and we	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Project has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Information was available at the statutory consultation, including the PEIR, providing details of the viewpoints agreed with stakeholders at that time, including details of the options available regarding the design of the Transmission Assets. Feedback has been considered at each stage of consultation, alongside a range of other factors including potential environmental constraints and engineering considerations. The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the onshore substations, including - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets- refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received. Details of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed designs will be developed post-consent. Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). Details of the landscape and visual impacts and effects are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES (document reference F3.10). This includes photography from viewpoints agreed with statutory consultees, as well as landscape visualisations of the proposed substations (Volume 3, Figure 10.5).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			would ask that you announce the decision as soon as possible so we can plan for the future as far away from this nightmare as possible.RegardsMary and David Barlow	
TA_0038_001_181123	S44	Email	1. I attended what can only be called a presentation – it was not a consultation – M&M employees on location were on transmit only, not receive.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0038_002_181123	S44	Email	2. No detailed maps of the proposed cable routing or the 3 proposed Electrical Substation Sites (ESS) were made available to the public to comment on. However, detailed maps had been made available to some landowners ahead of the statutory consultation; all parties should be given the same information.	The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR.
TA_0038_003_181123	S44	Email	3. A huge volume of information was presented on-line and at the statutory consultation (the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)) which was impossible to navigate and comprehend. Assistance at the Newton consultation was inadequate due to the number of people attending.	The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the EIA process. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR non-technical summary were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation). The Applicants issued a consultation newsletter to the consultation mailing zone using opaque envelopes during statutory consultation. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Applicants have undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to April 2024).
TA_0038_004_181123	S44	Email	4. The ESS selection process was not summarised in the consultation brochure.	The Applicants' site selection process was addressed throughout their statutory consultation brochure but was most concisely summarised on page 27. The brochure also pointed to where more information could be found in the PEIR (Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives).
TA_0038_005_181123	S44	Email	5. Given the lack of information for the exit route of the 400kv cables, has the consultation met the necessary standards for it to be effective (EN-5, Horlock Rules, Rochdale Envelope). When, and how, will the 400kv cables route be announced? And how will they public be able to comment on it?	The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor and onshore substations, including - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets - refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received. Details of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). These are based on the project description set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This chapter sets out the approach to site selection, including the use of the Project Design Envelope or Rochdale envelope approach, in line with case law. If the application is accepted for examination, there will be an opportunity for people to register their interest in the application with the Planning Inspectorate. Anyone registering an interest will be kept informed of the progress of the application, including when and how they can provide comments. Following a preliminary meeting the Examining Authority will confirm the timetable for the examination.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0038_006_181123	S44	Email	6. Is it acceptable to announce the results of Morecambe substation location i.e. option 1 or 2 after the statutory consultation period has ended? When & how will the announcement of option 1 or 2 for the Morecambe substation be made? And how will they public be able to comment on it?	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Our team have been carefully considering the feedback provided at our statutory and non-statutory consultations – alongside ongoing engineering, and environmental work – as we refine our plans. If the application is accepted for examination, there will be an opportunity for people to register their interest in the application with the Planning Inspectorate. Anyone registering an interest will be kept informed of the progress of the application, including when and how they can provide comments. Following a preliminary meeting the Examining Authority will confirm the timetable for the examination.
TA_0038_009_181123	S44	Email	The preceding non-statutory consultation by M&M was flawed because: 1. No explanation was ever provided or presented as to how the four potential zones for the 2 ESSs were identified or selected.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0038_021_181123	S44	Email	13. Can you actually provide examples of where you have taken public input (i.e. from the pre-statutory consultation) and amended your planning decisions or designs.	The Transmission Assets provide a connection to the National Grid for two nationally significant offshore wind farms, and therefore two sets of transmission infrastructure are required. Details of the site selection process and alternatives considered are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor and onshore substations, including - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets- refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received.
TA_0038_026_181123	S44	Email	4. The Bluefield solar farm is also planned for the same location compounding over development concerns. Not forgetting the 170 acre solar farm on nearby Clifton Marsh and the expansion of nuclear power generation in adjacent Clifton village.	The solar farm has been considered as part of the cumulative assessment for the onshore elements of the Transmission Assets. All schemes considered in the cumulative assessment are set out in Volume 1, Annex 5.5: Cumulative screening matrix and location plan of the ES (document reference F1.5.5). Bluefield solar farm has also been considered as a part of route planning and site selection process, documented in Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the ES: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4), with further detailed provided in Volume 1, Annex 4.3: Selection and Refinement of the Onshore Infrastructure (document reference F1.4.3).The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0040_001_191123	S44	Email	My name is REDACTED, I am writing to you as Director of REDACTED, a farming business based at REDACTED on land directly based along your proposed cable route. This proposed project would in any case, render my business unviable and unable to continue to operate, effectively closing my business down completely. This would obviously have a massive financial impact on myself and family.I would like to use the opportunity during this public consultation period, to unequivocally Object to your proposals and express my concerns over the proposed off shore Wind Farm cable routing and sub station locations within the fylde coast. I believe this would have a grossly negative impact on the Environment both physically, via the works proposed and Visually, damaging an untold	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			amount of wildlife habitat and green belt protected land, conservation area's, highly productive farmland and have a hugely detrimental impact on the wider community and local economy, putting local business, land owners and Farmers out of business. I believe it would create an untold amount of suffering for residents within the fylde coast for years to come via flooding and disruption ie traffic. Your lack of detail on some of the proposed cable routes and sub stations at this late stage and at this public consultation point in proceedings, is most worrying as this shows either an unprofessional approach to the matter, or completely unprepared, or at worst, both. It is extremely concerning that at this late stage we are asked to submit our opinions on a body of work that is neither complete nor suggest the possible outcomes thereafter the point of consultation. I feel that you have shown disregard to the community of the fylde coast in your methods up to now. This lack of transparency on your part, sets a precedent when approaching future issues and has created a level of mistrust that is beyond repair. This is another reason why I must whole heartedly Object on all parts of your proposals.	assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Following route refinement and landowner engagement, the impact has been reduced on this holding and the Applicant through Dalcour Maclaren will work with the landowner to reduce the impact of construction on the holding and business. Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business.
TA_0041_001_191123	S44	Email	As a trustee and marsh owner of Freckleton marsh I wish to bring to your attention my concerns over the proposed wind farm route and substations . Freckleton marsh with its neighbour Newton marsh are incredibly important conservation areas which have been heavily managed to protect the habitats of extremely rare ground nesting birds which requires local farms to bring on live stock to help manage the biodiversity of these sites, I am very concerned about the futures of the farms which are in the paths of these proposals and the disturbance of the surround farmland which could be detrimental to the marshes management . Both Marsh's are classed in the potential biodiversity net gain areas for the scheme yet we have had very little information on how this could impact the marsh's and their important eco systems including the water courses that feed this land which will have to be crossed by the cables . Dalcour Maclarens biodiversity potential net gain proposals are to vague and incomplete and haven't been conveyed to the relevant land owners thoroughly	An assessment of the impact and effects on affected receptors has been carried out in Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4). . Mitigation measures committed to by the Applicants are outlined within the ES and the project Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference: J11) and Marine Enhancement Statement (document reference: J12) submitted with the application for development consent.
TA_0043_014_211123	S44	Email	14 If the project is to go ahead, the threat to my biosecurity from contractors as they move from farm to farm is not to be underestimated. The legacy of such easily transmissible diseases such as foot and Mouth has seen increased tightening of biosecurity measures being implemented. My milk supply contract stipulates strict biosecurity measures are to be enforced. Defra also requires this.	The application includes an Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1). The measures to be implemented as part of the Code of Construction Practice seek to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.
TA_0043_015_211123	S44	Email	15 Any crossing points on the easement are extremely vulnerable to straying livestock. My experience is that large numbers of contractors using easements over my land tend to massively increase the risk of a gate being left open and livestock straying large distances from farm to farm or even onto the public highway. There are potential catastrophic consequences to health and safety of the general public,	As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).
TA_0043_024_211123	S44	Email	I strongly urge Morgan and Morecambe to consider alternative routes for laying their cables associated in this Offshore windfarm project. I request copies of reports of the four alternative routes considered for this cable laying be made immediately available for peer review in the public domain. I am dismayed that such reports have not been already published.I also ask for a copy of the surveys completed on my land to be sent to me at the above address.	Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3).Survey information is not available on a land holding basis however details can be found in the ES in respect of survey findings.
TA_0044_008_211123	S44	Email	8. We think BP, Morecambe and Morgan are being very economical with the truth, saying there will be no road closures and disruption will be minimal and trying to rush this application in, without looking at alternative, FOR THE ABOVE REASONS WE OBJECT TO THE MORECAMBE AND MORGAN PROJECT	The Applicants have committed that all road crossing will be undertaken using trenchless techniques, except for Leach Lane, however that can be trenched on a programmed basis and no road closures are expected. Traffic and transport impacts arising during the construction phase of the Transmission Assets have been fully assessed at section 7.11 Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference E3.7) with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8).
TA_0045_005_211123	S42/S44	Email	Lack of clear information informing the population about the development.Lack of time to properly consult the community.Putting profits before people.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The statutory consultation ran for over six weeks, exceeding

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				the 28 day statutory minimum requirement. Respondents could provide feedback at any time throughout this period. During this consultation, the Application held eight events both online and in-person. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0046_004_171123	S44	Email	As I have never received a call back as promised buy anyone in the months I've been trying to speak to someone regarding my concerns it's left me very unhappy. We can't have big firms such as yourselves and BP with no common sense of the area coming along leaving a scar on our lovely countryside.	Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants have been in touch with the consultee following the submission of this feedback.
TA_0047_001_251023	S42	Email	Will the proposed development fall within any of HSE's consultation distances? According to HSE's records, the onshore project components (Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms Transition Assets, Preliminary Environmental Information Report, Non Technical Summary, Figure 4 5 „Onshore Elements of the Transmission Assets”, Drawing No 12693 0075 03 Ver 01 03 10 2023 of the proposed development may be impacted by the following major hazard site• HSE Ref 4762 operated by Reliance Energy Ltd, Blackpool Land at Anna's Road, Higher Ballam, Nr Blackpool, FY 4 5 JX The Applicant should contact the above operator, to inform an assessment of whether or not the proposed development is vulnerable to a possible major accident.	The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions within Schedule 10 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). The Applicants will continue to engage with undertakers in relation to potential interactions with the Transmission Assets, including where protection of their assets may be necessary.
TA_0047_003_251023	S42	Email	Based on the information in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report, Non Technical Summary, dated October 2023 document reference (FLO MOR SUM 0002 MRCNS J 4029 RPS 10032 it is unlikely that the HSE would advise against this nationally significant infrastructure project Please note that the advice is based on HSE's existing policy for providing land use planning advice and the information which has been provided HSE's advice in response to a subsequent planning application may differ should HSE's policy or the scope of the development change by the time the Development Consent Order application is submitted	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0047_006_251023	S42	Email	Explosives sites CEMHD 7's response is no comment to make regarding this development as there are no HSE licenced explosive sites in the vicinity of the proposed development.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0047_007_251023	S42	Email	Electrical Safety No comment from a planning perspective.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0048_001_231123	S44	Email	the consultation is flawed for which i have been consulted by everyone who has made endeavour to respond as lead councillor on environment	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0010_166_221123	S42	Email	18 (3) Numbering has gone from 1 to 3. Please ensure all numbering is sequential.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0120_001_121123	S44	Email	Whilst I still need a reply in order to be able to consider my full response to the consultation, I would like to ensure that these objections are logged: I object to the use of land within residential areas as construction compounds including the two indicated on Blackpool Rd North. The area with grass and trees must not be used for such a purpose. It would be an eye sore in such a prominent area as well as denying children and dog walkers a valuable green area. I object to any disruption to the use of Blackpool Rd North Playing Fields. These are a valuable community asset used by hundreds of people, including my son who volunteers as a coach for a local football club for children. I object to any trenches being dug or drilling conducted in residential roads. The cables must be installed in the open land of the airport, either by trenches or a continuation of the horizontal drilling. I have not been able to find an explanation as to why this method can be used to run cables under the sea, beach and sand dunes but not all the way to the eastern side of Queensway.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0118_004_171123	S44	Email	2) The substations will be far too close to properties, two schools, Carr Hill and Strike Lane plus a number of Nurseries and children's homes which after researching I have found no other areas with substations so close to residential properties, families, schools, etc. 3) It will cause noise pollution to the people living in the area and beyond for a great distance. This will inevitably impact people's mental health when all we can hear is a constant humming. 4) This will also impact people's general health myself for one as I am asthmatic and need to have my windows open 24/7. However, this will be impossible due to the constant humming again 24/7. 5) People's health may also be impacted, myself included as I suffer from hypothyroidism and need access to Vitamin D via sunlight each day. Currently I do this by tending to my garden, fish pond and the wildlife that frequent my garden daily, however, with the constant humming in my ears it will be impossible for me to do so comfortably. 6) I understand that the noise levels will be 38db above ambient and approaching 70db, ear defence is required at 80db. Therefore, the constant humming will be torture. It will be like living in a concentration camp but with no means of escape as we will not be able to afford to move due to our property valuation plummeting massively.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0118_010_171123	S44	Email	Why have you failed to properly inform people at the next to useless consultations about the size of these hideous buildings or given us artists impressions of them in position? we get told you have none but surely with all the technology you have at your disposal you could have offered up something. At this present time no-one in the Freckleton area has had the opportunity to make an informed decision, yet you give us a deadline of Thurs 23rd Nov to object.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. Visualisations have been presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage.
TA_0124_001_171123	S44	Email	I vigorously object to the proposed substation in Newton With Scales, as a resident. There are way too many reasons for this, not withstanding the fact Mark Menzies MP, was not told when he was first made aware of the plans, that there was a plan for a substation /cabling and no information that it was to be placed in our small village. When he did discover this he instantly objected and has recommended residents to do the same.	Throughout the development of the Transmission Assets, the Applicants have aimed to be open and transparent with all stakeholders, including Mark Menzies as the MP for the constituency at the time. Please see section 3 of the Consultation report (document reference E1) for information on the early engagement undertaken by the Applicants from Spring/summer 2021 in regards to the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Mona Offshore Wind Project,

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>which included notifying Mark Menzies MP; a member of his team attended the consultation event at Lytham Assembly Rooms on 21 November 2022. A subsequent meeting took place with Mr Menzies on 18 December 2022. Section 3 of the Consultation report also provides details on follow up meetings with elected representatives, including Mark Menzies MP, between 2022 and 2023. A further meeting with a representative of Mr Menzies' office took place on 1 March 2023 which was subsequently followed up with an email update on 28 March 2023. As a section 47 consultee, Mark Menzies MP received notification of the launch of statutory consultation and also attended stakeholders briefings in September and October 2023. See section 4 of the Consultation report for further details.</p>
TA_0124_002_171123	S44	Email	<p>Here are just some of the reasons I object:1.The consultation has not been properly explained to our MP or to the residents. We cant see a picture of the proposed substation and where we have independently checked these out, they are horrendous eyesores of gargantuan proportion. No detailed maps were made available to us. We don't know how you came to propose our lovely village, instead of out at Penwortham, as Mark Menzies suggested initially and has since been campaigning for</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).Detailed information on the Transmission Assets including an outline construction programme is provided within Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Views of the substations are assessed from publicly accessible viewpoints and are assessed in Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES (document reference F3.10) and visualisations are presented within Volume 3, Figures of the ES (Figure 10.5, Parts 1 to 5) (document reference F3.12). The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR.</p>
TA_0124_004_171123	S44	Email	<p>3.Your website and information was near impossible to navigate and understand and this was clearly done deliberately to keep residents in the dark during the consultation - this is grossly unacceptable 4.Our house prices and valuations will plummet. This is a beautiful village and will be utterly destroyed with the sight, sound and work from the substation. No one will want to be moving into the village.</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens.The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>
TA_0125_009_181123	S44	Email	<p>14.Why have you failed to properly inform people at the next to useless consultations about the size of these hideous buildings or given us artists impressions of them in position? we get told you have none but surely with all the technology you have at your disposal you could have offered up something. What are you trying to hide? At this present time no-one in the Freckleton area has had the opportunity to make an informed decision, yet you give us a deadline of Thurs 23rd Nov to object.</p>	<p>Detailed information on the Transmission Assets including an outline construction programme is provided within Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Views of the substations are assessed from publicly accessible viewpoints and are assessed in Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES (document reference F3.10) and visualisations are presented within Volume 3, Figures of the ES (Figure 10.5, Parts 1 to 5).The consultation mailing zone was consistently reviewed throughout the pre-application process and was expanded between the non-statutory and statutory periods of consultation to ensure the local community were made aware of upcoming consultation activity. Full details of the consultation mailing zone can be found in the Consultation report (document</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				reference E1); for the statutory consultation a total of 52,587 properties and businesses we sent a newsletter to advertise the consultation. This was also sent to 22,814 properties and businesses on the Isle of Man. The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included local media advertising (online and offline) and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers. The Applicants attempted to hold an event in Freckleton during the statutory consultation period. However, this was no possible due to availability of the venue. The Transmission Assets held events nearby in Kirkham and newton-with-Scales, both less than two miles from Freckleton.
TA_0126_001_181123	S44	Email	1, Cannot find any explanation on how the four location search zones were identified or selected. Kirkham is currently being regenerated. Placing large scale industrial complexes on the edge of the town ruins the visual aspect of the area when clearly areas away from town could be considered.e.g closer to the estuary resulting in less impact on residents . 2. No detailed maps could be found ahead of the statutory consultation making the statutory consultation flawed. Site selection process not summarised in consultation brochure. Huge volume of information made the understanding of the overall proposals difficult.	Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Maximum parameters for the substation have been refined following statutory consultation. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. Visualisations have been presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage.
TA_0126_005_181123	S44	Email	6. This complex could easily be positioned away from residential areas thereby having so much less impact. The proposal shows no consideration for the impact on local residents quality of life. The overall consultation process and info provided by the developer has left residents feeling the developer wishes to railroad their preferred option through with no consideration for the impact on the area and to local residents. RegardsDisgusted resident.	Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Maximum parameters for the substation have been refined following statutory consultation. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0128_001_191123	S44	Email	Good morning, I am a resident of REDACTED freckleton, Preston, (REDACTED),and i am writing to you to let you know how utterly disgusted i am to find out that you are planning to erect two massive substations right near my house!!! bought this house 3 years ago,& was delighted with it, as it was in a peaceful semi rural location.Have you even considered (I think not),the noise, disruption,& the effect you will be putting on the wildlife,& also the increased traffic volumes & the devaluation of most, if not all the properties in the area.If you were to devalue my property, then I would have no other alternative than to seek compensation from yourselves, as, who would want to buy a property right next to two substations, which are going to be so huge.Why the hell would you want to build here in freckleton anyway, on the proposed sites as they are prone to flooding when we have alot of rain.It doesn't make any sense!Why can't you build them in the fields adjacent to the A584,between clifton fields & the warton airbase, where there are clearly no residential properties.I'm asking you, as	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			one human being to another, to please reconsider building in this idyllic green belt land & destroying not only the landscape but people's livelihoods, & their way of life.	chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0129_001_191123	S44	Email	I would like to object to the building of the sub Stations on the Fylde Coast. I feel that both statutory and non-statutory consultations are flawed as they have not presented detail plans of the proposed route and locations of these extensive installations.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Transmission Assets is fully committed to delivering a community benefits scheme in line with UK Government guidance, which is due to be published later this year. Ahead of the guidance being published we have been engaging with local people, businesses and organisations to identify key themes and projects that will deliver strategic benefits and directly support the local community and local priorities. We welcome further input from the local community and encourage you to reach out to the project team in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR.
TA_0130_002_191123	S44	Email	We are also unclear concerning any plans to compulsory purchase land and property, or not. Questions asked at your consultation meetings and webinars have been left open ended with no clear confirmation that you are ruling this out, answers have inferred it may be an option, so worrying for us as local residents.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate..
TA_0130_005_191123	S44	Email	I strongly support the following objection drawn up locally; "I would like to use the opportunity during this public consultation period, to unequivocally Object to your proposals and express my concerns over the proposed offshore Wind Farm cable routing and sub station locations within the Fylde coast. I believe this would have a grossly negative impact on the Environment both physically, via the works proposed and visually, damaging an untold amount of wildlife habitat and green belt protected land, conservation area's, highly productive farmland and have a hugely detrimental impact on the wider community and local economy, putting local business, land owners and Farmers out of business. I believe it would create an untold amount of suffering for residents within the Fylde coast for years to come via flooding and disruption i.e. traffic.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Transmission Assets is fully committed to delivering a community benefits scheme in line with UK Government guidance, which is due to be published later this year. The Transmission Assets is fully committed to delivering a community benefits scheme in line with UK Government guidance, which is due to be published later this year. Ahead of the guidance being published we have been engaging with local people, businesses and organisations to identify key themes and projects that will deliver strategic benefits and directly support the local community and local priorities. We welcome further input from the local community and encourage you to reach out to the project team in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0130_006_191123	S44	Email	Your lack of detail on some of the proposed cable routes and sub stations at this late stage and at this public consultation point in proceedings, is highly worrying as this shows either an unprofessional approach to the matter, or highly unprepared, or at worst, both. It is most concerning that at this late stage we are asked to submit our opinions on a body of work that is neither complete nor suggest the possible outcomes thereafter the point of consultation. I feel that you have shown disregard to the community of the Fylde coast in your methods up to now. This lack of transparency on your part, sets a precedent when approaching future issues and has created a level of mistrust that is beyond repair. This is another reason why I must whole heartedly Object on all parts of your proposals".	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				The Transmission Assets is fully committed to delivering a community benefits scheme in line with UK Government guidance, which is due to be published later this year. Ahead of the guidance being published we have been engaging with local people, businesses and organisations to identify key themes and projects that will deliver strategic benefits and directly support the local community and local priorities. We welcome further input from the local community and encourage you to reach out to the project team in due course.
TA_0131_002_191123	S44	Email	3) The lack of clarity when I telephoned you with regards to cable routes, sub-station locations and secondary options. I found this alarming. It was like talking to a company that didn't understand its own project.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0131_003_191123	S44	Email	4) The possible negative effect of my house value with proposed works which are long term, if I decide to move during this period. The property would be harder to sell with long term works continuing locally. Who would buy a house where as soon as you turn off the estate, you are constantly stuck in a traffic jam? You need to come up with a better solution which would have a lesser impact on the land, travel and the local residents. Why not run the cable along the estuary? I like the idea of wind farms and the clear benefits they bring, but the installation plan needs to be better than this.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). Further details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8).
TA_0134_001_191123	S44	Email	I am writing to express my personal views on the proposed Morecambe & Morgan Windfarms , proposed to be in my local area. As a starting point I would like to express that I do not consent to the proposed project. When I first saw a flyer I didn't feel that the information provided reflected the work that will be carried out. I travel daily through the fylde as i work in St Annes and live in Newton with Scales . The problems that i regularly face travelling to & from work are traffic congestion (there are not alternative routes) and the conditions of the road e.g. flooding , the fylde coast regularly gets areas of high water on the roads. Without the farmers regularly maintaining the dykes in this area will most definitely see more flooding .	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information.The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0134_005_191123	S44	Email	The whole consultation has not been properly explained to our MP or our local residents and lengthy reports , & feedback form written in language that is not fully understood by residents , i feel its written like this to overwhelm, and confuse the public , key points are missed out , how did you decide the 4 zones and why have you picked a location so near to a community . Why isn't this been done offshore?	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The feedback form enabled respondents to provide feedback on specific aspects of the proposals. It was structured to allow the Transmission Assets team to accurately categorise and assess feedback in the design process.Throughout the development of the Project, the Applicants have aimed to be open and transparent with all stakeholders, including Mark Menzies as the MP for the constituency at the time. Please see section 3 of the Consultation report (document reference E1) for information on the early engagement undertaken by the Applicants from Spring/summer 2021 in regards to the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Mona Offshore Wind Project, which included notifying Mark Menzies MP; a member of his team attended the consultation event at Lytham Assembly Rooms on 21 November 2022. A subsequent meeting took place with Mr Menzies on 18 December 2022. Section 3 of the Consultation report also provides details on follow up meetings with elected representatives, including Mark Menzies MP, between 2022 and 2023. A further meeting with a representative of Mr Menzies' office took place on 1 March 2023 which was subsequently followed up with an email update on 28 March 2023. As a section 47 consultee, Mark Menzies MP received notification of the launch of statutory consultation and also attended stakeholders briefings in September and October 2023. See section 4 of the Consultation report for further details.
TA_0134_006_191123	S44	Email	Our house prices will plummet and our emotional, spiritual and physical health will be compromised. I vigorously object to the proposed substation in zone 1 newton with scales.	The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.
TA_0135_001_191123	S44	Email	I wish to express my objections in the strongest terms, to the suggestion that land between Kirkham and Newton is an appropriate site for the development of 2 huge substations . I have lived on the Fylde Coast most of my life and currently live very close to this proposed site on REDACTED.I am appalled that this has been even permitted to get to this stage without prior consultation of the residents and only found out about this in the past week. The late notification of the process is most underhand especially when it also comes with the short time scale to raise any objections. Why has this proposal to erect substations estimated to be 60ft high and the size of 9 to 13 football pitches within close proximity of a residential area , not been ridiculed and thrown out at a much earlier stage	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>in the process?-The proposals set out in the publicity pamphlet seem incomplete, with no indication as to how the power will be taken forward from the substations to it's destination across the Ribble Estuary in Penwortham. The vague drawings and maps, do not clearly identify the actual impact on the surrounding area.-I will also call upon the Planning Department at Fylde Borough Council to block this proposal with the strongest possible response. This has no place in Rural Fylde.</p>	<p>highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants issued a consultation newsletter to the consultation mailing zone using translucent envelopes during statutory consultation. These envelopes were selected for sustainability and practicality reasons, with the intention of allowing the recipients to see that the information inside related to the Transmission Assets and associated consultation. The consultation mailing zone was consistently reviewed throughout the pre-application process and was expanded between the non-statutory and statutory periods of consultation to ensure the local community were made aware of upcoming consultation activity. Full details of the consultation mailing zone can be found in the Consultation report (document reference E1); for the statutory consultation a total of 52,587 properties and businesses we sent a newsletter to advertise the consultation. This was also sent to 22,814 properties and businesses on the Isle of Man. The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included local media advertising (online and offline) and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers.</p>
TA_0136_001_201123	S44	Email	<p>I am opposed to the development for the following reasons: Destruction and disruption of important wildlife habitats on Lytham Moss and beyond for birds, bats, newts, deer etc. Destruction and disruption to public rights of way and Bridleways on Lytham Moss and beyond. Major disruption to very busy highways and access routes, including but not limited to Queensway, Kilnhouse Rd and the new Moss Road that is currently under construction. Destruction and disruption to private residences along the route, including potential compulsory purchase of private gardens and grazing land. The devaluing of private dwellings along and surrounding the development, spoiling green views and acreage.</p>	<p>Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0137_001_201123	S44	Email	<p>I refer to your letter of 9th October along with enclosures. My address is REDACTED. I write as a prescribed consultee. Unfortunately, I am not able to complete and return the feedback form enclosed with your letter, nor make any worthwhile comments, as I find it quite impossible to determine how my property is to be affected by the proposed Project and what the impact will be. That based on all the information provided and on examining carefully the maps/diagrams contained in the statutory consultation brochure October 2023. I would therefore, appreciate you advising on this accordingly and providing clarity. Please also note, I wish to opt in to receive Project updates, and would ask that you note your data/file accordingly. I await your response.</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).</p>
TA_0138_002_201123	S44	Email	<p>At the consultation, the plans were vague, but it was clear there is an alternative option - to run the cables through the airport. This absolutely has to be the solution for the sake of our community. Since COVID, St Annes has been busier than ever with tourists and it seems crazy to ruin our town and community at a time when it is being regenerated. On a personal level, I am also very concerned about the work devaluing my home, as well as significantly disrupting my family's life for a significant period of time.</p>	<p>It is noted that the option presented at PEIR (placement of cables in trenches within the highways) near Blackpool Airport is no longer required. Details of the current design are provided in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Potential indirect impacts on tourism associated with potential changes to visual amenity of local areas has been assessed within Volume 4 Chapter 2: Socio-economics of the ES (document reference F4.2). Other potential impacts on local amenity and indirect impacts on residents and visitors have been assessed in Volume 1, Annex 5.1: Human health of the ES (document reference F1.5.1), Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8) and Volume 3, Chapter 9: Air quality of the ES (document reference F3.9). The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0139_001_201123	S44	Email	<p>I would like to use the opportunity during this public consultation period, to unequivocally Object to your proposals and express my concerns over the proposed off shore Wind Farm cable routing and substation locations within the Fylde coast. I believe this would have a grossly negative impact on the Environment both physically, via the works proposed and Visually, damaging an untold amount of wildlife habitat and green belt protected land, conservation areas, highly productive farmland and have a hugely detrimental impact on the wider community and local economy, putting local business, land owners and Farmers out of business. I believe it would create an untold amount of suffering for residents within the Fylde coast for years to come via flooding and disruption i.e. traffic. - Accompanying documentation. https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Fylde-Biodiversity-SPD-Adopted-11-September-2019-FINAL.pdf http://www.stannesonthesea-tc.gov.uk/documents/(12)%20150612-St.%20Anne%27s%20NDP%20Main%20Document%20Pre%20Submission%20Final.1.pdf https://www.birdguides.com/sites/europe/britain-ireland/britain/england/lancashire/lytham-moss/ https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/EL6.020b-vi-Matter-6-Appendix-CA4-part-1-Oyston-Estates-050-.pdf We as residents look forward to your response in writing to these questions and look forward to your site visit.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0139_002_201123	S44	Email	<p>Your lack of detail on some of the proposed cable routes and substations at this late stage and at this public consultation point in proceedings, is highly worrying as this shows either an unprofessional approach to the matter, or highly unprepared, or at worst, both. It is most concerning that at this late stage we are asked to submit our opinions on a body of work that is neither complete nor suggest the possible outcomes thereafter the point of consultation. I feel that you have shown disregard to the community of the Fylde coast in your methods up to now. This lack of transparency on your part, sets a precedent when approaching future issues and has created a level of mistrust that is beyond repair. This is another reason why I must whole heartedly Object on all parts of your proposals.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course.</p>
TA_0139_003_201123	S44	Email	<p>Morecambe & Morgan Wind Farm 3rd November 20231.) Please can you explain if these are our properties where the cable corridor will be in relation to these properties.2.) What noise pollution will be created by the installation of these cables and how will affect residents?3.) How will the air quality</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>affect residents close to the cable corridor?4.) What measures will be taken to ensure are properties do not become infested with vermin during the creation of the cable corridor?5.) What is the predicted length of traffic management on Queensway?6.) What is the predicted effect on the water table during the creation of the cable corridor and what your proposal to mitigate the effect on the water table?7.) How and where will the cable corridor cross Queensway?8.) What noise will these cables create once installed and live?9.) What protection for wildlife will be in place. Wildlife on Lytham moss land and land edging Queensway (B5261), there are great crested newts, otters, bats, water voles, etc. as well as birds.10.) How will the dykes be protected from debris?11.) How will residents be update on progress and planned disruption?12.) Can you guarantee Division Lane will not be used to import Cable/equipment?13.) Will the heavy machinery drilling digging etc likely cause any damage to our homes? If so what's in place for the cost of repair?</p>	<p>Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0139_004_201123	S44	Email	<p>10th November 2023In additional to the above questions still not answered in writing as of 9th November the residents would like to ask the following questions after Monday 6th November Webinar.14.)Why was the first route for the substations and cables axed, I believe Penwortham was not the first option?15.)How wide is he Indicative onshore export cable corridor? (Light purple on Lytham Moss) and where is it going on an ordnance survey map. If it is 122m wide, where will it be crossing Queensway? Our questions have not been adequately answered on this.16.)What size are the substations and is there only 4? Will there definitely not be a Substation, Booster stations in Blackpool or Lytham St Anne's? If Morecambe substation Sub Station 12500 sq metres roughly 30 acres max height 20 Metres, and Morgan substation is15 acres max height 20 Metres is the sites in Kirkham where they will be located?17.)If your proposed route is a Biologic Heritage Site for migrating birds would the project be stopped during migration? There are great crested newts, otters, bats, water voles, etc. as well as migrating birds such as pink foot geese and Whopper Swans.18.)Why have you asked some residents on the same street of Division Lane for details of people or organisations have interest in the land/ property, Mortgage / Charge, name of lender and mortgage reference and not others? Several residents own more than one piece of land and they have received 2 different letters why when these are generic letters? Is this because you are thinking of using your compulsory acquisition powers to acquire Land/Properties/Part of land in Blackpool, Lytham Moss, Lytham St Anne's? In the webinar on 6th November you stated you have to inform all interested parties but yet you are not asking all residents the same questions, is the mortgagee question because you want to come to a voluntary agreement to purchase land or property? 19.) Will the cabling create noise for residents similar to pylons?20.) How will you mitigate raising the water table?21.) There are only 3 routes in and out of Lytham St Annes from Blackpool and when one is shut you can sit in 45 minutes to an hour each way in delays if the Promenade or Queensway is shut effecting residents and businesses. If you are now proposing using Kilnhouse Lane, Leach Lane, Queensway and Blackpool Road North to install cable ducts, how long do you believe this work will take and how much disruption will it cause to residents and businesses. Queensway - Traffic management. This is the main arterial route into St Annes from Blackpool, extremely busy 40mph road.22.)How will you communicate with residents during construction? Please consider social media for project updates.23.) Can you guarantee Midgeland Road will not be used to import Cable/equipment?24.) Will bridal paths be out of use while installing the cable corridor?25.) Blackpool Council are also doing lots of alterations on Common Edge Road (EZ Zone https://blackpoolez.com), the drainage off these works are to go into a attenuation basin alongside Blackpool Airport, has this been considered in your planning for the cable corridor (https://pa.fylde.gov.uk/Planning/Display/23/0758).26.) The Lytham moss land is wet and very low lying. - could cause flooding to us on Division Lane how will this be combated.27.) What is the proximity of the cable corridor to properties on Division Lane.28.) How will you stop settlement on properties adjacent to the projects, path?29.) Fylde size of Division Lane is not connect to main drains and has Dykes and Septic Tanks either on our adjacent to properties, how will these be protected.30.) Is there a provision for cleaning Dykes once the project is finished, as when other project have been completed this has caused problems for residents and we as riparian owners have a responsibility to clear dykes, but we should not be expect to clear your waste into these dykes.On behalf of residents of REDACTED.</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE) which no longer includes any surface piercing structures. This includes the removal of the Morgan Booster Station and associated search areas. The OSPs are to be classed as part of the Generation Assets applications only. Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).Properties on Division Lane border the draft Order Limits and so the Project has a duty to consult with those legal interests as part of the DCO application. To ensure the Applicant has consulted with all land interests, Dalcour Maclaren undertake land referencing to identify these interests through HMLR searches and Land Interest Questionnaires. This includes in some circumstances requesting information for any third-party interests in the land, details of which are outlined in the land referencing methodology. Some parties are asked to provide information about their interest prior to the project order limits being refined. This captures a wider area than ultimately necessary. Being asked for this information does not mean that you will be directly affected. Interest are identified by plot rather than address so any off lying land will be covered. We have a duty to consult all parties with an interest in land, a mortgage is effectively an interest and entitled to notification.</p>
TA_0140_001_201123	S44	Email	<p>I've tried to complete your feedback form but have been unable to get it to send. So I'm emailing you instead.I'm aghast at the size and scale of your plans and the lack of clarity in what you're proposing.You have not taken into consideration the impact this will have on the Fylde -I'm totally against your plans. I feel that you're trying to blind us with science with information overload without</p>	<p>The feedback form enabled respondents to provide feedback on specific aspects of the proposals. It was structured to allow the Transmission Assets team to accurately categorise and assess feedback in the design process. Feedback could be received in a number of ways as set out within consultation</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>actually letting us know how we are going to be affected. I attended the meeting at Fylde Rugby Club and was disappointed to find that I couldn't get a straight answer to one simple question : how will this affect me? When I asked, all I was told was that he wasn't aware of how it would affect me and maybe another advisor could help (they couldn't). Even your feedback form is so complicated I believe this will put off a great many people having their say. Is this what you want maybe? All in all this is an absolute disgrace.</p>	<p>materials. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0144_002_201123	S44	Email	<p>Your lack of detail on some of the proposed cable routes and substation at this late stage and at this public consultation point in proceedings, is highly worrying as this shows either an unprofessional approach to the matter. Or at worst, both. It is most concerning that at this late stage we are asked to submit our opinions on a body of work that is neither complete nor suggest possible outcomes thereafter the point of consultation. I would feel you have shown disregard to the community of Fylde coast in your methods up to now. This lack transparency on your part, sets a precedent when approaching future issues and has created a level of mistrust that is beyond repair. This is another reason why I must whole heartedly object on all parts of your proposals.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Transmission Assets is fully committed to delivering a community benefits scheme in line with UK Government guidance, which is due to be published later this year. The Transmission Assets is fully committed to delivering a community benefits scheme in line with UK Government guidance, which is due to be published later this year. Ahead of the guidance being published we have been engaging with local people, businesses and organisations to identify key themes and projects that will deliver strategic benefits and directly support the local community and local priorities. We welcome further input from the local community and encourage you to reach out to the project team in due course.</p>
TA_0145_001_201123	S44	Email	<p>I am writing to register my objection to the proposed Morecambe and Morgan wind farm project, specifically the substations proposed to be in the village of Newton. Having visited the consultation event and having done further research myself, I can only conclude that the statutory consultation is flawed. Detailed maps were made available to landowners but not the general public. All information should be made available to all parties at the same time. Also your site selection process is included in the consultation brochure.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.</p>
TA_0145_006_201123	S44	Email	<p>In summary the consultation process has not been transparent, the correct information has not been provided and you have selected the zone 1 site without proper consideration of the other sites or alternative solutions such as using the Ribble estuary to link directly into the Penwortham substation.</p>	<p>The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			I hope you will reconsider your proposal and find a solution that, while it might not be as cost effective, will be more suitable to the environment and residents of the Fylde coast.	Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0146_002_201123	S44	Email	Your lack of detail on some of the proposed cable routes and substation at this late stage and at this public consultation point in proceedings, is highly worrying as this shows either an unprofessional approach to the matter. Or at worst, both. It is most concerning that at this late stage we are asked to submit our opinions on a body of work that is neither complete nor suggest possible outcomes thereafter the point of consultation. I would feel you have shown disregard to the community of Fylde coast in your methods up to now. This lack transparency on your part, sets a precedent when approaching future issues and has created a level of mistrust that is beyond repair. This is another reason why I must whole heartedly object on all parts of your proposals.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Transmission Assets is fully committed to delivering a community benefits scheme in line with UK Government guidance, which is due to be published later this year. The Transmission Assets is fully committed to delivering a community benefits scheme in line with UK Government guidance, which is due to be published later this year. Ahead of the guidance being published we have been engaging with local people, businesses and organisations to identify key themes and projects that will deliver strategic benefits and directly support the local community and local priorities. We welcome further input from the local community and encourage you to reach out to the project team in due course.
TA_0149_003_201123	S44	Email	Overall, I object to the entire development until such time as residents are provided with clear detailed information about the impact. We have not been given this in the course of the consultation and so any decisions based on our responses will be flawed in terms of to what extent they are supported by those directly affected.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0150_001_201123	S44	Email	I am writing to disapprove of the planned sub-stations in Zone 1. The decisions were illegally predetermined, making the consultation process flawed, and the reasons are false and inaccurate. I strongly oppose the development in this area.No detailed maps or models were made available to the public but were made available to land owners before the statutory consultation. All parties should legally have the same information, making the statutory consultation flawed.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.</p>
TA_0150_002_201123	S44	Email	Our local MP has been 'hoodwinked' over time, being drip-fed information and intentionally misled.	<p>Throughout the development of the Transmission Assets, the Applicants have aimed to be open and transparent with all stakeholders, including Mark Menzies as the MP for the constituency at the time. Please see section 3 of the Consultation report (document reference E1) for information on the early engagement undertaken by the Applicants from Spring/summer 2021 in regards to the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Mona Offshore Wind Project, which included notifying Mark Menzies MP; a member of his team attended the consultation event at Lytham Assembly Rooms on 21 November 2022. A subsequent meeting took place with Mr Menzies on 18 December 2022. Section 3 of the Consultation report also provides details on follow up meetings with elected representatives, including Mark Menzies MP, between 2022 and 2023. A further meeting with a representative of Mr Menzies' office took place on 1 March 2023 which was subsequently followed up with an email update on 28 March 2023. As a section 47 consultee, Mark Menzies MP received notification of the launch of statutory consultation and also attended stakeholders briefings in September and October 2023. See section 4 of the Consultation report for further details.</p>
TA_0150_006_201123	S44	Email	People invest their money to live in a semi-rural environment for mental health and wellbeing. This development promises to devalue their assets and destroy their chosen quality of life. There are alternative options laid out by the initial studies and FBCs plans, which should be reconsidered and different decisions made.	<p>An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the WorldHealth Organisation definition of health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing. Any effects are assessed to be not significant and appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards. The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0150_010_201123	S44	Email	BP is bullying through these decisions, seemingly with the backing of decision-makers already in the bag. This process is a sham, and I oppose the development for all the above reasons, including BP's obnoxious approach, assuming it can do whatever it wants with the Fylde's communities and landscape.It's a no from me.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information.Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents.The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included, but not limited to, local media advertising (online and offline), social media and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers.The EIA methodology is set out within Volume 1, Chapter 5: Environmental assessment methodology of the ES. The chapter describes how significance of effects has been assessed. Professional judgement is used to define the magnitude of impact and receptor sensitivity. The matrix is then used, together with professional judgement, to evaluate the significance of effect. The significance may be one, or a range of, no change, negligible, minor, moderate or major. In general, a significance of effect of moderate or greater is considered 'significant' in EIA terms. For each topic chapter, what is considered 'significant' has been clearly defined. Where further mitigation is not possible a residual significant effect may remain.Within the assessment chapters the justification for determining the significance of effect is described. Where a range is given, the assessment chapter details the reason for the significance that has been concluded.
TA_0151_001_201123	S44	Email	I am writing to vigorously object against the proposed substations in the Village of Newton with Scales, as a local resident.Below I have listed many reasons for the objections.Firstly, the proposal is flawed as the consultation has not been properly explained to residents. The website and information are near impossible to navigate and understand and I believe this is clearly done to confuse and keep residents in the dark.	In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E)). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information.The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). Through ongoing technical, engineering and environmental assessments and consultation feedback the ES builds on this work and presents the finalised design and details of the Transmission Assets, a NTS is also available (document reference F1).
TA_0152_003_201123	S44	Email	How on earth you came up with this location is beyond belief. All the literature you have provided on the proposals is extremely difficult to follow due to the volume and any maps are very small so you cannot determine exactly where it is.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0152_004_201123	S44	Email	Light and noise pollution is also another issue being so close to residential properties.	The impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets in terms of noise are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 8 : Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8). Visual effects, including effects arising from lighting, are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES (document reference F3.10).
TA_0153_002_201123	S44	Email	I am aware and support that environmental factors have to be considered, this is presumably why the river is not being used . Whichever route is chosen it will have an effect but a balance of risk has to be applied and all possible routes considered, including the use of Heysham substation, in order to minimise risks to humans ,livelihoods' and impact on the environment , including prime agricultural land. I do not feel real balance has been considered and made evident. This scheme should not go ahead without further consultation and evidence presented as to the various choices ,cost and practicality of each one.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0154_001_201123	S44	Email	I would like to raise our objections futher on behalf of both myself and my husband about these plans.Firstly the apparent consultation events have been limited in allowing the commity to consult. The kirkham one was 3 hours on a Saturday morning with little to no advertisement. It was held in a location away form and town center without easy access to public transport disenfranchising those with limited mobility, and who may not be able to access the one on line session for the same reasons. The team were unable to provide information or illustrations as to the exact size or appearance for the structural and Could not answer questions on the assesment around health, the electromagnetic field noise and health implications particularly in view of the sub stations being situated close to both the 1000 pupils local secondary and a primary school. Advice was givne to fill in the complex objection booklet. This does not allow for discussion nor adequate consultation Given this I do not feel the local community has actually been given opertunity to participate in a full consultation , and this needs to occur.	Multiple consultation events were held across the Transmission Assets area, both in-person and online, to ensure those wishing to attend could so and ask questions of the Applicant's Transmission Assets team. Contact details for the project team were also made available for anyone requiring additional support.The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC) for simplicity and accessibility. Wireline visualisations were made available at statutory consultation, showing the maximum parameters from various viewpoints. Visualisations are presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage.
TA_0154_004_201123	S44	Email	Fourthly the health and safety analysis of the impact of the substation seem s to be based on data from fylde Council. This data covers the hole of Fylde not just the kirkham/ Freckleton/Newton area and as such this is flawed. The social economic and health date for this are is significantly different to that of Lytham and St Annes which sques the information used for analysis. I note separate areas of preston were taken into account. This need reanalysis using specific local data to assess the social, economic and health effects tonthe area which will be negative in a rural area dependant on tourism and agriculture. Further issues center around the noise generation and health effects of having a substation close to schools and housing. This will have a significantly negative effect.on both causing stress loss of outdoor living space ans well as economic losing decreases in housing price. The sub stations at both Penwortham and Heysham are built at significant distances form housing and schools but the noise generation can be heat when passing them. It is not appropriate to build 2 substations near housing and schools. This is before any consideration on the EMF field generation and long term health effects on young people and residents. We fully object to the plans as outlined above	An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence populationhealth has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the World Health Organisation definition of health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing.Any effects are assessed to be not significant and appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards
TA_0155_001_211123	S44	Email	To whom it may concern.Find attached questions and comments on the proposed transmission assets of the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms. Reproduced below:Having attended a	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>consultation event, let's be clear, this was a box ticking exercise not a consultation. There was no information about health hazards, noise, no visual representation of the sub station installation and no admission of the design parameters driving the system design, other than the a feeling that the community was pretty far down the list. Because of the lack of information with regard to the sub stations I must wholeheartedly object and reject the project going ahead on the current basis.</p>	<p>three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents. The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included, but not limited to, local media advertising (online and offline), social media and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers. Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p>
TA_0155_004_211123	S44	Email	<p>It looks to me as though the design process is sloppy, secretive and poorly communicated. Nobody had any visualisations of the substation to give an idea of what an eyesore it must be and people were vague about the noise nuisance despite there being installations around the world. If noise is really not that far up the design criteria then it probably borders on the incompetent. Stating that the plans are "worst case", a commonly used expression, as though it is some comfort, is just a lazy way of not having the right criteria in place and failing to do robust investigative work. In these circumstances worst case becomes the easiest achievable outcome.</p>	<p>An assessment of the noise and vibration impacts due to the Transmission Assets are presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.2: Construction Noise and Vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.2) and Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational Noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3). The cumulative noise and vibration impacts with other proposed developments is considered in section 8.13 of Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8). An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects. Visualisations have been presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage.</p>
TA_0155_006_211123	S44	Email	<p>I am worried that the company are taking the view that this is a done deal and they will just do what they want. What is the process by which the companies will start to be accountable to the public?</p>	<p>Our team have been carefully considering the feedback provided at our statutory and non-statutory consultations – alongside ongoing engineering, and environmental work – as we refine our plans. If the application is accepted for examination, there will be an opportunity for people to register their interest in the application with the Planning Inspectorate. Anyone registering an interest will be kept informed of the progress of the application, including when and how they can provide comments. Following a preliminary meeting the Examining Authority will confirm the timetable for the examination.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0155_008_211123	S44	Email	Financial penalties are often used as an incentive to improve performance and ensure compliance. What are the proposed penalties for failure to achieve, for instance, the noise attenuation requirements?	The draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) (document reference C1) contains specific requirements (Req. 21A & 21B – Control of noise during operational stage). As a part of this requirement the Applicants will need to provide detailed information on any necessary noise attenuation and mitigation measures, including details of any monitoring that may be required during the operational phase of the projects. These detailed Operational Noise Management Plan(s) will be developed in consultation with the relevant planning authorities, prior to commencement of construction.
TA_0156_001_211123	S44	Email	I am writing to disapprove of the planned sub-stations in Zone 1. The decisions were illegally predetermined, making the consultation process flawed, and the reasons are false and inaccurate. I strongly oppose the development in this area. No detailed maps or models were made available to the public but were made available to land owners before the statutory consultation. All parties should legally have the same information, making the statutory consultation flawed.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.
TA_0156_002_211123	S44	Email	Our local MP has been 'hoodwinked' over time, being drip-fed information and intentionally misled.	Throughout the development of the Transmission Assets, the Applicants have aimed to be open and transparent with all stakeholders, including Mark Menzies as the MP for the constituency at the time. Please see section 3 of the Consultation report (document reference E1) for information on the early engagement undertaken by the Applicants from Spring/summer 2021 in regards to the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Mona Offshore Wind Project, which included notifying Mark Menzies MP; a member of his team attended the consultation event at Lytham Assembly Rooms on 21 November 2022. A subsequent meeting took place with Mr Menzies on 18 December 2022. Section 3 of the Consultation report also provides details on follow up meetings with elected representatives, including Mark Menzies MP, between 2022 and 2023. A further meeting with a representative of Mr Menzies' office took place on 1 March 2023 which was subsequently followed up with an email update on 28 March 2023. As a section 47 consultee, Mark Menzies MP received notification of the launch of statutory consultation and also attended stakeholders briefings in September and October 2023. See section 4 of the Consultation report for further details.
TA_0156_003_211123	S44	Email	I have also copied in our local MP, the Secretary of State, and our Prime Minister. I am also writing a letter to HRH King Charles, who recently awarded Friends of Newton Community Park (FoNCP) The King's Award for Voluntary Service. I'm sure His Royal Highness would oppose the community he awarded this prestigious honour to, having that community put at risk and all that great work he recognises being dismissed by BP for profits. Also, I have copied in the new Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, who was appointed on the 13th of November; Mr Barclay would no doubt have an interest in such destruction of what he has been tasked with protecting especially as he was born in Lytham St. Annes, whose tourism and businesses will be massively affected. It's a no from me.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0156_010_211123	S44	Email	Large employers will have difficulties attracting people to work in the area, workers already in the area will have major disruptions getting to work, emergency services will be affected, businesses will be affected, and people's mental health will be affected.	An Outline Employment and Skills Plan has been prepared and submitted as part of the application for development consent (document reference J31). This will be developed further post-consent to detail how the Applicants will engage with local workers and training providers for anticipated employment opportunities associated with the Transmission Assets. An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the World Health Organisation definition of health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing. Any effects are assessed to be not significant and appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards. Traffic and transport impacts arising during the construction phase of the Transmission Assets have been fully assessed at section 7.11 Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference E3.7) Further details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8). Details of the operation and maintenance phases are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Onshore maintenance would be limited to essential maintenance and/or emergency works. Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).</p>
TA_0156_011_211123	S44	Email	<p>BP is bullying through these decisions, seemingly with the backing of decision-makers already in the bag. This process is a sham, and I oppose the development for all the above reasons, including BP's obnoxious approach, assuming it can do whatever it wants with the Fylde's communities and landscape.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents. The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included, but not limited to, local media advertising (online and offline), social media and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers. The EIA methodology is set out within Volume 1, Chapter 5: Environmental assessment methodology of the ES. The chapter describes how significance of effects has been assessed. Professional judgement is used to define the magnitude of impact and receptor sensitivity. The matrix is then used, together with professional judgement, to evaluate the significance of effect. The significance may be one, or a range of, no change, negligible, minor, moderate or major. In general, a significance of effect of moderate or greater is considered 'significant' in EIA terms. For each topic chapter, what is considered 'significant' has been clearly defined. Where further mitigation is not possible a residual significant effect may remain. Within the assessment chapters the justification for determining the significance of effect is described. Where a range is given, the assessment chapter details the reason for the significance that has been concluded.</p>
TA_0157_001_211123	S44	Email	<p>To whom it may concern. Find attached questions and comments on the proposed transmission assets of the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms. REDACTED [ATTACHED DOCUMENT] Having attended a consultation event, let's be clear, this was a box ticking exercise not a consultation. There was no information about health hazards, noise, no visual representation of the sub station installation and no admission of the design parameters driving the system design, other than the a feeling that the community was pretty far down the list. Because of the lack of</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			information with regard to the sub stations I must wholeheartedly object and reject the project going ahead on the current basis.	to October 2024). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents. The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included, but not limited to, local media advertising (online and offline), social media and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers. Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.
TA_0157_004_211123	S44	Email	It looks to me as though the design process is sloppy, secretive and poorly communicated. Nobody had any visualisations of the substation to give an idea of what an eyesore it must be and people were vague about the noise nuisance despite there being installations around the world. If noise is really not that far up the design criteria then it probably borders on the incompetent. Stating that the plans are "worst case", a commonly used expression, as though it is some comfort, is just a lazy way of not having the right criteria in place and failing to do robust investigative work. In these circumstances worst case becomes the easiest achievable outcome.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0157_006_211123	S44	Email	I am worried that the company are taking the view that this is a done deal and they will just do what they want. What is the process by which the companies will start to be accountable to the public?	Our team have been carefully considering the feedback provided at our statutory and non-statutory consultations – alongside ongoing engineering, and environmental work – as we refine our plans. If the application is accepted for examination, there will be an opportunity for people to register their interest in the application with the Planning Inspectorate. Anyone registering an interest will be kept informed of the progress of the application, including when and how they can provide comments. Following a preliminary meeting the Examining Authority will confirm the timetable for the examination.
TA_0157_008_211123	S44	Email	Financial penalties are often used as an incentive to improve performance and ensure compliance. What are the proposed penalties for failure to achieve, for instance, the noise attenuation requirements?	The draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) (document reference C1) contains specific requirements (Req. 21A & 21B – Control of noise during operational stage). As a part of this requirement the Applicants will need to provide detailed information on any necessary noise attenuation and mitigation measures, including details of any monitoring that may be required during the operational phase of the projects. These detailed Operational Noise Management Plan(s) will be developed in consultation with the relevant planning authorities, prior to commencement of construction.
TA_0158_010_211123	S44	Email	I object to the proposed substation locations for the following reasons: 1. The statutory public consultation is flawed as you have not provided any detailed maps to the public, which you did to the landowners, ahead of the statutory consultation period. You should make all the information available to all interested parties at the same time. The site selection process isn't	The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			summarised in the consultation brochure and the amount of information provided makes it very difficult to navigate	The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.
TA_0158_016_211123	S44	Email	7.The PEIR does not identify permissible noise, light, vibration and EMR emission upper limits from the substations. Their approach to noise mitigation is not defined. Monitoring of noise limits MUST be monitored and enforces, however not specified in the consultation.	Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used. With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing. Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex. See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4). The impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets in terms of noise are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 8 : Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8). Visual effects, including effects arising from lighting, are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES (document reference F3.10).
TA_0159_001_211123	S44	Email	Good afternoon I am writing with regard to the above proposed Wind Farm. I have no objection to wind farming in general as I believe this is a sustainable source of clean renewable energy. However, as a resident of REDACTED which is halfway between Kirkham & Freckleton, I do have an objection to the route the cables are being laid to the proposed Sub-Stations and to the siting of said substations in our locality to service this Wind Farm. I do not understand why the route for the cables for this wind farm are coming through this locality when your information states that the wind farm will be located in Morecambe Bay some 21 miles away or more. It seems from the scant information received to-date that there has been little or no consideration for the local residents. There will be a detrimental impact and prolonged severe disruption caused by digging up the fields and numerous roads which will have an effect on local schools, nurseries and cause traffic obstructions. Not to mention the impact this will have on the local wildlife.	The siting and design of the substations has been developed through an iterative design process, e.g., the Morgan substation has been moved eastwards since submission of the PEIR to increase the distance between it and residential properties on Lower Lane. In addition, direct impacts are avoided on the public right of way and the footprint seems to respect field boundaries. Similarly, the Morecambe substation has also been located further away from a number of residential receptors. This is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). An Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2) has been developed and is provided within Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register (document reference F1.5.3) which sets out details of mitigation planting at the onshore substations, including the number, location, species and details of management and maintenance of planting. Where practical, landscape mitigation planting will be established as early as reasonably practicable in the construction phase
TA_0160_004_211123	S44	Email	The proposed locations are opposite a large residential area. I have not found an existing one like it in the UK so close to a residential area to obtain any facts. We have no idea what it will look like, as we are told you have no design / artist impressions or similar to show the residents it will affect. We just have a square meterage.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Visualisations have been presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage.
TA_0161_004_211123	S44	Email	A) Consultations The consultation process has been inadequate and flawed with people frustrated that they did not have any or enough information and then conversely that there was too much inaccessible and contradictory information provided on the Morecambe and Morgan website. Whilst the Morecambe and Morgan personnel attending the consultation events have been personable, they have not been able to answer many questions – the response often being 'we don't know yet'. If	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023)

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			so much is yet not known, how can the public be asked to consider the proposals at the moment, especially when their implementation will have a monumental impact on their community?	to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC) for simplicity and accessibility. The Transmission Assets is fully committed to delivering a community benefits scheme in line with UK Government guidance, which is due to be published later this year. Ahead of the guidance being published we have been engaging with local people, businesses and organisations to identify key themes and projects that will deliver strategic benefits and directly support the local community and local priorities. We welcome further input from the local community and encourage you to reach out to the project team in due course.
TA_0161_005_211123	S44	Email	<p>Ai Non-Statutory Consultations These were inadequate and flawed. Information (when provided) has been provided in a piecemeal manner. This project increasingly feels like a fait accompli and by limiting information and decisions you are not giving residents a real opportunity to have their say. - Generic postcards sent to residents had no indication that the project would significantly impact the village and parish. The same postcards were sent to residents from the Isle of Man to Lancashire. - Postcards were not received by all residents most notably those on the new housing estates, which are actually within metres of the Option 1 Morecambe Substation site. - I attended the first round of the non-statutory consultation in Lytham Assembly Rooms. The discussions were about cabling – there was no mention of substations. - I attended the second round of non-statutory consultations at Fylde Rugby Club and this is the first time that substations were mentioned. We were told that there were 4 search zones which would be down-selected to 2 for the statutory round. This gave us a modicum of hope that the arrival of substations in rural Newton was not inevitable. However, the information was totally misleading as only Zone 1 went forward to the Statutory round. - There were no non-statutory consultation events held in Newton-with-Scales, despite 2 of the 4 search zones being in the Parish. Members of the Parish Council attended consultations at other locations to request a consultation in Newton. This was refused, instead a representative who had worked for the project for just a few months attended a Parish Council meeting. This was just 3 days before the end of the non-statutory consultation period – giving very little time to construct a response. - Our Fylde MP, Mr Martin Menzies has informed constituents that he was not given a complete picture by the Project Team during this phase, as he had not been briefed about the substations. Once made aware he subsequently attended a Parish Council meeting in August and the Parish Council were able to tell him about the concerns regarding the cumulative impact of the number of existing and proposed energy projects in Newton. If the project team failed to keep the local M.P. updated – how can the residents be confident that they have been adequately informed and consulted in this process?</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Throughout the development of the Project, the Applicants have aimed to be open and transparent with all stakeholders, including Mark Menzies as the MP for the constituency at the time. Please see section 3 of the Consultation report (document reference E1) for information on the early engagement undertaken by the Applicants from Spring/summer 2021 in regards to the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Mona Offshore Wind Project, which included notifying Mark Menzies MP; a member of his team attended the consultation event at Lytham Assembly Rooms on 21 November 2022. A subsequent meeting took place with Mr Menzies on 18 December 2022. Section 3 of the Consultation report also provides details on follow up meetings with elected representatives, including Mark Menzies MP, between 2022 and 2023. A further meeting with a representative of Mr Menzies' office took place on 1 March 2023 which was subsequently followed up with an email update on 28 March 2023. As a section 47 consultee, Mark Menzies MP received notification of the launch of statutory consultation and also attended stakeholders briefings in September and October 2023. See section 4 of the Consultation report for further details.</p>
TA_0161_006_211123	S44	Email	<p>A ii) Statutory Consultation This was also inadequate and flawed: - Mailshots to residents were a 4-page leaflet, in a disposable plastic bag, like junk-mail. This was again designed to cover the Isle of Man through Lancashire. - Landowners, however, received a more substantial booklet. - These mailshots did not meet the needs of residents. It may have been a large distribution list, but quantity does equate to quality. Information was not targeted to the needs of the community most affected by the substations. - Neither of the above leaflets contained a map with enough detail so that the residents of Newton could identify their own home or street and hence they found it difficult to work out where the substations would be and work out. - However, some land owners received a map from the Morecambe and Morgan land agent, Dalcour MacCLaren, with significantly more detail. If this was made available to some why could it not have been made available to all? - As a result of the failure in the consultation materials in generating interest and engagement, many people were unaware of the scheme and its potential impact on our rural community, until Parish Council notices and social media posts engaged more of the community and encouraged attendance at the consultation event on October 26th. - This Oct 26th statutory consultation event in Newton with Clifton Village Hall was so well attended that people were turned away at the door by Morecambe & Morgan Security as the hall was full. Others including elderly people with mobility issues, who had been unable to access the materials on-line, drove on without stopping as there was nowhere left to park.</p>	<p>The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC) for simplicity and accessibility. Multiple consultation events were held across the Transmission Assets area, both in-person and online, to ensure those wishing to attend could do so and ask questions of the Applicant's Transmission Assets team. At particularly busy events, people were asked to wait outside to ensure the safety of members of the public, no one was turned away from any events. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>This surely demonstrates the passion which the residents feel for the community and their fear about its future. It also demonstrates the need for the consultation events to be full days rather than part days to spread the footfall and give more people an opportunity to attend.-Information provided at the consultation event comprised of some posters, huge folders and Morgan and Morecambe representatives to talk to. However, there was a large amount of frustration in the room as these representatives, although very personable, were unable to answer specific questions including what would the substations look like? -The consultation materials presented at the event covered the entire scheme – it was not tailored to include local interest and the questions which people really wanted answered about the impact on their home, local community and transport network. How could the project team think this was acceptable when the two substations are proposed for Newton? Can this be considered as meaningful consultation?-On-line materials which were meant to support the consultation were so vast and detailed that they added to the frustration as they were unmanageable and unnavigable for many people. The PEIR (Preliminary Environmental Impact Report) had a non-technical summary – but this summary was still 93 pages long!-Key information is still not available: the route of the cables from the substations to Penwortham, two options for the Morecambe substation and many other aspects.How can a 'consultation' with so many unknowns and flaws possibly have met the requirements for forwarding to DCO?Why is the online feedback form so onerous and cumbersome? It is off-putting from the outset.</p>	<p>time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Applicants designed the online and printed feedback forms to allow stakeholders to provide thorough and accurate feedback on the elements of the proposals most important to them. This allows the technical teams to review feedback relating to specific areas of the Transmission Assets throughout the design development process and ensure it is considered by the relevant specialists as the proposals are refined. The forms also allowed any general comments to be made.</p>
TA_0161_010_211123	S44	Email	<p>•There are no 'mockups' 2D or 3D of what the substations would look like, especially given their enormous size (45 acres). When will this visual information become available? Will residents be consulted?•The photographs that purport to show the visual impact of the substations were taken from obscure locations and not from the residential building line. These so called 'wirelines' are buried in huge documents. Why were these views not taken from residential sightlines?•Information regarding different substation technologies has not been made available and will impact the size, scale and visual appearance of the substations. The representatives at the consultation could not even say whether the substation design would be air cooled or gas cooled. When will decisions about substation design be shared? How long is going to take to grow trees tall enough to mask these monsters?</p>	<p>Wireline visualisations were made available at statutory consultation, showing the maximum parameters from various viewpoints. Visualisations are presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage.Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3).</p>
TA_0161_016_211123	S44	Email	<p>Mitigation•No information has been made available relating to how the project will mitigate :-othe construction activity;othe visual impact of the substations;othe noise and vibration levels both post and during construction;olight pollution from the sites;oelectro-magnetic radiation;How can residents comment in any meaningful way on any mitigation unless further consultation takes place? Who sets allowable standards for visual intrusions, light, noise, vibration, electro-magnetic radiation etcWho would enforce breaches in agreed mitigation standards?Although there may be local employment in the short term during construction, there will be no long term job prospects created by this project.ConclusionI object to the proposals which have been presented (not consulted) for the Morecambe and Morgan Wind Farm Transmission Assets. I hope that you will take my comments into account.</p>	<p>Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0162_001_211123	S44	Email	<p>I am writing to voice my disapproval of the current proposals. I own a rental property at REDACTED in St. Annes which is located near Blackpool Airport.I am very concerned that the scale of the work involved, the close proximity, and immense upheaval will detrimentally affect the area, its local businesses and the value of residential properties.Employers will have difficulties attracting people to work in the area, workers already in the area will have major disruptions getting to work, emergency services will be affected, businesses will be affected, and people's mental health will be affected.</p>	<p>An Outline Employment and Skills Plan has been prepared and submitted as part of the application for development consent (document reference J31). This will be developed further post-consent to detail how the Applicants will engage with local workers and training providers for anticipated employment opportunities associated with the Transmission Assets.An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the World Health Organisation definition of health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing. Any effects are assessed to be not significant and appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence tohealth protection standards. The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.
TA_0162_004_211123	S44	Email	I am heavily in favour of affordable green energy, but the infrastructure in the proposed plans are not acceptable when there are more sensitive and responsible alternatives. Repurposing of existing assets (Heysham power station) or routes like Ribble Estuary have been ignored. Also we have seen in recent times that companies like BP charge extortionate amounts for their energy and rake in obscene profits for what are essential services. They are a major factor in today's cost of living crisis. BP are pushing through these decisions, seemingly with the backing of decision-makers already in the bag. I oppose the development for all the above reasons.	The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0163_001_211123	S44	Email	I am writing to disapprove of the planned sub-stations in Zone 1. The decisions were illegally predetermined, making the consultation process flawed, and the reasons are false and inaccurate. I strongly oppose the development in this area.>>>> No detailed maps or models were made available to the public but were made available to land owners before the statutory consultation. All parties should legally have the same information, making the statutory consultation flawed.	Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.
TA_0163_002_211123	S44	Email	Our local MP has been 'hoodwinked' over time, being drip-fed information and intentionally misled.	Throughout the development of the Transmission Assets, the Applicants have aimed to be open and transparent with all stakeholders, including Mark Menzies as the MP for the constituency at the time. Please see section 3 of the Consultation report (document reference E1) for information on the early engagement undertaken by the Applicants from Spring/summer 2021 in regards to the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Mona Offshore Wind Project, which included notifying Mark Menzies MP; a member of his team attended the consultation event at Lytham Assembly Rooms on 21 November 2022. A subsequent meeting took place with Mr Menzies on 18 December 2022. Section 3 of the Consultation report also provides details on follow up meetings with elected representatives, including Mark Menzies MP, between 2022 and 2023. A further meeting with a representative of Mr Menzies' office took place on 1 March 2023 which was subsequently followed up with an email update on 28 March 2023. As a section 47 consultee, Mark Menzies MP received notification of the launch of statutory consultation and also attended stakeholders briefings in September and October 2023. See section 4 of the Consultation report for further details.
TA_0163_006_211123	S44	Email	People invest their money to live in a semi-rural environment for mental health and wellbeing. This development promises to devalue their assets and destroy their chosen quality of life. There are alternative options laid out by the initial studies and FBCs plans, which should be reconsidered and different decisions made.	An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the WorldHealth Organisation definition of

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing. Any effects are assessed to be not significant and appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards. The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0163_009_211123	S44	Email	<p>Large employers will have difficulties attracting people to work in the area, workers already in the area will have major disruptions getting to work, emergency services will be affected, businesses will be affected, and people's mental health will be affected.</p>	<p>An Outline Employment and Skills Plan has been prepared and submitted as part of the application for development consent (document reference J31). This will be developed further post-consent to detail how the Applicants will engage with local workers and training providers for anticipated employment opportunities associated with the Transmission Assets. An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the World Health Organisation definition of health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing. Any effects are assessed to be not significant and appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards. Traffic and transport impacts arising during the construction phase of the Transmission Assets have been fully assessed at section 7.11 Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference E3.7) Further details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8). Details of the operation and maintenance phases are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Onshore maintenance would be limited to essential maintenance and/or emergency works. Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).</p>
TA_0163_010_211123	S44	Email	<p>>> BP is bullying through these decisions, seemingly with the backing of decision-makers already in the bag. This process is a sham, and I oppose the development for all the above reasons, including BP's obnoxious approach, assuming it can do whatever it wants with the Fylde's communities and landscape.>>>> I have also copied in our local MP, the Secretary of State, and our Prime Minister. I am also writing a letter to HRH King Charles, who recently awarded Friends of Newton Community Park (FoNCP) The King's Award for Voluntary Service. I'm sure His Royal Highness would oppose the community he awarded this prestigious honour to, having that community put at risk and all that great work he recognises being dismissed by BP for profits.>>>> Also, I have copied in the new Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, who was appointed on the 13th of November; Mr Barclay would no doubt have an interest in such destruction of what he has been tasked with protecting especially as he was born in Lytham St. Annes, whose tourism and businesses will be massively affected.>>>> It's a no from me.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents. The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included, but not limited to, local media advertising (online and offline), social media and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers. The EIA methodology is set out within Volume 1, Chapter 5: Environmental assessment methodology of the ES. The chapter describes how significance of effects has been assessed. Professional judgement is used to define the magnitude of impact and receptor sensitivity. The matrix is then used, together with professional judgement, to evaluate the significance of effect. The significance may be one, or a range of, no change, negligible, minor, moderate or major. In general, a significance of effect of moderate or greater is considered 'significant' in EIA terms. For each topic chapter, what is considered 'significant' has been clearly defined. Where further mitigation is not possible a residual significant effect may remain. Within the assessment chapters the justification for determining the significance of effect is described. Where a range is given, the assessment chapter details the reason for the significance that has been concluded.
TA_0165_001_211123	S44	Email	I hope this letter finds you well. I am writing to express my deep concerns and dissatisfaction regarding the proposed construction of a substantial transformer in the village of Newton. As a concerned resident of this community, I believe it is crucial to address several issues that have not been adequately answered by the developers involved in this project. Before delving into the specific concerns, I want to mention that, due to the challenges encountered while navigating the online form provided by your company, we have opted to submit this complaint via email. The online form was difficult to navigate, and the little information provided did not make much sense, making it challenging to articulate our concerns effectively. Now, moving on to the substantive issues, it has come to our attention that there has been no provision of detailed design plans or an accurate scale of the proposed transformer building. The lack of transparency on this matter has left the residents of Newton in the dark, making it impossible for us to fully comprehend the impact this structure will have on our community.	The feedback form enabled respondents to provide feedback on specific aspects of the proposals. It was structured to allow the Transmission Assets team to accurately categorise and assess feedback in the design process. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).
TA_0167_001_171023	S44	Email	These proposed lengthy and intrusive works are unacceptable for a fragile coastal location such as ours and are, in my opinion, unlikely to gain little in the way of local support. With regard to my comments these are strictly confidential and I do not give consent for my personal details to be disclosed or for any of the above comments to be associated with me directly if they are publicised in any form for any purpose.	The Applicants responded to this query on 09 November 2023 providing links to the detail requested and contact details for the appointed lands agents acting on behalf of the Transmission Assets.
TA_0167_002_171023	S44	Email	This letter, together with my previous email dated 17th October 2023 and your e-mail responses on 27th October 2023 (REDACTED) and 9th November 2023 (Transmission Assets Team), is my response to the Statutory Consultation in respect of the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farm proposals. 1. Privacy As stated in my email of the 17th October 2023 in submitting my response to the proposals I do not consent to my personal details, including my name, postal and email addresses to be published in any way or form. My personal information is provided solely for the purposes of communication with the project team and comments made are to be anonymous if they are included in any publicly accessible format.	The Applicants responded to this query on 09 November 2023 providing links to the detail requested and contact details for the appointed lands agents acting on behalf of the Transmission Assets.
TA_0167_003_171023	S44	Email	2. Local Concerns As well as receiving the information sent by post, most recently the "Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms: Transmission Assets Statutory Consultation Brochure October 2023" I also obtained a copy of the "Preliminary Information Report - Non Technical Summary" when I attended the Consultation Event held at St Annes Cricket Club on 3rd November 2023. At this event I had the opportunity to speak to our local MP Mark Menzies as well as some members of your team who were present at this event. As a resident of the REDACTED, with our property located in the area identified as REDACTED on your Works Plans Sheet 2, we are obviously extremely concerned as to the effect of your proposals to our property, those of the other residents and to the surrounding area. Your plan shows a number of Work Plan Areas within your Transmission Assets red	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure,

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			lineboundary but the nature of the works to be carried out in each of these is generic in itsdescription with no detail of where cable routes are to be sited or the specific works to becarried out in each of the work areas identified. The only description of works from yourDevelopment Consent Order for land areas REDACTED reads:“Work No. 7A – Morgan access works including—(a)improvement of accesses to the public highway including works to visibility splays(b) up to four underground cable circuits in cable ducts(c) trenchless installation techniques”and“Work No. 7B – Morecambe access works including -(a) improvement of accesses to the public highway including works to visibility splays(b) up to two underground cable circuits and associated electrical circuit ducts(c) trenchless installation techniques”These generic statements are of no help in understanding specifically how we and otherresidents will be affected by the proposed works and seem to conflict with the statementsmade at the Consultation Event where your team stated there would be no compulsoryproperty purchases even though the works descriptions imply significant work in the areasREDACTED. You say that you need an onshore cable construction area with a width of 122 metres. Yourplans give no details of exactly where this contiguous area is to be. You will appreciate thatthe number of documents produced to support these proposals and the amount of information in these make it extremely difficult for members of the public to grasp the scaleof the construction works proposed - however it is clear that this will be extremely significantand intrusive.	deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information.Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents.The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Transmission Assets design has resulted in a reduced construction corridor width, as set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Details of the factors considered during the design evolution are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0167_004_171023	S44	Email	I am not sure how many of those who attended the consultation eventsappreciated the size and weight of the short section of High Voltage cable on display. Theprospect of installing eighteen of these for approximately 25km with a contiguous work areaof 120m implies a massive civil engineering project causing significant disruption over a prolonged period of time.The precise location of the onshore assets where they leave the sea bed is not identified northe specific infrastructure required at this point of entry. You simply state that theseunderground transition joint bays (presumably on the landfall area beyond the high tidemark) will be located in the vicinity of Blackpool Airport. This is insufficient information toexpect a considered response as it is simply too vague.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0167_007_171023	S44	Email	In 5.1.6.2 of the Non Technical Summary you state that meetings were held with landowners along the proposed onshore cable export route between February and May 2023. These meetings certainly did not involve ourselves or any other local residents as far as I am awareso it is not clear who and how many landowners you consulted and in respect of exactly what land.	Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).Alongside the public consultations held, Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants held meetings with interests directly impacted by the Project.
TA_0167_009_171023	S44	Email	Anecdotal evidence suggests that house sales have already stalled or fallen through due to the uncertainty of exactly what is being proposed and its specific effect on individual properties. Even if residents were not proposing to move for any reason the prospect of this major significant and intrusive project hangs over the entire area like dark clouds which, though threatening a storm, linger unpredictably and unsettle the populace below.	The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.
TA_0168_002_171123	S44	Email	2) Effect on house prices	The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.
TA_0168_004_171123	S44	Email	4) I live on REDACTED opposite the airport . I want full details on any impact this has on myself and all the vulnerable residents that live here regards disruption , road works , noise , pollution , house prices	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>
TA_0168_006_171123	S44	Email	6) I require full details every part of this proposal with no grey areas or complicated jargon	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).
TA_0169_001_111023	S44	Email	Our name is REDACTED and we live at REDACTED. We have only just bought this house with our life savings for our retirement. We would have not bought it had we had prior knowledge of your proposals. The threat of these proposals are already making our houses potentially unsaleable for what would appear quite a number of years. Even when completed this would be bound to affect the value of our homes . An even bigger concern would be the health risks associated with the proximity of the high voltage cables. Whilst we agree with the principle of wind farming, it seems totally ridiculous that you are trying to route these cables through a housing estate when there are nearby open fields . We appreciate we will need to send our comments in the booklets you have sent - but are writing to request a more detailed road map of how exactly both these proposed routes affect OUR SPECIFIC area. It is impossible to get an exact idea off the maps you have sent out	<p>The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate. Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used. With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing. Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex. See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0183_004_221123	S44	Email	The consultation process has been flawed and handled without due respect to the people of the Fylde. The whole project has been poorly publicised. The first we heard of the project was when small A4 flyers were posted on roadside telegraph poles asking which landowners had interest in certain parcels of land, with little information about the overall scale of the proposals. Anyone without a claim on the land would have thought little of it. It is only since the start of November that we realised the sheer scale of the plans. No scale models or actual projected drawings have been provided for the public to consider. The online form which you have provided as part of the consultation process is confusing at best, and the map you have provided is useless to us; it is too small for us to pinpoint exactly where you propose the route to go, and therefore exactly which landowners you intend to bankrupt in the process.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included, but not limited to, local media advertising (online and offline), social media and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information.
TA_0184_002_221123	S44	Email	The prices of the coastal dunes housing will be adversely affected for years and this is not acceptable. Local businesses will be adversely affected. There would be a huge loss of holidaymakers which would occur with this massive disruption.	The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate. Potential indirect impacts on tourism associated with potential changes to visual amenity of local areas has been assessed within Volume 4 Chapter 2: Socio-economics of the ES (document reference F4.2). Other potential impacts on local amenity and indirect impacts on residents and visitors have been assessed in Volume 1, Annex 5.1: Human health of the ES (document reference F1.5.1), Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8) and Volume 3, Chapter 9: Air quality of the ES (document reference F3.9).
TA_0184_004_221123	S44	Email	We also strongly object to the suspicious lack of details that have been given. Lots of expensive glossy brochures and zero actual information. Even at the events we could get no actual information. This feels like the truth is being kept from us because you are fully aware of the disastrous effect this scheme will have on our lives. We are fully behind our MP Mark Menzies in all of his objections.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included, but not limited to, local media advertising (online and offline), social media and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information.
TA_0185_002_221123	S44	Email	There have been two meetings with the Dalcour McLaren representatives and at no point was there mention of a substation, the discussion was only as a cable corridor. I asked the direct question if a substation would be required, and the answer was a categorical "No". I was then notified on the 9th	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>October 2023 that in fact there were 2 substations planned and the preferred area would be zone 1 which has a direct impact on the farm. This suggests all of the previous information was misleading and did not declare the full information set, which has left me ill-informed and unable to declare my objections until now. This was confirmed by Dalcour McLaren representative REDACTED at the meeting on the 26th October 2023. Please note this with holding of information is indeed underhand and has allowed then time to pass through public consultation. Inside the published documentation it states that landowners and business operators have been advised and that has not been the case it is a lie and totally dishonest.</p>	<p>statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch to continue discussions and negotiations, including compensation provisions to address impacts to the farming business.</p>
TA_0187_001_221123	S44	Email	<p>We are writing on behalf of ourselves and our neighbour [REDACTED] who has asked us to express her thoughts as she is away at presentWe are all very concerned about the proposed project as it will directly impact our lives and our properties. The scale of this project we think has been totally understated and it is difficult to understand how this can suddenly, with little notice, be thrown upon us.1. From what we understand we are very worried that the installation of cables will greatly affect our properties by devaluing them not only because of the work but also the very great risk of this work causing subsidence in this area. This would inevitably not only cause structural problems but would seriously devalue our properties.2. The disruption to our lives is totally unacceptable due to the significant amount of time the installation is going to take, not only immediate to our property but locally as well.</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.The typical maximum depth of cable installation using trenching methodology is approximately 1.8m. Trenchless, drilling methodologies are to be used locally where crossings are required (e.g. beneath roads/rivers). The installation depths will generally be within shallower geological deposits rather than deep within the consolidated bedrock. The drilling methodologies to be used are designed to minimise the displacement of surrounding materials (therefore minimising instability) and do not involve the injection of significant volumes of liquid into fractured bedrock at depth under the high-pressures that are often attributed to inducing tremors. Further detail is provided in Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions (document reference F3.1) of the ES.The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens.The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).</p>
TA_0188_001_221123	S44	Email	<p>I am writing to you to raise a number of important issues and concerns that I have regarding the proposed Morecambe and Morgan offshore wind farm development.Complete disregard for the impact on our livelihoodsI would like to start by pointing out how angry, distressed and disappointed we have been with the way that the proposals have been handled so far. We own and farm a 70 acre livestock farm in Freckleton that will be directly affected by the development, as it has been earmarked as the preferred location for the Morgan onshore substation. Whilst we have been aware of the potential development since Dalcour Maclaren contacted us in 2022 regarding non-intrusive ecological surveys on our land, at no point has the building of a substation ever been mentioned to us. The first we knew about this was in September 2023 when a neighbour contacted us following a local council meeting to ask if we knew about a substation being built on our land – on the field directly opposite our house. To say that we were distressed and upset by this news was an understatement, made worse by the fact that no-one from Dalcour Maclaren had to courtesy and decency to contact us before this news was made public. Since then our lives have been turned upside down as we have had to live with the uncertainty and lack of clarity over what the development will look like, how it will affect our lives and our business, and the endless cycle of phone conversations, meetings and time that has been taken up by this. It is very difficult to do all this whilst trying to run a business and raise a family. Our family have lived here for over 30 years, and in that time we have worked hard to make the farm the successful business that it is today. Now we have no idea whether or not our family business will still be viable in the future as we cannot get any answers regarding the scale of the development and exactly where it will be located. A farming business is very much a long-term investment as decisions cannot be made overnight, and plans have to be put in place now to minimise the impact of developments that may happen in two or three years time.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.Since the statutory consultation, Dalcour Maclaren, on behalf of the Applicant have been in contact with the land interests and their appointed land agent to discuss the proposed works and siting of the substation and associated access routes. The Applicant has taken into account the feedback recieved and as requested by the interested party, changed the siting of the substation which will have significant less long term impacts on the farming business. Dalcour Maclaren will continue to engage and provide updates to the land interest as further updates and information are available.</p>
TA_0188_002_221123	S44	Email	<p>Flawed consultationThe fact that we only received detailed maps and information on the proposed sites, despite them being on our land, less than a week prior to the consultation opening feels extremely deceitful. We had our first meeting with representatives from Dalcour Maclaren, bP and</p>	<p>The Applicants notes the response. Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants have met with the interested party during and throughout the time between the close of consultation and submission to discuss the order limits</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>Flotation Energy on the 26th of October (two weeks after the consultation opened), and even at this meeting there were more questions raised than answers given. How you can expect us to respond meaningfully to a consultation on a project which will have such a huge impact on our lives without providing us with all the relevant information such as access routes, cable routes, timescales, or any compensation strikes me as being very underhand and I would question the legality of this.</p>	<p>and to account for feedback provided. The Morgan Substation access has been amended to take into account the preference to move the access away from the farm holding and residential property. The Applicant has made best endeavours to take into account feedback provided by the interested party and has provided reasoned justification if requests have not been met.</p>
TA_0189_001_221123	S44	Email	<p>I support the windfarm project but certainly not in the way it is being proposed currently, particularly the Onshore Transmission Assets. I have been identified as owning land that is to be taken for the building of the Morgan substation. I was told about this on the 9th of October 2023, three days before the consultation opened. I only information I received was a basic map showing a rough outline of the proposed substation site. It didn't give details of any access roads or cable tracks, and to this date no more information has been supplied despite repeated requests. The general public and people living close to the site have also been refused this information, and that regarding noise, light, vibration and EMR emissions and the upper limits from the sites. Neither has anything been provided to give the public an impression of the size, scale and layout of the site. It is for these reasons that I believe the consultation process is totally flawed. How is it possible to have any meaningful consultation on this when the information is being constantly refused? At the start of the process Dalcour Maclaren said they were keen to work with us but so far they have been nothing but obstructive.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024) as well as ongoing landowner liaison following route refinements (further details are outlined within the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will continue discussions and negotiations with regards to any impacts to the farming business. Whilst it is acknowledged that there will be disturbance, it is through this discussion and negotiation that Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will seek to mitigate impacts to the farming business.</p>
TA_0192_001_221123	S44	Email	<p>Further to our previous telephone calls, emails and meetings in reference to the above, I herewith set out below my client's objections and observations with regards to the substation and transmission assets which affect my client's land holding. For the avoidance of doubt, I have attached a plan identifying my client's land holding, as edged purple with the proposed Morgan substation location and compound identified. As you can see, once you have overlaid my client's land holding you will be able to understand the impact that the proposed location of the substation and the compound could have on my client's land holding. On behalf of my client we state that the information presented in the statutory consultation is very poor, misleading and generally inadequate to make any justifiable feedback therefore my client reserves the right to make further consultations as and when Morgan and Morecambe release further, more detailed specification relating to the substation which would include, but not limited to, access, Design, scale, elevations and designs, ecological mitigation, noise and working operations. My client is just not able to make any viable consultation on such limited release of information to date other than to object in the strongest terms.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents. The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor and onshore substations, Detail design of Transmission Assets will follow in due course. The assessment of the impact of increased flood risk arising from additional surface water runoff is presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase. Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. Dalcour Maclaren will continue discussions and negotiations with regards to any impacts to the farming</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				business. Whilst it is acknowledged that there will be disturbance, it is through this discussion and negotiation that Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will seek to mitigate impacts to the farming business.
TA_0193_005_221123	S44	Email	The lack of detail on the consultation maps does not allow a full consultation, it does not at this stage provide any information relating to the working practicalities. The depth of the cable, drainage, reinstatement has all been void in terms of information provided and therefore reserve the right to make further consultations. My clients also own land to the [REDACTED], circled on the attached plan. My client will reserve the right to make representations within this area in due course.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The design of the Transmission Assets is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Detail design of Transmission Assets will follow in due course. Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business.
TA_0194_004_221123	S44	Email	In general, the cable route is objected to in the strongest terms. The route has been poorly researched with the lack of communication and ability for landowners to communicate their concerns and practical issues in relation to the proposed route. Our clients reserve the right for further representations when more detailed modelling occurs. Given the lack of detailed modelling and information within the Statutory Consultation, our clients have questioned the validity of the consultation. I trust that you will acknowledge receipt for the Statutory Consultation within the appropriate timeframes.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business and practical elements of the construction.
TA_0196_001_221123	S44	Email	I would like to use the opportunity during this public consultation period, to unequivocally Object to your proposals and express my concerns over the proposed off shore Wind Farm cable routing and sub station locations within the fylde coast. I believe this would have a grossly negative impact on the Environment both physically, via the works proposed and Visually, damaging an untold amount of wildlife habitat and green belt protected land, conservation area's, highly productive farmland and have a hugely detrimental impact on the wider community and local economy, putting local business, land owners and Farmers out of business. I believe it would create an untold amount of suffering for residents within the fylde coast for years to come via flooding and disruption ie traffic. Your lack of detail on some of the proposed cable routes and sub stations at this late stage and at this public consultation point in proceedings, is highly worrying as this shows either an unprofessional approach to the matter, or highly unprepared, or at worst, both. It is most concerning that at this late stage we are asked to submit our opinions on a body of work that is neither complete nor suggest the possible outcomes thereafter the point of consultation. I feel that you have shown disregard to the community of the fylde coast in your methods up to now. This lack of transparency on your part, sets a	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			precedent when approaching future issues and has created a level of mistrust that is beyond repair. This is another reason why I must whole heartedly Object on all parts of your proposals.	impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0197_001_221123	S44	Email	I am writing to disapprove of the planned sub-stations in Zone 1. The decisions were illegally predetermined, making the consultation process flawed, and the reasons are false and inaccurate. I strongly oppose the development in this area. No detailed maps or models were made available to the public but were made available to land owners before the statutory consultation. All parties should legally have the same information, making the statutory consultation flawed.	Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level of detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.
TA_0197_002_221123	S44	Email	Our local MP has been 'hoodwinked' over time, being drip-fed information and intentionally misled.	Throughout the development of the Transmission Assets, the Applicants have aimed to be open and transparent with all stakeholders, including Mark Menzies as the MP for the constituency at the time. Please see section 3 of the Consultation report (document reference E1) for information on the early engagement undertaken by the Applicants from Spring/summer 2021 in regards to the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Mona Offshore Wind Project, which included notifying Mark Menzies MP; a member of his team attended the consultation event at Lytham Assembly Rooms on 21 November 2022. A subsequent meeting took place with Mr Menzies on 18 December 2022. Section 3 of the Consultation report also provides details on follow up meetings with elected representatives, including Mark Menzies MP, between 2022 and 2023. A further meeting with a representative of Mr Menzies' office took place on 1 March 2023 which was subsequently followed up with an email update on 28 March 2023. As a section 47 consultee, Mark Menzies MP received notification of the launch of statutory consultation and also attended stakeholders briefings in September and October 2023. See section 4 of the Consultation report for further details.
TA_0197_006_221123	S44	Email	People invest their money to live in a semi-rural environment for mental health and wellbeing. This development promises to devalue their assets and destroy their chosen quality of life. There are alternative options laid out by the initial studies and FBCs plans, which should be reconsidered and different decisions made.	An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the WorldHealth Organisation definition of

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing. Any effects are assessed to be not significant and appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards. The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0197_010_221123	S44	Email	<p>BP is bullying through these decisions, seemingly with the backing of decision-makers already in the bag. This process is a sham, and I oppose the development for all the above reasons, including BP's obnoxious approach, assuming it can do whatever it wants with the Fylde's communities and landscape. I have also copied in our local MP, the Secretary of State, and our Prime Minister. I am also writing a letter to HRH King Charles, who recently awarded Friends of Newton Community Park (FoNCP) The King's Award for Voluntary Service. I'm sure His Royal Highness would oppose the community he awarded this prestigious honour to, having that community put at risk and all that great work he recognises being dismissed by BP for profits. Also, I have copied in the new Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, who was appointed on the 13th of November; REDACTED would no doubt have an interest in such destruction of what he has been tasked with protecting especially as he was born in Lytham St. Annes, whose tourism and businesses will be massively affected.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents. The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included, but not limited to, local media advertising (online and offline), social media and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers. The EIA methodology is set out within Volume 1, Chapter 5: Environmental assessment methodology of the ES. The chapter describes how significance of effects has been assessed. Professional judgement is used to define the magnitude of impact and receptor sensitivity. The matrix is then used, together with professional judgement, to evaluate the significance of effect. The significance may be one, or a range of, no change, negligible, minor, moderate or major. In general, a significance of effect of moderate or greater is considered 'significant' in EIA terms. For each topic chapter, what is considered 'significant' has been clearly defined. Where further mitigation is not possible a residual significant effect may remain. Within the assessment chapters the justification for determining the significance of effect is described. Where a range is given, the assessment chapter details the reason for the significance that has been concluded.</p>
TA_0198_001_221123	S44	Email	<p>I would like to use the opportunity during this public consultation period, to unequivocally Object to your proposals and express my concerns over the proposed off shore Wind Farm cable routing and sub station locations within the fylde coast. I believe this would have a grossly negative impact on the Environment both physically, via the works proposed and Visually, damaging an untold amount of wildlife habitat and green belt protected land, conservation area's, highly productive farmland and have a hugely detrimental impact on the wider community and local economy, putting local business, land owners and Farmers out of business. I believe it would create an untold amount of suffering for residents within the fylde coast for years to come via flooding and disruption ie traffic. Your lack of detail on some of the proposed cable routes and sub stations at this late stage and at this public</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>consultation point in proceedings, is highly worrying as this shows either an unprofessional approach to the matter, or highly unprepared, or at worst, both. It is most concerning that at this late stage we are asked to submit our opinions on a body of work that is neither complete nor suggest the possible outcomes thereafter the point of consultation. I feel that you have shown disregard to the community of the fylde coast in your methods up to now. This lack of transparency on your part, sets a precedent when approaching future issues and has created a level of mistrust that is beyond repair. This is another reason why I must whole heartedly Object on all parts of your proposals.</p>	<p>stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0200_007_221123	S44	Email	<p>How and by whom, any agreed mitigation would be enforced Consultation reqd for Individual Communities (Freckleton) stating how the locals of Freckleton would be affected</p>	<p>Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Any mitigation measures put in place would be a condition of the Development Consent Order if granted.</p>
TA_0200_012_221123	S44	Email	<p>Lack of transparency in documentation - On line documentation is vast & Overwhelming many Local points of interest are buried within these volumes.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR.
TA_0200_013_221123	S44	Email	Changing the Character of the Village from Rural to Industrial - Affecting Property Prices, any compensation packages due to property been de valued.	The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.
TA_0201_001_221123	S44	Email	We have been to the Consultation Meetings and quite frankly, the situation is disgraceful and we are no wiser. There are no mock photographs to give any indication of the scale of the operation or any idea what the finished substations will look like, and therefore how do you expect constructive feedback for something so vague. We have requested this information to no avail.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. Wireline visualisations were made available at statutory consultation, showing the maximum parameters from various viewpoints. Visualisations are presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage.
TA_0201_002_221123	S44	Email	Our personal situation is with regard to the devaluation of our house if option 2 is chosen, and again no information can be given at present so we are all in limbo. Our house will be opposite the substation and all the building work, and our main objections are the proximity to our house	The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.
TA_0201_006_221123	S44	Email	We don't even know if we will receive any compensation for the devaluation of our property so we can escape the ensuing nightmare.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0202_001_221123	S44	Email	<p>REDACTED</p> <p>Dear Sirs The photos are of recent accidents and floods this year. The video contains footage regarding the state of all minor roads I have attended your consultation meetings, and may I firstly say we support green energy whether it be wind farm or solar, but this scheme coming on shore in the Fylde Basin is absolutely ludicrous in this area and I believe you do not understand the type of land or infrastructure you are dealing with. In other words, I am not for this proposal at all. Myself I am a farmer's wife who farms with my husband and son. I also care for my husband with severe Multiple Sclerosis and is wheelchair bound, though he still has his wits about him. I have been on various meetings and flooding groups relating to serious flooding issues since 2013 and most folk relating to these matters know who I am. I am currently on a working group with Fylde Borough Council because of my local knowledge of flood and land issues. I have held various meetings with the MP's due to my position with the National Farmers Union as REDACTED and I am a member of the local community within Fylde, Ballam and the surrounding areas of Lytham and Fylde both rural and urban. Our Farm We have a 270-acre farm with a head of 240 cattle at one time and rear beef for Morrisons. We also have planning with Sonnidex for a solar farm taking up 70 acres of our land so we thought would be future proofing our income because we are losing the basic payment income from the Rural Payments agency because we have left Europe. This would give us 200 acres left for cattle grazing making silage, growing cereals to feed our cattle and meet the demands of traceability with feeding the cattle. We need these 200 acres to survive otherwise we cannot farm. We also winter sheep and grow Nordmann Fir Christmas Trees which have a variety of sizes in the ground, and we have just replanted one main area related to this project. The tree sector is a mainstream income for our farm as we have developed this good liaison with the area over the last 20 years and this project will affect our business and cause severe disruption. Points to raise. Options The options for the cable route are daft. Why not take it down the far side of River Ribble to Penwortham causing less disruption and build the substations at Penwortham. Secondly it could go straight across to Heysham where there is a corridor with out any SSSI attached to it. Lack of communication and clarity. We first had the letter of the surveys saying that you would give us £250 per survey and if we did not agree it read that you would still come on the land anyway. This is uncourteous and appalling type of behaviour and shows us just what we are dealing with. The pretty literature and displays from your consultation meetings do not clarify exactly where the cable route, land and accesses are going to be, or the impact on the road systems in the area, so what is going to happen is polished over. That is not good enough. Seeing that the route and compounds may be using this farmland to go through we are totally dismayed that nobody has been to see us yet regarding any of this and demand that somebody who knows what they are talking about visit our farm. Tomorrow's generation of farmers My son is 29 years of age and has vested his future in agriculture and is very passionate about land issues and how we move forward. Since joining us he must be fully commended for making the farm profitable during the days of my husband's illness. He works on his own on the farm with the help of contract labour when required and contractors. In this area there are several young men who are succeeding in agriculture and wishing to carry on with their young families. It is lovely to see, and everyone helps each other out. He has re-drained a lot of the farm himself by hiring a draining machine and sorting out some of the fields that were flooded. Where he has done this operation, it has been successful for our purposes. Your proposals would ruin every drain we have and displace the water table and flood the rest of the fields we have. This would also cause mental health issues for this young rural community. Land Issues and water table infrastructure</p>	<p>The Applicants note your response and through Dalcour Maclaren will be in touch with interests and their appointed agents to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business and practical elements of the construction. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0203_001_231123	S44	Email	To whom it may concern, Morecambe and Morgan regarding the Wind Farm Consultation. I am writing to disapprove of the planned sub-stations in Zone 1. The decisions were illegally predetermined, making the consultation process flawed, and the reasons are false and inaccurate. I strongly oppose the development in this area. No detailed maps or models were made available to the public but were made available to land owners before the statutory consultation. All parties should legally have the same information, making the statutory consultation flawed. .	Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level of detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.
TA_0203_002_231123	S44	Email	Our local MP has been 'hoodwinked' over time, being drip-fed information and intentionally misled.	Throughout the development of the Transmission Assets, the Applicants have aimed to be open and transparent with all stakeholders, including Mark Menzies as the MP for the constituency at the time. Please see section 3 of the Consultation report (document reference E1) for information on the early engagement undertaken by the Applicants from Spring/summer 2021 in regards to the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Mona Offshore Wind Project, which included notifying Mark Menzies MP; a member of his team attended the consultation event at Lytham Assembly Rooms on 21 November 2022. A subsequent meeting took place with Mr Menzies on 18 December 2022. Section 3 of the Consultation report also provides details on follow up meetings with elected representatives, including Mark Menzies MP, between 2022 and 2023. A further meeting with a representative of Mr Menzies' office took place on 1 March 2023 which was subsequently followed up with an email update on 28 March 2023. As a section 47 consultee, Mark Menzies MP received notification of the launch of statutory consultation and also attended stakeholders briefings in September and October 2023. See section 4 of the Consultation report for further details.
TA_0203_006_231123	S44	Email	People invest their money to live in a semi-rural environment for mental health and wellbeing. This development promises to devalue their assets and destroy their chosen quality of life. There are alternative options laid out by the initial studies and FBCs plans, which should be reconsidered and different decisions made.	An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the WorldHealth Organisation definition of health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing. Any effects are assessed to be not significant and appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards. The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0203_010_231123	S44	Email	BP is bullying through these decisions, seemingly with the backing of decision-makers already in the bag. This process is a sham, and I oppose the development for all the above reasons, including BP's obnoxious approach, assuming it can do whatever it wants with the Fylde's communities and landscape	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024) as well as ongoing landowner liaison following route refinements (further details are outlined within the Consultation Report

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>(document reference E1).In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information.Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents.The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included, but not limited to, local media advertising (online and offline), social media and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers.The EIA methodology is set out within Volume 1, Chapter 5: Environmental assessment methodology of the ES. The chapter describes how significance of effects has been assessed. Professional judgement is used to define the magnitude of impact and receptor sensitivity. The matrix is then used, together with professional judgement, to evaluate the significance of effect. The significance may be one, or a range of, no change, negligible, minor, moderate or major. In general, a significance of effect of moderate or greater is considered 'significant' in EIA terms. For each topic chapter, what is considered 'significant' has been clearly defined. Where further mitigation is not possible a residual significant effect may remain.Within the assessment chapters the justification for determining the significance of effect is described. Where a range is given, the assessment chapter details the reason for the significance that has been concluded.</p>
TA_0204_001_231123	S44	Email	<p>I am writing to disapprove of the planned sub-stations in Zone 1. The decisions were illegally predetermined, making the consultation process flawed, and the reasons are false and inaccurate. I strongly oppose the development in this area.No detailed maps or models were made available to the public but were made available to land owners before the statutory consultation. All parties should legally have the same information, making the statutory consultation flawed. .</p>	<p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.</p>
TA_0204_002_231123	S44	Email	<p>Our local MP has been 'hoodwinked' over time, being drip-fed information and intentionally misled.</p>	<p>Throughout the development of the Transmission Assets, the Applicants have aimed to be open and transparent with all stakeholders, including Mark Menzies as the MP for the constituency at the time. Please see section 3 of the Consultation report (document reference E1) for information on the early engagement undertaken by the Applicants from Spring/summer 2021 in regards to the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Mona Offshore Wind Project, which included notifying Mark Menzies MP; a member of his team attended the consultation event at Lytham Assembly Rooms on 21 November 2022. A subsequent meeting took place with Mr Menzies on 18 December 2022. Section 3 of the Consultation report also provides details on follow up meetings with elected representatives, including Mark Menzies MP, between 2022 and 2023. A further meeting with a representative of Mr Menzies' office took place on 1 March 2023 which was subsequently followed up with an email update on 28 March 2023. As a section 47 consultee, Mark Menzies MP received notification of the launch of statutory consultation and also attended stakeholders briefings in September and October 2023. See section 4 of the Consultation report for further details.</p>
TA_0204_006_231123	S44	Email	<p>People invest their money to live in a semi-rural environment for mental health and wellbeing. This development promises to devalue their assets and destroy their chosen quality of life.</p>	<p>An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the WorldHealth Organisation definition of health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing. Any effects are assessed to be not significant and appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards. The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0204_0010_231123	S44	Email	<p>BP is bullying through these decisions, seemingly with the backing of decision-makers already in the bag. This process is a sham, and I oppose the development for all the above reasons, including BP's obnoxious approach, assuming it can do whatever it wants with the Fylde's communities and landscapelt's a definite no from me!</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents. The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included, but not limited to, local media advertising (online and offline), social media and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers. The EIA methodology is set out within Volume 1, Chapter 5: Environmental assessment methodology of the ES. The chapter describes how significance of effects has been assessed. Professional judgement is used to define the magnitude of impact and receptor sensitivity. The matrix is then used, together with professional judgement, to evaluate the significance of effect. The significance may be one, or a range of, no change, negligible, minor, moderate or major. In general, a significance of effect of moderate or greater is considered 'significant' in EIA terms. For each topic chapter, what is considered 'significant' has been clearly defined. Where further mitigation is not possible a residual significant effect may remain. Within the assessment chapters the justification for determining the significance of effect is described. Where a range is given, the assessment chapter details the reason for the significance that has been concluded.</p>
TA_0205_001_231123	S44	Email	<p>I am writing to you on behalf of the above-named client to make formal representation in relation to the proposed offshore wind farm, which proposes to transport electricity to the National Grid power station at Penwortham. As part of the consultation map, a large proportion of land, 10 hectares (25 acres) from REDACTED's farm has been allocated for biodiversity net gain. Approximately 4.20 hectares (10.37 acres) or thereabouts is designated under REDACTED allocation on your proposed</p>	<p>Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>workplans and an additional 5.70 hectares (14.08 acres) or thereabouts has been allocated in the REDACTED allocation. We require confirmation as to what these allocations are. This scheme poses a significant risk to the viability of the farming operation. It involves the best and most versatile agricultural land. The landowners' cattle and sheep graze/are fed from the land, every blade of grass matters. The land is designated as Grades 2 and 3 on the Agricultural Land Classification Map for England. Additional land is rented and additional fodder is already purchased in as there is not sufficient acreage to meet feed requirements. This will lead to an even greater requirement at greater expense to the business. The total owned landholding extends to 52.42 hectares (129.52 acres) or thereabouts, the loss of land represents a loss of 20% of the total farm holding for an extended period of time, whether that be temporary or permanent in nature. Agricultural Enterprise: The farming enterprise is a mixed dairy and youngstock farm. Current numbers on the farm areas follows: - Dairy Cows - 400 - Other cattle / calves - 200-250 - Sheep - 300-400 As stated above, the landowner has a number of major concerns with the project, namely: - The land being taken is some of the best and most versatile land (grade 2 and grade 3) on the holding but also more widely in Lancashire and around the country. Alternative land is not possible to come by in the locality and will not serve the holding as this land does, with it being adjacent to the farmyard. Alternative land will need to be sourced. - Slurry Regulations - in the very near future, the legal requirement of all farms on slurry-based systems will be to have 6 months storage. The land forming part of the scheme provides an extremely valuable outlet for slurry. The loss of this land will be very detrimental to slurry storage requirements on the holding, as the landowner loses the ability to spread on this land, leading to greater volume in the store all year round. The proposed biodiversity designation will see restrictions on spreading of slurry and farmyard manure. A major concern for a well-stocked farm. - Loss of vital mowing and grazing land - the remainder of the land within the biodiversity allocation is used for silage production and/or cattle/sheep grazing. Absolutely vital to the farming business. - Additional feed requirements - as a result of losing land, the landowner will be required to purchase additional fodder and bedding, the cows will have to be supplementary fed. - There are some concerns over the existing agri-environmental scheme located on the land. There is an existing Countryside Stewardship agreement, which incorporates capital items such as fencing and hedging. The landowner has incurred costs in instructing a land agent to prepare and submit the application. There are concerns in being able to manage the hedgerows as agreed with the Rural Payments Agency and therefore likely to incur payment reductions. Potential loss of BPS. - Reinstatement - what does the allocation entail, will it impact fencing, hedging and drainage? It will require full and proper reinstatement. The landowner has major concerns around the disturbance of existing land drains, the problem only likely to become apparent months after the scheme is complete. - How will this 'biodiverse' land be managed? - Impact on land value - How can the business plan / further investments be implemented with so much uncertainty? - The landowner is adamant that no access is to be taken through the farmyard. This would cause major disturbance/intrusion on the farming enterprise. - Biosecurity - the developers' use of contractors is considered a risk to biosecurity. People, machinery and materials will be brought on site, adding a significant risk to biosecurity and potential contamination risks. - Future access - how and when will access be taken onto the land in the future. What will the landowner be left with? How will the land be managed? - Severance - the impact of the land taken being severed to that of the remainder of farm land holding. - Injurious affection - significant concerns of the land lost impact on the remaining value of the holding. Significant diminution in value as a result of the scheme. - The impact of the land being taken would have catastrophic effects on the business and livelihood - future farming generations will also suffer. We also wish to know further information in relation to on what basis the land will be acquired for the purposes of the scheme.</p>	<p>carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP). The Applicants through Dalcour Maclaren and appointed drainage specialists will engage with landowners regarding pre-construction and post-construction drainage, tying into existing infrastructure where possible. The Outline CoCP and outline surface water and groundwater management plan (document reference J1.9) includes measures in relation to drainage. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0205_002_231123	S44	Email	<p>Land Affected: REDACTED I am writing to you on behalf of the above-named client to make formal representation in relation to the proposed offshore wind farm, which proposes to transport electricity to the National Grid power station at Penwortham. As part of the consultation map, a large proportion of land, 10 hectares (25 acres) from REDACTED farm has been allocated for biodiversity net gain. Approximately 4.20 hectares (10.37 acres) or thereabouts is designated under REDACTED allocation on your proposed workplans and an additional 5.70 hectares (14.08 acres) or thereabouts has been allocated in the REDACTED allocation. We require confirmation as to what these allocations are. This scheme poses a significant risk to the viability of the farming operation. It involves the best and most versatile agricultural land. The landowners' cattle and sheep graze/are fed from the land, every blade of grass matters. The land is designated as Grades 2 and 3 on the Agricultural Land Classification Map for England. Additional land is rented and additional fodder is already purchased in as there is</p>	<p>Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>not sufficient acreage to meet feed requirements. This will lead to an even greater requirement at greater expense to the business. The total owned landholding extends to 52.42 hectares (129.52 acres) or thereabouts, the loss of land represents a loss of 20% of the total farm holding for an extended period of time, whether that be temporary or permanent in nature. Agricultural Enterprise: The farming enterprise is a mixed dairy and youngstock farm. Current numbers on the farm areas follows:- Dairy Cows - 400- Other cattle / calves – 200-250- Sheep – 300-400 As stated above, the landowner has a number of major concerns with the project, namely:- The land being taken is some of the best and most versatile land (grade 2 and grade 3) on the holding but also more widely in Lancashire and around the country. Alternative land nigh on impossible to come by in the locality and will not serve the holding as this land does, with it being adjacent to the farmyard. Alternative land will need to be sourced.- Slurry Regulations – in the very near future, the legal requirement of all farms on slurry based systems will be to have 6 months storage. The land forming part of the scheme provides an extremely valuable outlet for slurry. The loss of this land will be very detrimental to slurry storage requirements on the holding, as the landowner loses the ability to spread on this land, leading to greater volume in the store all year round. The proposed biodiversity designation will see restrictions on spreading of slurry and farmyard manure. A major concern for a well-stocked farm.- Loss of vital mowing and grazing land – the remainder of the land within the biodiversity allocation is used for silage production and/or cattle/sheep grazing. Absolutely vital to the farming business.- Additional feed requirements – as a result of losing land, the landowner will be required to purchase additional fodder and bedding, the cows will have to be supplementary fed.- There are some concerns over the existing agri-environmental scheme located on the land. There is an existing Countryside Stewardship agreement, which incorporates capital items such as fencing and hedging. The landowner has incurred costs in instructing a land agent to prepare and submit the application. There are concerns in being able to manage the hedgerows as agreed with the Rural Payments Agency and therefore likely to incur payment reductions. Potential loss of BPS.- Reinstatement – what does the allocation entail, will it impact fencing, hedging and drainage? It will require full and proper reinstatement. The landowner has major concerns around the disturbance of existing land drains, the problem only likely to become apparent months after the scheme is complete.- How will this 'biodiverse' land be managed?- Impact on land value- How can the business plan / further investments be implemented with so much uncertainty?- The landowner is adamant that no access is to be taken through the farmyard. This would cause major disturbance/intrusion on the farming enterprise.- Biosecurity – the developers use of contractors is considered a risk to biosecurity. People, machinery and materials will be brought on site, adding a significant risk to biosecurity and potential contamination risks.- Future access – how and when will access be taken onto the land in the future. What will the landowner be left with? How will the land be managed?- Severance – the impact of the land taken being severed to that of the remainder of farm land holding.- Injurious affection – significant concerns of the land lost impact on the remaining value of the holding. Significant diminution in value as a result of the scheme.- The impact of the land being taken would have catastrophic effects on the business and livelihood – future farming generations will also suffer. We also wish to know further information in relation to on what basis the land will be acquired for the purposes of the scheme.</p>	<p>environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0206_001_231123	S44	Email	<p>Thank you for your correspondence. At the consultation event at Newton what was discussed with your engineering and consents colleagues was that : none of the issues given in the programme documentation set as the reasons for not continuing the tidal route to a land fall adjacent to the National Grid specified connect point at Penwortham, were insurmountable with appropriate best practice. They agreed. Your colleagues also indicated that this would be the preferable route - if a Heysham connection was not available - rather than a land route across the Fylde. They also seemed to be of the view, in line with the documentation set, that regulatory authorities had not been engaged to determine what it would take to obtain permission to extend the tidal cable route with a landfall at Penwortham, nor to secure converter substation sites on land already allocated by Local Planning Authorities for industrial uses such as those converter substations. I provided further information, which I include references to below. They agreed to find that out and reply to me. I undertook then to discuss this with government representatives to determine how that should be used to engage & influence those authorities in coordination with the Morgan & Morecambe (M&M) developers to deliver a less impactful and more efficient development options for assessment. Obviously your reply has not yet addressed that. Indeed, your reply seems to allude to a greater level of disruption and adverse impact to the environment not declared for the sea and land borne routes that are being proposed. How are the impacts being mitigated in the approach you are</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The Electricity System Operator (ESO) is responsible for planning and operation of the transmission system and ensuring the balance of electricity generation with electricity demand. The Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm were scoped into the Pathway to 2030 workstream of the UK Government's Offshore Transmission Network Review (OTNR). As part of the OTNR, the ESO assessed options to improve the coordination of offshore wind farm connections and associated transmission networks. In July 2022, the UK Government published the Pathway to 2030 Holistic Network Design (HNDR) Report which set out the results of the OTNR. A key output of the HNDR process was the recommendation that the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm should work collaboratively in connecting the two offshore wind farms to the National Grid</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>proposing? You have a significant programme that could endure the rest of this century, beyond most of our lifetimes, so it is important that the best practice approach is adopted from the outset. If you could provide a full, first time complete reply that would be very much appreciated. I have copied in Parish, District and County Council representatives. I will seek their advice as to where else we should share these ideas. In that way representations can be made to local and national regulators, including government, to jointly develop lower impact and more effective solutions in delivering offshore wind generated energy to the National Grid specified connection at Penwortham. I look forward to hearing from you.</p>	<p>electricity transmission network at Penwortham in Lancashire. The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological designations protected by national and international legislation. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt Estuary Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in extremely long construction timeframes and risk extensive, and potentially long-term damage to sensitive and protected habitats that support smelt and protected bird species, whilst also presenting unsafe working conditions during construction. The approach to site selection has been based on avoiding damage to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).</p>
TA_0206_005_231123	S44	Email	<p>5. A possible set of risk mitigations in response to the issues given as reasons not to adopt and consistently assess routes across and along the littoral coastal zones might include: the developers will access global best practice for cable laying in tidal & environmentally protected estuaries; secure one or more appropriately sized cable laying vessels & world-class delivery organisation for this type of work; and establish a safe way of working for all staff and involved stakeholders. This will be agreed with the applicable regulatory bodies. This can then be taken into the option assessment.</p>	<p>The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented. Direct pipe or microtunnelling is proposed beneath the River Ribble to ensure that there would be no direct impacts on the river habitats. As set out in Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3), Crossing techniques are set out within Volume 1, Annex 3.2: Onshore Crossing Schedule of the ES (document reference F1.3.2) which is submitted as part of the application for development consent. Further information on the proposed approach to construction is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES.</p>
TA_0207_003_231123	S44	Email	<p>4. On the land in question we are at an advanced stage of talks with respect to an Option Agreement for a Battery Electricity Storage Scheme. The construction of the Morecambe and Morgan cable routes may well impinge upon the area which is required for this scheme and reduce the availability of land for the same. The financial effects of this will be quite severe and are likely to lead to a substantial compensation claim in respect of the same.</p>	<p>Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business and holding. The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code.</p>
TA_0207_006_231123	S44	Email	<p>• The building in the north western corner of Parcel Number REDACTED is the subject of an imminent Case Q application for conversion to residential dwelling and the likely impact of the scheme particularly during the construction phase will affect the ability of the owners to build out and ultimately if needed market the property once converted. • The Landowners recently began the groundworks on an expansion programme of the business (REDACTED). Although the land for this project is on a parcel of land on the north side of division lane, just falling outside the boundary of interest to the project, they have obtained planning consent for a 31m x 15m steel portal frame barn with 10 no. internal stables and additional storage for hay and straw. The plan moving forward is to complete the works in the upcoming months ahead, as mentioned earlier all relevant ground works are complete and ready for the erection of the building. The proposed northern cable route would call into question the viability of these plans where works have already begun to be built. They have highlighted land on parcel number REDACTED to help sustain this operation by way of additional grazing, hay and haylage production and removal and spreading of manure. This is of great concern to the integrity and sustainability of the business moving forward. • REDACTED provides an alternative education provision for 6 - 25 year old young people and has operated from REDACTED since 2015. The provision is called Changing Lives Through Horses and is run in conjunction with our National Governing Body, the British Horse Society. Over the last 9 years the provision has</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES. Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1). These measures seek to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings and businesses. Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			accepted referrals from local services and schools including Blackpool Council and Lancashire County Council, with great success and results for participants. My clients are concerned that in view of the cable route affecting the riding school these valuable services could be jeopardised as this provision is inextricably linked to REDACTED.	Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business.
TA_0209_001_231123	S44	Email	I have tried to attend a couple of your consultation meetings but was unable to speak to anyone due to the volume of people attending. I am a landowner with hard standing and land of approx 20 acres, situated Freckleton/Newton area. I would like to enquire if this would be of interest to you in your work?	The Applicant notes your response. The site selection process that has taken place to date has meant that the land is not current identified within the order limits. Transmission Asset routing can be found within the Works Plans - Onshore and Offshore (document reference B7) and Works Plans - Onshore (document reference B8) and the Land Plans (document reference B10).
TA_0211_003_231123	S44	Email	8 I am concerned about the biosecurity of our livestock considering their will be a vast number of contractor vehicles coming and going from our farmland. Experience has shown that contractors can leave gates open- gates are an integral part of keeping different groups of livestock separately and protecting animals from straying unseen onto the highway with all the obvious health and safety risks to the general public. How will you ensure that gates remain as they are left by us?	Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).
TA_0214_001_231123	s44	Email	Overall, I object to the entire development until such time as residents are provided with clear detailed information about the impact. We have not been given this in the course of the consultation and so any decisions based on our responses will be flawed in terms of to what extent they are supported by those directly affected.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR.
TA_0215_001_231123	S44	Email	I am writing this email as the Director/Proprietor of REDACTED, based on Marton Moss. Also user/owner of some of the land proposed to be affected by the cable route and surrounding bridle paths. If the route chosen includes my land on REDACTED, it would have a catastrophic and ruinous effect on my business. Therefore I am taking the opportunity during this public consultation period, to unequivocally Object to your proposals and express my concerns over the proposed off shore Wind Farm cable routing and sub station locations within the fylde coast. I believe this would have a grossly negative impact on the Environment both physically, via the works proposed and Visually, damaging an untold amount of wildlife habitat and green belt protected land, conservation area's, highly productive farmland and have a hugely detrimental impact on the wider community and local economy, putting local business, land owners and Farmers out of business. I believe it would create an untold amount of suffering for residents within the fylde coast for years to come via flooding and disruption ie traffic. Your lack of detail on some of the proposed cable routes and sub stations at this late stage and at this public consultation point in proceedings, is highly worrying as this shows either an unprofessional approach to the matter, or highly unprepared, or at worst, both. It is very concerning that at this late stage we are asked to submit our opinions on a body of work that is	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024) as well as ongoing landowner liaison following route refinements (further details are outlined within the Consultation Report (document reference E1)). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>neither complete nor suggest the possible outcomes thereafter the point of consultation. I feel that you have shown disregard to the community of the fylde coast in your methods up to now. This lack of transparency on your part, sets a precedent when approaching future issues and has created a level of mistrust that is beyond repair. This is another reason why I must whole heartedly Object on all parts of your proposals.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0216_001_231123	S44	Email	<p>Having attended the consultation on 3 November at St annes cricket club and reviewed the documents provided, I would like to use the opportunity during this public consultation period, to unequivocally Object to your proposals and express my concerns over the proposed off shore Wind Farm cable routing and sub station locations within the fylde coast. I believe this would have a grossly negative impact on the Environment both physically, via the works proposed and Visually, damaging an untold amount of wildlife habitat and green belt protected land, conservation area's, highly productive farmland and have a hugely detrimental impact on the wider community and local economy, putting local business, land owners and Farmers out of business. I believe it would create an untold amount of suffering for residents within the fylde coast for years to come via flooding and disruption ie traffic. Your lack of detail on some of the proposed cable routes and sub stations at this late stage and at this public consultation point in proceedings, is highly worrying as this shows either an unprofessional approach to the matter, or highly unprepared, or at worst, both. It is most concerning that at this late stage we are asked to submit our opinions on a body of work that is neither complete nor suggest the possible outcomes thereafter the point of consultation. I feel that you have shown disregard to the community of the fylde coast in your methods up to now. This lack of transparency on your part, sets a precedent when approaching future issues and has created a level of mistrust that is beyond repair. This is another reason why I must whole heartedly Object on all parts of your proposals.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0221_005_231123	S44	Email	5, misleading information i think Dalcour Maclaren have glossed over a lot of important facts, in the delivery of this consultation. And it is left to the individual's to delve into volumes of 'pier documents, which are not written in layman's terms and get you bogged down in facts . i still don't think the general public have much idea about this project and its impact on the area and economy.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024) as well as ongoing landowner liaison following route refinements (further details are outlined within the Consultation Report (document reference E1).. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0222_001_231123	S44	Email	Our clients are farmers, with land within the proposed "400Kv grid connection cable corridor search area". Due to the potential impact on their land, our clients have instructed REDACTED to make initial submissions to the statutory consultation in respect of the following questions, numbered as per the consultation feedback form:Question 3Lack of Information:Our clients hold land at Clifton within the 400Kv grid connection cable corridor search area, and to date, our client have not had any direct engagement from Morecambe & Morgan regarding the proposed routing in this area, and therefore the potential impact upon their land. As such, it is difficult for our clients to make any definitive comment, as the potential impact on their business is unknown. Due to the undefined route of the proposed cable in the area of the 400Kv grid connection cable corridor search area, it is considered that this consultation is premature, and denies our clients the opportunity to make proper representations.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0222_002_231123	S44	Email	General Disturbance:It is not possible for our clients to provide constructive comments or feedback on the onshore proposals, as we do not know if, or how, it may impact them. There are no plans of the route, or proposed timing for works in the region of our clients' land. It is understood that more route information may be available than has been released to the public, and should this be the case, it is suggested that such should be provided at the earliest opportunity, and our clients provided with another opportunity to comment ahead of any DCO application being finalised.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0222_007_231123	S44	Email	<p>Question 4.5 It is our clients' view that, if they are to proceed, the Morecambe & Morgan schemes must be conjoined, collaboratively designed, and delivered as on single scheme, to minimize the potential impact on landowners, farmers, and the wider public in the vicinity.</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0222_008_231123	S44	Email	<p>Question 6 It is not possible to provide any specific comments in the respect of proposed compound areas, or temporary and permanent access areas, in the vicinity of our clients' property, as none are defined within the 400Kv grid connection cable corridor search area. The decision to proceed with this consultation, ahead of the route being defined within the 400Kv grid connection cable corridor search area, has denied our clients the opportunity to properly consider the proposals, and contribute fully to this consultation. It is again suggested that the proposed route in this area should be made available, and a further round of consultation undertaken ahead of any draft DCO being finalised.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0222_009_231123	S44	Email	Question 11 Given the lack of any definitive information regarding the proposed location of the grid connection, it is difficult for our clients to make any definitive comment in this respect. We would further draw your attention to the comments made above, that the proposed route of the grid connection should be defines, and further consultation undertaken once this has been provided. Notwithstanding the above, it is considered that care should be taken in planning the grid connection, to cause as little disturbance to, and permanent loss of, agricultural land, as is possible in the delivery of the scheme.	The Electricity System Operator (ESO) is responsible for planning and operation of the transmission system and ensuring the balance of electricity generation with electricity demand. The Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm were scoped into the Pathway to 2030 workstream of the UK Government's Offshore Transmission Network Review (OTNR). As part of the OTNR, the ESO assessed options to improve the coordination of offshore wind farm connections and associated transmission networks. In July 2022, the UK Government published the Pathway to 2030 Holistic Network Design (HNDR) Report which set out the results of the OTNR. A key output of the HNDR process was the recommendation that the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm should work collaboratively in connecting the two offshore wind farms to the National Grid electricity transmission network at Penwortham in Lancashire. Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)
TA_0222_013_231123	S44	Email	Question 16 We would ask that you take into account our clients' comments when considering the next stage of the Morecambe & Morgan schemes in the formulation of the DCO application. We would urge the Morecambe & Morgan schemes to undertake further specific engagement with landowners, and would welcome opportunities to make further representations in respect of the draft DCO with better information available.	The Applicants notes your response. We are committed to working Landowners that are impacted by the project. Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicant will continue to engage with land interests and their agent regarding the land rights being sought for Project and to continue discussions on how disruption on farming practices can be minimised.
TA_0222_014_231123	S44	Email	Our clients are the developers of REDCATED, a residential development scheme of 1,150 dwellings, and associated school, nature park and farmland conservation area, parts of which are included in the scheme. REDACTED are instructed to make initial submissions to the statutory consultation in respect of the following questions numbered as per the consultation feedback form: Question 3 Information As landowners and developers with land potentially impacted by the scheme, our clients have only had the information available within the public domain to consider provided as to the potential impact on their property and development. Insufficient information has been provided to properly assess the impact of the proposed project on their property, development and the undertakings which they have given to support this. It is therefore difficult to make definitive comment as to the impact on our client and the true effect of these schemes on them. It is considered that this consultation is premature, and that significant further information is required by landowners before they can properly contribute to such a consultation. Corridor Options Based on the limited information provided, our client favours the proposed "Indicative Onshore Export Cable Corridor Option 1 (north)* as this route, on prima facie evidence, presents less potential impact to their property and development. General Disturbance Due to the lack of proper landowner engagement by Morecambe & Morgan prior to this consultation, and therefore a lack of information to accurately assess the potential impact of the scheme on our client, it is essential that the proposed Morecambe & Morgan scheme must not interfere with the ability of our client to pursue their development deliver their planning obligations, or impact upon their ability to sell completed residential units.	The Applicants have made design changes since PEIR and the southern option (Option 2) which passed through to the south of Higher Balham has been removed and Option 1 taken forward. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024) as well as ongoing landowner liaison following route refinements (further details are outlined within the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.
TA_0222_015_231123	S44	Email	Questions 3.3 The unilateral undertakings made in respect of our client's development require the provision and maintenance of an approved nature park forming part of the development. Nothing in the construction of the scheme, or the BNG associated therewith, must be allowed to prejudice the ability of our client to deliver the required nature park in accordance with agreed Nature Park Management Plan (or any revision thereof agreed in writing by Council and Natural England). No more specific comment can be made on the potential impact, due to the lack of site specific information and engagement provided by the Morecambe & Morgan schemes to date. The unilateral undertakings in respect of our client's development also requires the provision and maintenance of an approved Farmland Conservation Area to form part of the development. Nothing in the construction of the project, or the BNG associate therewith, must be allowed to prejudice the ability of our client to deliver the Farmland Conservation Area in accordance with the agreed FCA	The Applicants have made design changes since PEIR and this interests owned land is no longer within the draft Order Limits.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			Management Plan (or any revision thereof agreed in writing by the Council and Natural England). No more specific information and engagement provided by the Morecambe & Morgan schemes to date.	
TA_0222_016_231123	S44	Email	Question 3.4 Our client's development incorporates an undertaking to implement, or procure the implementation of, the Queensway Bird Hazard and Control Plan, mitigating the risk of hazardous bird activity in the flight path of Blackpool Airport. It is considered that the proposed construction of the scheme, and/or the BNG requirements resulting therefrom must not adversely impact on the ability of our clients to deliver their undertakings under the Queensway Bird Hazard and Control Plan, or place additional burden on them in doing so.	The Transmission Assets design has resulted in a reduced construction corridor width, as set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Details of the factors considered during the design evolution are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0222_018_231123	S44	Email	Question 3.7 Our clients have significant concerns regarding the impact of the Morecambe & Morgan project on the road network in the vicinity of their development, how this may impact on the provision of their development, and the sale of the dwellinghouses they are creating. Specific comment is not possible due to the lack of site specific information provided by Morecambe & Morgan to date.	Traffic and transport impacts arising during the construction phase of the Transmission Assets have been fully assessed at section 7.11 Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference E3.7). Details of the operation and maintenance phases are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Onshore maintenance would be limited to essential maintenance and/or emergency works. Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).
TA_0222_019_231123	S44	Email	Question 3.8 Our client has significant concerns regarding the impact of noise and vibration created by the construction of the Morecambe & Morgan scheme on their development, and the potential impact on the sale of the dwellinghouses they are developing. However, specific comment is not possible due to the lack of site specific information provided to date by Morecambe & Morgan.	An assessment of noise and vibration impacts during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Transmission Assets is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.2: Construction Noise and Vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.2). This includes an assessment of all construction activities required, as well as noise impacts due to construction traffic on the local highway network. The assessment of operational noise impacts is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3) and includes an assessment of noise impacts due to the plant equipment forming the electrical strategy for the onshore substations.
TA_0222_020_231123	S44	Email	Question 3.9 Our clients have significant concerns regarding the impact of the proposed scheme on air quality in the vicinity of their development, and the potential impact of this on their potential sale of the dwellinghouses they are constructing as part of that development. However, no specific comment is possible due to the lack of site specific information provided to date by Morecambe & Morgan.	Commitments in relation to air quality are set out in Table 9.15 of Volume 3, Chapter 9: Air Quality of the ES (document reference F3.9). These include measures to control dust through a Dust Management Plan (DMP). IAQM guidance indicates that implementation of these measures is effective. The assessment indicates that there would be no significant effects arising from air quality emissions from traffic during the construction or decommissioning phases. Effects during the operational phases are not likely and have been scoped out in agreement with the Planning Inspectorate. An assessment on human health in relation to air quality impacts, including emissions associated with construction and decommissioning activities, has been undertaken (refer to Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1)). Operational air quality effects (e.g., maintenance vehicle emissions) are not anticipated to be of a scale, even accounting for non-threshold effects, that could affect population health.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0222_022_231123	S44	Email	Question 4.5 It is our client's view that is they are to proceed, the Morecambe & Morgan schemes must be conjoined, designed, and delivered, as one single scheme to minimize the impact on their property, development and other land supporting the same.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0222_023_231123	S44	Email	Question 6 See comments in respect of Question 4 above. In addition to this, before our client could effectively comment on the appropriateness of the location of any proposed compound, it would be necessary to have further site specific information in respect of the size, specification, duration, use of land, and its reinstatement thereafter. <i>"Our clients are of the opinion that, based on the limited information provided by Morecambe & Morgan to date, that the proposed land take for the scheme is excessive, particularly in respect of biodiversity net gain (BNG)"</i>	The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor and onshore substations.
TA_0222_024_231123	S44	Email	Question 11 Given the lack of any definitive information regarding the location of the proposed grid connection, it is difficult to make any definitive comment in this respect.	The Electricity System Operator (ESO) is responsible for planning and operation of the transmission system and ensuring the balance of electricity generation with electricity demand. The Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm were scoped into the Pathway to 2030 workstream of the UK Government's Offshore Transmission Network Review (OTNR). As part of the OTNR, the ESO assessed options to improve the coordination of offshore wind farm connections and associated transmission networks. In July 2022, the UK Government published the Pathway to 2030 Holistic Network Design (HNDR) Report which set out the results of the OTNR. A key output of the HNDR process was the recommendation that the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm should work collaboratively in connecting the two offshore wind farms to the National Grid electricity transmission network at Penwortham in Lancashire.
TA_0222_027_231123	S44	Email	Question 16 We would ask that you take into account our client's comments when considering the next stage of the Morecambe & Morgan schemes and formulation of the DCO. We and our clients would urge the Morecambe & Morgan schemes to undertake further specific engagement with landowners, and would welcome further opportunities to make representations in respect of the draft DCO with better information available. Naturally, we and our clients would welcome the opportunity to engage on a site specific basis if the opportunity were available.	The Applicants notes your response. We are committed to working Landowners that are impacted by the project. Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicant will continue to engage with land interests and their agent regarding the land rights being sought for Project and to continue discussions on how disruption on farming practices can be minimised.
TA_0223_001_231123	S44	Email	I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's. This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area, and I really do think you need to have a rethink.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0224_001_231123	S44	Email	I wish to formally object to the proposed "Project" - The Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0225_002_231123	S44	Email	Slurry Lagoon Infrastructure Scheme There has recently been government grant funding made available to construct a slurry lagoon in land immediately north of the farmstead, subject to planning permission, in order to store slurry from a 240 cow herd at a cost of circa £200,000 and in order to claim the grant the lagoon must be completed by December 2024. If the wind farm projects go ahead this will threaten the significant investment in constructing a slurry lagoon which may/will not be required as the dairy farm will cease if the projects go ahead as currently proposed. To mitigate the losses from the wind farm projects the slurry lagoon scheme will continue as planned as there will be no compensation payable for the loss of grant funding if the wind farm projects do not go ahead as currently proposed. [REDACTED]	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0225_011_231123	S44	Email	Open Cut Trench Method My client objects to an open cut trench method of laying high voltage cables with a 122m wide corridor, if indeed cables cannot be carried on existing National Grid infrastructure.	An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented.
TA_0225_014_231123	S44	Email	Project Consultation with Land Interests prior to Statutory Consultation We are particularly concerned at the lack of prior consultation and the ongoing lack of additional scheme details which are essential in order to provide a fully informed consultation response. My significant concerns relating to the public consultation process are as follows; 1. No information whatsoever relating to the proposed substation locations until circulation of an engagement map 3 days before the opening of the statutory consultation on 12 October 2023. 2. No landowner consultation whatsoever within Zone 1 prior to the opening of the statutory consultation on 12 October 2023. 3. A complete lack of consultation over the proposed siting of the substation proposals within Zone 1. This has led to misinformation within the public consultation documents which incorrectly advises that substation site selection process included landowner consultation. 4. The projects have not carried out any ecology, groundwater, soil surveys etc on land proposed to site Morecambe 2 substation until surveys commenced August 2023 and we understand that no surveys have taken place at [REDACTED] to date therefore no survey data was available prior to deciding on the proposed sites as presented at public consultation. This has led to misinformation within the public consultation documents which incorrectly advises that substation site selection process included detailed land surveys. I refer to points 2 and 3 above and provide the details of my client's consultations which have taken place to date in respect of the substation siting proposals; - Morgan Substation affected land interests meetings; [REDACTED] meeting 14 November 2023 (DM only, no Morgan representative)- Morecambe Substation affected land interests meetings; [REDACTED] meeting 14 November 2023 (DM, RB, IM, KD Morecambe representatives) In summary, the public consultation commenced on 12 October 2023, the first consultation with my client regarding the proposed substation sitings was held on 14 November 2023. There was no prior communication, correspondence, meetings to discuss these proposals whatsoever. We are particularly concerned that BP Morgan did not consider it necessary to attend this first and particularly important landowner meeting. My first knowledge of the proposed substation locations was over a Teams meeting on 6 October 2023 where I was shown a screenshot of a Zone 1 map known as the "Morgan and Morecambe Engagement Map" classified as CONFIDENTIAL as Dalcour Maclaren (DM) were under instruction not to release this map. On Monday 9 October 2023 DM advised that they now had consent to release the substation locations map just three days prior to the opening of the public consultation period. This Morgan and Morecambe Engagement Map had clearly been produced for some time prior to the start of the public	Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024) as well as ongoing landowner liaison following route refinements (further details are outlined within the Consultation Report (document reference E1)). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level of detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			consultation period however for reasons unbeknown to myself or my clients they projects did not wish to engage with the affected landowners prior to public consultation. The poor landowner consultation coupled with public consultation documents advising the public that substation sites selection process included landowner consultation is dishonest and has led to some public anger towards an affected landowner who is presented by the projects to have been consulted and implied as being complicit in substation siting.	
TA_0225_015_231123	S44	Email	My significant concerns relating to the two projects as presented are as follows; 1. Morgan and Morecambe Projects are completely independent companies who's only common interest is to obtain a Development Consent Order (DCO) for their respective schemes; 1.1 If a DCO is granted to both schemes this will cause major disturbance to the whole Rural Fylde and Rural Preston areas for many years, not a three year construction window as indicated in the statutory consultation documents, as each company will not commence and complete their respective projects transmission asset construction simultaneously. 1.2 In the event that one project does not commence at all this will create significant uncertainties as to if/when it will ever commence. For example, BP Morgan Project could be completed by 2028 whilst Flotation Morecambe Project may stall or even cease to exist given that Flotation Energy Limited is a new Co incorporated on 21 May 2018 with poor cashflow having reported a loss in trading profit to 31 December 2022 and their accounts advise 'Principle risks and uncertainties' including Liquidity Risk (access to capital), Credit Risk, Foreign Exchange Risk. These risks relate to being wholly reliant on third party funding. The Morecambe Wind Farm Project is a major financial undertaking in construction of both offshore and onshore assets.	Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business including any severance and injurious affection. The matters raised in this feedback will be included within those negotiations and discussions to progress the land agreements.
TA_0225_017_231123	S44	Email	3. No indicative information relating to the cable corridor route east of Lower Lane, Freckleton. 4. No indicative permanent access route to the Morgan substation site. 5. No indicative permanent access route to the Morecambe substation site options. 6. No cable trench permanent easement width details.	Transmission Asset routing can be found within the Works Plans (document reference B7, B8) and the Land Plans (document reference B10). Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms and as part of those discussions and negotiations detailed information will be provided to confirm the rights sought and required easement widths.
TA_0225_026_231123	S44	Email	Consultation Feedback Summary The statutory consultation is completely flawed as there has been no land interest consultation whatsoever prior to commencing the statutory consultation period. The statutory consultation documents include false and misleading information particularly around but not limited to the substation site selection process involving landowners which is completely untrue. The consultation does not include any proposed cable corridor route whatsoever within Zone 1 which makes it impossible to fully engage or respond in full to this statutory consultation. This cable route information is essential in order to qualify a statutory consultation for a proposed development of a significant cables corridor within Zone 1, an area of circa 500 acres. The consultation does not include any proposed cable corridor route whatsoever when leaving Zone 1 which makes it impossible to fully engage or respond in full to this statutory consultation. This cable route information is essential in order to qualify a statutory consultation for a proposed development of a significant cables corridor to the east of Zone 1. There is no information for proposed permanent access routes to either Morecambe substation options or Morgan substation. This permanent access route information is essential in order to qualify a statutory consultation for a proposed development of a significant permanent access routes within Zone 1, an area of circa 500 acres. We have been informed by Dalcour MacLaren that there is additional information available held by the projects which is not being released since the commencement of the statutory consultation period as this would now prejudice the ongoing statutory consultation.	Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024) as well as ongoing landowner liaison following route refinements (further details are outlined within the Consultation Report (document reference E1)). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.
TA_0225_027_231123	S44	Email	The proposals will completely disrupts the ease of moving livestock at [REDACTED]	Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).
TA_0225_031_231123	S44	Email	Morgan and Morecambe projects have targeted [REDACTED] without any consultation nor completing of any full ecology or geological surveys and with no prior consultation with the land interests over site selection. The landowner has yet to meet any representative from BP Morgan project. The fact that the statutory public consultation documentation includes false statements of	Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>prior landowner consultation in the substation site selection process renders the statutory consultation asflawed and my client requires a formal written apology together with a public statement to rectify this untruthful reporting.The statutory consultation has not complied with statutory planning law requirements as necessary under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 as amended.We reserve our position to make further representations if/when information is made available and in so doing so we question the validity of the current statutory consultation process.</p>	<p>requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted as well as ongoing landowner liaison following route refinements (further details are outlined within the Consultation Report.The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.</p>
TA_0226_003_231123	S44	Email	<p>Substation Site Layout, Design and AppearanceThere is no consultation information available showing cross-sections, block plans, landscaping,fencing, aircraft beacons etc of each proposed substation site therefore how could a publicconsultation exercise provide any useful feedback when essential details are not made available ?</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Wireline visualisations were made available at statutory consultation, showing the maximum parameters from various viewpoints. Visualisations are presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage.The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).</p>
TA_0226_004_231123	S44	Email	<p>Slurry Lagoon Infrastructure SchemeThere has recently been government grant funding made available to construct a slurry lagoon in landimmediately north of the farmstead, subject to planning permission, in order to store slurry from a 300cow herd at a cost of circa £200,000 and in order to claim the grant the lagoon must be completed byDecember 2024.If the wind farm projects go ahead this will threaten the significant investment in constructing a slurrylagoon which may/will not be required as the dairy farm will cease if the projects go ahead ascurrently proposed. To mitigate the losses from the wind farm projects the slurry lagoon scheme willcontinue as planned as there will be no compensation payable for the loss of grant funding if the windfarm projects do not go ahead as currently proposed.</p>	<p>The Applicants note your response.</p>
TA_0226_007_231123	S44	Email	<p>Open Cut Trench MethodMy client objects to an open cut trench method of laying high voltage cables with a 122m widecorridor, if indeed cables cannot be carried on existing National Grid infrastructure.</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented. Dalcour McLaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).
TA_0226_008_231123	S44	Email	<p>Project Consultation with Land Interests prior to Statutory Consultation I am particularly concerned at the lack of prior consultation and the ongoing lack of additional scheme details which are essential in order to provide a fully informed consultation response. Our significant concerns relating to the public consultation process are as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No information whatsoever relating to the proposed substation locations until circulation of an engagement map 3 days before the opening of the statutory consultation on 12 October 2023. 2. No landowner consultation whatsoever within Zone 1 prior to the opening of the statutory consultation on 12 October 2023. 3. A complete lack of consultation over the proposed siting of the substation proposals within Zone 1. This has led to misinformation within the public consultation documents which incorrectly advises that substation site selection process included landowner consultation. 4. The projects have not carried out any ecology, groundwater, soil surveys etc on land proposed to site Morecambe 2 substation until surveys commenced August 2023 and a Magnetometer Survey has not been carried out therefore no survey data was available prior to deciding on the proposed sites as presented at public consultation. This has led to misinformation within the public consultation documents which incorrectly advises that substation site selection process included detailed land surveys. I refer to points 2 and 3 above and provide the details of my client's consultations which have taken place to date in respect of the substation siting proposals; Meeting with Project Representatives Dalcour McLaren/Rory O'Brien/Amy Townsend; - Morgan and Morecambe Substation affected meeting 26 October 2023. Prior to this one meeting during Statutory Consultation I have sat in one meeting with my client held with Dalcour McLaren (James Moran) - Ecology Licence Surveys meeting 6 December 2022. Dalcour MacLaren held an ecology licensing meeting with my client and during that meeting my client asked and was advised that there would be no substations on his farm, yet Morecambe substation Option 2 is wholly within [REDACTED]. In summary, the public consultation commenced on 12 October 2023, the first consultation with my client regarding the proposed substation sitings was held on 26 October 2023. There was no prior communication, correspondence, meetings to discuss these proposals whatsoever. My first knowledge of the proposed substation locations was over a Teams meeting on 6 October 2023 where I was shown a screenshot of a Zone 1 map known as the "Morgan and Morecambe Engagement Map" classified as CONFIDENTIAL as Dalcour McLaren (DM) were under instruction not to release this map. On Monday 9 October 2023 DM advised that they now had consent to release the substation locations map just three days prior to the opening of the public consultation period. This Morgan and Morecambe Engagement Map had clearly been produced for some time prior to the start of the public consultation period however for reasons unbeknown to myself or my clients the projects did not wish to engage with the affected landowners prior to public consultation. The poor landowner consultation coupled with public consultation documents advising the public that substation sites selection process included landowner consultation is dishonest and has led to some public anger towards an affected landowner who is presented by the projects to have been consulted and implied as being complicit in substation siting. 	<p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024) as well as ongoing landowner liaison following route refinements (further details are outlined within the Consultation Report (document reference E1)). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.</p>
TA_0226_011_231123	S44	Email	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. No indicative information relating to the cable corridor route east of [REDACTED]. 4. No indicative permanent access route to the Morgan substation site. 5. No indicative permanent access route to the Morecambe substation site options. 6. No cable trench permanent easement width details. 	<p>Transmission Asset routing can be found within the Works Plans (document reference B7, B8) and the Land Plans (document reference B10). Dalcour McLaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms and as part of those discussions and negotiations detailed information will be provided to confirm the rights sought and required easement widths.</p>
TA_0226_015_231123	S44	Email	<p>High Voltage Cable Corridor Open cut trench method of laying high voltage cables with a 122m wide corridor for two independent projects is not feasible given the major disturbance and risks of staggered implementation. Open cut trenches plus haul roads will cause significant land damage by</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>compaction of subsoil,contamination of topsoil, damage to land drains, significant disruption to farm grassland and livestockmanagement, additional temporary gates and fences, temporary water troughs, limited crossingpoints, extra use of public highways, conflict between farm activities and contractor HGVs, loss ofsignificant areas of silage and maize growing land.There is a Horizontal Directional Drill option which is capable of drilling up to 1000m below groundand at a reasonable depth to sit below land drainage systems.A further option is that as National Grid are due to upgrade their whole existing network in order tocarry 400Kv in the very near future, there is existing National Grid infrastructure within Zone 1 whichwill soon be able to carry 400Kv which should also be given serious consideration.This may also provide an alternative to requiring substations.</p>	<p>The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented. Dalcour McLaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).</p>
TA_0226_020_231123	S44	Email	<p>Consultation Feedback SummaryThe statutory consultation is completely flawed as there has been no land interest consultationwhatsoever prior to commencing the statutory consultation period.The statutory consultation documents include false and misleading information particularly around butnot limited to the substation site selection process involving landowners which is a completely untrue.My client was expressly advised by Dalcour MacLaren that substations were not being considered onhis farm.The consultation does not include any proposed cable corridor route whatsoever within Zone 1 whichmakes it impossible to fully engage or respond in full to this statutory consultation. This cable routeinformation is essential in order to qualify a statutory consultation for a proposed development of asignificant cables corridor within Zone 1, an area of circa 500 acres.There is no information for proposed permanent access routes to either Morecambe substationoptions or Morgan substation. This permanent access route information is essential in order to qualifya statutory consultation for a proposed development of a significant permanent access routes withinZone 1, an area of circa 500 acres.We have been informed by Dalcour MacLaren that there is additional information available held by theprojects which is not being released since the commencement of the statutory consultation period asthis would now prejudice the ongoing statutory consultation.</p>	<p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024) as well as ongoing landowner liaison following route refinements (further details are outlined within the Consultation Report (document reference E1).The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.</p>
TA_0226_025_231123	S44	Email	<p>Substation footprint doubled in size in order to provide on-site BNG should not be allowed as this completely restricts the potential substation site locations to unsuitable locations. Morgan and Morecambe projects have targeted [REDACTED] without any consultation nor completing of any full ecology or geological surveys and with no prior consultation with the land interests over site selection.</p>	<p>An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects.</p>
TA_0226_026_231123	S44	Email	<p>The fact that the statutory public consultation documentation includes false statements ofprior landowner consultation in the substation site selection process renders the statutoryconsultation as flawed and my client requires a formal written apology together with a publicstatement to rectify this untruthful reporting.The statutory consultation has not complied with statutory planning law requirements as necessaryunder section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 as amended.We reserve our position to make further representations if/when information is made available and inso doing so we question the validity of the current statutory consultation process.</p>	<p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.
TA_0227_001_231123	S44	Email	This consultation feedback is made on behalf of [REDACTED], who own the freehold and is an owner occupier.[REDACTED]is a productive grassland farm of approximately 51 acres of Grade 3 land which has a predominantly southerly sloping aspect. The farm land is accessed through the farm yard off [REDACTED] [REDACTED] is significantly affected by the proposed Morecambe substation Option 1 site which is proposed to be situated at the south end of the holding, completely occupying the majority of the farmable land in this area together with a similar size of temporary construction compound immediately to the north of the substation site which will leave unfarmable areas, therefore during the construction phase this will take the whole 51 acres out of production and will permanently take approx. 18 acres, leaving approx. 25 acres of farmable land. This is of course less any additional land required for permanent access. During the construction phase the farm will lose additional land for cable corridor laying which would be out of production for a minimum of 3 years, plus additional land recovery years.	Transmission Asset routing can be found within the Works Plans (document reference B7, B8) and the Land Plans (document reference B10). Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms and as part of those discussions and negotiations detailed information will be provided to confirm the rights sought and required easement widths.
TA_0227_007_231123	S44	Email	Substation Site Layout, Design and Appearance There is no consultation information available showing cross-sections, block plans, landscaping, fencing, aircraft beacons etc of each proposed substation site therefore how could a public consultation exercise provide any useful feedback when essential details are not made available ?	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Wireline visualisations were made available at statutory consultation, showing the maximum parameters from various viewpoints. Visualisations are presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0227_008_231123	S44	Email	Project Consultation prior to Statutory Consultation I am particularly concerned at the lack of prior consultation and the ongoing lack of additional scheme details which are essential in order to provide a fully informed consultation response. Our significant concerns relating to the public consultation process are as follows; 1. No information whatsoever relating to the proposed substation locations until circulation of an engagement map 3 days before the opening of the statutory consultation on 12 October 2023. 2. No landowner consultation whatsoever within Zone 1 prior to the opening of the statutory consultation on 12 October 2023. 3. A complete lack of consultation over the proposed siting of the substation proposals within Zone 1. This has led to misinformation within the public consultation documents which incorrectly advises that substation site selection process included landowner consultation. 4. The projects have not carried out any ecology, groundwater, soil surveys etc on land proposed to site Morecambe 2 substation until surveys commenced August 2023 therefore no survey data was available prior to deciding on the proposed sites as presented at public consultation. This has led to misinformation within the public consultation documents which incorrectly advises that substation site selection process included detailed land surveys. I refer to points 2 and 3 above and provide the details of my client's consultations which have taken place to date in respect of the substation siting proposals; Meeting with Project Representatives Dalcour Maclaren/Rory O'Brien/Amy Townsend; - Morecambe Substation affected meeting 19 October	Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			2023There was no prior communication, correspondence, meetings to discuss these proposals whatsoever. My first knowledge of the proposed substation locations was over a Teams meeting on 6 October 2023 where I was shown a screenshot of a Zone 1 map known as the "Morgan and Morecambe Engagement Map" classified as CONFIDENTIAL as Dalcour Maclaren (DM) were under instruction not to release this map. On Monday 9 October 2023 DM advised that they now had consent to release the substation locations map just three days prior to the opening of the public consultation period. This Morgan and Morecambe Engagement Map had clearly been produced for some time prior to the start of the public consultation period however for reasons unbeknown to myself or my clients the projects did not wish to engage with the affected landowners prior to public consultation. The poor landowner consultation coupled with public consultation documents advising the public that substation sites selection process included landowner consultation is dishonest as the statutory consultation presented by the projects advises that landowners have been consulted and implies their being complicit in substation siting.	
TA_0227_011_231123	S44	Email	<p>3. No indicative information relating to the cable corridor route east of Lower Lane, Freckleton.</p> <p>4. No indicative permanent access route to the Morgan substation site.</p> <p>5. No indicative permanent access route to the Morecambe substation site options.</p> <p>6. No cable trench permanent easement width details.</p>	Transmission Asset routing can be found within the Works Plans (document reference B7, B8) and the Land Plans (document reference B10). Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms and as part of those discussions and negotiations detailed information will be provided to confirm the rights sought and required easement widths.
TA_0227_015_231123	S44	Email	High Voltage Cable Corridor Open cut trench method of laying high voltage cables with a 122m wide corridor for two independent projects is not feasible given the major disturbance and risks of staggered implementation. Open cut trenches plus haul roads will cause significant land damage by compaction of subsoil, contamination of topsoil, damage to land drains, significant disruption to farm grassland and livestock management, additional temporary gates and fences, temporary water troughs, limited crossing points, extra use of public highways, conflict between farm activities and contractor HGVs, loss of significant areas of silage and maize growing land. There is a Horizontal Directional Drill option which is capable of drilling up to 1000m below ground and at a reasonable depth to sit below land drainage systems. A further option is that as National Grid are due to upgrade their whole existing network in order to carry 400Kv in the very near future, there is existing National Grid infrastructure within Zone 1 which will soon be able to carry 400Kv which should also be given serious consideration. This may also provide an alternative to requiring substations.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented. Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).
TA_0227_019_231123	S44	Email	<p>Consultation Feedback Summary</p> <p>The statutory consultation is completely flawed as there has been no land interest consultation whatsoever prior to commencing the statutory consultation period. The statutory consultation documents include false and misleading information particularly around but not limited to the substation site selection process involving landowners which is completely untrue. The consultation does not include any proposed cable corridor route whatsoever within Zone 1 which makes it impossible to fully engage or respond in full to this statutory consultation. This cable route information is essential in order to qualify a statutory consultation for a proposed development of a significant cables corridor within Zone 1, an area of circa 500 acres. There is no information for proposed permanent access routes to either Morecambe substation options or Morgan substation. This permanent access route information is essential in order to qualify a statutory consultation for a proposed development of a significant permanent access routes within Zone 1, an area of circa 500 acres. We have been informed by Dalcour Maclaren that there is additional information available held by the projects which is not being released since the commencement of the statutory consultation period as this would now prejudice the ongoing statutory consultation. The Morecambe substation Option 1 project has targeted [REDACTED] only and without any consultation nor prior consultation with the landowner over site selection. There has been one meeting only regarding the Morecambe project substation siting and this was during the statutory consultation period. Substation footprint doubled in size in order to provide on-site BNG should not be allowed as this completely</p>	Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			restricts the potential substation site locations to unsuitable locations. The fact that the statutory public consultation documentation includes false statements of prior landowner consultation in the substation site selection process renders the statutory consultation as flawed and my client requires a formal written apology together with a public statement to rectify this untruthful reporting. The statutory consultation has not complied with statutory planning law requirements as necessary under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 as amended. We reserve our position to make further representations if/when information is made available and in so doing so we question the validity of the current statutory consultation process.	
TA_0228_002_231123	S44	Email	These wind farm projects highlight Newton Marsh for potential Biodiversity Net Gain. Newton Marsh should be removed following this statutory consultation as the land mass is sensitively managed expanse of tidal land which has special protections and should therefore not be considered as part of a completely separate development project particularly when the Trustees have not had any prior consultation whatsoever with the developers.	Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3) has been prepared and will be submitted as part of the application for development consent. The impact on the SSSIs has been provided in section 3.1.2 and section 3.11.3 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken within the ES, including the following with reference to ornithology:- Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5)- Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).
TA_0228_003_231123	S44	Email	Project Consultation with Land Interests prior to Statutory Consultation We are particularly concerned at the lack of prior consultation and the ongoing lack of additional scheme details which are essential in order to provide a fully informed consultation response.	Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.
TA_0228_006_231123	S44	Email	No indicative information relating to the cable corridor route east of Lower Lane, Freckleton. No indicative permanent access route to the Morgan substation site. No indicative permanent access route to the Morecambe substation site options.	Transmission Asset routing can be found within the Works Plans (document reference B7, B8) and the Land Plans (document reference B10). Dalcour MacLaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms and as part of those discussions and negotiations detailed information will be provided to confirm the rights sought and required easement widths.
TA_0228_008_231123	S44	Email	Consultation Feedback Summary The statutory consultation is flawed as there has been no land interest consultation whatsoever prior to commencing the statutory consultation period. The consultation does not include any proposed cable corridor route whatsoever within Zone 1 which makes it impossible to fully engage or respond in full to this statutory consultation. This cable route information is essential in order to qualify a statutory consultation for a proposed development of a significant cables corridor within Zone 1, an area of circa 500 acres. The consultation does not include any proposed cable corridor route whatsoever when leaving Zone 1 which makes it impossible to fully engage or respond in full to this statutory consultation. This cable route information is essential in order to qualify a statutory consultation for a proposed development of a significant cables corridor to the east of Zone 1. There is no information for proposed permanent access routes to either Morecambe substation options or Morgan substation. This permanent access route information is essential in order to qualify a statutory consultation for a proposed development of a significant permanent access routes within Zone 1, an area of circa 500 acres. We have been informed by Dalcour MacLaren that there is additional information available held by the projects which	Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience. Transmission Asset

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			is not being released since the commencement of the statutory consultation period as this would now prejudice the ongoing statutory consultation.	routing can be found within the Works Plans (document reference B7, B8) and the Land Plans (document reference B10). Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms and as part of those discussions and negotiations detailed information will be provided to confirm the rights sought and required easement widths.
TA_0228_010_231123	S44	Email	The landowner has yet to meet any representative from Morgan or Morecambe project. The statutory consultation has not complied with statutory planning law requirements as necessary under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 as amended. We reserve our position to make further representations if/when information is made available and in so doing so we question the validity of the current statutory consultation process.	Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.
TA_0210_002_231123	S44	Email	These wind farm projects highlight Freckleton Marsh for potential Biodiversity Net Gain. Freckleton Marsh should be removed following this statutory consultation as the land mass is a sensitively managed expanse of tidal land which has special ornithology management conditions and should therefore not be considered as part of a completely separate development project particularly when the Trustees have not had any prior consultation whatsoever with the developers.	Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3) has been prepared and will be submitted as part of the application for development consent. The impact on the SSSIs has been provided in section 3.1.2 and section 3.11.3 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken within the ES, including the following with reference to ornithology:- Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5)- Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).
TA_0210_003_231123	S44	Email	Project Consultation with Land Interests prior to Statutory Consultation We are particularly concerned at the lack of prior consultation and the ongoing lack of additional scheme details which are essential in order to provide a fully informed consultation response.	Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.
TA_0210_006_231123	S44	Email	No indicative information relating to the cable corridor route east of Lower Lane, Freckleton. No indicative permanent access route to the Morgan substation site. No indicative permanent access route to the Morecambe substation site options.	Transmission Asset routing can be found within the Works Plans (document reference B7, B8) and the Land Plans (document reference B10). Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms and as part of those discussions and negotiations detailed information will be provided to confirm the rights sought and required easement widths.
TA_0210_008_231123	S44	Email	Consultation Feedback Summary The statutory consultation is flawed as there has been no land interest consultation whatsoever prior to commencing the statutory consultation period. The	Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>consultation does not include any proposed cable corridor route whatsoever within Zone 1 which makes it impossible to fully engage or respond in full to this statutory consultation. This cable route information is essential in order to qualify a statutory consultation for a proposed development of a significant cables corridor within Zone 1, an area of circa 500 acres. The consultation does not include any proposed cable corridor route whatsoever when leaving Zone 1 which makes it impossible to fully engage or respond in full to this statutory consultation. This cable route information is essential in order to qualify a statutory consultation for a proposed development of a significant cables corridor to the east of Zone 1. There is no information for proposed permanent access routes to either Morecambe substation options or Morgan substation. This permanent access route information is essential in order to qualify a statutory consultation for a proposed development of a significant permanent access routes within Zone 1, an area of circa 500 acres. We have been informed by Dalcour MacLaren that there is additional information available held by the projects which is not being released since the commencement of the statutory consultation period as this would now prejudice the ongoing statutory consultation.</p>	<p>Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience. Transmission Asset routing can be found within the Works Plans (document reference B7, B8) and the Land Plans (document reference B10). Dalcour MacLaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms and as part of those discussions and negotiations detailed information will be provided to confirm the rights sought and required easement widths.</p>
TA_0210_010_231123	S44	Email	<p>The landowner has yet to meet any representative from Morgan or Morecambe project. The statutory consultation has not complied with statutory planning law requirements as necessary under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 as amended. We reserve our position to make further representations if/when information is made available and in so doing so we question the validity of the current statutory consultation process.</p>	<p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.</p>
TA_0229_006_231123	S44	Email	<p>Substation Site Layout, Design and Appearance There is no consultation information available showing cross-sections, block plans, landscaping, fencing, aircraft beacons etc of each proposed substation site therefore how could a public consultation exercise provide any useful feedback when essential details are not made available ?</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Wireline visualisations were made available at statutory consultation, showing the maximum parameters from various viewpoints. Visualisations are presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter,</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0229_007_231123	S44	Email	Project Consultation prior to Statutory Consultation I am particularly concerned at the lack of prior consultation and the ongoing lack of additional scheme details which are essential in order to provide a fully informed consultation response.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.
TA_0229_010_231123	S44	Email	3. No indicative information relating to the cable corridor route east of Lower Lane, Freckleton. 4. No indicative permanent access route to the Morgan substation site. 5. No indicative permanent access route to the Morecambe substation site options. 6. No cable trench permanent easement width details.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. Transmission Asset routing can be found within the Works Plans (document reference B7, B8) and the Land Plans (document reference B10).
TA_0229_017_231123	S44	Email	Consultation Feedback Summary The statutory consultation is completely flawed as there has been no land interest consultation whatsoever prior to commencing the statutory consultation period. The statutory consultation documents include false and misleading information particularly around but not limited to the substation site selection process involving landowners which is completely untrue. The consultation does not include any proposed cable corridor route whatsoever within Zone 1 which makes it impossible to fully engage or respond in full to this statutory consultation. This cable route information is essential in order to qualify a statutory consultation for a proposed development of a significant cables corridor within Zone 1, an area of circa 500 acres. There is no information for proposed permanent access routes to either Morecambe substation options or Morgan substation. This permanent access route information is essential in order to qualify a statutory consultation for a proposed development of a significant permanent access routes within Zone 1, an area of circa 500 acres. We have been informed by Dalcour MacLaren that there is additional information available held by the projects which is not being released since the commencement of the statutory consultation period as this would now prejudice the ongoing statutory consultation. Substation footprint doubled in size in order to provide on-site BNG should not be allowed as this completely restricts the potential substation site locations to unsuitable locations. The statutory consultation has not complied with statutory planning law requirements as necessary under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 as amended. We reserve our position to make further representations if/when information is made available and in so doing so we question the validity of the current statutory consultation process.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.
TA_0230_001_231123	S44	Email	This consultation feedback is made on behalf of [REDACTED], who own the freehold and is an owner occupier. [REDACTED] comprises a dwelling house which is the family home, a range of former farm out buildings together with 5 acres of land used for horse grazing turnout. The siting of the proposed Morecambe substation Option 1 site is directly in view of [REDACTED] which has a predominant south facing view with the boundary of the substation being about 200m from the property. The substation will also be within 100m of a new housing development of four detached dwellings which has been acquired recently and site clearance commenced Planning Appln Ref. No: [REDACTED] at site address [REDACTED]. It is wholly unacceptable to consider the Morgan substation site in this location given its close proximity to my client's family home and other dwelling houses at [REDACTED]. Impact on [REDACTED] The substation site is far too close to dwelling houses and my client's dwelling in particular with health, visual and noise in mind. The construction traffic, noise, dust	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			etc will be heard and seen on a daily basis for several years which is totally unacceptable in a residential area immediately next to protected countryside. My client is also very concerned that the proposed building will create accelerated wind velocity on the leeward side of the proposed building as the wind direction is predominantly from the west which after deflection from the proposed building will hit landfall on my client's property creating turbulent destructive winds.	offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). An assessment of noise and vibration impacts during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Transmission Assets is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.2: Construction Noise and Vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.2). This includes an assessment of all construction activities required, as well as noise impacts due to construction traffic on the local highway network. The assessment of operational noise impacts is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3) and includes an assessment of noise impacts due to the plant equipment forming the electrical strategy for the onshore substations.
TA_0230_005_231123	S44	Email	Substation Site Layout, Design and Appearance There is no consultation information available showing cross-sections, block plans, landscaping, fencing, aircraft beacons etc of each proposed substation site therefore how could a public consultation exercise provide any useful feedback when essential details are not made available ?	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Wireline visualisations were made available at statutory consultation, showing the maximum parameters from various viewpoints. Visualisations are presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0230_006_231123	S44	Email	Project Consultation prior to Statutory Consultation I am particularly concerned at the lack of prior consultation and the ongoing lack of additional scheme details which are essential in order to provide a fully informed consultation response.	Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level of detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.
TA_0230_009_231123	S44	Email	3. No indicative information relating to the cable corridor route east of Lower Lane, Freckleton. 4. No indicative permanent access route to the Morgan substation site.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>5. No indicative permanent access route to the Morecambe substation site options.</p> <p>6. No cable trench permanent easement width details.</p>	<p>Transmission Asset routing can be found within the Works Plans (document reference B7, B8) and the Land Plans (document reference B10).</p>
TA_0230_016_231123	S44	Email	<p>Consultation Feedback Summary</p> <p>The statutory consultation is completely flawed as there has been no land interest consultation whatsoever prior to commencing the statutory consultation period. The statutory consultation documents include false and misleading information particularly around but not limited to the substation site selection process involving landowners which is completely untrue. The consultation does not include any proposed cable corridor route whatsoever within Zone 1 which makes it impossible to fully engage or respond in full to this statutory consultation. This cable route information is essential in order to qualify a statutory consultation for a proposed development of a significant cables corridor within Zone 1, an area of circa 500 acres. There is no information for proposed permanent access routes to either Morecambe substation options or Morgan substation. This permanent access route information is essential in order to qualify a statutory consultation for a proposed development of a significant permanent access routes within Zone 1, an area of circa 500 acres. We have been informed by Dalcour MacLaren that there is additional information available held by the projects which is not being released since the commencement of the statutory consultation period as this would now prejudice the ongoing statutory consultation</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.</p>
TA_0230_020_231123	S44	Email	<p>The proposed building will create accelerated wind velocity on the leeward side of the proposed building as the wind direction is predominantly from the west which after deflection from the proposed building will hit landfall on my client's property creating turbulent destructive winds. We reserve our position to make further representations if/when information is made available and in so doing so we question the validity of the current statutory consultation process.</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.</p>
TA_0231_003_231123	S44	Email	<p>Open Cut Trench Method</p> <p>My client objects to an open cut trench method of laying high voltage cables with a 122m wide corridor, if indeed cables cannot be carried on existing National Grid infrastructure.</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented.</p>
TA_0231_004_231123	S44	Email	<p>Project Consultation with Land Interests prior to Statutory Consultation</p> <p>I am particularly concerned at the lack of prior consultation and the ongoing lack of additional scheme details which are essential in order to provide a fully informed consultation response. Our significant concerns relating to the public consultation process are as follows;</p> <p>1. No information whatsoever relating to the proposed substation locations until circulation of an engagement map 3 days before the opening of the statutory</p>	<p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>consultation on 12 October 2023.2. No landowner consultation whatsoever within Zone 1 prior to the opening of the statutory consultation on 12 October 2023.3. A complete lack of consultation over the proposed siting of the substation proposals within Zone 1. This has led to misinformation within the public consultation documents which incorrectly advises that substation site selection process included landowner consultation.4. The projects have not carried out any ecology, groundwater, soil surveys etc on land proposed to site Morecambe 2 substation until surveys commenced August 2023 therefore no survey data was available prior to deciding on the proposed sites as presented at public consultation. This has led to misinformation within the public consultation documents which incorrectly advises that substation site selection process included detailed land surveys. I refer to points 2 and 3 above and provide the details of my client's consultations which have taken place to date in respect of the substation siting proposals; Meeting with Project Representatives Dalcour Maclaren/ [REDACTED]- Morgan and Morecambe Substation affected meeting 26 October 2023 At this one and only ever meeting with my clients we raised many concerns which we hope have been taken on board, however my main observation was that the representatives for both wind farm projects were present and it was [REDACTED] of Flotation Energy who led the responses which was a surprise to myself as Flotation Energy have nothing to do with the proposal on my client's land. I also came away from this meeting particularly concerned that BP Morgan did not consider it necessary to attend this first and particularly important landowner meeting with a more senior representative as [REDACTED] advised that she had only been in the job a couple of months. In summary, everything and anything which [REDACTED] addressed during this meeting was irrelevant to the project which was being proposed on my client's land and whilst Dalcour Maclaren addressed standard rights and accommodation works etc there was no opportunity to discuss in any detail whatsoever anything material to the proposed scheme whilst we did raise alternative worse case options for the siting of the Morgan substation. There was no prior communication, correspondence, meetings to discuss these proposals whatsoever. My first knowledge of the proposed substation locations was over a Teams meeting on 6 October 2023 where I was shown a screenshot of a Zone 1 map known as the "Morgan and Morecambe Engagement Map" classified as CONFIDENTIAL as Dalcour Maclaren (DM) were under instruction not to release this map. On Monday 9 October 2023 DM advised that they now had consent to release the substation locations map just three days prior to the opening of the public consultation period. This Morgan and Morecambe Engagement Map had clearly been produced for some time prior to the start of the public consultation period however for reasons unbeknown to myself or my clients the projects did not wish to engage with the affected landowners prior to public consultation. The poor landowner consultation coupled with public consultation documents advising the public that substation sites selection process included landowner consultation is dishonest and has led to some public anger towards an affected landowner who is presented by the projects to have been consulted and implied as being complicit in substation siting.</p>	<p>feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level of detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience. Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business including any severance and injurious affection. The matters raised in feedback will be included within those negotiations and discussions to progress the land agreements.</p>
TA_0231_007_231123	S44	Email	<p>3. No indicative information relating to the cable corridor route east of Lower Lane, Freckleton. 4. No indicative permanent access route to the Morgan substation site. 5. No indicative permanent access route to the Morecambe substation site options. 6. No cable trench permanent easement width details.</p>	<p>Transmission Asset routing can be found within the Works Plans (document reference B7, B8) and the Land Plans (document reference B10). Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms and as part of those discussions and negotiations detailed information will be provided to confirm the rights sought and required easement widths.</p>
TA_0231_012_231123	S44	Email	<p>Substation Site Layout, Design and Appearance There is no consultation information available showing cross-sections, block plans, landscaping, fencing, aircraft beacons etc of each proposed substation site therefore how could a public consultation exercise provide any useful feedback when essential details are not made available ?</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Wireline visualisations were made available at statutory consultation, showing the maximum parameters from various viewpoints. Visualisations are presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).</p>
TA_0231_013_231123	S44	Email	<p>High Voltage Cable Corridor Open cut trench method of laying high voltage cables with a 122m wide corridor for two independent projects is not feasible given the major disturbance and risks of staggered implementation. Open cut trenches plus haul roads will cause significant land damage by compaction of subsoil, contamination of topsoil, damage to land drains, significant disruption to farm grassland and livestock management, additional temporary gates and fences, temporary water troughs, limited crossing points, extra use of public highways, conflict between farm activities and contractor HGVs, loss of significant areas of silage and maize growing land. There is a Horizontal Directional Drill option which is capable of drilling up to 1000m below ground and at a reasonable depth to sit below land drainage systems. A further option is that as National Grid are due to upgrade their whole existing network in order to carry 400Kv in the very near future, there is existing National Grid infrastructure within Zone 1 which will soon be able to carry 400Kv which should also be given serious consideration. This may also provide an alternative to requiring substations.</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented. Dalcour McLaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).</p>
TA_0231_017_231123	S44	Email	<p>Consultation Feedback Summary The statutory consultation is completely flawed as there has been no land interest consultation whatsoever prior to commencing the statutory consultation period. The statutory consultation documents include false and misleading information particularly around but not limited to the substation site selection process involving landowners which is completely untrue. The consultation does not include any proposed cable corridor route whatsoever within Zone 1 which makes it impossible to fully engage or respond in full to this statutory consultation. This cable route information is essential in order to qualify a statutory consultation for a proposed development of a significant cables corridor within Zone 1, an area of circa 500 acres. There is no information for proposed permanent access routes to either Morecambe substation options or Morgan substation. This permanent access route information is essential in order to qualify a statutory consultation for a proposed development of a significant permanent access routes within Zone 1, an area of circa 500 acres. We have been informed by Dalcour MacLaren that there is additional information available held by the projects which is not being released since the commencement of the statutory consultation period as this would now prejudice the ongoing statutory consultation.</p>	<p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.</p>
TA_0231_019_231123	S44	Email	<p>The Morgan project has targeted [REDACTED] without any consultation nor prior consultation with the land interests over site selection. There has been one meeting only regarding the Morgan substation siting and this was during the statutory consultation period which was held with an inexperienced BP Morgan representative and with the majority of questions answered by a representative of Flotation Energy who has no interest in the scheme proposal on my client's land. The fact that the statutory public consultation documentation includes false statements of prior landowner consultation in the substation site selection process renders the statutory consultation as flawed and my client requires a formal written apology together with a public statement to rectify this untruthful reporting. The statutory consultation has not complied with statutory planning law requirements as necessary under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 as amended. We reserve our</p>	<p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			position to make further representations if/when information is made available and inso doing so we question the validity of the current statutory consultation process.	taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.
TA_0232_001_231123	S44	Email	I am totally opposed to the plans, ther are no details of any buildings to be on site, and no shown access roads therfore I cannot a truly informative decision.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included, but not limited to, local media advertising (online and offline), social media and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers.In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. Traffic and transport impacts arising during the construction phase of the Transmission Assets have been fully assessed at section 7.11 Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference E3.7). Details of the operation and maintenance phases are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Onshore maintenance would be limited to essential maintenance and/or emergency works.
TA_0233_003_231123	S44	Email	Open Cut Trench MethodMy client objects to an open cut trench method of laying high voltage cables with a 122m widecorridor, if indeed cables cannot be carried on existing National Grid infrastructure due to similarconstruction concerns in construction traffic, noise, dust etc will be heard and seen on a daily basis forseveral years which is totally unacceptable in a residential area immediately next to protectedcountryside.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent.The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented.
TA_0233_004_231123	S44	Email	Project Consultation with Land Interests prior to Statutory ConsultationI am particularly concerned at the lack of prior consultation and the ongoing lack of additional schemedetails which are essential in order to provide a fully informed consultation response.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.
TA_0233_005_231123	S44	Email	Our significant concerns relating to the public consultation process are as follows; 1. No information whatsoever relating to the proposed substation locations until circulation of an engagement map 3 days before the opening of the statutory consultation on 12 October 2023. 2. No landowner consultation whatsoever within Zone 1 prior to the opening of the statutory consultation on 12 October 2023. 3. A complete lack of consultation over the proposed siting of the substation proposals within Zone 1. This has led to misinformation within the public consultation documents which incorrectly advises that substation site selection process included landowner consultation. 4. The projects have not carried out any ecology, groundwater, soil surveys etc on my client's land and land proposed to site Morecambe 2 substation until surveys commenced August 2023 therefore no survey data was available prior to deciding on the proposed sites as presented at public consultation. This has led to misinformation within the public consultation documents which incorrectly advises that substation site selection process included detailed land surveys. There was no prior communication, correspondence, meetings to discuss the substation site proposals whatsoever. My first knowledge of the proposed substation locations was over a Teams meeting on 6 October 2023 where I was shown a screenshot of a Zone 1 map known as the "Morgan and Morecambe Engagement Map" classified as CONFIDENTIAL as Dalcour Maclaren (DM) were under instruction not to release this map. On Monday 9 October 2023 DM advised that they now had consent to release the substation locations map just three days prior to the opening of the public consultation period. This Morgan and Morecambe Engagement Map had clearly been produced for some time prior to the start of the public consultation period however for reasons unbeknown to myself or my clients they projects did not wish to engage with the affected landowners prior to public consultation. The poor landowner consultation coupled with public consultation documents advising the public that substation sites selection process included landowner consultation is dishonest and has led to some public anger towards an affected landowner who is presented by the projects to have been consulted and implied as being complicit in substation siting.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience. Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business including any severance and injurious affection. The matters raised in feedback will be included within those negotiations and discussions to progress the land agreements.
TA_0233_008_231123	S44	Email	3. No indicative information relating to the cable corridor route east of Lower Lane, Freckleton. 4. No indicative permanent access route to the Morgan substation site. 5. No indicative permanent access route to the Morecambe substation site options. 6. No cable trench permanent easement width details.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. Transmission Asset routing can be found within the Works Plans (document reference B7, B8) and the Land Plans (document reference B10).
TA_0233_013_231123	S44	Email	Substation Site Layout, Design and Appearance There is no consultation information available showing cross-sections, block plans, landscaping, fencing, aircraft beacons etc of each proposed substation site therefore how could a public consultation exercise provide any useful feedback when essential details are not made available ?	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Wireline visualisations were made available at statutory consultation, showing the maximum parameters from various viewpoints. Visualisations are presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0233_014_231123	S44	Email	High Voltage Cable Corridor Open cut trench method of laying high voltage cables with a 122m wide corridor for two independent projects is not feasible given the major disturbance and risks of staggered implementation. There is a Horizontal Directional Drill option which is capable of drilling up to 1000m below ground and at a reasonable depth to sit below land drainage systems. A further option is that as National Grid are due to upgrade their whole existing network in order to carry 400Kv in the very near future, there is existing National Grid infrastructure within Zone 1 which will soon be able to carry 400Kv which should also be given serious consideration. This may also provide an alternative to requiring substations.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented.
TA_0233_018_231123	S44	Email	Consultation Feedback Summary The statutory consultation is completely flawed as there has been no land interest consultation whatsoever prior to commencing the statutory consultation period. The statutory consultation documents include false and misleading information particularly around but not limited to the substation site selection process involving landowners which is completely untrue. The consultation does not include any proposed cable corridor route whatsoever within Zone 1 which makes it impossible to fully engage or respond in full to this statutory consultation. This cable route information is essential in order to qualify a statutory consultation for a proposed development of a significant cables corridor within Zone 1, an area of circa 500 acres. There is no information for proposed permanent access routes to either Morecambe substation options or Morgan substation. This permanent access route information is essential in order to qualify a statutory consultation for a proposed development of a significant permanent access routes within Zone 1, an area of circa 500 acres. We have been informed by Dalcour MacLaren that there is additional information available held by the projects which is not being released since the commencement of the statutory consultation period as this would now prejudice the ongoing statutory consultation. The statutory consultation has not complied with statutory planning law requirements as necessary under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 as amended. We reserve our position to make further representations if/when information is made available and in so doing so we question the validity of the current statutory consultation process.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.
TA_0234_001_231123	S44	Email	My clients are completely against the proposed projects as their son and daughter-in-law as they appreciate the devastation that will happen if these projects go ahead, together with likely impact on their own land through construction of substations and cable corridors. REDACTED is occupied under the terms of an Agricultural Holdings Act 1986 tenancy, it is a highly productive grassland dairy farm of approximately 200 acres of Grade 2 to Grade 3 land which has a predominantly level aspect which runs north/south over a linear distance of about 1.8 km from the farmstead which is situated at the most southerly end of the farm abutting the A584, to its most northerly extent of farmland which adjoins REDACTED. At its narrowest point which is running east from REDACTED to its east boundary is about 100m. REDACTED has a current milking herd of 300 dairy cows plus followers. The dairy followers are contract reared at REDACTED by REDACTED & Michelle Fare. Fare Farms Limited has invested significantly over recent years in constructing a 1km farm cow track infrastructure which provides direct access from the farmstead to the most northerly block of land which not only improves cow foot health but saves man hours, improves grassland management and prevents any need to use the public highway. In addition, batches of dairy followers as and when required at the farm are walked along the cow track from Greenbank Farm to REDACTED. REDACTED is significantly affected by the Morecambe substation Option 2 site which is proposed to be situated in the middle of the holding, completely severing the farmstead from a large block of land lying to the north of the proposed substation. In addition, there are two temporary	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>construction compounds proposed to facilitate the construction of Morecambe substation Option 2 also wholly located within the farm holding. This Option 2 location abuts the narrowest point of the holding and therefore completely severs the farm in half with no direct access to the northerly block which this substation proposal would create. Morecambe substation Option 2 occupies approx. 16 acres plus approx. 13 acres of temporary construction compound and is wholly within REDACTED boundaries. If my client would have been asked to provide Flotation Energy with a worse case scenario then this proposed location would be it! In addition to the proposed Morecambe substation Option 2 site the holding is also significantly affected by the proposed Morgan Substation site which permanently takes an additional 15 acres of land from the holding. In summary REDACTED is a 200 acre of which about 170 acres is ring fenced farm with direct internal track access to all fields from the farmstead. If the projects go ahead with Morgan and Morecambe 2 option then REDACTED will become a 169 acres farm of which about 64 acres adjoining the farmstead, 74 acres north of Morecambe 2 and 31 acres on the east side of Lower Lane. This is of course less any additional land required for permanent access. During the construction phase REDACTED would lose approx. 42 acres for cable corridor laying plus 13 acres of temporary construction compound, therefore an additional 55 acres out of production for a minimum of 3 years, plus additional land recovery years. During construction REDACTED will become about 114 acres, of which approximately 100 acres farmable which takes half the farm out of production and therefore unviable as a dairy farm. It is wholly unacceptable to consider Morecambe substation Option 2 site in this location as it will completely devastate REDACTED and will not be viable as a dairy farm either during the construction phases or thereafter.</p>	<p>provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). In particular, The assessment of the impact of increased flood risk arising from additional surface water runoff is presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase. An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects. Socio-economics is assessed at Volume 4, Chapter 2 of the ES (document reference: F4.2). Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will continue discussions and negotiations with regards to any impacts to the farming business. Whilst it is acknowledged that there will be disturbance, it is through this discussion and negotiation that Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will seek to mitigate impacts to the farming business.</p>
TA_0234_003_231123	S44	Email	<p>Substation Site Layout, Design and Appearance There is no consultation information available showing cross-sections, block plans, landscaping, fencing, aircraft beacons etc of each proposed substation site therefore how could a public consultation exercise provide any useful feedback when essential details are not made available ?</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Wireline visualisations were made available at statutory consultation, showing the maximum parameters from various viewpoints. Visualisations are presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).</p>
TA_0234_004_231123	S44	Email	<p>Slurry Lagoon Infrastructure Scheme There has recently been government grant funding made available to construct a slurry lagoon in land immediately north of the farmstead, subject to planning permission, in order to store slurry from a 300 cow herd at a cost of circa £200,000 and in order to claim the grant the lagoon must be completed by December 2024. If the wind farm projects go ahead this will threaten the significant investment in constructing a slurry lagoon which may/will not be required as the dairy farm will cease if the projects go ahead as currently proposed. To mitigate the losses from the wind farm projects the slurry lagoon scheme will continue as planned as there will be no compensation payable for the loss of grant funding if the wind farm projects do not go ahead as currently proposed.</p>	<p>Your feedback has been noted.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0234_007_231123	S44	Email	Open Cut Trench MethodMy client objects to an open cut trench method of laying high voltage cables with a 122m widecorridor, if indeed cables cannot be carried on existing National Grid infrastructure.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented.
TA_0234_008_231123	S44	Email	Project Consultation with Land Interests prior to Statutory ConsultationI am particularly concerned at the lack of prior consultation and the ongoing lack of additional schemedetails which are essential in order to provide a fully informed consultation response.	Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.
TA_0234_009_231123	S44	Email	Our significant concerns relating to the public consultation process are as follows;1. No information whatsoever relating to the proposed substation locations until circulation of anengagement map 3 days before the opening of the statutory consultation on 12 October 2023.2. No landowner consultation whatsoever within Zone 1 prior to the opening of the statutoryconsultation on 12 October 2023.3. A complete lack of consultation over the proposed siting of the substation proposals withinZone 1. This has led to misinformation within the public consultation documents whichincorrectly advises that substation site selection process included landowner consultation.4. The projects have not carried out any ecology, groundwater, soil surveys etc on landproposed to site Morecambe 2 substation until surveys commenced August 2023 and aMagnetometer Survey has not been carried out therefore no survey data was available priorto deciding on the proposed sites as presented at public consultation. This has led to misinformation within the public consultation documents which incorrectly advises thatsubstation site selection process included detailed land surveys.There was no prior communication, correspondence, meetings to discuss these proposalswhatsoever.My first knowledge of the proposed substation locations was over a Teams meeting on 6 October2023 where I was shown a screenshot of a Zone 1 map known as the "Morgan and MorecambeEngagement Map" classified as CONFIDENTIAL as Dalcour Maclaren (DM) were under instructionnot to release this map.On Monday 9 October 2023 DM advised that they now had consent to release the substationlocations map just three days prior to the opening of the public consultation period.This Morgan and Morecambe Engagement Map had clearly been produced for some time prior to thestart of the public consultation period however for reasons unbeknown to myself or my clients theyprojects did not wish to engage with the affected landowners prior to public consultation.The poor landowner consultation coupled with public consultation documents advising the public thatsubstation sites selection process included landowner consultation is dishonest and has led to somepublic anger towards an affected landowner who is presented by the projects to have been consultedand implied as being complicit in substation siting.	Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business including any severance and injurious affection. The matters raised in feedback will be included within those negotiations and discussions to progress the land agreements.
TA_0234_012_231123	S44	Email	3. No indicative information relating to the cable corridor route east of Lower Lane, Freckleton. 4. No indicative permanent access route to the Morgan substation site.	Transmission Asset routing can be found within the Works Plans (document reference B7, B8) and the Land Plans (document reference B10). Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>5. No indicative permanent access route to the Morecambe substation site options.</p> <p>6. No cable trench permanent easement width details.</p>	<p>Heads of Terms and as part of those discussions and negotiations detailed information will be provided to confirm the rights sought and required easement widths.</p>
TA_0234_016_231123	S44	Email	<p>High Voltage Cable Corridor Open cut trench method of laying high voltage cables with a 122m wide corridor for two independent projects is not feasible given the major disturbance and risks of staggered implementation. Open cut trenches plus haul roads will cause significant land damage by compaction of subsoil, contamination of topsoil, damage to land drains, significant disruption to farm grassland and livestock management, additional temporary gates and fences, temporary water troughs, limited crossing points, extra use of public highways, conflict between farm activities and contractor HGVs, loss of significant areas of silage and maize growing land. There is a Horizontal Directional Drill option which is capable of drilling up to 1000m below ground and at a reasonable depth to sit below land drainage systems. A further option is that as National Grid are due to upgrade their whole existing network in order to carry 400Kv in the very near future, there is existing National Grid infrastructure within Zone 1 which will soon be able to carry 400Kv which should also be given serious consideration. This may also provide an alternative to requiring substations.</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented. Dalcour McLaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).</p>
TA_0234_021_231123	S44	Email	<p>Consultation Feedback Summary The statutory consultation is completely flawed as there has been no land interest consultation whatsoever prior to commencing the statutory consultation period. The statutory consultation documents include false and misleading information particularly around but not limited to the substation site selection process involving landowners which is a completely untrue. My client was expressly advised by Dalcour MacLaren that substations were not being considered on his farm. The consultation does not include any proposed cable corridor route whatsoever within Zone 1 which makes it impossible to fully engage or respond in full to this statutory consultation. This cable route information is essential in order to qualify a statutory consultation for a proposed development of a significant cables corridor within Zone 1, an area of circa 500 acres. There is no information for proposed permanent access routes to either Morecambe substation options or Morgan substation. This permanent access route information is essential in order to qualify a statutory consultation for a proposed development of a significant permanent access routes within Zone 1, an area of circa 500 acres. We have been informed by Dalcour MacLaren that there is additional information available held by the projects which is not being released since the commencement of the statutory consultation period as this would now prejudice the ongoing statutory consultation. The proposal also completely disrupts the ease of moving livestock from the contract rearing unit at REDACTED.</p>	<p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.</p>
TA_0234_026_231123	S44	Email	<p>Morgan and Morecambe projects have targeted REDACTED without any consultation nor completing of any full ecology or geological surveys and with no prior consultation with the land interests over site selection. The statutory consultation has not complied with statutory planning law requirements as necessary under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 as amended. We reserve our position to make further representations if/when information is made available and in so doing so we question the validity of the current statutory consultation process. Signed REDACTED</p>	<p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.</p>
TA_0235_003_231123	S44	Email	<p>Open Cut Trench Method My client objects to an open cut trench method of laying high voltage cables with a 122m wide corridor, if indeed cables cannot be carried on existing National Grid</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. An Outline Code of Construction Practice</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			infrastructure due to similar construction concerns in construction traffic, noise, dust etc will be heard and seen on a daily basis for several years which is totally unacceptable in a residential area immediately next to protected countryside.	(document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented.
TA_0235_004_231123	S44	Email	Project Consultation with Land Interests prior to Statutory Consultation I am particularly concerned at the lack of prior consultation and the ongoing lack of additional scheme details which are essential in order to provide a fully informed consultation response. Our significant concerns relating to the public consultation process are as follows; 1. No information whatsoever relating to the proposed substation locations until circulation of an engagement map 3 days before the opening of the statutory consultation on 12 October 2023. 2. No landowner consultation whatsoever within Zone 1 prior to the opening of the statutory consultation on 12 October 2023. 3. A complete lack of consultation over the proposed siting of the substation proposals within Zone 1. This has led to misinformation within the public consultation documents which incorrectly advises that substation site selection process included landowner consultation. 4. The projects have not carried out any ecology, groundwater, soil surveys etc on my client's land and land proposed to site Morecambe 2 substation until surveys commenced August 2023 therefore no survey data was available prior to deciding on the proposed sites as presented at public consultation. This has led to misinformation within the public consultation documents which incorrectly advises that substation site selection process included detailed land surveys. There was no prior communication, correspondence, meetings to discuss the substation site proposals whatsoever. My first knowledge of the proposed substation locations was over a Teams meeting on 6 October 2023 where I was shown a screenshot of a Zone 1 map known as the "Morgan and Morecambe Engagement Map" classified as CONFIDENTIAL as Dalcour Maclaren (DM) were under instruction not to release this map. On Monday 9 October 2023 DM advised that they now had consent to release the substation locations map just three days prior to the opening of the public consultation period. This Morgan and Morecambe Engagement Map had clearly been produced for some time prior to the start of the public consultation period however for reasons unbeknown to myself or my clients the projects did not wish to engage with the affected landowners prior to public consultation. The poor landowner consultation coupled with public consultation documents advising the public that substation sites selection process included landowner consultation is dishonest and has led to some public anger towards an affected landowner who is presented by the projects to have been consulted and implied as being complicit in substation siting.	Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level of detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.
TA_0235_007_231123	S44	Email	3. No indicative information relating to the cable corridor route east of Lower Lane, Freckleton. 4. No indicative permanent access route to the Morgan substation site. 5. No indicative permanent access route to the Morecambe substation site options. 6. No cable trench permanent easement width details.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. Transmission Asset routing can be found within the Works Plans (document reference B7, B8) and the Land Plans (document reference B10).
TA_0235_012_231123	S44	Email	Substation Site Layout, Design and Appearance There is no consultation information available showing cross-sections, block plans, landscaping, fencing, aircraft beacons etc of each proposed substation site therefore how could a public consultation exercise provide any useful feedback when essential details are not made available ?	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Wireline visualisations were made available at statutory consultation, showing the maximum parameters from various viewpoints. Visualisations are presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).</p>
TA_0235_013_231123	S44	Email	<p>High Voltage Cable Corridor Open cut trench method of laying high voltage cables with a 122m wide corridor for two independent projects is not feasible given the major disturbance and risks of staggered implementation. There is a Horizontal Directional Drill option which is capable of drilling up to 1000m below ground and at a reasonable depth to sit below land drainage systems. A further option is that as National Grid are due to upgrade their whole existing network in order to carry 400Kv in the very near future, there is existing National Grid infrastructure within Zone 1 which will soon be able to carry 400Kv which should also be given serious consideration. This may also provide an alternative to requiring substations.</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented.</p>
TA_0235_017_231123	S44	Email	<p>Consultation Feedback Summary The statutory consultation is completely flawed as there has been no land interest consultation whatsoever prior to commencing the statutory consultation period. The statutory consultation documents include false and misleading information particularly around but not limited to the substation site selection process involving landowners which is completely untrue. There is no information for proposed permanent access routes to either Morecambe substation options or Morgan substation. This permanent access route information is essential in order to qualify a statutory consultation for a proposed development of a significant permanent access routes within Zone 1, an area of circa 500 acres. We have been informed by Dalcour MacLaren that there is additional information available held by the projects which is not being released since the commencement of the statutory consultation period as this would now prejudice the ongoing statutory consultation. The statutory consultation has not complied with statutory planning law requirements as necessary under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 as amended. We reserve our position to make further representations if/when information is made available and in so doing so we question the validity of the current statutory consultation process. Signed REDACTED</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level of detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.</p>
TA_0236_002_231123	S44	Email	<p>Throughout this consultation I have found the information put forward to the public to be very vague, lacking up front information and challenging to navigate the online information presented. With documents hundreds of pages long containing the extent to the proposals plainly named (appendix i, ii, iii etc) I feel this has been done intentionally to deter people from finding the ridiculous extent of the proposals.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR.</p>
TA_0237_001_231123	S44	Email	<p>As a resident of REDACTED I am writing to object to your proposal due to you not giving enough information. This area is semi-rural and I am concerned what impact this will have on the wildlife. I also have concerns how the work will affect my property/home. The delays that will be caused whilst work carried out along queensway, and the length of time these delays will be.</p>	<p>The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets on protected species and protected habitats are considered in Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES. Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on onshore ecology and nature conservation are provided in section 3.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference: F3.3). Traffic and transport impacts arising during the construction phase of the Transmission Assets have been fully assessed at section 7.11 Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference E3.7) with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8). Details of the operation and maintenance phases are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Onshore maintenance would be limited to essential maintenance and/or emergency works. Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).</p>
TA_0239_001_231123	S44	Email	<p>I too would like to use the opportunity during this public consultation period, to unequivocally Object to your proposals and express my concerns over the proposed offshore Wind Farm cable routing and substation locations within the fylde coast. I believe this would have a grossly negative impact on the Environment both physically, via the works proposed and Visually, damaging an untold amount of wildlife habitat and green belt protected land, conservation area's, highly productive farmland and have a hugely detrimental impact on the wider community and local economy, putting local business, landowners and Farmers out of business. I believe it would create an untold amount of suffering for residents within the fylde coast for years to come via flooding and disruption i.e. traffic. Your lack of detail on some of the proposed cable routes and sub stations at this late stage and at this public consultation point in proceedings, is highly worrying as this shows either an unprofessional approach to the matter, or highly unprepared, or at worst, both. It is most concerning that at this late stage we are asked to submit our opinions on a body of work that is neither complete nor suggest the possible outcomes thereafter the point of consultation. I feel that you have shown disregard to the community of the fylde coast in your methods up to now. This lack of transparency on your part, sets a</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			precedent when approaching future issues and has created a level of mistrust that is beyond repair. This is another reason why I must wholeheartedly Object on all parts of your proposals.	impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0243_002_231123	S44	Email	No detailed maps or models were made available to the public but were made available to land owners before the statutory consultation. All parties should legally have the same information, making the statutory consultation flawed.	Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.
TA_0243_003_231123	S44	Email	Our local MP has seemingly been 'hoodwinked' over time, being drip-fed information and intentionally misled.	Throughout the development of the Transmission Assets, the Applicants have aimed to be open and transparent with all stakeholders, including Mark Menzies as the MP for the constituency at the time. Please see section 3 of the Consultation report (document reference E1) for information on the early engagement undertaken by the Applicants from Spring/summer 2021 in regards to the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Mona Offshore Wind Project, which included notifying Mark Menzies MP; a member of his team attended the consultation event at Lytham Assembly Rooms on 21 November 2022. A subsequent meeting took place with Mr Menzies on 18 December 2022. Section 3 of the Consultation report also provides details on follow up meetings with elected representatives, including Mark Menzies MP, between 2022 and 2023. A further meeting with a representative of Mr Menzies' office took place on 1 March 2023 which was subsequently followed up with an email update on 28 March 2023. As a section 47 consultee, Mark Menzies MP received notification of the launch of statutory consultation and also attended stakeholders briefings in September and October 2023. See section 4 of the Consultation report for further details.
TA_0243_007_231123	S44	Email	People invest their money to live in a semi-rural environment for mental health and wellbeing. This development promises to devalue their assets and destroy their chosen quality of life. There are alternative options laid out by the initial studies and FBCs plans, which should be reconsidered and different decisions made.	An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>the ES. This assessment utilises the WorldHealth Organisation definition of health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing. Any effects are assessed to be not significant and appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards. The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0243_011_231123	S44	Email	<p>BP does not appear to have acted in an ethical or moral manner, seemingly pushing through these decisions, with the backing of decision-makers already in the bag. This process is a sham, and I oppose the development for all the above reasons. Also, I have copied in the new Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, who was appointed on the 13th of November; REDACTED would no doubt have an interest in such destruction of what he has been tasked with protecting especially as he was born in Lytham St. Annes, whose tourism and businesses will be massively affected.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents. The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included, but not limited to, local media advertising (online and offline), social media and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers. The EIA methodology is set out within Volume 1, Chapter 5: Environmental assessment methodology of the ES. The chapter describes how significance of effects has been assessed. Professional judgement is used to define the magnitude of impact and receptor sensitivity. The matrix is then used, together with professional judgement, to evaluate the significance of effect. The significance may be one, or a range of, no change, negligible, minor, moderate or major. In general, a significance of effect of moderate or greater is considered 'significant' in EIA terms. For each topic chapter, what is considered 'significant' has been clearly defined. Where further mitigation is not possible a residual significant effect may remain. Within the assessment chapters the justification for determining the significance of effect is described. Where a range is given, the assessment chapter details the reason for the significance that has been concluded.</p>
TA_0244_002_231123	S44	Email	<p>No detailed maps or models were made available to the public but were made available to land owners before the statutory consultation. All parties should legally have the same information, making the statutory consultation flawed.</p>	<p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.
TA_0244_003_231123	S44	Email	Our local MP has seemingly been 'hoodwinked' over time, being drip-fed information and intentionally misled.	Throughout the development of the Transmission Assets, the Applicants have aimed to be open and transparent with all stakeholders, including Mark Menzies as the MP for the constituency at the time. Please see section 3 of the Consultation report (document reference E1) for information on the early engagement undertaken by the Applicants from Spring/summer 2021 in regards to the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Mona Offshore Wind Project, which included notifying Mark Menzies MP; a member of his team attended the consultation event at Lytham Assembly Rooms on 21 November 2022. A subsequent meeting took place with Mr Menzies on 18 December 2022. Section 3 of the Consultation report also provides details on follow up meetings with elected representatives, including Mark Menzies MP, between 2022 and 2023. A further meeting with a representative of Mr Menzies' office took place on 1 March 2023 which was subsequently followed up with an email update on 28 March 2023. As a section 47 consultee, Mark Menzies MP received notification of the launch of statutory consultation and also attended stakeholders briefings in September and October 2023. See section 4 of the Consultation report for further details.
TA_0244_007_231123	S44	Email	People invest their money to live in a semi-rural environment for mental health and wellbeing. This development promises to devalue their assets and destroy their chosen quality of life. There are alternative options laid out by the initial studies and FBCs plans, which should be reconsidered and different decisions made.	An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the WorldHealth Organisation definition of health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing. Any effects are assessed to be not significant and appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards. The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0244_011_231123	S44	Email	BP does not appear to have acted in an ethical or moral manner, seemingly pushing through these decisions, with the backing of decision-makers already in the bag. This process is a sham, and I oppose the development for all the above reasons. Also, I have copied in the new Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, who was appointed on the 13th of November; REDACTED would no doubt have an interest in such destruction of what he has been tasked with protecting especially as he was born in Lytham St. Annes, whose tourism and businesses will be massively affected.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents. The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included, but not limited to, local media advertising (online and offline), social media and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers. The EIA methodology is set out within Volume 1, Chapter 5: Environmental assessment methodology of the ES. The chapter describes how significance of effects has been assessed. Professional judgement is used to define the magnitude of impact and receptor sensitivity. The matrix is then used, together with professional judgement, to evaluate the significance of effect. The significance may be one, or a range of, no change, negligible, minor, moderate or major. In general, a significance of effect of moderate or greater is considered 'significant' in EIA terms. For each topic chapter, what is considered 'significant' has been clearly defined. Where further mitigation is not possible a residual significant effect may remain. Within the assessment chapters the justification for determining the significance of effect is described. Where a range is given, the assessment chapter details the reason for the significance that has been concluded.</p>
TA_0245_001_231123	S44	Email	<p>I would like to use the opportunity during this public consultation period, to unequivocally Object to your proposals and express my concerns over the proposed off shore Wind Farm cable routing and sub station locations within the fylde coast. I believe this would have a grossly negative impact on the Environment both physically, via the works proposed and Visually, damaging an untold amount of wildlife habitat and green belt protected land, conservation area's, highly productive farmland and have a hugely detrimental impact on the wider community and local economy, putting local business, land owners and Farmers out of business. I believe it would create an untold amount of suffering for residents within the fylde coast for years to come via flooding and disruption ie traffic. Your lack of detail on some of the proposed cable routes and sub stations at this late stage and at this public consultation point in proceedings, is highly worrying as this shows either an unprofessional approach to the matter, or highly unprepared, or at worst, both. It is most concerning that at this late stage we are asked to submit our opinions on a body of work that is neither complete nor suggest the possible outcomes thereafter the point of consultation. I feel that you have shown disregard to the community of the fylde coast in your methods up to now. This lack of transparency on your part, sets a precedent when approaching future issues and has created a level of mistrust that is beyond repair. This is another reason why I must whole heartedly Object on all parts of your proposals.</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0246_001_231123	S44	Email	We remain concerned that there does not appear to be a plan we can look at, that shows us the complete route of the cables to Penwortham. We also do know that the protected river will still have to be crossed at some point! It still seems to me that you should be using Heysham Power Station instead of Penwortham. Can you please answer my questions.	The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Direct pipe or microtunnelling is proposed beneath the River Ribble to ensure that there would be no direct impacts on the river habitats. As set out in Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3), Crossing techniques are set out within Volume 1, Annex 3.2: Onshore Crossing Schedule of the ES (document reference F1.3.2) which is submitted as part of the application for development consent. Further information on the proposed approach to construction is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES.
TA_0247_001_231123	S44	Email	I would like to take this opportunity during the public consultation period, to unequivocally Object to your proposals and express my concerns over the proposed off shore Wind Farm cable routing and sub station locations within the Fylde coast. I believe this would have a grossly negative impact on the Environment both physically, via the works proposed and visually, damaging an untold amount of wildlife habitat and green belt protected land, conservation areas, highly productive farmland and have a hugely detrimental impact on the wider community and local economy, putting local businesses, land owners and farmers out of business. I believe it would create an untold amount of suffering for residents within the fylde coats for years to come via flooding and disruption i.e traffic. Your lack of detail on some of the proposed cable routes and sub stations at this late stage and at this public consultation point in proceedings is highly worrying as this shows either an unprofessional approach to the matter, or highly unprepared, or at worst, both. It is most concerning that at this late stage we are asked to submit our opinions on a body of work that is neither complete nor suggest the possible outcomes thereafter the point of consultation. I feel that you have shown disregard to the community of the Fylde coats in your methods up to now. This lack of transparency on your part, sets a precedent when approaching future issues and has created a level of mistrust that is beyond repair. This is another reason why i must whole heartedly Object on all parts of your proposals.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0248_001_231123	S44	Email	<p>I am putting my feedback/objections to the Wind Farm Project in writing. I am not prepared to complete your paper feedback form as I strongly believe this has been made as difficult as possible for people to complete. You are asking for feedback on technical reports which are fact. Without reading all of your documents in full it would be impossible to comment on them nor would I be qualified to do so. I have attended a number of your consultation events, a Newton with Scales Parish council meeting where a project representative was in attendance and now 2 of your Statutory consultations and also had two site visits to my property. All I can say is that they were all a waste of time. All information provided is available on your web site. This project has been fed piecemeal and lacks transparency. There is no evidence of how the four possible areas for substations were arrived at and how this has now been reduced to Zone 1. All you are doing is fulfilling your statutory obligations without giving vital information to land owners and the general public. Your information has been sketchy, and changes without notification. There has been a total lack of consideration for land owners, house owners, wildlife, the risk of severe flooding and environmental damage. Your two companies act like bullies who intimidate those possibly in danger of losing their land, their lifestyle taken away from them, reduction in property prices due to this ugly, noisy and unwanted development in the area. No other alternatives have been put forward and it would appear that Zone one has been chosen as the only site. In addition to my objections with regard to our land for which we have worked hard to initially acquire but also to develop it into a useable stable yard and small holding I also live on REDACTED in St Annes. We only found out about the proposed cable route through St Annes about three weeks before this round of statutory consultations and only via a mail shot. This has given little time for residents to assimilate their objections.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0248_004_231123	S44	Email	<p>Your statutory consultations only fulfil your legal obligations. No information was provided that could not have been obtained from your web site. Information given at the events has been confusion, contradictory between your representatives at the same consultation and sketchy at best. This whole process that me as land owners in Newton has been extremely stressful and is affecting my health. Originally, we were approached with the possibility of cables running under our small holding of just 8 acres using directional drilling technique. This in itself would have caused a considerable amount of disruption and stress to the horses and livestock we have on our land. At an on-site meeting which we were under the impression was to discuss the cable corridor, we were informed that our land was being considered for substations. This has now been refined so our land is not in the area earmarked for the substation but quite possibly in line for underground cables which if they go under our land will completely monopolise it. How are we supposed to accommodate our animals and manage our land? We are now also told that it would not be directional drilling technique that would be used but open trenches. This would render our land unusable for the duration of cable laying and some considerable time after that.</p>	<p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience. Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business.</p>
TA_0249_001_231123	S44	Email	<p>I am putting my feedback/objections to the Wind Farm Project in writing. I am not prepared to complete your paper feedback form as I strongly believe this has been made as difficult as possible for people to complete. You are asking for feedback on technical reports which are fact. Without</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>reading all of your documents in full it would be impossible to comment on them nor would I be qualified to do so.I have attended a number of your consultation events, a Newton with Scales Parish council meeting where a project representative was in attendance and now 2 of your Statutory consultations and also had two site visits to my property. All I can say is that they were all a waste of time. All information provided is available on your web site. This project has been fed piecemeal and lacks transparency. There is no evidence of how the four possible areas for substations were arrived at and how this has now been reduced to Zone 1. All you are doing is fulfilling your statutory obligations without giving vital information to land owners and the general public. Your information has been sketchy, and changes without notification.. There has been a total lack of consideration for land owners, house owners, wildlife, the risk of severe flooding and environmental damage. Your two companies act like bullies who intimidate those possibly in danger of losing their land, their lifestyle taken away from them, reduction in property prices due to this ugly, noisy and unwanted development in the area. No other alternatives have been put forward and it would appear that Zone one has been chosen as the only site. In addition to my objections with regard to our land for which we have worked hard to initially acquire but also to develop it into a useable stable yard and small holding I also live on REDACTED in St Annes. We only found out about the proposed cable route through St Annes about three weeks before this round of statutory consultations and only via a mail shot. This has given little time for residents to assimilate their objections.</p>	<p>statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course.The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR.The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0249_004_231123	S44	Email	<p>Your statutory consultations only fulfil your legal obligations. No information was provided that could not have been obtained from your web site. Information given at the events has been confusion, contradictory between your representatives at the same consultation and sketchy at best. This whole process that me as land owners in Newton has been extremely stressful and is affecting my health. Originally, we were approached with the possibility of cables running under our small holding of just 8 acres using directional drilling technique. This in itself would have caused a considerable amount of disruption and stress to the horses and livestock we have on our land.At an on-site meeting which we were under the impression was to discuss the cable corridor, we were informed that our land was being considered for substations.This has now been refined so our land is not in the area earmarked for the substation but quite possibly in line for underground cables which if they go under our land will completely monopolise it. How are we supposed to accommodate our animals and manage our land? We are now also told that it would not be directional drilling technique that would be used but open trenches. This would render our land unusable for the duration of cable laying and some considerable time after that.</p>	<p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business.</p>

E1.16.3 Policy and legislation table of responses

E1.16.3.1 Policy and legislation table of responses (via feedback form)

Table E1.16.3.1: Policy and legislation context consultation responses (feedback form)

As set out in section 4.7.4 of the Consultation report (document reference E1). Responses have been allocated to the most appropriate topic(s). If a consultee did not provide a response for a question/sub-question this is not recorded. If a consultee included 'N/A', 'none', 'no comment', 'Nil', 'No', in response to a question, this has also not been recorded. Where a consultee provided a response which stated 'see response above' or similar, the response has been replicated in brackets and italics.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicant's response
TA_0057_001_231123	S44	Online feedback form	2		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicant's response
						out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0057_002_231123	S44	Online feedback form	5		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicant's response
						significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0057_003_231123	S44	Online feedback form	6		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicant's response
						significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0057_004_231123	S44	Online feedback form	8		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicant's response
						significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0057_005_231123	S44	Online feedback form	9		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicant's response
						significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0057_006_231123	S44	Online feedback form	10		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicant's response
						significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0057_007_231123	S44	Online feedback form	11		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicant's response
						significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0057_008_231123	S44	Online feedback form	12		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicant's response
						significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0057_009_231123	S44	Online feedback form	14		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicant's response
						significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0057_010_231123	S44	Online feedback form	16		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3).</p> <p>Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicant's response
						significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0060_008_151123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.6	Conservation area green belt land are being used everyday for recreation nature and wildlife	It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0104_001_101123	S44	Online feedback form	3		I Strongly Object to Option 1 (north of higher ballam) cable route on the lytham moss due to the major impact on my agricultural business, surrounding agricultural and equestrian businesses, the financial toll and damage it would have on these businesses and local residents on division lane and environmental damage and impact on green belt farm land. This area is protected green belt, development is damaging and harmful to the environment and in my opinion the option 2 cable route (south of higher ballam) would be preferable if this project ever happens.	The Applicants have made design changes since PEIR and the southern option (Option 2) which passed through to the south of Higher Balham has been removed, to mitigate potential impacts related to ornithology on the Farmland Conservation Area. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0105_001_231123	S44	Online feedback form	1		I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's. This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the proposed siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicant's response
TA_0105_002_231123	S44	Online feedback form	2		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0105_003_231123	S44	Online feedback form	5		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid,</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicant's response
						then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0105_004_231123	S44	Online feedback form	6		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0105_005_231123	S44	Online feedback form	7		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicant's response
						the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0105_006_231123	S44	Online feedback form	8		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0105_007_231123	S44	Online feedback form	9		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicant's response
						Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0105_008_231123	S44	Online feedback form	10		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0105_009_231123	S44	Online feedback form	11		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicant's response
						The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0105_010_231123	S44	Online feedback form	14		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0105_011_231123	S44	Online feedback form	16		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicant's response
					<p>the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0113_005_151123	S44	Online feedback form	8		<p>The proposed area is green belt and the proposals are not in line with the Fylde Local plan. Local communities will be impacted severely by the huge substations in terms of the visual impact , noise and light pollution.</p> <p>An offshore wind farm project should be able to utilise the River Ribble to reach the national grid rather than creating large blots on the landscape. The current plans are impacting on the environment of local communities.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.</p> <p>The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).</p> <p>Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicant's response
						provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).

E1.16.3.2 Policy and legislation table of responses (via all other methods)

Table E1.16.3.2: Policy and legislation tables of responses (via all other methods)

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0017_009_231123	S42/S44	Email	<p>Legislation</p> <p>The application will need to demonstrate that the proposed development will fully comply with the requirements of all relevant legislation, including (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Planning Act 2008 and associated secondary legislation; • The Environment Act 2021 and associated secondary legislation; • Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)) Regulations 2017 • The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended); • The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended); • The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (as amended); 	<p>The legislative background that has informed the assessment is provided in section 3.2.1 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). The application of relevant legislation to the assessment of impacts on onshore ecology and nature conservation is demonstrated through the evaluation and identification of important ecological features, as set out in section 3.6.4. The assessment of impacts is provided in section 3.11.</p>
TA_0017_010_231123	S42/S44	Email	<p>Policy</p> <p>The application should demonstrate that the proposed development will fully comply with the requirements of all relevant national and local planning policy, including (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Statements, including for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) o National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) o National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5) • The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF); • Local Plan policies. <p>Section 5.3 of National Policy Statement EN-1 sets out requirements in respect of Biodiversity and geological conservation. National Policy statement EN-1 states that "Where the development is subject to EIA the applicant should ensure that the ES clearly sets out any effects on internationally, nationally and locally designated sites of ecological or geological conservation importance, on protected species and on habitats and other species identified as being of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity. The applicant should provide environmental information proportionate to the infrastructure where EIA is not required to help the IPC consider thoroughly the potential effects of a proposed project". National Policy statement EN-1 also states that "The applicant should show how the project has taken advantage of opportunities to conserve and enhance biodiversity and geological conservation interests". The NPPF states that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity (See Paragraph 174). The NPPF also states that "if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused" (See Paragraph 180). In order to meet the requirements of the NPPF, the planning application will therefore need to demonstrate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all elements of the development would be located and designed to avoid or minimise harm to biodiversity, and • adequate mitigation/compensation for any unavoidable impacts, as well as net gains for biodiversity, will be provided. 	<p>The policy background that has informed the assessment is provided in section 3.2.2 and section 3.2.3 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). The application of relevant policy to the assessment of impacts on onshore ecology and nature conservation is demonstrated through the evaluation and identification of important ecological features, as set out in section 3.6.4. The assessment of impacts is provided in section 3.11. Information on biodiversity net gain is provided in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11) and information on biodiversity benefit is provided in the Outline Ecological Management Plan (document reference J6).</p>
TA_0017_011_231123	S42/S44	Email	<p>Guidelines</p> <p>The planning application should demonstrate that the proposed development will comply with recognised guidelines, including (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Infrastructure Planning guidance and advice notes including for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Advice Note Seven: Environmental Impact Assessment Advice Note Ten: Habitats Regulations Assessments • Government Circular: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation – Statutory Obligations and their impact within the planning system (ODPM 06/2005, DEFRA 01/2005). • Planning for Biodiversity and Geological Conservation: A Guide to Good Practice (March 2006). • Relevant Planning Practice Guidance, including (but not limited to) Environmental Impact Assessment and Natural Environment. https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance • CIEEM Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment, 2018; • Ecological Impact Assessment Checklist (CIEEM & ALGE, 2019); • BS42020 Biodiversity – Code of Practice for Planning and Development. • Biodiversity net gain. Good practice principles for development - CIEEM, IEMA & CIRIA (2019). • Recognised survey and mitigation guidelines, including (but not limited to) current Natural England standing advice, guidelines and Technical Information Notes. • Any emerging guidelines relating to compliance with the requirements of the Environment Act 2021. 	<p>The guidance documents that have informed the assessment are set out in section 3.2.5 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). The application of relevant guidance to the assessment of impacts on onshore ecology and nature conservation is demonstrated through the evaluation and identification of important ecological features, as set out in section 3.6.4. The assessment of impacts is provided in section 3.11. Information on biodiversity net gain is provided in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefits Statement (document reference J11) and biodiversity benefit in the Outline Ecological Management Plan (document reference J6).</p>
TA_0026_003_231123	S42/S44	Email	<p>Planning Applications</p> <p>To advance the EZ objectives, a series of planning applications have been made or are in the pipeline. The first planning applications for the Enterprise Zone have focussed upon the eastern extent of the Enterprise Zone boundary adjacent to Common Edge Road. Planning permission has been granted for the Common Edge Community Sports Village, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full planning permission – 12 no. grassed pitches (refs. 20/0108 Blackpool and 20/0114 Fylde); and • Full planning permission for the remainder of sports facilities, namely the Construction of a 3G rugby pitch and a 3G football pitch alongside an ancillary changing / spectator building of 675sqm GIA, reconfiguration and extension to existing car park, provision of spectator hardstanding areas and new landscaping, with the creation of a pedestrian footway and junction works to the existing access road, Division Lane (refs. 20/0564 and 20/0677) <p>An application for the land to the north of the Sports Village, named the Eastern</p>	<p>The Applicants welcome Blackpool Airport's engagement. The Project will continue to engage with Blackpool Airport, in relation to potential impacts which may arise from the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Transmission Assets. Including where they may arise in relation to the Masterplan</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>Gateway, has subsequently been approved and planning permission granted for: •Outline planning permission with all matters reserved for - Reconfiguration of Common Edge Road to create a new point of access into the Enterprise Zone and provision of new spine road from this access point to Amy Johnson Way; Erection of up to 35,000sqm of business, industrial and storage and warehousing uses (Classes E(g), B2 and B8); Erection of up to 275sqm retail floorspace (Class E(a)); Erection of up to 275sqm cafe floorspace (Class E(b)); Highways works including reconfiguration of the junction of Common Edge Road and School Road; Associated infrastructure including drainage works, electric vehicle charging hub, substations, car parking and landscaping; Demolition of a single storey building at Collins Park and no. 2 School Road (refs. 22/0265 and 22/0267). There are two current applications, which are: •Hybrid planning application relating to Enterprise Zone development consisting of a full planning application for the construction of new access roads, existing highways improvement works and drainage works; and outline planning application for the construction of 5 no. hangars, a commercial unit (class B2/E(g)) and car parking, alongside associated infrastructure works with access applied for and all other matters reserved. This application will support the Airport and wider Enterprise Zone designation by providing new modern hangars which will allow older units which are in a poor condition elsewhere at the Airport to be removed. This would in turn allow for these sites, located fronting Squires Gate Lane, to be redeveloped for alternative employment uses suited to the principles of the Enterprise Zone's Masterplan (refs. 23/0634 and 23/0589). •Reserved Matters application for the construction of the spine road associated with outline planning permission (refs. 23/0812 Blackpool)</p>	
TA_0026_004_231123	S42/S44	Email	<p>Planning PolicyThe statutory development plan framework for the majority of the airport and the Enterprise Zone is the Fylde Local Plan to 2032. The Local Plan policies map, illustrates that the airport itself is subject to a range of designations including green belt and the EZ boundary alongside land allocated for employment development. [Fig. 1]. Policy DLF1 refers to the four strategic locations for development where future growth will be directed, and identifies that the Fylde/Blackpool periphery is one of the key development locations within the Borough. •Lytham and St Annes; •Fylde – Blackpool periphery •Warton; and •Kirkham and Wesham Policy EC4 relates solely to Blackpool Airport Enterprise Zone. The policy states that the designation of the Enterprise Zone will help create more businesses, jobs and attract international investment, with positive benefits across the wider economic area. The Council will support the sustainable development of Blackpool Airport, including working to explore the potential to develop commercial aeronautical activity and to relocate operational buildings and facilities closer to the main runway, in the areas outside the green belt, unless there are overriding operational requirements that constitute very special circumstances and which justify development in the green belt. Policy T3 concerns Blackpool Airport and states that the land designated as green belt within the airport will be safeguarded from non-airport related development and the continuing operation and viability of the airport as a sub-regional facility will be supported, unless there are overriding operational requirements that constitute very special circumstances and which justify development in the green belt. With regard to further development, required in relation to the operation of the Airport, this will be located in accordance with the masterplan prepared to guide development that delivers the objectives of the Enterprise Zone, in the areas outside the green belt, unless there are overriding operational requirements that constitute very special circumstances and which justify development in the green belt. The NPPF sets out national green belt policy, with Paragraph 147 stating that inappropriate development is by definition, harmful to the green belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances, a matter specifically addressed by the development plan which acknowledges that the need for airport related development may justify its location within the green belt where very special circumstances can be demonstrated.</p>	<p>The Applicants welcome Blackpool Airport's engagement. The Project will continue to engage with Blackpool Airport, in relation to potential impacts which may arise from the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Transmission Assets. Including where they may arise in relation to the Masterplan</p>
TA_0026_006_231123	S42/S44	Email	<p>However, before such a route can be agreed it is essential that the developers of the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms fully understand the issues and intentions of the EZ and Blackpool Council in respect of current operations and their future masterplan which is an essential element of the EZ programme. Without delivering the development outline in the evolving masterplan, the EZ will not be successful and the fundamental aims including the creation of 5,000 new jobs and the attraction of over £300m in private investment will not occur. This letter is the formal start of that process and we expect that discussions with the developers will take place whilst the route for the assets is finalised.</p>	<p>The Applicants welcome Blackpool Airport's engagement. The Project will continue to engage with Blackpool Airport, in relation to potential impacts which may arise from the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Transmission Assets. Including where they may arise in relation to the Masterplan</p>
TA_0038_010_181123	S44	Email	<p>2. The PIER appears to totally ignore the Fylde Borough Council (FBC) Local (development) Plan which had already identified Enterprise Zones and brown field sites as potential candidate location zones.</p>	<p>Other proposed developments, including allocated development sites, have been considered in the cumulative assessment of each onshore topic chapter (see Volume 3 of the ES, document reference F3).</p>
TA_0045_003_211123	S42/S44	Email	<p>Building on green belt land and the destruction of the landscape.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the Transmission Assets Order Limits pass through Green Belt land and that parts of the onshore cable routes and the onshore substations fall within the Green Belt. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). When assessed on the planning balance, in particular regarding the significant benefits of the Transmission Assets in relation to facilitating the connection of two nationally significant offshore wind farms to the national grid, this outweighs the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness or any other harm. The assessment also takes into account matters such as visual amenity impact and landscape character which relate to the openness of the Green Belt. The scheme design has been developed through an iterative process to achieve a design freeze, including consideration of alternative onshore substation location options. Alternative designs and technology are considered in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0010_008_221123	S42	Email	Volume 1 Chapter 2: Policy and Legislation Context2.1. Section 2.4.4 correctly identified that the proposed development is within the North West Marine Plan areas. MMO notes that the policies within the North West Marine Plan relevant to each environmental topic are presented and addressed in the individual topic chapters of the PEIR. MMO requests that all policies are reviewed and presented in a single, coherent document such as a table, instead of a number of separate references throughout the submission.2.2. This must be produced as part of the Environmental Statement (ES) to enable the Secretary of State to review compliance of the North West Marine Plan when making planning decisions for the sea, coast, estuaries and tidal waters, as well as developments that impacts these areas, such as infrastructure.2.3. The North West Marine Plan policies can be accessed using Explore Marine Plans: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/explore-marine-plans	The Applicants note your response. The North West Marine Plan policies are addressed in the Planning Statement, submitted as part of the DCO Application (document reference J28).
TA_0124_003_171123	S44	Email	2.No explanation was given as to how the 4 location zones were identified or selected in the first place. PIER ignores FBC local plan identified enterprise zones and brown field sites as potential candidate zones	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0129_002_191123	S44	Email	The selection of the zones does not seem logical or balanced and seems to have had a predetermined answer. Often exaggerating impacts to achieve the 'desired result', ie Zone 1. For example, stating a high pressure gas main is located in Zone 2, when it is only present in the extreme eastern edge. Similarly for flood risks and assessment of impact on wildlife.The whole scheme goes against strategic development plans for Fylde green belt and the Kirkham separation zone. These are huge structures and will fundamentally change the area from being farming and rural to industrial. This is clearly against the culture of the area and will impact the lives of many, many residents and business owners in the region.Why can't the cables be run further down the estuary and then use brown field sites near the proposed connection point to the national grid, at Pemwortham.In short, building these structures and running associated cables will have a massive detrimental effect on the area and is against the existing democratically agreed development plans for the area and the consultation has not been impartial and considered all factors equally. In short flawed and hence should be disregarded as incomplete and the plan rejected.	The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.
TA_0130_005_191123	S44	Email	I strongly support the following objection drawn up locally; "I would like to use the opportunity during this public consultation period, to unequivocally Object to your proposals and express my concerns over the proposed offshore Wind Farm cable routing and sub station locations within the Fylde coast. I believe this would have a grossly negative impact on the Environment both physically, via the works proposed and visually, damaging an untold amount of wildlife habitat and green belt protected land, conservation area's, highly productive farmland and have a hugely detrimental impact on the wider community and local economy, putting local business, land owners and Farmers out of business. I believe it would create an untold amount of suffering for residents within the Fylde coast for years to come via flooding and disruption i.e. traffic.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Transmission Assets is fully committed to delivering a community benefits scheme in line with UK Government guidance, which is due to be published later this year. The Transmission Assets is fully committed to delivering a community benefits scheme in line with UK Government guidance, which is due to be published later this year. Ahead of the guidance being published we have been engaging with local people, businesses and organisations to identify key themes and projects that will deliver strategic benefits and directly support the local community and local priorities. We welcome further input from the local community and encourage you to reach out to the project team in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0135_003_191123	S44	Email	The proposed site is very close to the residential areas of Kirkham , Freckleton and Newton .Over the past few years we have lost so much of our green belt farmland to development, which in itself is a tragedy; but to consider completely destroying this huge area and turning it over to industrial site is horrendous.-How can it ever be appropriate to permanently destroy farmland and disrupt thousands of lives , when there will surely be a site more suitable that causes less disruption.	It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0140_005_201123	S44	Email	I believe that the substations are going to be on green belt and are absolutely huge.They are going to be close to schools which is appalling.	It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0142_001_201123	S44	Email	I am writing this email to lodge a complaint about the two massive substations, you are planning to build on green belt farm land in lower lane Freckleton. Having lived in the area for the past 3 years I am very concerned about the impact that this will have on the environment and the wildlife, but also the disruption it will cause to the local residents way of life.We like our way of life,here which is quiet and peaceful & I would like it to remain this way.Also I'm extremely worried about the fact that your buildings could,most likely devalue my property.	Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).The

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.
TA_0145_002_201123	S44	Email	The non statutory consultation is also flawed. There was no information as to how the four location search zones were identified or selected. You have also not considered identified enterprise zones and brown field sites as identified by Fylde Borough Council. The PEIR obviously shows that you have predetermined the outcome in favour of zone 1, the RAG assessment is biased in favour of zone 1, with the rating being inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect. Below are some of the points which demonstrate this. High pressure gas main. The high pressure gas main only touches the extreme eastern edge of zone 2, this could be managed. This is not made clear. Flood risk – Inspection of flood zone maps shows there is little difference in flood risk between zones 1 and 2. This is not made clear. Zone 1 and zone 2 are roughly equidistant from SSSI so not a factor to differentiate siting as claimed. Bluefield solar farm development is not in zone 2, it is just in zone 1. Inconsistent treatment of wildlife concerns and surveys. Limited number of ornithological surveys used to inform RAG selection process for sites. Zone 1 lies within Kirkham/Newton area of separation zone and FBC green belt. This is not weighted appropriately in the RAG. Proximity to residential development is not factored in the RAG selection assessment for zones.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0146_001_201123	S44	Email	I would like to take this opportunity during this public consultation period, to unequivocally object to your proposals and express my concerns over the proposed offshore wind farm cable routing and sub station locations within the Fylde coast. I believe this would have a grossly negative impact on the environment both physically, via the proposed work and visually, damaging an untold amount of wildlife and green belt protected land, conservation areas highly productive farmland and have a hugely detrimental impact on the wide community and local economy, putting local business, land owners and farmers out of business. I believe it would create an untold amount of suffering for residents within the Fylde coast for years to come via flooding and disruption to traffic.	Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0150_003_201123	S44	Email	The Non-statutory consultation was also flawed and, therefore, should be ignored as there was no explanation as to how the four search zone locations were identified in the first place. The PIER overlooks Fylde Borough Council's local plan, identifying Enterprise Zones, brownfield sites, and potential candidate zones. FBC should, therefore, refute the current plans and force them to be reconsidered in line with their strategy for the region. The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1—no consideration of locale to residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones. The RAG survey ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0150_006_201123	S44	Email	People invest their money to live in a semi-rural environment for mental health and wellbeing. This development promises to devalue their assets and destroy their chosen quality of life. There are alternative options laid out by the initial studies and FBCs plans, which should be reconsidered and different decisions made.	An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the WorldHealth Organisation definition of health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing. Any effects are assessed to be not significant and appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards. The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0151_007_201123	S44	Email	<p>It is in a rural green belt area of farming agricultural land, which will result in the loss of pastureland and dairy farms will be rendered commercially non-viable with consequently adverse socio-economic impact.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt. The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>
TA_0152_002_201123	S44	Email	<p>If wind farms are green energy how can the destruction of green belt land in this local community be classed as "green". Newton is just a little village with a primary school & farms which is very rural/ agricultural which will just be ruined with your intensive development.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0152_005_201123	S44	Email	The cable corridors to Penwortham should be sent down the river rather than across prime pasture land . Both areas have significant wildlife and sites of special scientific interest which ideally should not be disturbed but I feel the river would be less obtrusive.Why do we need such large substations in such close proximity on green pasture land when there are FBC Enterprise Zones and brown field sites which could be considered ?	The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0156_004_211123	S44	Email	The Non-statutory consultation was also flawed and, therefore, should be ignored as there was no explanation as to how the four search zone locations were identified in the first place. The PIER overlooks Fylde Borough Council's local plan, identifying Enterprise Zones, brownfield sites, and potential candidate zones. FBC should, therefore, refute the current plans and force them to be reconsidered in line with their strategy for the region.The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1—no consideration of locale to residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones.The RAG survey ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0158_011_211123	S44	Email	2.The non-statutory consultation is also flawed. No explanation was provided on how the four zones were selected. Preliminary Environmental Information Report ignores the Fylde Borough Council Enterprise Zones and brown field sites as options.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0158_018_211123	S44	Email	9.Apparently the original site chosen was in Penwortham, near the current substation at Howick and out of view from the public, yet the people of Penwortham rejected this sound proposal. In Newton it will be stand out as a massive blot on our greenbelt! I urge you to reconsider the location of this substation to somewhere more appropriate.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.</p>
TA_0160_003_211123	S44	Email	<p>The villages will lose their identity and due to the green belt land being built on, will merge into one industrial town. Kirkham, is a Heritage town, which will also lose its identity.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt. The project team has worked closely with the HET at Lancashire County Council and with Historic England to ensure that adverse effects on the historic environment have been avoided, reduced or offset wherever possible. The assessment of residual effects is set out within section 5.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 5: Historic Environment of the ES (document reference F3.5).</p>
TA_0161_014_211123	S44	Email	<p>•No route has yet been declared for the 400kV cables from the substations to Penwortham. It is still showed as a large tract of land that is potentially impacted. There is still no information about how the cables will cross the River Ribble, though the project team said verbally that there would be no infrastructure above ground. How can you guarantee there will be no further infrastructure above ground for the Ribble crossing if you do not yet know the route or the engineering challenges faced?•All cabling being put in place via wide 120m trenches apart from when crossing the river and major roads. Why can't trenchless technology be used along the whole route? This would be less intrusive and disruptive to the farmers and livestock. Farmers are saying that the land would take tens of years to recover and become productive again after being displaced during trench digging. •There is much talk in the press after the Winsor report about the move to overhead cables to speed the delivery of additional electricity into the National Grid. Is there a possibility that the underground cables will be changed to overhead cables?</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets design has resulted in a reduced construction corridor width, as set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Details of the factors considered during the design evolution are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). Direct pipe or microtunnelling is proposed beneath the River Ribble to ensure that there would be no direct impacts on the river habitats. As set out in Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3), Crossing techniques are set out within Volume 1, Annex 3.2: Onshore Crossing Schedule of the ES (document reference F1.3.2) which is submitted as part of the application for development consent. Further information on the proposed approach to construction is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES. The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6).
TA_0162_003_211123	S44	Email	Environmental, local community, sensitivity for agriculture and wildlife, FBC strategy, noise pollution, community health and other critical factors are being pushed aside for BP's profits. The development will significantly adversely impact local amenities, change character from rural to industrial, and cause potential flooding due to massive displacement by the enormous industrial development, ruining farmland for decades and placing homes at risk.	Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0163_003_211123	S44	Email	The Non-statutory consultation was also flawed and, therefore, should be ignored as there was no explanation as to how the four search zone locations were identified in the first place. The PIER overlooks Fylde Borough Council's local plan, identifying Enterprise Zones, brownfield sites, and potential candidate zones. FBC should, therefore, refute the current plans and force them to be reconsidered in line with their strategy for the region.>>>> The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1—no consideration of locale to residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones.>>>> The RAG survey ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0163_006_211123	S44	Email	People invest their money to live in a semi-rural environment for mental health and wellbeing. This development promises to devalue their assets and destroy their chosen quality of life. There are alternative options laid out by the initial studies and FBCs plans, which should be reconsidered and different decisions made.	An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the WorldHealth Organisation definition of health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing. Any effects are assessed to be not significant and appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards. The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0168_001_171123	S44	Email	I have real concerns about your proposal for this project in the Fylde I require full details of the following : 1)Effect on the greenbelt areas / farmland around Lytham ST Annes	It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt. The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES.</p>
TA_0185_007_221123	S44	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mental health of myself and my family would be impacted seeing the land being changed from a green belt to a brown field site, which has been farmed for three generations of my family. 	<p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt. An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the World Health Organisation definition of health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing. Any effects are assessed to be not significant and appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards.</p>
TA_0189_006_221123	S44	Email	<p>5. I agree that we need energy security but more importantly we also need food security for our growing population. To go ahead with these proposals on prime agricultural greenbelt land would ruin numerous businesses but bP et al don't seem to care about that as long as they can make even more money.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt. The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES. Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). This includes the preparation of a Soil Management Plan in general accordance with the Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference: J1.7), which has been submitted with the DCO application. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction of the Transmission Assets. These measures also comprise the preparation of a Code of Construction Practice in general accordance with the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) submitted with the DCO application. The measures to be implemented as part of the Code of Construction Practice seek to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.</p>
TA_0196_001_221123	S44	Email	<p>I would like to use the opportunity during this public consultation period, to unequivocally Object to your proposals and express my concerns over the proposed off shore Wind Farm cable routing and sub station locations within the fylde coast. I believe this would have a grossly negative impact on the Environment both physically, via the works proposed and Visually, damaging an untold amount of wildlife habitat and green belt protected land, conservation area's, highly productive farmland and have a hugely detrimental impact on the wider community and local economy, putting local business, land owners and Farmers out of business. I believe it would create an untold amount of suffering for residents within the fylde coast for years to come via flooding and disruption ie traffic. Your lack of detail on some of the proposed cable routes and sub stations at this late stage and at this public consultation point in proceedings, is highly worrying as this shows either an unprofessional approach to the matter, or highly unprepared, or at worst, both. It is most concerning that at this late stage we are asked to submit our opinions on a body of work that is neither complete nor suggest the possible outcomes thereafter the point of consultation. I feel that you have shown disregard to the community of the fylde coast in your methods up to now. This lack of transparency on your part, sets a precedent when approaching future issues and has created a level of mistrust that is beyond repair. This is another reason why I must whole heartedly Object on all parts of your proposals.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0197_003_221123	S44	Email	The Non-statutory consultation was also flawed and, therefore, should be ignored as there was no explanation as to how the four search zone locations were identified in the first place. The PIER overlooks Fylde Borough Council's local plan, identifying Enterprise Zones, brownfield sites, and potential candidate zones. FBC should, therefore, refute the current plans and force them to be reconsidered in line with their strategy for the region. The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1—no consideration of locale to residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones. The RAG survey ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0198_001_221123	S44	Email	I would like to use the opportunity during this public consultation period, to unequivocally Object to your proposals and express my concerns over the proposed off shore Wind Farm cable routing and sub station locations within the fylde coast. I believe this would have a grossly negative impact on the Environment both physically, via the works proposed and Visually, damaging an untold amount of wildlife habitat and green belt protected land, conservation area's, highly productive farmland and have a hugely detrimental impact on the wider community and local economy, putting local business, land owners and Farmers out of business. I believe it would create an untold amount of suffering for residents within the fylde coast for years to come via flooding and disruption ie traffic. Your lack of detail on some of the proposed cable routes and sub stations at this late stage and at this public consultation point in proceedings, is highly worrying as this shows either an unprofessional approach to the matter, or highly unprepared, or at worst, both. It is most concerning that at this late stage we are asked to submit our opinions on a body of work that is neither complete nor suggest the possible outcomes thereafter the point of consultation. I feel that you have shown disregard to the community of the fylde coast in your methods up to now. This lack of transparency on your part, sets a precedent when approaching future issues and has created a level of mistrust that is beyond repair. This is another reason why I must whole heartedly Object on all parts of your proposals.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0200_002_221123	S44	Email	Using Brownfield sites as opposed to Green Belt	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0201_003_221123	S44	Email	the loss of green belt	It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0203_003_231123	S44	Email	The Non-statutory consultation was also flawed and, therefore, should be ignored as there was no explanation as to how the four search zone locations were identified in the first place. The PIER overlooks Fylde Borough Council's local plan, identifying Enterprise Zones, brownfield sites, and potential candidate zones. FBC should, therefore, refute the current plans and force them to be reconsidered in line with their strategy for the region. The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1—no consideration of locale to residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones. The RAG survey ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0203_011_231123	S44	Email	<p>Furthermore, the substation plans directly go against the Government's National Planning Policy Framework. Specifically chapter 13, paragraphs 137 to 151. The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. Paragraph 138. Green Belt serves 5 purposes: (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; (b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; (c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; (d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Paragraph 149: A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt as inappropriate. Exceptions to this are: (a) buildings for agriculture and forestry; (b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it; (c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; (d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces; (e) limited infilling in villages; (f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and (g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority. The potential problem is paragraph 151 as it mentions renewable energy: When located in the Green Belt, elements of many renewable energy projects will comprise inappropriate development. In such cases developers will need to demonstrate very special circumstances if projects are to proceed. Such very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources. But with brown belt alternatives available the developer must concentrate on those. They have the same or better opportunity to deliver wider benefits associated with the production of energy from renewable sources. I advocate sustainability; I have respect for the environment. However, I wholly object to the destruction that is proposed.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0204_003_231123	S44	Email	<p>The Non-statutory consultation was also flawed and, therefore, should be ignored as there was no explanation as to how the four search zone locations were identified in the first place. The PIER overlooks Fylde Borough Council's local plan, identifying Enterprise Zones, brownfield sites, and potential candidate zones. FBC should, therefore, refute the current plans and force them to be reconsidered in line with their strategy for the region. The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1—no consideration of locale to residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones. The RAG survey ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0206_004_231123	S44	Email	<p>4. The assessment has seemed not to have embraced the Local Planning Authorities Development Plans, which offer areas already authorised for similar industrial type development as well as other protected land use areas. It did not appear that those Local Planning Authorities had been engaged to discuss the options. Fylde Borough Council has land already allocated through the Local Development Plan for the proposed type of M&M programme industrial infrastructure development. This includes the Warton Enterprise Zone, which is also supported by Lancashire County Council and site owner BAE Systems. This zone already includes buildings of a scale that may be suitable for reuse in the converter sub-stations. The site offers land, coastal and estuary access. See link - https://investinlancashire.com/enterprise-zones/warton-aviation-enterprise-zone/ Preston City Council has land designated for industrial development on the Riversway Phase B development policy EP5 area. See Preston City Council Local Plan and Policies Map. You will see that this site is immediately opposite to the National Grid on the banks of the Ribble estuary. Your colleagues stated that whilst National Grid specified that they would only permit a connection to Penwortham, rather than their preference of Heysham. Your colleagues also indicated that National Grid were not supportive of facilitating the availability of land adjacent to their substation connection, which is where your colleagues stated would be their preferred location. It is noted that South Ribble's MP Katherine Fletcher, whose constituency includes Penwortham, has publicly welcomed that National Grid has specified Penwortham as a</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The Electricity System Operator (ESO) is responsible for planning and operation of the transmission system and ensuring the balance of electricity generation with electricity demand. The Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm were scoped into the Pathway to 2030 workstream of the UK Government's Offshore Transmission Network Review (OTNR). As part of the OTNR, the ESO assessed options to improve the coordination of offshore wind farm connections and associated transmission networks. In July 2022,</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			landfall connection for the M&M programme. Ms Fletcher may then provide some support for National Grid to make available property of best practice sized & designed converter stations adjacent to their substation, whilst still protecting the environment. See link - https://www.katherinefletcher.uk/news/katherine-fletcher-mp-welcomes-proposals-expansion-penwortham-substation-upgrade-national-grid	the UK Government published the Pathway to 2030 Holistic Network Design (HNDR) Report which set out the results of the OTNR. A key output of the HNDR process was the recommendation that the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm should work collaboratively in connecting the two offshore wind farms to the National Grid electricity transmission network at Penwortham in Lancashire.
TA_0215_001_231123	S44	Email	I am writing this email as the Director/Proprietor of REDACTED, based on Marton Moss. Also user/owner of some of the land proposed to be affected by the cable route and surrounding bridle paths. If the route chosen includes my land on REDACTED, it would have a catastrophic and ruinous effect on my business. Therefore I am taking the opportunity during this public consultation period, to unequivocally Object to your proposals and express my concerns over the proposed off shore Wind Farm cable routing and sub station locations within the fylde coast. I believe this would have a grossly negative impact on the Environment both physically, via the works proposed and Visually, damaging an untold amount of wildlife habitat and green belt protected land, conservation area's, highly productive farmland and have a hugely detrimental impact on the wider community and local economy, putting local business, land owners and Farmers out of business. I believe it would create an untold amount of suffering for residents within the fylde coast for years to come via flooding and disruption ie traffic. Your lack of detail on some of the proposed cable routes and sub stations at this late stage and at this public consultation point in proceedings, is highly worrying as this shows either an unprofessional approach to the matter, or highly unprepared, or at worst, both. It is very concerning that at this late stage we are asked to submit our opinions on a body of work that is neither complete nor suggest the possible outcomes thereafter the point of consultation. I feel that you have shown disregard to the community of the fylde coast in your methods up to now. This lack of transparency on your part, sets a precedent when approaching future issues and has created a level of mistrust that is beyond repair. This is another reason why I must whole heartedly Object on all parts of your proposals.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024) as well as ongoing landowner liaison following route refinements (further details are outlined within the Consultation Report (document reference E1)). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0216_001_231123	S44	Email	Having attended the consultation on 3 November at St annes cricket club and reviewed the documents provided, I would like to use the opportunity during this public consultation period, to unequivocally Object to your proposals and express my concerns over the proposed off shore Wind Farm cable routing and sub station locations within the	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>fyld coast. I believe this would have a grossly negative impact on the Environment both physically, via the works proposed and Visually, damaging an untold amount of wildlife habitat and green belt protected land, conservation area's, highly productive farmland and have a hugely detrimental impact on the wider community and local economy, putting local business, land owners and Farmers out of business. I believe it would create an untold amount of suffering for residents within the fylde coast for years to come via flooding and disruption ie traffic. Your lack of detail on some of the proposed cable routes and sub stations at this late stage and at this public consultation point in proceedings, is highly worrying as this shows either an unprofessional approach to the matter, or highly unprepared, or at worst, both. It is most concerning that at this late stage we are asked to submit our opinions on a body of work that is neither complete nor suggest the possible outcomes thereafter the point of consultation. I feel that you have shown disregard to the community of the fylde coast in your methods up to now. This lack of transparency on your part, sets a precedent when approaching future issues and has created a level of mistrust that is beyond repair. This is another reason why I must whole heartedly Object on all parts of your proposals.</p>	<p>community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0223_001_231123	S44	Email	<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's. This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area, and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0225_009_231123	S44	Email	The farmstead plus adjoining paddock is Allocated for Housing in the Local Plan.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0225_016_231123	S44	Email	2. The projects are not sustainable;2.1 Given the extensive development impact within the Green Belt and Open Countryside on agricultural businesses which will impact Food Security.2.2 Significant loss of the most productive grassland in the UK which in turn causes a significant loss in Carbon Sequestration (Carbon Capture).2.3 Major impact on the diverse wildlife and ecology within Rural Fylde and Rural Preston areas for many years to come.2.4 The large buildings proposed to house the substation equipment require significant cooling apparatus which will be powered by natural gas which is not sustainable energy and is a huge drain on the UK's already unstable gas reserves.2.5 35 year projects will not benefit the next generation. This is not sustainable development.	It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0225_023_231123	S44	Email	Policies to protect agricultural land and soil Developers and local planning authorities (LPAs) should refer to the following government policies and legislation when considering development proposals that affect agricultural land and soils. They aim to protect: -the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land from significant, inappropriate or unsustainable development proposals -all soils by managing them in a sustainable way Natural England uses these policies to advise on development proposals as a statutory consultee in the planning process. A Green Future: Our	The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			25 Year Plan to improve the Environment 2018 sets out the government's 25-year plan to improve the health of the environment by using natural resources more sustainably and efficiently. It plans to:-protect the best agricultural land-put a value on soils as part of our natural capital-manage soils in a sustainable way by 2030-restore and protect peatland	F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.
TA_0225_024_231123	S44	Email	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) LPAs should use the NPPF to make decisions about the natural and local environment to:-protect and enhance landscapes, biodiversity, geology and soils-recognise soils as a natural capital asset that provide important ecosystem services-consider the economic and other benefits of BMV agricultural land, and try to use areas of poorer quality land instead of higher quality land-prevent soil, air, water, or noise pollution, or land instability from new and existing development Use ALC survey data to assess the loss of land or quality of land from a proposed development. You should take account of smaller losses (under 20ha) if they're significant when making your decision. Your decision should avoid unnecessary loss of BMV land. In summary, as the land identified for both Morecambe substation site options is Grade 2 and Morgan Grade 3, this would cause the permanent loss of up to 50 acres of BMV land as currently proposed.	The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.
TA_0226_016_231123	S44	Email	Agricultural Land Classification The projects public consultation data for Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) does not identify the most up to date ALC Data. The projects public consultation data advises that the proposed substation sites ALC is as follows; Source https://bp-mmt.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/transmission/PEIR/Volume+3/Volume+3+Annexes/Transmission+Assets+PEIR+Vol+3+Annex+6.1.pdf 1.3.5 Agricultural Land Classification Morgan substation site – Grade 3b 1.4.5.2 The published soils information indicates that this area comprises predominantly Salwick series, the slightly better drained of the soils on medium textured glacial till likely to be classified as mainly ALC Subgrade 3a due to winter wetness. There are small areas of the less well drained Clifton series also indicated within the area. These would be likely to be graded ALC Subgrade 3b due to wetness limitation. Morecambe substation site option 1 (north) – Grade 3a and 3b 1.4.5.3 This area comprises almost entirely Salwick series, the slightly better drained of the soils, on medium textured glacial till which are likely to be graded mainly as ALC Subgrade 3a due to wetness limitation. There is a strip of the medium textured variety of the Douglas series (Dj2') running along the Dow Brook along the western edge of the site which would be likely to be graded lower quality Subgrade 3b land. Morecambe substation site option 2 (south) Grade 3a 1.4.5.4 This site comprises entirely Salwick series, the slightly better drained of the soils on medium textured glacial till which would be likely to be graded predominantly ALC Subgrade 3a because of winter wetness. Natural England Provisional Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Provisional My findings are that both Morecambe Substation Options 1 and 2 have an ALC Grade of Grade 2. Morgan Substation has an ALC Grade of Grade 3. Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Published by: Natural England Last updated: 20 May 2020. Source: Natural England Open Data Publication Defra group ArcGIS Online organisation https://naturalengland-defra.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/provisional-agricultural-land-classification-alc-england/explore Morgan Substation Site Grade 3 ALC Grades (Provisional) © ADAS & Defra: GEOGEXT 5 Morecambe Substation Site Options Grade 2 ALC Grades (Provisional) © ADAS & Defra: GEOGEXT 5 Protecting the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land from significant, inappropriate or unsustainable development proposals https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land	The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.
TA_0226_017_231123	S44	Email	Policies to protect agricultural land and soil Developers and local planning authorities (LPAs) should refer to the following government policies and legislation when considering development proposals that affect agricultural land and soils. They aim to protect:-the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land from significant, inappropriate or unsustainable development proposals-all soils by managing them in a sustainable way Natural England uses these policies to advise on development proposals as a statutory consultee in the planning process. A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to improve the Environment 2018 sets out the government's 25-year plan to improve the health of the environment by using natural resources more sustainably and efficiently. It plans to:-protect the best agricultural land-put a value on soils as part of our natural capital-manage soils in a sustainable way by 2030-restore and protect peatland	The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.
TA_0226_018_231123	S44	Email	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) LPAs should use the NPPF to make decisions about the natural and local environment to: -protect and enhance landscapes, biodiversity, geology and soils-recognise soils as a natural capital asset that provide important ecosystem services-consider the economic and other benefits of BMV agricultural land, and try to use areas of poorer quality land instead of higher quality land-prevent soil, air, water, or noise pollution, or land instability from new and existing development Use ALC survey data to assess the loss of land or quality of land from a proposed development. You should take account of smaller losses (under 20ha) if they're significant when making your decision. Your decision should avoid unnecessary loss of BMV land. In summary, as the land identified for both Morecambe substation site options is Grade 2 and Morganis Grade 3, this would cause the permanent loss of up to 50 acres of BMV land as currently proposed.	The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.
TA_0227_003_231123	S44	Email	Area of Separation The site of this substation proposal is within an Area of Separation within Fylde Council Local Plan which has been made policy in order to prevent further development which otherwise see the sprawl and merging of Kirkham with Newton. There are two massive substations proposed within this green belt and area of separation which completely goes against a clear and enforceable Local Plan Policy as my client has had a dwelling refused in his yard due to this Area of Separation policy.	It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0227_017_231123	S44	Email	Policies to protect agricultural land and soil Developers and local planning authorities (LPAs) should refer to the following government policies and legislation when considering development proposals that affect agricultural land and soils. They aim to protect: -the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land from significant, inappropriate or unsustainable development proposals -all soils by managing them in a sustainable way Natural England uses these policies to advise on development proposals as a statutory consultee in the planning process. A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to improve the Environment 2018 sets out the government's 25-year plan to improve the health of the environment by using natural resources more sustainably and efficiently. It plans to: -protect the best agricultural land -put a value on soils as part of our natural capital -manage soils in a sustainable way by 2030 -restore and protect peatland	The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.
TA_0227_018_231123	S44	Email	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) LPAs should use the NPPF to make decisions about the natural and local environment to: -protect and enhance landscapes, biodiversity, geology and soils-recognise soils as a natural capital asset that provide important ecosystem services-consider the economic and other benefits of BMV agricultural land, and try to use areas of poorer quality land instead of higher quality land-prevent soil, air, water, or noise pollution, or land instability from new and existing development Use ALC survey data to assess the loss of land or quality of land from a proposed development. You should take account of smaller losses (under 20ha) if	The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			they're significant when making your decision. Your decision should avoid unnecessary loss of BMV land. In summary, as the land identified for both Morecambe substation site options is Grade 2 and Morganis Grade 3, this would cause the permanent loss of up to 50 acres of BMV land as currently proposed.	mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.
TA_0229_003_231123	S44	Email	Area of Separation The site of this substation proposal is within an Area of Separation within Fylde Council Local Plan which has been made policy in order to prevent further development which otherwise see the sprawl and merging of Kirkham with Newton. There are two massive substations proposed within this green belt and area of separation which completely goes against a clear and enforceable Local Plan Policy.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0229_015_231123	S44	Email	Policies to protect agricultural land and soil Developers and local planning authorities (LPAs) should refer to the following government policies and legislation when considering development proposals that affect agricultural land and soils. They aim to protect: -the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land from significant, inappropriate or unsustainable development proposals -all soils by managing them in a sustainable way Natural England uses these policies to advise on development proposals as a statutory consultee in the planning process. A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to improve the Environment 2018 sets out the government's 25-year plan to improve the health of the environment by using natural resources more sustainably and efficiently. It plans to: -protect the best agricultural land -put a value on soils as part of our natural capital -manage soils in a sustainable way by 2030 -restore and protect peatland	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.
TA_0229_016_231123	S44	Email	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) LPAs should use the NPPF to make decisions about the natural and local environment to: -protect and enhance landscapes, biodiversity, geology and soils -recognise soils as a natural capital asset that provide important ecosystem services -consider the economic and other benefits of BMV agricultural land, and try to use areas of poorer quality land instead of higher quality land -prevent soil, air, water, or noise pollution, or land instability from new and existing development Use ALC survey data to assess the loss of land or quality of land from a proposed development. You should take account of smaller losses (under 20ha) if they're significant when making your decision. Your decision should avoid unnecessary loss of BMV land. In summary, as the land identified for Morecambe substation site options is Grade 2.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0230_002_231123	S44	Email	<p>Area of SeparationThe site of this substation proposal is within an Area of Separation within Fylde Council Local Plan which has been made policy in order to prevent further development which otherwise see the sprawl and merging of Kirkham with Newton. There are two massive substations proposed within this green belt and area of separation which completely goes against a clear and enforceable Local Plan Policy.</p>	<p>provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.</p> <p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0230_004_231123	S44	Email	<p>Proposed Substation FootprintsThe proposed footprints of the Morgan and Morecambe permanent substation sites are approximately 30 acres and 18 acres respectively. These site areas are taken up by approximately 50% BNG (Biodiversity Net Gain). This information was provided by a Flotation Energy engineer. This is wholly unacceptable as in providing on-site BNG purely for financial savings has narrowed the substations site selection process to one only option for Morgan and two only options for Morecambe. It is clear that had the substation sites design concentrated on that area which was wholly necessary to transmission, ie approx. 15 acres for Morgan and 9 acres for Morecambe then suitable substation site locations could have been expanded to present more options and allowed for flexibility during this consultation process.</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). As set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11), the Transmission Assets are not subject to a mandatory net gain requirement under the Environment Act 2021. Nevertheless, the Applicants have worked with statutory consultees to discuss the approach, and to develop the design, to allow the maximum benefit to biodiversity within the parameters of the project. For the Transmission Assets, biodiversity benefit will be delivered within identified biodiversity benefit areas within the Transmission Assets Order Limits: Onshore (referred to as the Onshore Order Limits). Further qualitative benefits to biodiversity are proposed via potential collaboration with stakeholders and local groups, contributing to existing plans and programmes, both within and outside the Onshore Order Limits. Further details of the approach to biodiversity benefit are provided in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11). The calculation undertaken for the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11) utilises the latest biodiversity metric published by Defra (4.0).</p>
TA_0230_005_231123	S44	Email	<p>Substation Site Layout, Design and AppearanceThere is no consultation information available showing cross-sections, block plans, landscaping, fencing, aircraft beacons etc of each proposed substation site therefore how could a public consultation exercise provide any useful feedback when essential details are not made available ?</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Wireline visualisations were made available at statutory consultation, showing the maximum</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>parameters from various viewpoints. Visualisations are presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).</p>
TA_0230_014_231123	S44	Email	<p>Policies to protect agricultural land and soil Developers and local planning authorities (LPAs) should refer to the following government policies and legislation when considering development proposals that affect agricultural land and soils. They aim to protect:-the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land from significant, inappropriate or unsustainable development proposals-all soils by managing them in a sustainable way Natural England uses these policies to advise on development proposals as a statutory consultee in the planning process. A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to improve the Environment 2018 sets out the government's 25-year plan to improve the health of the environment by using natural resources more sustainably and efficiently. It plans to:-protect the best agricultural land-put a value on soils as part of our natural capital-manage soils in a sustainable way by 2030-restore and protect peatland</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.</p>
TA_0230_015_231123	S44	Email	<p>LPAs should use the NPPF to make decisions about the natural and local environment to:-protect and enhance landscapes, biodiversity, geology and soils-recognise soils as a natural capital asset that provide important ecosystem services-consider the economic and other benefits of BMV agricultural land, and try to use areas of poorer quality land instead of higher quality land-prevent soil, air, water, or noise pollution, or land instability from new and existing development Use ALC survey data to assess the loss of land or quality of land from a proposed development. You should take account of smaller losses (under 20ha) if they're significant when making your decision. Your decision should avoid unnecessary loss of BMV land. In summary, as the land identified for Morecambe substation site options is Grade 2.</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.</p>
TA_0231_015_231123	S44	Email	<p>Policies to protect agricultural land and soil Developers and local planning authorities (LPAs) should refer to the following government policies and legislation when considering development proposals that affect agricultural land</p>	<p>The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			and soils. They aim to protect:-the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land from significant, inappropriate or unsustainable development proposals-all soils by managing them in a sustainable way Natural England uses these policies to advise on development proposals as a statutory consultee in the planning process. A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to improve the Environment 2018 sets out the government's 25-year plan to improve the health of the environment by using natural resources more sustainably and efficiently. It plans to:-protect the best agricultural land-put a value on soils as part of our natural capital-manage soils in a sustainable way by 2030-restore and protect peatland	best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.
TA_0231_016_231123	S44	Email	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) LPAs should use the NPPF to make decisions about the natural and local environment to:-protect and enhance landscapes, biodiversity, geology and soils-recognise soils as a natural capital asset that provide important ecosystem services-consider the economic and other benefits of BMV agricultural land, and try to use areas of poorer quality land instead of higher quality land-prevent soil, air, water, or noise pollution, or land instability from new and existing development Use ALC survey data to assess the loss of land or quality of land from a proposed development. You should take account of smaller losses (under 20ha) if they're significant when making your decision. Your decision should avoid unnecessary loss of BMV land. In summary, as the land identified for both Morecambe substation site options is Grade 2 and Morganis Grade 3, this would cause the permanent loss of up to 50 acres of BMV land as currently proposed.	The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.
TA_0233_016_231123	S44	Email	Policies to protect agricultural land and soil Developers and local planning authorities (LPAs) should refer to the following government policies and legislation when considering development proposals that affect agricultural land and soils. They aim to protect:-the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land from significant, inappropriate or unsustainable development proposals-all soils by managing them in a sustainable way Natural England uses these policies to advise on development proposals as a statutory consultee in the planning process. A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to improve the Environment 2018 sets out the government's 25-year plan to improve the health of the environment by using natural resources more sustainably and efficiently. It plans to:-protect the best agricultural land-put a value on soils as part of our natural capital-manage soils in a sustainable way by 2030-restore and protect peatland	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.
TA_0233_017_231123	S44	Email	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) LPAs should use the NPPF to make decisions about the natural and local environment to:-protect and enhance landscapes, biodiversity, geology and soils-recognise soils as a natural capital asset that provide important ecosystem services-consider the economic and other benefits of BMV agricultural land, and try to use areas of poorer quality land instead of higher quality land-prevent soil, air, water, or noise pollution, or land instability from new and existing development Use ALC survey data to assess the loss of land or quality of land from a proposed development. You should take account of smaller losses (under 20ha) if they're significant when making your decision. Your decision should avoid unnecessary loss of BMV land. In summary, as the land identified for both Morecambe substation site options is Grade 2 and Morganis Grade 3, this would cause the permanent loss of up to 50 acres of BMV land as currently proposed.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.
TA_0234_018_231123	S44	Email	Policies to protect agricultural land and soil Developers and local planning authorities (LPAs) should refer to the following government policies and legislation when considering development proposals that affect agricultural land	The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>and soils. They aim to protect:-the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land from significant, inappropriate or unsustainable development proposals-all soils by managing them in a sustainable way Natural England uses these policies to advise on development proposals as a statutory consultee in the planning process. A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to improve the Environment 2018 sets out the government's 25-year plan to improve the health of the environment by using natural resources more sustainably and efficiently. It plans to:-protect the best agricultural land-put a value on soils as part of our natural capital-manage soils in a sustainable way by 2030-restore and protect peatland</p>	<p>best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.</p>
TA_0234_019_231123	S44	Email	<p>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) LPAs should use the NPPF to make decisions about the natural and local environment to:-protect and enhance landscapes, biodiversity, geology and soils-recognise soils as a natural capital asset that provide important ecosystem services-consider the economic and other benefits of BMV agricultural land, and try to use areas of poorer quality land instead of higher quality land-prevent soil, air, water, or noise pollution, or land instability from new and existing development Use ALC survey data to assess the loss of land or quality of land from a proposed development. You should take account of smaller losses (under 20ha) if they're significant when making your decision. Your decision should avoid unnecessary loss of BMV land. In summary, as the land identified for both Morecambe substation site options is Grade 2 and Morganis Grade 3, this would cause the permanent loss of up to 50 acres of BMV land as currently proposed.</p>	<p>The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.</p>
TA_0235_015_231123	S44	Email	<p>Policies to protect agricultural land and soil Developers and local planning authorities (LPAs) should refer to the following government policies and legislation when considering development proposals that affect agricultural land and soils. They aim to protect:-the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land from significant, inappropriate or unsustainable development proposals-all soils by managing them in a sustainable way Natural England uses these policies to advise on development proposals as a statutory consultee in the planning process. A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to improve the Environment 2018 sets out the government's 25-year plan to improve the health of the environment by using natural resources more sustainably and efficiently. It plans to:-protect the best agricultural land-put a value on soils as part of our natural capital-manage soils in a sustainable way by 2030-restore and protect peatland</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.</p>
TA_0235_016_231123	S44	Email	<p>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) LPAs should use the NPPF to make decisions about the natural and local environment to:-protect and enhance landscapes, biodiversity, geology and soils-recognise soils as a natural capital asset that provide important ecosystem services-consider the economic and other benefits of BMV agricultural land, and try to use areas of poorer quality land instead of higher quality land-prevent soil, air, water, or noise pollution, or land instability from new and existing development Use ALC survey data to assess the loss of land or quality of land from a proposed development. You should take account of smaller losses (under 20ha) if they're significant when making your decision. Your decision should avoid unnecessary loss of BMV land. In summary, as the land identified for both Morecambe substation site options is Grade 2 and Morganis Grade 3, this would cause the permanent loss of up to 50 acres of BMV land as currently proposed.</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.</p>
TA_0236_006_231123	S44	Email	<p>I strongly disapprove of the proposed location of the substations in the picturesque green belt heart between freckleton, Kirkham and newton. I strongly believe that the lack of design information regarding the substation is</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>intentional to deceive the public! 45acre 20meters tall this fill be a eyesore on the environment. Also the close location to 2 schools I believe the associated noise(buzzing) of such substations will be damaging to the health of my children when they attend these schools in the future. I believe the highlight option for it to be located next to the existing penwortham substitution would be far more appropriate.</p>	<p>Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.</p>
TA_0239_001_231123	S44	Email	<p>I too would like to use the opportunity during this public consultation period, to unequivocally Object to your proposals and express my concerns over the proposed offshore Wind Farm cable routing and substation locations within the fylde coast. I believe this would have a grossly negative impact on the Environment both physically, via the works proposed and Visually, damaging an untold amount of wildlife habitat and green belt protected land, conservation area's, highly productive farmland and have a hugely detrimental impact on the wider community and local economy, putting local business, landowners and Farmers out of business. I believe it would create an untold amount of suffering for residents within the fylde coast for years to come via flooding and disruption i.e. traffic. Your lack of detail on some of the proposed cable routes and sub stations at this late stage and at this public consultation point in proceedings, is highly worrying as this shows either an unprofessional approach to the matter, or highly unprepared, or at worst, both. It is most concerning that at this late stage we are asked to submit our opinions on a body of work that is neither complete nor suggest the possible outcomes thereafter the point of consultation. I feel that you have shown disregard to the community of the fylde coast in your methods up to now. This lack of transparency on your part, sets a precedent when approaching future issues and has created a level of mistrust that is beyond repair. This is another reason why I must wholeheartedly Object on all parts of your proposals.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>(PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0243_001_231123	S44	Email	<p>I am writing to disapprove of the planned sub-stations in Zone 1. I strongly oppose the development in this area. The concern that is at the forefront of my objection relates to the unnecessary planned use of Green Belt land which has clearly been designated as Green Belt land for a reason yet this appears to be overlooked in the face of a company trying to reduce costs at the detriment of nature; farming land which has already been significantly reduced; and the health and wellbeing of local residents. The substation plans directly go against the Government's National Planning Policy Framework. Specifically chapter 13, paragraphs 137 to 151. The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. Paragraph 138. Green Belt serves 5 purposes: (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; (b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; (c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; (d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Paragraph 149: A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt as inappropriate. Exceptions to this are: (a) buildings for agriculture and forestry; (b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it; (c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; (d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces; (e) limited infilling in villages; (f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and (g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would: not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority. The potential problem is paragraph 151 as it mentions renewable energy: When located in the Green Belt, elements of many renewable energy projects will comprise inappropriate development. In such cases developers will need to demonstrate very special circumstances if projects are to proceed. Such very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources. But with brown belt alternatives available the developer must concentrate on those. They have the same or better opportunity to deliver wider benefits associated with the production of energy from renewable sources. In summary, the Government's own National Planning Policy Framework is grounds enough for an objection and is something the Government and local authorities must adhere to, and it's something BP's solicitors would struggle to get around.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0243_004_231123	S44	Email	<p>The Non-statutory consultation was also flawed and, therefore, should be ignored as there was no explanation as to how the four search zone locations were identified in the first place. The PIER overlooks Fylde Borough Council's local plan, identifying Enterprize Zones, brownfield sites, and potential candidate zones. FBC should, therefore, refute the current plans and force them to be reconsidered in line with their strategy for the region. The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1—no consideration of locale to residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones. The RAG survey ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect.</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0244_001_231123	S44	Email	I am writing to disapprove of the planned sub-stations in Zone 1. I strongly oppose the development in this area. The concern that is at the forefront of my objection relates to the unnecessary planned use of Green Belt land which has clearly been designated as Green Belt land for a reason yet this appears to be overlooked in the face of a company trying to reduce costs at the detriment of nature; farming land which has already been significantly reduced; and the health and wellbeing of local residents. The substation plans directly go against the Government's National Planning Policy Framework. Specifically chapter 13, paragraphs 137 to 151. The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. Paragraph 138. Green Belt serves 5 purposes: (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; (b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; (c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; (d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Paragraph 149: A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt as inappropriate. Exceptions to this are: (a) buildings for agriculture and forestry; (b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it; (c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; (d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces; (e) limited infilling in villages; (f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and (g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would: not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority. The potential problem is paragraph 151 as it mentions renewable energy: When located in the Green Belt, elements of many renewable energy projects will comprise inappropriate development. In such cases developers will need to demonstrate very special circumstances if projects are to proceed. Such very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources. But with brown belt alternatives available the developer must concentrate on those. They have the same or better opportunity to deliver wider benefits associated with the production of energy from renewable sources. In summary, the Government's own National Planning Policy Framework is grounds enough for an objection and is something the Government and local authorities must adhere to, and it's something BP's solicitors would struggle to get around.	It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0244_004_231123	S44	Email	The Non-statutory consultation was also flawed and, therefore, should be ignored as there was no explanation as to how the four search zone locations were identified in the first place. The PIER overlooks Fylde Borough Council's local plan, identifying Enterprize Zones, brownfield sites, and potential candidate zones. FBC should, therefore, refute the current plans and force them to be reconsidered in line with their strategy for the region. The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1—no consideration of locale to residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones. The RAG survey ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0245_001_231123	S44	Email	I would like to use the opportunity during this public consultation period, to unequivocally Object to your proposals and express my concerns over the proposed off shore Wind Farm cable routing and sub station locations within the fylde coast. I believe this would have a grossly negative impact on the Environment both physically, via the works proposed and Visually, damaging an untold amount of wildlife habitat and green belt protected land, conservation	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>area's, highly productive farmland and have a hugely detrimental impact on the wider community and local economy, putting local business, land owners and Farmers out of business. I believe it would create an untold amount of suffering for residents within the fylde coast for years to come via flooding and disruption ie traffic. Your lack of detail on some of the proposed cable routes and sub stations at this late stage and at this public consultation point in proceedings, is highly worrying as this shows either an unprofessional approach to the matter, or highly unprepared, or at worst, both. It is most concerning that at this late stage we are asked to submit our opinions on a body of work that is neither complete nor suggest the possible outcomes thereafter the point of consultation. I feel that you have shown disregard to the community of the fylde coast in your methods up to now. This lack of transparency on your part, sets a precedent when approaching future issues and has created a level of mistrust that is beyond repair. This is another reason why I must whole heartedly Object on all parts of your proposals.</p>	<p>undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0247_001_231123	S44	Email	<p>I would like to take this opportunity during the public consultation period, to unequivocally Object to your proposals and express my concerns over the proposed off shore Wind Farm cable routing and sub station locations within the Fylde coast. I believe this would have a grossly negative impact on the Environment both physically, via the works proposed and visually, damaging an untold amount of wildlife habitat and green belt protected land, conservation areas, highly productive farmland and have a hugely detrimental impact on the wider community and local economy, putting local businesses, land owners and farmers out of business. I believe it would create an untold amount of suffering for residents within the fylde coats for years to come via flooding and disruption i.e traffic. Your lack of detail on some of the proposed cable routes and sub stations at this late stage and at this public consultation point in proceedings is highly worrying as this shows either an unprofessional approach to the matter, or highly unprepared, or at worst, both. It is most concerning that at this late stage we are asked to submit our opinions on a body of work that is neither complete nor suggest the possible outcomes thereafter the point of consultation. I feel that you have shown disregard to the community of the Fylde coats in your methods up to now. This lack of transparency on your part, sets a precedent when approaching future issues and has created a level of mistrust that is beyond repair. This is another reason why i must whole heartedly Object on all parts of your proposals.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>

E1.16.4 Project description table of responses

E1.16.4.1 Project description table of responses (via feedback form)

Table E1.16.4.1: Project description

As set out in section 4.7.4 of the Consultation report (document reference E1). Responses have been allocated to the most appropriate topic(s). If a consultee did not provide a response for a question/sub-question this is not recorded. If a consultee included 'N/A', 'none', 'no comment', 'Nil', 'No', in response to a question, this has also not been recorded. Where a consultee provided a response which stated 'see response above' or similar, the response has been replicated in brackets and italics.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0052_001_131123	S44	Hardcopy feedback form	1		<p>1. Environment - Great crested newts, bats, otters, foxes, birds, rabbits, hares, hedgehogs etc are going to be made homeless. What do you propose to do with them?</p> <p>2. The easiest route is surely down the estuary, away from homes, farms, livelihoods. Why is this not an option? I knwo (sic) the river is tidal so would take longer and cost more but is MONEY really that much of a concern? It would appear it's not when it comes to compensating home owners who are going to lose value on their properties and affecting their childrens inheritances.</p> <p>3. What do you propose to do to make the area more attractive (i.e. trees, hedges etc)</p> <p>4. Lower Lane is a little lane and not suitable for heavy vehicles. How are you going to combat this?</p> <p>5. In comparison to the grid at Howick Cross how big will these substations be? We note that there are no properties very close to the grid at Howick Cross and those closest can't see it as huge mounds have been built and grassed over. Is this something we can expect?</p> <p>6. Are we going to have the constant humming even at 150m from the substation 24/7 so we can never open windows in our properties or sit out in our gardens during the summer? It was loud!!!</p> <p>7. With regard to EMF emissions, can this be stated as 100% safe? If not why is this being located as down on the substation plan fig 4.25?</p> <p>8. There are two local schools in the area close to the substations (Cornhill and Strike Lane). Have the schools been considered during th planning.</p> <p>9. What is being considered (sic) with regard to screening the substations and not leaving them as a blot on the landscape!</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0055_002_051123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.5	<p>Blackpool Airport is an historical important airport and a popular airport for local training of pilots.</p> <p>The airport is the 20th busiest in the UK and it is not understood how a trench of such size can be accommodated if it is to be over 250 metres from human habitation (ideally at the very least 500 metres). Notwithstanding that the proposed trench is unconventionally shallow , I am not sure if this is cost saving or the fact the land is marsh like in many cases - has the impact to the airport been considered and is the prohibitions/ordinances on the use of airport land fully covered?</p> <p>Electromagnetic radiation - has this been considered for usage of this airport?</p>	<p>The effects of EMF on navigation aids are assessed in Volume 3, Chapter 11: Aviation and radar of the ES (document reference F3.11). This includes consideration of impacts on the operation of the airport and impacts in relation to EMF.</p>
TA_0060_002_151123	S44	Online feedback form	2		<p>At the consultations the information was help back and fluffed over. Very unprofessional.</p> <p>Exactly where are these being placed?</p>	<p>Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<p>What sizes are these to be?</p> <p>What are their noise levels?</p> <p>Is it green belt land that you are using if so I wish to state my disprove and I with it recorded that this is to be disallowed to take place.</p>	<p>document (document reference J3). Maximum parameters for the substation have been refined following statutory consultation. As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.</p>
TA_0060_013_151123	S44	Online feedback form	5		<p>The distances between the pipes is very wide so it is bound to affect someone somewhere. Is it not possible to lay them deeper on top of each other rather than side by side.</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).</p> <p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0067_008_221123	S44	Online feedback form	8		<p>Unightly, enormous and again detail hidden deep in the documentation. An environmental diaster.</p>	<p>An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects.</p> <p>Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0011_008_181023	S42	Online feedback form	3	3.7	Maintenance , it is assumed that maintenance to proposed infrastructure following initial construction phases would be limited to essential and emergency works. Few details are available regarding on site staffing or maintenance programmes, but subject to attendance being similar to adjacent sub stations, and that noted in Table 7.7 of Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport the council has no real objection on maintenance grounds.	Details of the operation and maintenance phases are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Onshore maintenance would be limited to essential maintenance and/or emergency works.
TA_0070_003_231123	S44	Online feedback form	9		area sizes needed appear excessive.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).
TA_0074_014_211123	S44	Online feedback form	8		I'm horrified at the size of them and although I don't live near I would object	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).
TA_0074_015_211123	S44	Online feedback form	12		I think they are useless in light of the size of this project and the huge negative impact it will have	Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).
TA_0075_003_071123	S44	Online feedback form	3		Because the exact location of onshore cables has not yet been determined, it's causing anxiety and worry, so the sooner the cable route is determined the better.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3).
TA_0078_008_051123	S44	Online feedback form	4	4.2	We were told at the meeting that the airport were not wanting the cabling to go straight through over Queensway and across the open fields. (which is why the roads may have to be used) This is not acceptable. I don't believe the airport should be able to dictate where the cables are laid any more than we are.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3).
TA_0078_011_051123	S44	Online feedback form	8		What was initially pitched as the laying of underground cables connecting to the National Grid at Penwortham, now includes proposals for two massive new substations in rural Fylde.	It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1,

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					The loss of grade A farmland and local greenbelt is wholly unacceptable and will cause massive damage to these communities. These are massive structures covering huge areas and will be a huge blot on the landscape.	chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0080_009_201123	S44	Online feedback form	5		Sand dunes opposite us are a natural sea defence. I am concerned about the installation of the underground cables compromising sea defences and causing flooding to our properties. I am also concerned about the size and the location of the transition joint boxes. I would like more information please. I'm also concerned about the impact on the habitats of the nature reserve bordering our estate . Also we have concerns about the windfarm development causing radar disruption at Blackpool airport and safety issues.	The location of formal flood defences was informed by Environment Agency Spatial flood defences (including attributes), and not the North West Regional Land Drainage Byelaws. The sand dunes are classified as flood defences within the ES. Impacts and effects in relation to flood risk are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 3: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Details of the design of the Transmission Assets are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The Applicants have engaged with Blackpool Airport throughout the EIA process. Impacts and effects in relation to Blackpool Airport are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 11: Aviation and radar of the ES (document reference F3.11).
TA_0084_002_091123	S44	Online feedback form	2		Unsure what this will be? The size and position?	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE) which no longer includes any surface piercing structures. This includes the removal of the Morgan Booster Station and associated search areas. The OSPs are to be classed as part of the Generation Assets applications only.
TA_0085_001_191123	S44	Online feedback form	3		I have strong objections to the Onshore corridor element of the project as I live immediately where you are looking at corridor options by Blackpool airport on REDACTED. My objections include: Concerns about the following: 1) The impact of the wide corridor immediately next to our properties, but also will it go under our land? Questions asked at your webinars and meetings re compulsory purchase, have not been ruled out, inferring this may be an option. So we are unclear as you haven't decided! 2) Lack of clarity even at the end of the consultation period that you can't say where the corridor will run - by/under the airport and REDACTED, or under neighbouring roads in St Annes - indeed given it's width the same as a 6 lane motorway, I'd suggest it will impact REDACTED whichever you choose. 3) Impact of the corridor activity on dykes and flood risk - dykes at front and rear of our properties (the rear one is by the fields you are looking at using) - activity could cause flooding and or blockages. Also potential rise in the water table which is already a concern in the area. 4) Vermin - we know from other local digging, drilling that this has driven vermin into our homes! 5) Noise from the amount of electricity being transmitted right by our homes. 6) Impact on the local wildlife in the area 7) Bridle paths - there are a number of local bridle paths for horse owners and these will be disrupted and cause concerns for animals and owners	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The assessment of the impact of increased flood risk arising from additional surface water runoff is presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<p>alike</p> <p>8) Noise disruption during construction - your Code of Construction Practice not only refers to work 07:00 to 19:00 Mon to Fri and 08:00 to 13:00 Sat, including 1 hour before and 1 hour after for mobilisation and demobilisation activities, which is bad enough, you also talk about circumstances where you will have specifics works on a continuous basis 24/7, including running of generators, (which everyone know are noisy), emergency back up supplies and trenchless technology operations which require 24 hour machinery. Paras 1.4.3 refer.</p> <p>9) What access will be required to land involving access down REDACTED - this question has not been adequately answered at consultation meetings.</p> <p>10) Disruptive lighting at the bottom of our gardens/land during works</p> <p>11) Major concerns re traffic disruption to the local area during construction as follows:</p> <p>11.1 - REDACTED has limited access and currently Blackpool council are proposing reclosing the Midgeland Road access again, which leaves us only 1 access to Queensway that even during no roadworks is very difficult to get out of REDACTED throughout most of the day. Major disruption will not only cause bottle necks on Queensway, Common Edge Road and School Road again (as seen during Blackpool Council EZ leisure village roadworks - taking 4 months to slightly widen a very short stretch of a few yards) it will severely impact us as residents. We therefore know what chaos is caused. Note Queensway is 1 of only 2 roads to get to and from between St Annes and Blackpool.</p> <p>11.2 - Traffic and works disruption impact to neighbouring roads in St Annes using these routes to join up with land by REDACTED</p>	
TA_0085_011_191123	S44	Online feedback form	8		The proposed substations are enormous taking up the footprint of 13 football pitches as being 20 metres high. This will be an enormous blot on the landscape to our Fylde coast region not least the major impact on those living nearby. This region relies on tourists who will be severely put off by such eyesores on entering the Fylde area.	An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects. A full impact assessment on socio-economics is presented in Volume 4 Chapter 2 of the ES (document reference F4.2).
TA_0085_012_191123	S44	Online feedback form	9		See response to number 8 <i>(The proposed substations are enormous taking up the footprint of 13 football pitches as being 20 metres high. This will be an enormous blot on the landscape to our Fylde coast region not least the major impact on those living nearby. This region relies on tourists who will be severely put off by such eyesores on entering the Fylde area.)</i>	An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects. A full impact assessment on socio-economics is presented in Volume 4 Chapter 2 of the ES (document reference F4.2).
TA_0085_013_191123	S44	Online feedback form	10		See response to number 8 <i>(The proposed substations are enormous taking up the footprint of 13</i>	An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<i>football pitches as being 20 metres high. This will be an enormous blot on the landscape to our Fylde coast region not least the major impact on those living nearby. This region relies on tourists who will be severely put off by such eyesores on entering the Fylde area.)</i>	the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects. A full impact assessment on socio-economics is presented in Volume 4 Chapter 2 of the ES (document reference F4.2).
TA_0091_005_111123	S44	Online feedback form	3		What is lacking, is examples of the impact on local communities. Where exactly the corridors will be, what construction would involve, where storage facilities are going to be located, for how long, the noise element. All of this is missing in the documentation.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0091_006_111123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.2	Without specifying the actual corridor route, how can an assessment be made to flood risk?	The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor and onshore substations, including - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets - refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received. The assessment of the impact of increased flood risk arising from additional surface water runoff is presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase. Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). An Outline CoCP (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0091_007_111123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.3	What is needed is an understanding of the specific route before this question can be answered.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0091_008_111123	S44	Online feedback form	4		I'm concerned about the impact on my property and my local communities. The corridor area is far too vague which has led to speculation of where and what might happen. Artistic impressions are vital as much of the material provided doesn't address key concerns. By now, the routes must be known but are simply not being shared. Also, the project material is hard to understand for many people leading to lethargy or avoidance which means feedback will not be watered down. The consultations need to be based on realistic outcomes so that people can properly understand the direct impact on them, their lifestyles and their health as well as their property prices.	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>Design changes have included refinements of the location and design of the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor and onshore substations, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets - refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received. <p>The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).</p> <p>The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>
TA_0091_009_111123	S44	Online feedback form	5		Need to have specific details as the zones have not been refined. Therefore I'd like to review this as the project develops	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0091_011_111123	S44	Online feedback form	8		The size is a major concern. I had no idea that they would be on the scale that they are until I read a report from my MP. I feel that we have all been misled about this aspect, which makes me suspicious of the project in its entirety.	<p>The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).</p> <p>Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Maximum parameters for the substation have been refined following statutory consultation.</p> <p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0091_012_111123	S44	Online feedback form	9		The size is a major concern. The lack of clarity about it in the consultations too. It was only after reading an article from my MP that I got to completely understand the size and scope of these stations. Why is this not made more clear in the documentation?	<p>The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).</p> <p>Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Maximum parameters for the substation have been refined following statutory consultation.</p> <p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0091_015_111123	S44	Online feedback form	16		I'd like to understand how this is going to impact on me personally. My home, community and my life in general. I attended the consultation and asked lots of questions, most of which were answered vaguely. This is due to the lack of specific details about the corridor route. This must be known by now.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Applicants are working with affected parties to fully understand the impact that the Transmission Assets will have on them and their businesses and identify way to mitigate these. Amendments have been made to the routing following feedback gathered over the course of our landowner engagement meetings, as well as from feedback received throughout the pre- application stage. The Applicants will continue to engage with landowners as the Transmission Assets develops, as appropriate.
TA_0092_027_151123	S44	Online feedback form	4		Timescales, impacts throughout the lift (sic) of the project and beyond completion.	Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).
TA_0094_006_061123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.8	Clearly a problem from a noise aspect in a quite rural area. Vibration in a sandy soil area could lead to disturbance of housing foundations	An assessment of the noise and vibration impacts due to the Transmission Assets are presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.2: Construction Noise and Vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.2) and Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational Noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3). The cumulative noise and vibration impacts with other proposed developments is considered in section 8.13 of Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8). The typical maximum depth of cable installation using trenching methodology is approximately 1.8m. Trenchless, drilling methodologies are to be used locally where crossings are required (e.g. beneath roads/rivers). The installation depths will generally be within shallower geological deposits rather than deep within the consolidated bedrock. The drilling methodologies to be used are designed to minimise the displacement of surrounding materials (therefore minimising instability) and do not involve the injection of significant volumes of liquid into fractured bedrock at depth under the high-pressures that are often attributed to inducing tremors. Further detail is provided in Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions (document reference F3.1) of the ES.
TA_0098_011_081123	S44	Online feedback form	4		You have been very secretive about the building of the substations. Even our local MP Mark Menzies has been kept in the dark about it . There is no reason why you cant take the cables through the sea and along the River Ribble . You could build substations on the land close to the river if necessary. Nobody lives down there and the excuse of harming plants and fish is not good enough, when you think of all the wildlife and plants you will kill going through the land.	Throughout the development of the Project, the Applicants have aimed to be open and transparent with all stakeholders, including Mark Menzies as the MP for the constituency at the time. Please see section 3 of the Consultation report (document reference E1) for information on the early engagement undertaken by the Applicants from Spring/summer 2021 in regard to the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Mona Offshore Wind Project, which included notifying Mark Menzies MP; a member of his team attended the consultation event at Lytham Assembly Rooms on 21 November 2022. A subsequent meeting took place with Mr Menzies on 18 December 2022. Section 3 of the Consultation report also provides details on follow up meetings with elected representatives, including Mark Menzies MP, between 2022 and 2023. A further meeting with a representative of Mr Menzies' office took place on 1 March 2023 which was subsequently followed up with an email update on 28 March 2023. As a section 47 consultee, Mark Menzies MP received notification of the launch of statutory consultation and also attended stakeholders briefings in September and October 2023. See section 4 of the Consultation report for further details.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0098_017_081123	S44	Online feedback form	9		It is too big and in the wrong place. It needs to be down on Freckleton Marsh out of the way of everybody. Also see my comments above.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0101_003_121123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.6	I reject that the green land around Kilhouse Lane be used for storing of machinery as a dog walker I use this land daily and will have a huge impact.	The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets on recreational resources, including PRow are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES. Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of this chapter of the ES. This includes preparation of a PRow Management Strategy in general accordance with the Outline PRow Management Strategy (document reference J1.5) submitted with the DCO application. The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g. National Cycle Routes (NCRs), Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Transmission Assets.
TA_0106_015_281023	S44	Online feedback form	10		There is no information on the size and scale of the substation. Is it a green box or the size of a house?	Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0111_017_131123	S44	Hardcopy feedback form	16		The SSSI of Lytham St Annes Nature Reserve should NOT be involved in this Project. An alternative route should be used. The cabling proposed along the Railway line in Kilgrimol Gardens should not proceed. There are obvious health issues and a devaluation of property worth is inevitable. The Project should NOT go ahead using the proposed landfall site and route. Alternatives should once again be considered.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). The impact on Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI is considered within section 1.11.9 of Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1) and n section 3.11 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).

E1.16.4.2 Project description table of responses (via all other methods)

Table E1.16.4.2: Project description table of responses (via all other methods)

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0001_010_231123	S42	Email	1.9 Volume 1, Chapter 3 (general) Some key parameters for Morgan and Morecambe Transmission Assets are clearly defined, while others are vaguely defined due to the lack of technical annexes and/or supporting information from modelling outputs for Morgan and Morecambe Transmission. We advise that parameters and MDS are clearly defined in the final ES, and that model outputs for The Morgan and Morecambe Transmission Assets are provided, either within the text or as a separate Annex.	The assessment undertaken was an evidence-based conceptual study, as agreed through the scoping process. Therefore, modelling of the Transmission Assets was not undertaken. Model outputs used to support the ES can be found within Volume 2, Annex 1.1: Physical Processes Associated Modelling Studies (document reference F2.1.1). This includes both the Mona Offshore Wind Project, Environmental Statement, Volume 6, Annex 1.1: Physical processes technical report; and Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets, Environmental Statement, Volume 4, Annex 1.1: Physical Processes Technical Report. The project description has been refined with respect to further project definition as presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This refinement includes that the OSPs relating to the Generation Assets and are not included in the Transmission Assets Application as outlined in the MDS table presented in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), Table 1.13: Maximum design scenario considered for assessment of impacts.
TA_0001_011_231123	S42	Email	1.1 Volume 1, Chapter 3, 3.5.1.5 We note that there is a possibility that all or part of the Offshore Service Platforms (OSPs) could be classed as part of the Generation Assets or the Transmission Assets. We advise that this optionality should ideally be resolved prior to the application and assessed within the relevant ES. The applicant to clarify which aspect of the proposed project the OSPs fall under (i.e. Generation or Transmission Assets), this should then be refined and assessed within the relevant ES.	The Applicants note your response. The OSPs are to be classed as part of the Generation Assets Applications only, and have been removed from the Transmission Assets Application.
TA_0001_012_231123	S42	Email	1.11 Volume 1, Chapter 3, 3.7.3 Natural England acknowledges that the developer will submit a UXO clearance method statement once UXO surveys are complete. Applications should provide sufficient information to assess the size and depths of craters within the ES and commit to avoiding sensitive benthic receptors. This is especially important where UXO clearance may affect designated sites or features. A more detailed assessment of potential crater impacts should be included within the final application.	Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) has been updated to include an assessment of temporary habitat disturbance associated with potential UXO detonation. An assessment of the clearance of the largest anticipated UXO is provided within Volume 1, Annex 5.2: Underwater Sound Technical Report of the ES (document reference F1.5.2).
TA_0001_013_231123	S42	Email	1.12 Volume 1, Chapter 3, 3.7.3 We welcome the developer's consideration of low order UXO clearance methods such as deflagration and welcome further stakeholder consultation around these techniques should they be suitable. Follow up UXO clearance methodology through the EPP process and with stakeholders in statutory and non-statutory consultations.	The Applicants have proposed that any identified UXO needing clearing will be preferentially cleared using low order techniques. The Detailed MMMP(s) will include for the use of low order techniques, where possible, as the primary mitigation measure alongside other measures (as set out in CoT64). As such underwater noise modelling has been conducted for UXO clearance using both low order and high order methods.
TA_0001_014_231123	S42	Email	1.13 Volume 1, Chapter 3, 3.7.3.9 Where the cable corridor crosses an area of high-density boulders and coarse material, we recommend the developer considers micro-siting if there is capacity within the planned cable corridor. We note that the developer has stated boulder clearance would occur within the footprint of installation activities. However, specific boulder clearance methodology and the location for boulder deposition should clearly be stated within the Application. Boulder clearance methodology and location of boulder deposition should be clearly stated within the ES along with further details for micro-siting of cables if applicable.	The description of seabed preparation including boulder clearance has been refined and is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Micrositing of cables around boulders would be onerous and impractical. Boulders pose a risk of damage and exposure to cables as well as an obstruction risk to the cable installation equipment. Therefore, any boulders identified as likely to impact installation will need to be moved to the side (side cast), away from the immediate location of the cable infrastructure. There are two key methods of clearing boulders, boulder plough and boulder grab. Where a high density of boulders is seen, the expectation is that a plough will be required to clear the cable installation corridor. Where medium and low densities of boulders are present, a subsea grab is expected to be employed. Boulder clearance will occur within the footprint of other site preparation activities. All boulders will remain in the vicinity (i.e. sidecast only) of the area they were cleared from. Sidecasting will not result in significant increases in SSC or changes to the seabed characteristics or physical processes.
TA_0001_015_231123	S42	Email	1.14 Volume 1, Chapter 3, 3.7.3.10 It is noted that if offshore infrastructure crosses existing out of service cables, the developer intends on removing these. We advise that the specific methodology for the proposed cable removal along with any associated impacts should be stated in the Application. We agree that this should also be undertaken in consultation with the asset owner and in accordance with the International Cable Protection Committee guidelines (2011). The proposed cable removal methodology for existing out of service	The methodology for cable removal is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			cables should be clearly stated within the submitted ES and undertaken in consultation with the asset owner and the International Cable Protection Committee guidelines (2011)	
TA_0001_016_231123	S42	Email	1.15 Volume 1,Chapter 3,3.7.3.12 We note that the MDS for sandwave clearance is based on the assumption that up to 60% of the cable route and 60% of foundation locations may require sandwave clearance. These are exceptionally large areas when compared to other offshore windfarm projects.We strongly recommend effort is taken to refine down this substantial MDS for sandwave clearance in the final application. We advise that site-specific geophysical survey data should be used to refine the MDS. The extent and location of sediment disturbance (area, volume) should be provided for affected MPAs/features (e.g. Fylde MCZ). Natural England also queries how will the sediment be retained within designated sites to ensure that the subtidal mud and sand will fully recover i.e., have the same structure and function.	PDE refinements have been made between the PEIR and final application using the available geophysical survey data. These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for sandwave clearance (and associated temporary habitat disturbance) within the Fylde MCZ. Project engineers have refined the parameters for sandwave clearance in the Fylde MCZ from 60% to 5% for the Morgan export cables and from 30% to 5% for the Morecambe export cables. It should also be noted that sandwave clearance is an important tool to facilitate the successful burial of cables and to minimise the requirements for external cable protection.The techniques used for sandwave clearance will be undertaken with the aim of depositing material in the direct vicinity of its original location, with no sediment being removed from the sediment cell. Further information has been provided within Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), section 1.10: Assessment of effects, to characterise the recoverability of sandwave features within the physical processes study area.
TA_0001_017_231123	S42	Email	1.16 Volume 1,Chapter 3, Table 3.5 It seems that some parameters associated with sandwave clearance have not been included, without these it is not clear how the figures for sandwave clearance and seabed preparation were derived. The developer mentions 60% of the cable route and 60% of the foundations may need sandwave clearance. We suggest all parameters (i.e. length/width/area/depth) should be included in the MDS tables.We advise the developer to consider additional parameters for inclusion in Table 3.5 to provide clarity around the sandwave volume MDS figures, namely:- Length of cable route requiring sandwave clearance (km)- Width of sandwave clearance disturbance corridor (m)- Indicative depth of sandwave clearance dredging (m)- Area of seabed disturbed by sandwave clearance (m2)- Seabed preparation areas for foundations (m2).36	PDE refinements have been made between the PEIR and final application. These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for sandwave clearance (and associated temporary habitat disturbance) within the Fylde MCZ. Project engineers have refined the parameters for sandwave clearance, using the available geophysical survey data, in the Fylde MCZ from 60% to 5% for the Morgan export cables and from 30% to 5% for the Morecambe export cables. Further information has been provided within Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), section 1.10, Assessment of effects, to characterise the recoverability of sandwave features within the physical processes study area. Parameters such as length, width, depth and volume of sandwave clearance have been included within Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), Table 1.13: Maximum design scenario considered for the assessment of impacts. Full details of the refined MDS applicable to fish and shellfish ecology are outlined within section 3.9.1 of Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3).
TA_0001_018_231123	S42	Email	1.17 Volume 1,Chapter 3,Table 3.6 The MDS for OSPs is high when compared to other projects of a similar scale (i.e. 6 x OSPs, 1 booster station).We advise that this is refined. We note that for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project, the developer has included two different MDS options for OSPs. Natural England advise that the preferred option would be to have 1 large OSP rather than 4 small OSP as this will have a smaller footprint and therefore least impact on the seabed.Clarify and refine OSP parameters for the ES submission. Include seabed preparation parameters for the areas for foundations (as mentioned above).	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications.
TA_0001_021_231123	S42	Email	1.2 Volume 1,Chapter 3, Tables 3.9 –3.14 It is not clear whether secondary scour has been included in the project description and MDS parameters. The project description only refers to scour protection.We advise that secondary scour protection impacts are scoped in and included in the MDS parameters. If they are included within the project description, this should be clearly stated and defined in the submitted ES.	Secondary scour has been considered within the assessment and CEA of the ES, as seen within Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), section 1.10 Assessment of effects and section 1.12 Cumulative effects assessment. Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) has been updated to include an assessment of secondary scour which draws on the assessment presented in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1).
TA_0001_053_231123	S42	Email	Screening 1.52 Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the PEIR, outlines that the offshore export cable will be installed by Horizontal Directional Drilling, or equivalent trenchless technique.Concerns about impacts on potential key receptors/Appropriate of analysis - From experience on other windfarms HDD can fail on occasion, the applicant should ensure that the worst case scenario at landfall takes this into consideration. This should consider impacts on Lytham St.Annes Dunes SSSI with a sufficient baseline collected to assess impact postconstruction and identify the need for remedial measures if needed.	Cable installation at landfall does not rely on HDD techniques, at this stage both open-cut trenching and trenchless techniques are being considered. Further information regarding landfall is included within Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0001_059_231123	S42	Email	2.6 Volume 1,Chapter 3,3.7.3 Natural England acknowledges that the developer will submit a UXO clearance method statement once UXO surveys are complete.Applications should provide sufficient information to assess the size and depths of craters within the ES and commit to avoiding sensitive benthic receptors. This is especially important where UXO clearance may affect designated sites or features.A more detailed assessment of potential crater impacts should be included within the final application.	Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) has been updated to include an assessment of temporary habitat disturbance associated with potential UXO detonation.
TA_0001_060_231123	S42	Email	2.7 Volume 1,Chapter 3,3.7.3 We welcome the developers consideration of low order UXO clearance methods such as deflagration and welcome further stakeholder consultation around these techniques should they be suitable.Follow up UXO clearance methodology through the EPP process and with stakeholders in statutory and non-statutory consultations.	The Applicants have proposed that any identified UXO needing clearing will be preferentially cleared using low order techniques. The Detailed MMMP(s) will include for the use of low order techniques, where possible, as the primary mitigation measure alongside other measures (as set out in CoT64). As such underwater noise modelling has been conducted for UXO clearance using both low order and high order methods.
TA_0001_061_231123	S42	Email	2.8 Volume 1,Chapter 3,3.7.3.9 Where the cable corridor crosses an area of high-density boulders and coarse material, we recommend the developer considers micro-siting wherever there is capacity within the planned cable corridor. We note that the developer has stated boulder clearance would occur within the footprint of installation activities. However, specific boulder clearance methodology and the location for boulder deposition should clearly be stated within the Application.Boulder clearance methodology and location of boulder deposition should be clearly stated within the submitted ES, along with further details for micro-siting of cables if applicable.	Micrositing of cables around boulders would be onerous and impractical. Boulders pose a risk of damage and exposure to cables as well as an obstruction risk to the cable installation equipment. Therefore, any boulders identified as likely to impact installation will need to be moved to the side (side cast), away from the immediate location of the cable infrastructure. There are two key methods of clearing boulders, boulder plough and boulder grab. Where a high density of boulders is seen, the expectation is that a plough will be required to clear the cable installation corridor. Where medium and low densities of boulders are present, a subsea grab is expected to be employed. Boulder clearance will occur within the footprint of other site preparation activities. All boulders will remain in the vicinity (i.e. sidecast only) of the area they were cleared from.
TA_0001_101_231123	S42	Email	Project Description 1.5 Vol 1, Ch 3 / Vol 2 Ch 3 The project parameters are clear. NA	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0001_102_231123	S42	Email	Natural England's Position on Worst Case Scenario or Scenarios 1.6 Vol 1, Ch 3 / Vol 2 Ch 3 The Maximum Design Scenario (MDS) is broadly suitable. NA	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0001_110_231123	S42	Email	Methodology 1.14 Vol 2, Ch3 Please note that Natural England defer to CEFAS on the suitability of the underwater noise modelling parameters and methods.To note.	The Applicants note your response. Comments from CEFAS have been addressed and responded to separately.
TA_0001_111_231123	S42	Email	Methodology 1.15 Vol 2, Ch3,Table 3.14 Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets – Method statements and installation plans. Natural England should be consulted on for the Construction Method Statements, Mitigation Protocols, EMPs and Installation plans in advance of construction to ensure that all the correct measures are secured. This should be secured within the DCO/dML.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0001_188_231123	S42	Email	6.2 One of the main justifications of having less significant impact on ecological receptors is the use of HDD or alternative trenchless techniques. However, no evidence is provided within the report as to why this approach is less intrusive and will have less impact.Further evidence should be provided regarding this approach, to set out why using these techniques will have less of impact including description, predicted noise levels, operation and methodology.	Direct pipe trenchless installation is proposed beneath the sand dunes. This technology will ensure there is no open trenching through the dunes. This will avoid any direct loss of vegetation and habitats. Instead, the drill will pass beneath the dunes at depth. Where necessary consideration of any indirect effects on the habitat and measures to avoid, minimise or mitigate these is provided in section 3.11 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). Direct pipe or microtunnelling is proposed beneath the River Ribble to ensure that there would be no direct impacts on the river habitats. As set out in Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3), The risk of bentonite breakout will be controlled through the bentonite breakout plan. An Outline Bentonite Breakout Plan (document reference J1.13) is provided as an annex to the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (document reference J1). Crossing techniques are set out within Volume 1, Annex 3.2: Onshore Crossing Schedule of the ES (document reference F1.3.2) which is submitted as part of the application for development consent. Further information on the proposed approach to construction is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0001_195_231123	S42	Email	Project Description 6.9 The proposed development description – does not provide detail as to what is happening at Fairhaven (adjacent to RSPB Fairhaven Lakes). The area is shown on the Phase 1 Habitat Survey maps as section 9 (Figure 1.3I - page 17 of Vol 3. Annex 3.2 Interim Phase 1 Habitat Survey Technical Report). From aerial photos, this area appears to be coastal habitats with dunes and saltmarsh (although not designated, this would be a Priority Habitat). Part of this area falls within the geological site – Lytham Coastal Changes SSSI. Provide further detail for this area in the submitted ES.	The section of the Transmission Assets Order Limits adjacent to RSPB Fairhaven Lakes is proposed for ornithological mitigation (with no development to take place at this location). Refer to Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES for further details. Consideration of sites with a geological designation present within the study area is set out in section 1.6.2 of Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1) with the assessment for relevant sites, including Lytham Coastal Changes SSSI provided in section 1.11.2. It has however, been concluded that there will be no impact on Lytham Coastal Changes SSSI, which lies outside the Transmission Assets Order Limits.
TA_0001_272_231123	S42	Email	Screening 8.3 The offshore export cable will be installed from the location at/near Blackpool Airport by Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD), or equivalent trenchless technique across the sand dunes at Lytham St. Annes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Exploring and detailing a maximum design scenario and other environmental constraints for these operations is critical. It is also critical that the methodology for the trenchless technique is determined at the earliest opportunity, and in consultation with Natural England, to ensure that the impact can be avoided in the first instance. Sufficient survey programmes should be planned to allow a full understanding of the operations so a holistic impact assessment can be carried out. The outcomes of this assessment and any mitigation measures required to address potential impacts should be reported in the submitted ES.	Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3) assesses the impacts on Lytham St. Anne's Dunes SSSI. Direct pipe trenchless installation is proposed in this location as it's the most appropriate for use in sensitive settings, in part because it reduces the risk of collapse that is associated with cable installation using horizontal directional drilling (HDD).
TA_0001_283_231123	S42	Email	All efforts to avoid areas of boulders or minimise the need for boulder clearance by micro-siting should be explored through a boulder clearance methodology and stated within the Application, and the potential impacts of boulder placement on sediment movement carefully assessed.	The description of potential impacts relating to seabed preparation including boulder clearance has been refined with respect to further project definition as presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Micro-siting of cables around boulders would be onerous and impractical. Boulders pose a risk of damage and exposure to cables as well as an obstruction risk to the cable installation equipment. Therefore, any boulders identified as likely to impact installation will need to be moved to the side (side cast), away from the immediate location of the cable infrastructure. There are two key methods of clearing boulders, boulder plough and boulder grab. Where a high density of boulders is seen, the expectation is that a plough will be required to clear the cable installation corridor. Where medium and low densities of boulders are present, a subsea grab is expected to be employed. Boulder clearance will occur within the footprint of other site preparation activities. All boulders will remain in the vicinity (i.e. sidecast only) of the area they were cleared from. The impact is fully assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2).
TA_0001_284_231123	S42	Email	From experience on other windfarms, HDD can fail on occasion. Therefore, the applicant should ensure that the worst case scenario at landfall takes this into consideration. This should consider impacts on Lytham St. Annes Dunes SSSI with a sufficient baseline collected to assess impact post construction.	Impacts to the ecological features of the Lytham St. Annes Dunes SSSI are assessed in Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). Direct pipe trenchless installation is proposed from the transition joint bays to an exit pit at or above MHWS. This will avoid the loss of vegetation and habitats across the sand dunes at Lytham St. Annes SSSI. This method has been selected to address this issue as it's the most appropriate for use in sensitive geological settings, in part because it reduces the risk of collapse that is associated with cable installation using HDD. Further information regarding the landfall is included within Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).
TA_0002_015_171123	S42	Email	9. Conclusions The overall conclusion that the Parish Council has reached is that, with the evidence and status presented, we must object to the proposals. The following reasons support this objection: 1) The consultation process has been flawed in its execution. 2) Insufficient information has been provided to enable a proper assessment of the impact of the design on the total environment of the Fylde. 3) Consequently, the proposed plan does not have a level of maturity commensurate with presentation for approval. 4) The impact on individual landowners has not been determined, relating to both the development and implementation phase and the subsequent in-service life cycle of the system. 5) Costs associated with levels of compensation appear to have been underestimated. 6) The impression has been created that the programme is underfunded and that any additional costs would have to be sought by access to the public purse, a similar situation to that	The Applicant notes your response. Responses to detailed comments provided in turn associated to each topic raised (see unique reference TA_0002).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			occurring with the HS2 project.7) The impact of the loss of amenity, for both residents and visitors, is considered too high a price to pay for the proposed development, when all possible alternatives have been summarily dismissed for reasons that are unclear.	
TA_0003_002_221123	S42/S44	Email	Firstly, there is repeated reference in the consultation documentation to details of various elements of the proposal not having been finalised. This includes, but is not limited to, the route of the proposed cabling, the design and technology to be used in the construction of the proposed sub stations and the provision of compensatory habitat required to address Biodiversity Net Gain. Whilst it is appreciated that such matters may not have been available during the non-statutory consultation when the views of the local community were sought to help inform the design parameters of the project, it is considered that the design of the scheme should have reached a much more advanced stage. As matters stand, there are many questions on which the local authority and community are unable to provide meaningful responses and so the pre-application has taken place prematurely. The Planning Inspectorate advise that "The length of time taken to prepare and consult on a project will vary depending upon its scale and complexity." The Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Windfarms: Transmission Assets is a significant project, and many conflicting interests will need to be balanced during the decision-making process. Fylde Council considers that there should be further community and stakeholder engagement ahead of the formal submission of the proposal to the Planning Inspectorate to allow the views of the local community to be obtained and any matters more fully assessed at a time when the project is further developed.	The design of the Transmission Assets has been developed further since the statutory consultation (PEIR). This design evolution has taken into account the findings of the iterative EIA process and feedback from stakeholders. As such the location of key elements of the Transmission Assets and the Order Limits have been refined, as reflected in the application for development consent. This has included development of the approach to biodiversity benefit, as set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11). Engagement through the Evidence Plan Process has continued throughout the EIA process, including Expert Working Groups attended by Fylde Council. Further targeted consultation has been undertaken, for example, for landowners where additional land interests have been identified.
TA_0003_003_221123	S42/S44	Email	In addition to the lack of certainty regarding the scheme that is being consulted upon, the council is concerned that the consultation material has not contained sufficient detail to allow an assessment of potential impacts to be considered. In particular, based on the summary documents that have been produced it is difficult to understand the siting of infrastructure and cable routing. Whilst additional detail is contained in the on-line documentation, many members of the community have not been able to locate this information amongst the extensive documentation contained in the PIER.	The design of the Transmission Assets has been developed further since the statutory consultation (PEIR). This design evolution has taken into account the findings of the iterative EIA process and feedback from stakeholders. As such the location of key elements of the Transmission Assets and the Order Limits have been refined, as reflected in the application for development consent. Further targeted consultation has been undertaken, for example, for landowners where additional land interests have been identified. At the PEIR and ES stages, a non-technical summary has been provided to summarise the findings of the EIA process in non-technical language.
TA_0003_004_221123	S42/S44	Email	The location of the substations in relative close proximity to established residential settlements and individual residential properties is of concern to the council and the lack of detailed information to allow an assessment of these impacts heightens that concern. It also seems that the opportunity for those property owners to fully appreciate the potential location and scale of the infrastructure relative to their property undermines the value of the consultation process at this stage.	The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the onshore substations, including - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets- refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received. Details of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4).
TA_0003_006_221123	S42/S44	Email	Wherever the substations are located, it is essential that the technology used minimises the need for the substations, the size of the structures required, and/or delivers the structures in a disaggregated form to minimise their visual impact in the landscape.	The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the onshore substations, including - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets- refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received. Details of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). In addition, an Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2) has been prepared as part of the ES to include measures to mitigate effects on landscape and visual receptors during construction, operation and maintenance of the Transmission Assets.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0005_113_231123	S42	Email	2. Terming the new developments as substations was highly misleading as most people's understanding of a substation is a small unassuming building which would not merit much concern. The proposed multiple buildings on the converter substation sites are higher than any other buildings in the towns of Kirkham or St Annes, other than the church spires. Their presence in the proposed form & location will completely change the rural character of the area, in conflict with the Local Development Plan and essentially nullify the considerable investment of national funds to regenerate Kirkham as a rural destination.	The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the onshore substations, including - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets- refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received. Details of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3).
TA_0018_009_231123	S42/S44	Email	i) Given the lack of information for the exit route of the 400kv cables and the two different options for the Morecambe substations, the consultation has not met the necessary standards for it to be effective (EN-5, Horlock Rules, Rochdale Envelope case law). The date when the choice of options and cable exit route will be announced is unknown. This point was raised with the developer at the Thursday 26th October 2023 public consultation and is key information to enable informed observations to be made by those participating in the consultation	The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor and onshore substations, including - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets- refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received. Details of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). These are based on the project description set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This chapter sets out the approach to site selection, including the use of the Project Design Envelope or Rochdale envelope approach, in line with case law.
TA_0019_014_231123	S42/S44	Email	There is minimal information of the impact on the community during the build stage of the project, measurable in years. The consultation seems to concentrate on the "as implemented" characteristics of the project and omits the development consequences on, among others, the local transport network and traffic flows (site access points have not yet been chosen), noise from traffic building, piling, trenching etc	Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1). Further details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8).
TA_0035_019_221123	S42/S44	Email	3.8.1.6 Issue Lack of clarity regarding the works in the area of the sand dunes SSSI. Impact Potential for damage to the physical and ecological integrity of the sand dunes Solution Further clarification regarding use and location of potential cofferdam within sand dunes SSSI.	Direct pipe trenchless installation is proposed beneath the sand dunes. This technology will ensure there is no open trenching through the dunes. This will avoid any direct loss of vegetation and habitats. Instead, the drill will pass beneath the dunes at depth. Where necessary consideration of any indirect effects on the habitat and measures to avoid, minimise or mitigate these is provided in section 3.11 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). Crossing techniques are set out within Volume 1, Annex 3.2: Onshore Crossing Schedule of the ES (document reference F1.3.2) which is submitted as part of the application for development consent.
TA_0035_059_221123	S42/S44	Email	CoT30 Issue In the area to the north of the River Ribble continuous landfilling has taken place either with or without containment and/or significant capping. Waste types may have included Low Level Radioactive Waste, therefore detailed and specific investigation and appropriate HSE should be employed as stated, further investigation from historical nuclear disposal may also be necessary. The proximity of landfills to where the cable is proposed to cross the river provides a risk of contaminated groundwater connecting via the bore to the surface waters in the river, depending on the system to be utilised to undertake the drilling. Impact A pathway could be established between contaminated groundwaters and surface waters of the River Ribble. Solution	This is considered and assessed in section 1.11.3 of Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1). The methodology for the River Ribble crossing is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The development of the proposed techniques (microtunnelling or direct pipe) has taken into account the known ground conditions. Where the onshore export cable corridor or 400 kV grid connection cable corridor crosses sites of particular sensitivity (e.g. embanked Environment Agency surface watercourses, Sites of Special Scientific Interest or groundwater inner Source Protection Zones) a hydrogeological risk assessment will be undertaken where practicable to inform a site-specific crossing method statement which will also be agreed with the relevant authorities prior to construction.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			Where HDD is proposed especially on or about the River Ribble, consideration in respect of the 'set back' of the drill pad entry spot should be considered further. The high permeability of shallow formations adjacent to the River corridor may require that the points of penetration and egress are previously treated by cementing with grout to form an impermeable base to aid controlled circulation within the proposed bore. This again to prevent possible contamination	
TA_0035_065_221123	S42/S44	Email	<p>CoT02 The following features will be crossed by HDD (or other trenchless methodologies), as set out in the Onshore Crossing Schedule to be submitted as part of the application for the development consent: - the following Environment Agency main rivers, Moss Sluice, east of Midgeland Road; along Pegs Lane; Wrea Brook southeast of Cartmell Lane; Dow Brook east of Lower Lane between the A584 and the A583; Middle Pool north of Lund Way;</p> <p>Issue Ensure the use of trenchless techniques at vulnerable locations.</p> <p>Impact Open trench cable laying methods would cause increased environmental risk at these locations</p> <p>Solution To be included in DCO submission</p>	CoT02 remains in place as part of the application for development consent. Details of crossings are set out in the Onshore Crossing Schedule (Volume 1, Annex 3.2: Onshore crossing schedule of the ES (document reference F1.3.2)). Trenchless techniques will be used to cross the River Ribble where the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor is proposed. Where any trenched crossings are proposed, method statements would be produced.
TA_0035_081_221123	S42/S44	Email	<p>CoT44</p> <p>The Project Description (Volume 1, Chapter 3 of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)) sets out that the installation of the onshore export cable corridor at Lytham St Annes SSSI and the St Anne's Old Links Golf Course will be undertaken by HDD (or other trenchless methodologies).</p> <p>Issue Ensure the use of trenchless techniques at vulnerable locations.</p> <p>Impact Open trench cable laying methods would cause significant long-term damage at these locations</p> <p>Solution To be included in DCO submission</p>	Direct pipe trenchless installation is proposed beneath the sand dunes (including the Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI and golf course). This technology will ensure there is no open trenching through the dunes. This will avoid any direct loss of vegetation and habitats. Instead, the drill will pass beneath the dunes at depth. Crossing techniques are set out within Volume 1, Annex 3.2: Onshore Crossing Schedule of the ES (document reference F1.3.2) which is submitted as part of the application for development consent.
TA_0035_088_221123	S42/S44	Email	<p>CoT86 An Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) will be prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. CoCP(s) will be developed in accordance with the outline CoCP. Where required, trenched techniques may be used for minor ditches or smaller watercourses that are frequently dry. In these cases, measures will be implemented to protect water quality and flow and these will be detailed within the outline CoCP.</p> <p>Issue Measures to protect water quality and flow during trenched crossing of minor watercourses have yet to be fully developed.</p> <p>Impact Risk to the environment</p> <p>Solution Measures to be included in Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission.</p>	CoT86 remains in place. An Outline Code of Construction Practice is provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1). Details of crossings are set out in the Onshore Crossing Schedule (Volume 1, Annex 3.2: Onshore crossing schedule of the ES (document reference F1.3.2)). Where any trenched crossings are proposed, method statements would be produced, in advance of works taking place.
TA_0035_099_221123	S42/S44	Email	<p>Climate Change</p> <p>Issue Offsetting Green house Gas emissions</p> <p>Suggestion Consider local opportunities for offsetting GHG emissions. Engage with local partners (as above) who could support with some of this.</p>	A Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy (document reference J4) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The GHG Reduction Strategy outlines options to reduce construction-related emissions, enabling reduced whole life emissions.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0036_010_231123	S44	Email	Having received the e-mail from REDACTED on the 9th November as regards the project itself in the wider sense we have no comments upon it. Our concerns are simply the potential disruption to our activities and the possible impact of those upon the haulage contract that we have with Total Energies for the transport of bitumen to their Preston Facility. The area shown in the consultation documents shows our Railway at the very eastern edge of the land being considered on the north bank of the River Ribble.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0036_011_231123	S44	Email	One of my colleagues Mr REDACTED is a local resident and has attended one of your consultation meetings in that capacity. He has told me that the representative there indicated that the plan was to bore underneath the railway between Blackpool South & Kirkham at a point to be determined. Can you confirm that if it were the case these cables were to cross our Railway that this would be the method and not the large pathway shown on page 24 of the booklet. If there is any suggestion of serious disruption to our activities caused by this development then we would object to that and insist that suitable measures are put in place. As I say we are not just a seasonal heritage railway but also operate commercial freight services which could be jeopardised by a significant closure period putting large numbers of lorries onto local roads.	The Applicants note your response. The Ribble Steam Railway lies outside of the Transmission Assets Order Limits and no impacts are anticipated.
TA_0038_005_181123	S44	Email	5. Given the lack of information for the exit route of the 400kv cables, has the consultation met the necessary standards for it to be effective (EN-5, Horlock Rules, Rochdale Envelope). When, and how, will the 400kv cables route be announced? And how will they public be able to comment on it?	The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor and onshore substations, including - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets- refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received. Details of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). These are based on the project description set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This chapter sets out the approach to site selection, including the use of the Project Design Envelope or Rochdale envelope approach, in line with case law. If the application is accepted for examination, there will be an opportunity for people to register their interest in the application with the Planning Inspectorate. Anyone registering an interest will be kept informed of the progress of the application, including when and how they can provide comments. Following a preliminary meeting the Examining Authority will confirm the timetable for the examination. I
TA_0047_004_251023	S42	Email	Would Hazardous Substances Consent be needed? It is not clear whether the applicant has considered the hazard classification of any chemicals that are proposed to be present at the development Hazard classification is relevant to the potential for accidents For example, hazardous substances planning consent is required to store or use any of the Categories of Substances or Named Hazardous Substances set out in Schedule 1 of The Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2015 as amended, if those hazardous substances will be present on, over or under the land at or above the controlled quantities There is an addition rule in the Schedule for below threshold substances If hazardous substances planning consent is required, please consult HSE on the application	The Applicants confirm that no hazardous substance consent will be required to be obtained.
TA_0010_009_221123	S42	Email	Volume 1 Chapter 3: Project Description 3.1. MMO would like to discuss further the management of Works and any related plans or conditions to ensure a consistent approach with the Local Planning Authority on the area between MHWS and Mean Low Water Springs. 3.2. Works 4a and 4b should be included within the dML as they are below MHWS.	The Applicant and the MMO have been and will continue to engage on matters relating to the deemed marine licences as appropriate. Intertidal work no. 4A and 4B have been included in Schedules 14 and 15 respectively.
TA_0010_118_221123	S42	Email	Volume 4 Chapter 3: Climate Change 17.1. MMO defers to and supports the statutory advice provided by the Natural England or Local Planning Authority, and the Environment Agency regarding the Project's resilience to impacts of climate change.	The Applicants note your response.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0118_008_171123	S44	Email	10) We are by no means against alternative energy, I can't call it green because it's not and never can be but for you to create so much up-heavel to good agricultural land and farms for over a 30 mile stretch of land over 120m wide to link up to Penwortham is appalling and very wrong. You are going under peoples properties, land, roads, railways and the river when you could do as the National Grid suggested and use Heysham substation which is currently still in use until it is de-commissioned in 2028.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0125_003_181123	S44	Email	6.I strongly object, also to you proposing to build 2 substations, one the size of 18 football pitches, the other the size of 9 football pitches and 20m in height, not including the height of the lightning protection masts.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0130_001_191123	S44	Email	As a resident of REDACTED adjacent to Blackpool airport. I will be directly impacted by a number of the proposals and also I have concerns about those further afield such as the substation locations and size. On a personal level, REDACTED will be impacted as we are surrounded by dykes both at the front and rear of properties so a strong potential for flooding and rise in water table. The cable corridor will be as wide as a 6 lane motorway and at the moment you are still not clear whether you are passing under the airport, under Queensway (adjacent to our land) or using neighbouring roads in St Annes. Given the corridor's expected width it would suggest no matter which you choose you will impact adjacent to REDACTED.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). It is noted that the option presented at PEIR (placement of cables in trenches within the highways) near Blackpool Airport is no longer required. Details of the current design are provided in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The assessment of the impact of increased flood risk arising from additional surface water runoff is presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase. The Applicants through Dalcour Maclaren and appointed drainage specialists will engage with landowners regarding pre-construction and post-construction drainage, tying into existing infrastructure where possible. The Outline CoCP and outline surface water and groundwater management plan (document reference J1.9) includes measures in relation to drainage.
TA_0134_002_191123	S44	Email	Straight away i wonder how an already challenging route will cope with the work needed to lay down these pipes as indicated in point 4.4.2.7 in the consultation , a temporary construction corridor of 122M & 70M wide completed. The construction will definitely cause great disruption to the village and the residents. I am unsure how you are even allowed to build this so close to residential houses. the working hours of construction are very long and antisocial , which will cause a noisy, busy environment for all residents. There are no predicted pictures of what the substations will look like ??? But we do know from the report that will be 46acres and 6 stories high . The proposed area of zone 1 is adjunct to 2 schools effecting for some children the whole of there schooling life. A project of this type will cause noise pollution (60-80 decibels) adults can suffer with hearing problems & loss listening to decibel 70 for a prolonged period of time, so i feel this will impact all residents and future generations too.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0139_003_201123	S44	Email	<p>Morecambe & Morgan Wind Farm 3rd November 20231.) Please can you explain if these are our properties where the cable corridor will be in relation to these properties.2.) What noise pollution will be created by the installation of these cables and how will affect residents?3.) How will the air quality affect residents close to the cable corridor?4.) What measures will be taken to ensure are properties do not become infested with vermin during the creation of the cable corridor?5.) What is the predicted length of traffic management on Queensway?6.) What is the predicted effect on the water table during the creation of the cable corridor and what your proposal to mitigate the effect on the water table?7.) How and where will the cable corridor cross Queensway?8.) What noise will these cables create once installed and live?9.) What protection for wildlife will be in place. Wildlife on Lytham moss land and land edging Queensway (B5261), there are great crested newts, otters, bats, water voles, etc. as well as birds.10.) How will the dykes be protected from debris?11.) How will residents be update on progress and planned disruption?12.) Can you guarantee Division Lane will not be used to import Cable/equipment?13.) Will the heavy machinery drilling digging etc likely cause any damage to our homes? If so what's in place for the cost of repair?</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0139_004_201123	S44	Email	<p>In additional to the above questions still not answered in writing as of 9th November the residents would like to ask the following questions after Monday 6th November Webinar.14.)Why was the first route for the substations and cables axed, I believe Penwortham was not the first option?15.)How wide is he Indicative onshore export cable corridor? (Light purple on Lytham Moss) and where is it going on an ordnance survey map. If it is 122m wide, where will it be crossing Queensway? Our questions have not been adequately answered on this.16.)What size are the substations and is there only 4? Will there definitely not be a Substation, Booster stations in Blackpool or Lytham St Anne's? If Morecambe substation Sub Station 12500 sq metres roughly 30 acres max height 20 Metres, and Morgan substation is15 acres max height 20 Metres is the sites in Kirkham where they will be located?17.)If your proposed route is a Biologic Heritage Site for migrating birds would the project be stopped during migration? There are great crested newts, otters, bats, water voles, etc. as well as migrating birds such as pink foot geese and Whooper Swans.18.)Why have you asked some residents on the same street of Division Lane for details of people or organisations have interest in the land/ property, Mortgage / Charge, name of lender and mortgage reference and not others? Several residents own more than one piece of land and they have received 2 different letters why when these are generic letters? Is this because you are thinking of using your compulsory acquisition powers to acquire Land/Properties/Part of land in Blackpool, Lytham Moss, Lytham St Anne's? In the webinar on 6th November you stated you have to inform all interested parties but yet you are not asking all residents the same questions, is the mortgagee question because you want to come to a voluntary agreement to purchase land or property? 19.) Will the cabling create noise for residents similar to pylons?20.) How will you mitigate raising the water table?21.) There are only 3 routes in and out of Lytham St Annes from Blackpool and when one is shut you can sit in 45 minutes to an hour each way in delays if the Promenade or Queensway is shut effecting residents and businesses. If you are now proposing using Kilnhouse Lane, Leach Lane, Queensway and Blackpool Road North to install cable ducts, how long do you believe this work will take and how much disruption will it cause to residents and businesses. Queensway - Traffic management. This is the main arterial route into St Annes from Blackpool, extremely busy 40mph road.22.)How will you communicate with residents during construction? Please consider social media for project updates.23.) Can you guarantee Midgeland Road will not be used to import Cable/equipment?24.) Will bridal paths be out of use while installing the cable corridor?25.) Blackpool Council are also doing lots of alterations on Common Edge Road (EZ Zone https://blackpoolez.com), the drainage off these works are to go into a attenuation basin alongside Blackpool Airport, has this been considered in your planning for the cable corridor (https://pa.fylde.gov.uk/Planning/Display/23/0758).26.) The Lytham moss land is wet and very low lying. - could cause flooding to us on Division Lane how will this be combated.27.) What is the proximity of the cable corridor to properties on Division Lane.28.) How will you stop settlement on properties adjacent to the projects, path?29.) Fylde size of Division Lane is not connect to main drains and has Dykes and Septic Tanks either on our adjacent to</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE) which no longer includes any surface piercing structures. This includes the removal of the Morgan Booster Station and associated search areas. The OSPs are to be classed as part of the Generation Assets applications only. Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).Properties on Division Lane border the draft Order Limits and so the Project has a duty to consult with those legal interests as part of the DCO application. To ensure the Applicant has consulted with all land interests, Dalcour Maclaren undertake land referencing to identify these interests through HMLR searches and Land Interest Questionnaires. This includes in some circumstances requesting information for any third-party interests in the land, details of which are outlined in the land referencing methodology. Some parties are asked to provide information about their interest prior to the project order limits being refined. This captures a wider area than ultimately necessary. Being asked for this information does not mean that you will be directly affected. Interest are identified by plot rather than address so any off lying land will be covered. We have a duty to consult all parties with an interest in land, a mortgage is effectively an interest and entitled to notification.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			properties, how will these be protected.30.) Is there a provision for cleaning Dykes once the project is finished, as when other project have been completed this has caused problems for residents and we as riparian owners have a responsibility to clear dykes, but we should not be expect to clear your waste into these dykes.On behalf of residents of REDACTED.	
TA_0151_008_201123	S44	Email	The building work will create enormous disruption to the village for years to come, no time scale period of construction has been given, or whether both installations will be completed at the same time or after each other.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).
TA_0155_004_211123	S44	Email	It looks to me as though the design process is sloppy, secretive and poorly communicated.Nobody had any visualisations of the substation to give an idea of what an eyesore it must be and people were vague about the noise nuisance despite there being installations around the world. If noise is really not that far up the design criteria then it probably borders on the incompetent. Stating that the plans are "worst case", a commonly used expression, as though it is some comfort, is just a lazy way of not having the right criteria in place and failing to do robust investigative work. In these circumstances worst case becomes the easiest achievable outcome.	An assessment of the noise and vibration impacts due to the Transmission Assets are presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.2: Construction Noise and Vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.2) and Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational Noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3).The cumulative noise and vibration impacts with other proposed developments is considered in section 8.13 of Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8).An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects. Visualisations have been presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage.
TA_0155_005_211123	S44	Email	As the design parameters mature, clearly the legislation with regard to radiation and noise will need to be validated and implemented. With particular regards to noise I would like to see the commitment to the appropriate legislation together with an assessment of the nuisance, and an incentive to ensure that failure to achieve the current levels have a higher impact than cost.How much transparency will there be in the design decision making process? Who will have sight of this process and what will be the right of representation by the public? I would like to know when the design parameters, in particular, the specifications with regard to noise, will be available for public examination?	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). An assessment of the noise and vibration impacts due to the Transmission Assets are presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.2: Construction Noise and Vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.2) and Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational Noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3).The cumulative noise and vibration impacts with other proposed developments is considered in section 8.13 of Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8).Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used. With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing. Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex.See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4). Our team have been carefully considering the feedback provided at our statutory and non-statutory consultations – alongside ongoing engineering, and environmental work – as we refine our plans. If the application is accepted for examination, there will be an opportunity for people to register their interest in the application with the Planning Inspectorate. Anyone

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				registering an interest will be kept informed of the progress of the application, including when and how they can provide comments. Following a preliminary meeting the Examining Authority will confirm the timetable for the examination.
TA_0157_005_211123	S44	Email	As the design parameters mature, clearly the legislation with regard to radiation and noise will need to be validated and implemented. With particular regards to noise I would like to see the commitment to the appropriate legislation together with an assessment of the nuisance, and an incentive to ensure that failure to achieve the current levels have a higher impact than cost. How much transparency will there be in the design decision making process? Who will have sight of this process and what will be the right of representation by the public? I would like to know when the design parameters, in particular, the specifications with regard to noise, will be available for public examination?	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). An assessment of the noise and vibration impacts due to the Transmission Assets are presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.2: Construction Noise and Vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.2) and Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational Noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3). The cumulative noise and vibration impacts with other proposed developments is considered in section 8.13 of Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8). Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used. With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing. Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex. See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4). Our team have been carefully considering the feedback provided at our statutory and non-statutory consultations – alongside ongoing engineering, and environmental work – as we refine our plans. If the application is accepted for examination, there will be an opportunity for people to register their interest in the application with the Planning Inspectorate. Anyone registering an interest will be kept informed of the progress of the application, including when and how they can provide comments. Following a preliminary meeting the Examining Authority will confirm the timetable for the examination.
TA_0158_014_211123	S44	Email	5.The PEIR is flawed as the visual impacts are grossly understated. Why have no artists impressions been down from all angles to provide residents with a reasonable impression of the scale and size of the substation. 30 meters tall is the same height as Conwy Castle and is going to look ridiculous within the proposed site.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects. Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage. Visualisations have been presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3).
TA_0160_004_211123	S44	Email	The proposed locations are opposite a large residential area. I have not found an existing one like it in the UK so close to a residential area to obtain any facts. We have no idea what it will look like, as we are told you have no design / artist impressions or similar to show the residents it will affect. We just have a square meterage.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Visualisations have been presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage.
TA_0161_001_211123	S44	Email	Proposed Morecambe & Morgan Wind Farms – Transmission Assets Comments on and objections to the consultation and project proposals: I am writing as a resident and homeowner in Newton-with-Scales. I am very concerned about the proposals regarding the Morecambe and Morgan Windfarm Transmissions Assets and the negative impact which they will have on our quiet rural village. The proposals to place two enormous substations within metres of our village, alongside the digging of a cable corridor wider than the M55 motorway, shows a total disregard for the lives and well-being of the people who have chosen to live here and work here. Never once did I imagine that this small historically agricultural village, in RURAL Fylde would be chosen for potential INDUSTRIALISATION on a mammoth scale.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0161_009_211123	S44	Email	Substations & Cabling •Two large substations in close proximity will result in over intensive development and industrialisation of Zone 1. This will have a significantly adverse impact to local amenity and a change of character from rural/agricultural to industrial, especially when compounded with the proposed Bluefield Solar Farm. The visual and audible intrusions on peoples lives by having not just one, but two substations will be unbearable. Why does the project need two substations? Why are they so vast? Why can they not be co-located? •Most other substations in the UK appear to be much further away from communities – this scheme appears to be setting an unwelcome precedent in terms of proximity to residential areas. Why are you now considering building so close o a community?	The Electricity System Operator (ESO) is responsible for planning and operation of the transmission system and ensuring the balance of electricity generation with electricity demand. The Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm were scoped into the Pathway to 2030 workstream of the UK Government's Offshore Transmission Network Review (OTNR). As part of the OTNR, the ESO assessed options to improve the coordination offshore wind farm connections and associated transmission networks. In July 2022, the UK Government published the Pathway to 2030 Holistic Network Design (HNDR) Report which set out the results of the OTNR. A key output of the HNDR process was the recommendation that the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm should work collaboratively in connecting the two offshore wind farms to the National Grid electricity transmission network at Penwortham in Lancashire. The Transmission Assets provide a connection to the National Grid for two nationally significant offshore wind farms and contribute to the UK Government's ambition to deliver 50 GW offshore wind by 2030 in order to achieve net zero by 2050. The need for Transmission Assets is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 2: Policy and legislation context (document reference F1.2) of the ES. Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0161_010_211123	S44	Email	•There are no 'mockups' 2D or 3D of what the substations would look like, especially given their enormous size (45 acres). When will this visual information become available? Will residents be consulted? •The photographs that purport to show the visual impact of the substations were taken from obscure locations and not from the residential building line. These so called 'wirelines' are buried in huge documents. Why were these views not taken from residential sightlines? •Information regarding different substation technologies has not been made available and will impact the size, scale and visual appearance of the substations. The representatives at the consultation could not even say whether the substation design would be air cooled or gas cooled. When will decisions about substation design be shared? How long is going to take to grow trees tall enough to mask these monsters?	Wireline visualisations were made available at statutory consultation, showing the maximum parameters from various viewpoints. Visualisations are presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage. Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3).
TA_0161_014_211123	S44	Email	•No route has yet been declared for the 400kV cables from the substations to Penwortham. It is still showed as a large tract of land that is potentially impacted. There is still no information about how the cables will cross the River Ribble, though the project team said verbally that there would be no infrastructure above ground. How can you guarantee there will be no further infrastructure above ground for the Ribble crossing if you do not yet know the route or the engineering challenges faced? •All cabling being put in place via wide 120m	The Transmission Assets design has resulted in a reduced construction corridor width, as set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Details of the factors considered during the design evolution are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>trenches apart from when crossing the river and major roads. Why can't trenchless technology be used along the whole route? This would be less intrusive and disruptive to the farmers and livestock. Farmers are saying that the land would take tens of years to recover and become productive again after being displaced during trench digging. •There is much talk in the press after the Winsor report about the move to overhead cables to speed the delivery of additional electricity into the National Grid. Is there a possibility that the underground cables will be changed to overhead cables?</p>	<p>part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). Direct pipe or microtunnelling is proposed beneath the River Ribble to ensure that there would be no direct impacts on the river habitats. As set out in Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3), Crossing techniques are set out within Volume 1, Annex 3.2: Onshore Crossing Schedule of the ES (document reference F1.3.2) which is submitted as part of the application for development consent. Further information on the proposed approach to construction is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES. The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6).</p>
TA_0161_015_211123	S44	Email	<p>•There is little detailed information about how the construction phase will impact the local area. It is likely to last several years causing massive disruption with long noisy working hours. The consultation booklet states construction period of 3 years but the PEIR indicates 60 months. There is no statement that the construction of the substations will be concurrent. If it is not concurrent the construction period could be extended unnecessarily. •Access during and post construction is also an issue. The A583 is a fast and busy road and access along here will cause major delays. Newton has a village shop, post office and hairdressers. People need to leave the village to work, visit the GP/hospital, do a weekly shop etc. People need to cross the A583 to get from the main village settlement to the Church and Village Hall. These ordinary, everyday activities will become increasingly difficult with the increase in the number of heavy vehicles predicted. There is also a proposal to use small rural roads – roads regularly used recreationally by residents e.g. Parrox Lane, Newton. These single track roads, bordered with historic hedgerows are a totally impractical option. •Removal of our hedgerows and construction in our fields totally destroys our traditional landscape character.</p>	<p>Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1). Traffic and transport impacts arising during the construction phase of the Transmission Assets have been fully assessed at section 7.11 Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference E3.7). Details of the operation and maintenance phases are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Onshore maintenance would be limited to essential maintenance and/or emergency works. Further details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8). An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects.</p>
TA_0165_007_211123	S44	Email	<p>In light of these concerns, I kindly request that the developers provide the following: Detailed design plans and an accurate scale of the proposed transformer building. A comprehensive explanation justifying the selection of the chosen location for the transformer. A thorough study on the potential noise and light pollution, along with proposed measures to mitigate these effects. A clear plan addressing the increased risk of flooding in the area, including improvements to drainage systems. Detailed information on the construction and disruption caused by creating a channel for cables from St Annes to the proposed transformer location. Plans to mitigate the loss of farm land and any compensatory measures. I believe that addressing these issues transparently and responsibly is crucial to ensuring the well-being and safety of the residents of Newton. I appreciate your prompt attention to these matters and hope all residents will be given this information in due course. Thank you for your understanding and cooperation.</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Specifically, the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets in terms of noise are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 8 : Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8). Visual effects, including effects arising from lighting, are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES (document reference F3.10). The assessment of the impact of increased flood risk arising from additional surface water runoff is presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>
TA_0167_004_171023	S44	Email	<p>I am not sure how many of those who attended the consultation events appreciated the size and weight of the short section of High Voltage cable on display. The prospect of installing eighteen of these for approximately 25km with a contiguous work area of 120m implies a massive civil engineering project causing significant disruption over a prolonged period of time. The precise location of the onshore assets where they leave the sea bed is not identified nor the specific infrastructure required at this point of entry. You simply state that these underground transition joint bays (presumably on the landfall area beyond the high tide mark) will be located in the vicinity of Blackpool Airport. This is insufficient information to expect a considered response as it is simply too vague.</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0167_005_171023	S44	Email	<p>You have stated that (4.3.1.2 of the Non Technical Summary) that the cable (surely you mean the eighteen High Voltage cables) is to be installed beneath the sand dunes and the Golf Course using HDD or other trenchless techniques. Even if this is possible how deep will this tunnelling be and what is the effect of vibration or subsidence in what is already a fragile geological area (e.g. the effects of fracking when previously carried out nearby)? Subsidence is an issue in Lytham St Annes and none of the properties in the area proposed for the onshore assets were built to deal with excessive vibration or soil movement. Are you to be responsible, as the Coal Authority is, for compensating any and all of the property owners adversely affected by your works in respect of subsidence or other detrimental effects? You state that you will simply use HDD or other trenchless methodologies but leave open the possibility of open excavation where this is not possible but give no further detail of the impact of this should it be necessary. I am unconvinced by the statement in 8.9.5.3 of the Non-Technical Summary that effects of noise and vibration, which you admit will occur, may be reduced via the implementation of a bespoke method statement to limit noise and vibration. You give little detail of what or how effective this will be and blandly state with such measures in place no significant effects are predicted. How do you define significant? Where is the evidence showing how such method statements have been used and how effective they have proved? These are almost throwaway statements on the very issues that are likely to cause the most significant upset to residents in all areas of the proposed works. Where are the details of your contingency plans if open excavation becomes necessary and how do you intend to carry this out given that the Sand Dunes and the Nature Reserves are all, or in part, Sites of Special Scientific Interest? Are you proposing to excavate the Golf Course if tunnelling is not practical. Have the owners of members of this Club agreed to this or even to the tunnelling if that takes place?</p>	<p>The EIA methodology is set out within Volume 1, Chapter 5: Environmental assessment methodology of the ES. The chapter describes how significance of effects has been assessed. Professional judgement is used to define the magnitude of impact and receptor sensitivity. The matrix is then used, together with professional judgement, to evaluate the significance of effect. The significance may be one, or a range of, no change, negligible, minor, moderate or major. In general, a significance of effect of moderate or greater is considered 'significant' in EIA terms. For each topic chapter, what is considered 'significant' has been clearly defined. Where further mitigation is not possible a residual significant effect may remain. Within the assessment chapters the justification for determining the significance of effect is described. Where a range is given, the assessment chapter details the reason for the significance that has been concluded. The typical maximum depth of cable installation using trenching methodology is approximately 1.8m. Trenchless, drilling methodologies are to be used locally where crossings are required (e.g. beneath roads/rivers). The installation depths will generally be within shallower geological deposits rather than deep within the consolidated bedrock. The drilling methodologies to be used are designed to minimise the displacement of surrounding materials (therefore minimising instability) and do not involve the injection of significant volumes of liquid into fractured bedrock at depth under the high pressures that are often attributed to inducing tremors. Further detail is provided in Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions (document reference F3.1) of the ES. An assessment of the noise and vibration impacts due to the Transmission Assets are presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.2: Construction Noise and Vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.2) and Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational Noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3). The cumulative noise and vibration impacts with other proposed developments is considered in section 8.13 of Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0167_010_171023	S44	Email	<p>3. General Comments on the Overall Scheme</p> <p>On Page 5 of the Non-Technical Summary you give some background to the apparent “need” for this project. You state it is the “ambition” of the present UK Government to generate 50GW of electricity from offshore wind by 2030 forming part of the pursuit of the “UK Net Zero Target”. You will be aware that a General Election will be held before January 2025. If a week is a long time in politics then over 12 months is an eternity! There has never been any public vote on “Net Zero” - a policy which has seemingly simply been imposed by successive Conservative Governments. The current Prime Minister has already relaxed some of these targets and seems to be aware that the pursuit of this objective should not involve unacceptable additional costs to the general public. I understand the current government has accepted that fossil fuels will remain as a source of primary fuel for power generation for the foreseeable future and to that end has allowed exploration licences to be issued to find future reservoirs of oil and gas for exploitation. It is quite probable that “Net Zero”, and its cost will form a significant part of Party Manifestos as and when they are published and we may see more public discussion on the effect of these policies on business and the general public. Whether or not there is widespread support for “Net Zero” when it is fully defined and publicly debated remains to be seen in my opinion. Although I have not had the time to fully research the amount of wind power currently connected provisional figures I retrieved indicated approximately 30GW of generating capacity by both onshore and offshore wind powered generation combined. I also believe that there already consents given for more wind power to be established off the shore of Scotland which will add to whatever the true overall wind powered generating capacity is. Of course the wind does not always blow but when it does one report states, “According to research, a wind turbine produces at or above its average rate around 40% of the time, meaning it produces little to no power 60% of the time due to various reasons. The average capacity factor of a wind turbine over one year usually falls between 20% to 30%.” From Science Direct, “Wind turbines are found to lose a percentage of their output per year, with average load factors declining from 28.5% when new to 21% at age 19.” These figures may or may not be true but surely a key factor in assessing the need for this project is the level of generation actually achieved not just the connected generating capacity. This large and intrusive project is intended to provide some 2GW of generating capacity but the true output over a 35 year lifespan has not been shown as far as I am aware. Neither has the carbon footprint of the project as a whole been given - including the manufacture, transportation, construction and installation of the assets and all the travel, accommodation, printing etc to date and throughout the project by the Project Team and the Contractors involved. This should also include the carbon footprint from decommissioning and recycling assets at the end of their productive life. Although wind generated electricity is currently a significant component of the energy mix there are other alternatives to just adding more wind powered turbines. Investment in Energy Storage is one example. Great British Nuclear and the prospect of Small Modular Reactors which can be factory built, scaled and sited nearer to the Transmission connection points without the need for the extensive and disruptive impact of this proposed offshore Windfarm project is another. And we have vast amounts of under utilised roof areas where solar panels could potentially be installed leading to localised demand reduction. National Grid are already experimenting with the Demand Flexibility Service and the rush towards Electric Cars is already faltering. Heat Pumps have been shown to be less than effective for the vast majority of our ageing housing stock and we have already had many insulation schemes carried out in the past which leave very little room for further cost effective insulation. The Domestic and SME Energy Market is all but broken with, I would suggest, the majority of Domestic Customers now on the Standard Variable Tariff and competition having fallen by the wayside. The prospect of loading further costs on Domestic and SME Customers to subsidise a “Green” Agenda is in my view wholly unacceptable. Very few, if any, would wish to revert to a Coal based Power Generation estate which along with Nuclear formed the basis of our power supply before the “Dash for Gas” in the 1980s. We do, however, currently have a good mix of power generation and at the time of writing this letter the ESO Monthly Electricity Statistics for October showed the overall power generating mix as:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wind - 33.7% • Gas - 27% • Nuclear - 13.9% • Imports - 10.7% • Biomass - 6% • Solar - 3.4% • Hydro - 2.6% • Coal - 1.6% • Storage - 1.1% <p>For the month of June 2023 the statistics were:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gas 36.9% • Wind 19.2% • Nuclear 16.7% • Imports 13.1% • Solar 9.3% • Biomass 2.8% • Hydro 0.6% • Storage 	<p>This response appears to relate partly to the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and/or the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (the generation assets), which are subject to separate applications for development consent. The Transmission Assets provide a connection to the National Grid for two nationally significant offshore wind farms and contribute to the UK Government’s ambition to deliver 50 GW offshore wind by 2030 in order to achieve net zero by 2050. The need for Transmission Assets is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 2: Policy and legislation context (document reference F1.2) of the ES.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			0.9%• Coal 0.3%To me this gives an indication of the variability of effective power generation from Wind and these are just but two of the months I sampled for the current year 2023. More investment in battery storage, solar and nuclear would help to give a more balanced selection of availablepower and to my mind these, together with managed Demand Side Flexibility, are a better use of resources than yet another wind farm when we already have consents given for increasing this form of generation.	
TA_0167_011_171023	S44	Email	4. Conclusions Irrespective of the current Governments “Green Agenda” ambitions I do not believe further investment in yet another offshore wind farm is warranted. Apart from the non specific nature of the proposals presented to date I see no need for a 25km x 120m intrusive and disruptive Civil Engineering project the overall carbon footprint of which is unspecified and the cost benefits uncertain.Taking into account the comments I have made above I wish to register my objection to this scheme and I hope that my views, and those of other respondents, will be fully taken into account.	Impacts and effect in relation to climate change are set out in Volume 4, Chapter 1: Climate change of the ES (document reference F4.1). The Transmission Assets are required to connect two nationally significant offshore wind farms to the National Grid, contributing to Government climate change commitments.
TA_0118_012_151123	S44	Email	I am writing this email to let you know I was informed at one of your consultation events that the National grid suggested 2 options to you one at Penwortham and one at Heysham. I strongly oppose your choice of Penwortham due to you causing major disruptions from Lytham to Freckleton and then onwards to Penwortham when you could use the substation due to end in 2028 in Heysham. If you use Heysham one you will not be using good agricultural land which is currently used by local farmers to make a living, you will not be disrupting homes and families in the process, you will not be deliberately killing wildlife and you will not need to build 2 substations in a rural part of Freckleton one of which is the size of 13 football pitches and 70ft high overlooking peoples properties. Your proposals for doing this are totally unacceptable and in my view immoral when you can use Heysham and save a lot of time and money.	Under the Offshore Transmission Network Review, the National Grid Electricity System Operator (NGESO) is responsible for assessing options to improve the coordination offshore wind generation connections and transmission networks and has undertaken a Holistic Network Design Review (HNDR). A key output of the HNDRprocess was the recommendation that the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm should work collaboratively in connecting the two offshore wind farms to the National Grid electricity transmission network at Penwortham in Lancashire.Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0183_005_221123	S44	Email	Your proposals also include building two giant substations on greenbelt land. The sheer scale of these – one alone being bigger 13 football pitches and over 20 meters high - is completely unsuitable for the area in which you propose them. They are adjacent to two schools – Carr Hill Secondary School and Strike Lane Primary School. Your plans show not only a total disregard for the environment, but also a total disregard for local schoolchildren. Noise from the project, which we understand will continuously hum once complete, along with its construction, will distract them from their learning. Disruption to the roads will lead to delays in getting to school, increasing stress for students and parents alike and therefore affecting their mental health.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).An assessment of the noise and vibration impacts due to the Transmission Assets are presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.2: Construction Noise and Vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.2) and Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational Noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3).The cumulative noise and vibration impacts with other proposed developments is considered in section 8.13 of Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8). An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1).Traffic and transport impacts arising during the construction phase of the Transmission Assets have been fully assessed at section 7.11 Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference E3.7). Details of the operation and maintenance phases are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Onshore maintenance would be limited to essential maintenance and/or emergency works. Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0185_010_221123	S44	Email	With regards to the timescales there are two companies that are in theory working in collaboration, if this is a true collaboration then consent to start should only be allowed for one construction time frame rather than a potential sequential build. This HAS to be a condition of the approvals as the impact of allowing one to be built and then a second one will create a period of up to 10 years where the area would be a potential construction site which impacts all of the local community mentally, physically with access on the road infrastructure and economically.	The Development Consent Order (DCO) is an order made under the Planning Act 2008, as amended, granting development consent. The draft DCO was available during consultation for review and as such a specific question included on the feedback forms. An updated draft DCO has been submitted as part of the application (document reference C1) and includes an explanatory note. Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).
TA_0186_006_221123	S44	Email	.The timeframe suggested is that it could take up to 3 years to build, however due to there being two companies and funding may be approved this could be built sequentially which is totally unacceptable. A condition of the planning approval HAS to be that they are completed together or not at all as the worst option could lead to a gap in the build following construction of the Morgan and Morecambe starts which could make the whole project an elapsed time of up to 10 years which is totally detrimental to the whole community from a wellbeing perspective and a local economy perspective not to mention the highway road devastation. I would anticipate that these points are reviewed, and I would like a response to each one.	The Development Consent Order (DCO) is an order made under the Planning Act 2008, as amended, granting development consent. The draft DCO was available during consultation for review and as such a specific question included on the feedback forms. An updated draft DCO has been submitted as part of the application (document reference C1) and includes an explanatory note. In completing these assessments, the Applicants have taken the scenario on a worst case basis where the projects are built sequentially. This permits the feasibility to be thoroughly tested, whilst working with stakeholders and affected parties to mitigate impacts associated with the construction phase.
TA_0187_001_221123	S44	Email	We are writing on behalf of ourselves and our neighbour [REDACTED] who has asked us to express her thoughts as she is away at present. We are all very concerned about the proposed project as it will directly impact our lives and our properties. The scale of this project we think has been totally understated and it is difficult to understand how this can suddenly, with little notice, be thrown upon us. 1. From what we understand we are very worried that the installation of cables will greatly affect our properties by devaluing them not only because of the work but also the very great risk of this work causing subsidence in this area. This would inevitably not only cause structural problems but would seriously devalue our properties. 2. The disruption to our lives is totally unacceptable due to the significant amount of time the installation is going to take, not only immediate to our property but locally as well.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The typical maximum depth of cable installation using trenching methodology is approximately 1.8m. Trenchless, drilling methodologies are to be used locally where crossings are required (e.g. beneath roads/rivers). The installation depths will generally be within shallower geological deposits rather than deep within the consolidated bedrock. The drilling methodologies to be used are designed to minimise the displacement of surrounding materials (therefore minimising instability) and do not involve the injection of significant volumes of liquid into fractured bedrock at depth under the high-pressures that are often attributed to inducing tremors. Further detail is provided in Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions (document reference F3.1) of the ES. The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate. Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).
TA_0189_012_221123	S44	Email	9. Any open cut trenches, roads, fences etc on the cable routes would cause massive disruption for cattle movements. We regularly need to move the stock around the farm for welfare reasons and any changes to the layout would upset the cattle and make movement extremely difficult.	The Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings. In addition the Outline Construction Fencing Plan (document reference J1.10) provides measures for livestock fencing during construction to ensure farming operations can continue where possible. Dalcour McLaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).
TA_0192_004_221123	S44	Email	The whole location of the substations is illogical - the access and proximity to residential areas makes the position inappropriate. If a substation is required then surely it would be more appropriate to have it closer to the main arterial roads rather than in a semi-rural location with inappropriate access. My clients object to the location of the substation and the compound in the strongest sense, being an ill thought out, ill-conceived location, with	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1,

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			minimal consultations or release of information. Therefore, we reserve the right to make further consultations and representations when information is provided.	Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3).
TA_0193_002_221123	S44	Email	There has been no justification, reasoning, or validity as to why the cable route is shown through my clients which creates two sharp 90 degree turns, increasing the land affected by the cable route. By straightening the cable it could potentially reduce the impact on my client's farming business and allow for more appropriate crossing points and reduce the amount of small severed parcels of fields as the route at the moment not only takes up large portions of the field but leaves small severed areas that are too small to be actively farmed for grazing and silage, increasing the impact.	Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Following route refinement, Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms to secure the rights for the compound which will include provisions for compensation of severed land and impact on farming operations. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).
TA_0194_003_221123	S44	Email	The land is inter-dispersed with Environment Agency controlled ditches and dykes which will mean that directional drilling is required. This will impact our client's greatly over the large areas that will be proposed for reception and thrusting areas. The information is lacking in terms of its technical ability in order for our clients to make any meaningful representations over the route.	The Applicants through Dalcour Maclaren and appointed drainage specialists will engage with landowners regarding pre-construction and post-construction drainage, tying into existing infrastructure where possible. The Outline CoCP and outline surface water and groundwater management plan (document reference J1.9) includes measures in relation to drainage.
TA_0200_001_221123	S44	Email	i am sending this email to object to the proposed windfarm at Freckleton/Newton/Kirkham, Please find attached a list of Questions and key points. REDACTED Windfarm Substation Key Points• How, Who & where was the location of the sites determined	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3).
TA_0200_010_221123	S44	Email	Cabling is addressed in materials as being put in place via alarmingly wide trenches but to be trenchless across Rivers and Roads, why not under Farmland this would be less Intrusive.	The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented.
TA_0200_011_221123	S44	Email	Where is the cabling going to run	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0202_002_221123	S44	Email	All this land you are crossing in the Fylde Basin was drained by the Dutch in 1840. 6000 acres drained at a cost of £3000 and I liken it to Amsterdam with interconnecting water channels to take run off waters out to sea. The towns of South Blackpool, by the airport, St Annes and Lytham the water does not flow out to sea via the conventional method because the land is higher than where we live. The water flows in a loop backwards and out to sea at Dock Bridge by McDonalds at Lytham. It has 3 storm pumps and tidal flaps and is an EA asset as are the main water courses in the area. The water table is too high, and we believe the settings are not low enough and rarely the flap doors are open because of silt in the estuary. We have a fight to keep the channels open out to sea and the legislation between Natural England and the Marine Management Organisation is seriously difficult to obtain. The other issue is the building of houses on flood plains and knowing the water table can't be lowered in these areas due to subsidence. The area is very fragile with the water infrastructure. There is only a 3-metre fall of land, that water flows from the M55 to the	The assessment of the impact of increased flood risk arising from additional surface water runoff is presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). An Outline CoCP (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase. The Applicants through Dalcour Maclaren and appointed drainage specialists will engage with landowners regarding pre-construction and post-construction drainage, tying into existing infrastructure where possible. The Outline CoCP and outline surface water and groundwater management plan (document reference J1.9) includes measures in relation to drainage.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			pumping station and this onshore is difficult to maintain. Liggard Brook is stationary and full of silt, so it is not functioning so the water from Lytham and Blackpool Airport area, flows from Moss Sluice Liggard Brook across Birks Watercourse to Main Drain. Main Drain is the Main artery for our area. Branch Drain takes water from Marton and if there is any force of water overflows onto the land. Wrea Brook is not fit for purpose because it is not big enough for all the extra developments that have been built in recent years. The brook is poorly maintained and overflows on heavy rainfall. There is constant flooding of properties and road networks within the catchment. Dow Brook is no different. With the construction of 122 metre strip and access roads you may destroy the waterway infrastructure and displace the water table and will cause further flooding both on land and property.	
TA_0202_004_221123	S44	Email	Onto manholes 2 metre squared visible to see we will not be able to farm the land as we would normally do with agricultural machinery. This would cause more loss of agri-land trying to work around all the obstacles in the field. The manholes are likely to become tangled in the machinery or working operation. The drainage of fields and surrounding land would collapse with the width of the 122-metre route and the heavy HGV and heavy machinery being placed on it. The consequences of this would displace the water and cause the whole of the Fylde Basin to flood, which eventually over time would back onto those properties built on potential flood plains and flood the properties, which is what we are seeing now. This would have terrible consequences for both rural and urban fringes. You can do all the surveys you wish but from working with various organisations and being a person at ground level I can assure you that the building of properties has had a detrimental effect on the Fylde and the flooding is happening to frequently. We have been known to be 6 months under water during the winter months and this year we were flooded on 23/07/2023 where the cereals were under water and all you could see was the heads of corn. Cuadrilla had a site on Anna's Road and had to reinstate the land following their fracking site. They removed the stone and put the soil back in place and that site has not been able to be farmed since. Where the site is, is a bog. I really don't think you can reinstate a site to its former glory, and I can assure you that it will take 15 – 20 years to become good land again. A reinstated site will need double the amount of fertiliser and double the manure to make it fertile again. You cannot wave a magic wand for that.	Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES. Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). This includes the preparation of a Soil Management Plan in general accordance with the Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference: J1.7), which has been submitted with the DCO application. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction of the Transmission Assets. These measures also comprise the preparation of a Code of Construction Practice in general accordance with the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) submitted with the DCO application. The measures to be implemented as part of the Code of Construction Practice seek to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings. Further detailed information regarding the methodology, scope and results of the soil surveys is provided in Volume 3, Annex 6.2: Soil surveys data technical report of the ES (document reference F3.6.2). Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions are assessed in Volume 3, Chapter 1 of the ES (document reference E3.1).
TA_0206_002_231123	S44	Email	By way of further information :- 1. It is noted that the current proposed M&M cable landfall requires the crossing of protected estuary area. With that principle established, presumably the mitigations have been agreed with the applicable environmental regulatory bodies and so there are further mitigations open to other areas of the estuary.	The onshore export cable corridor will cross existing infrastructure and obstacles such as roads, railways and rivers. All major crossings, such as major roads, river and rail crossings will be undertaken using trenchless techniques, such as auger boring or micro-tunnelling, where practicable. Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).
TA_0206_003_231123	S44	Email	2. The M&M programme seems to have adopted a design and implementation approach of land use for the converter substations and cable routes, such that the size of these seem to be approximately 240% bigger than the equivalent converter substations and cable route swathes on the Dogger wind energy programme around Cottingham. In addition, there will be more local lessons learned to be gleaned from the experience on the Walney wind energy programmes. By adopting even this practice with reduced land use, this should open up further applicable potential converter station sites and cable routing options for the M&M programme. 3. The construction swathe proposed for the M&M programme across subsea sections seems to be narrower and therefore less intrusive than that adopted for proposed land borne sections.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3).
TA_0207_001_231123	S44	Email	We have been instructed to act on behalf of REDACTED in respect of the above land which will be affected by the scheme if the northern route at Higher Ballam is chosen. We would confirm our concerns and considerations are as follows: 1. There is a lack of detail available to enable a full response to be submitted. This detail includes widths of easements required which seem to vary between 30m and 70m wide. 2. We find the proposed working width of 122m to be excessive for the laying of the proposed electrical circuits being for up to six circuits.	The Transmission Assets design has resulted in a reduced construction corridor width, as set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include permanent land take proposed and compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business and holding. Details of the Maximum design parameters can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3)

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0207_007_231123	S44	Email	<p>• We are concerned regarding the likely timing of the scheme and the fact that although Morecambe and Morgan purport to be acting together there is no guarantee that the actual construction phase will take place simultaneously and it may well be that the two schemes act independently with an extended construction period and we would suggest that they are both required to act together to minimise the impact on both Landowners and the local community.</p>	<p>The Electricity System Operator (ESO) is responsible for planning and operation of the transmission system and ensuring the balance of electricity generation with electricity demand. The Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm were scoped into the Pathway to 2030 workstream of the UK Government's Offshore Transmission Network Review (OTNR). As part of the OTNR, the ESO assessed options to improve the coordination offshore wind farm connections and associated transmission networks. In July 2022, the UK Government published the Pathway to 2030 Holistic Network Design (HNDR) Report which set out the results of the OTNR. A key output of the HNDR process was the recommendation that the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm should work collaboratively in connecting the two offshore wind farms to the National Grid electricity transmission network at Penwortham in Lancashire. Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).</p>
TA_0214_003_231123	s44	Email	<p>I object to any disturbance of local wildlife as there are clearly alternatives available which seem to be ignored due to additional costs. For example, why not continue horizontal drilling further inland? Why not use the soon to be decommissioned power station to the north as a connection point to the national grid?</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets on protected species and protected habitats are considered in Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES. Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on onshore ecology and nature conservation are provided in section 3.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference: F3.3). The onshore export cable corridor will cross existing infrastructure and obstacles such as roads, railways and rivers. All major crossings, such as major roads, river and rail crossings will be undertaken using trenchless techniques, such as auger boring or micro-tunnelling, where practicable. Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).</p>
TA_0214_006_231123	s44	Email	<p>I object to any trenches being dug or drilling conducted in residential roads. The cables must be installed in the open land of the airport, either by trenches or a continuation of the horizontal drilling. I have not been able to find an explanation as to why this method can be used to run cables under the sea, beach and sand dunes but not all the way to the eastern side of Queensway.</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The proposed works would not restrict access and measures to control impacts are set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8). The Applicants have committed that all road crossing will be undertaken using trenchless techniques, except for Leach Lane, however that can be trenched on a programmed basis and no road closures are expected.</p>
TA_0219_001_231123	S44	Email	<p>REDACTED are instructed to make representations on behalf of the above Landowners in respect of the Morecambe and Morgan Wind Farms. The Landowners are affected in two areas being REDACTED General Commentary Although the schemes have indicated a working area of 122m in width plus additional compounds and wider areas at road, rail and ditch crossing we have not received any final confirmation on these areas or on the easement width which will be required. We understand that the working area such as the railway crossing could be almost 200m wide and the information we have received on Easement widths which sterilise parts of the land is that it could be between 30m and 70m wide. We feel that these working and easement widths are excessive for the nature of the scheme and as a comparison would highlight the 48 inch gas pipeline which was laid between Pannal and Nether Kellet and which attracted a 24m easement and 42m working width. Not only will this sterilise the easement area for future development but we are also so concerned regarding drainage within the working area and within the easement area. The land is low lying and requires careful maintenance and remediation/improvement of the</p>	<p>Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). The Applicant also through Dalour Maclaren and the appointment of drainage</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			drainage schemes on a continuing ongoing basis. The excessive proposals for easement which will mean that drainage within those areas will be somewhat restricted and may even have to be carried out by hand digging rather than machine which will have a severe ongoing effect on the land drainage within the area.	specialists will engage with landowners regarding pre-construction and post-construction drainage, tying into existing infrastructure where possible.
TA_0219_004_231123	S44	Email	We are concerned that although the two schemes purport to be working together there is clearly no commitment to do so when the construction phases commence (if the scheme is granted permission) and there has been no indication of the separate between the scheme other than to say they will be adjacent to each other. If the schemes are genuinely seeking to work together this should include all aspects right through to construction and beyond so that the effect on Landowners and local residents is minimised.	The Electricity System Operator (ESO) is responsible for planning and operation of the transmission system and ensuring the balance of electricity generation with electricity demand. The Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm were scoped into the Pathway to 2030 workstream of the UK Government's Offshore Transmission Network Review (OTNR). As part of the OTNR, the ESO assessed options to improve the coordination offshore wind farm connections and associated transmission networks. In July 2022, the UK Government published the Pathway to 2030 Holistic Network Design (HNDR) Report which set out the results of the OTNR. A key output of the HNDR process was the recommendation that the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm should work collaboratively in connecting the two offshore wind farms to the National Grid electricity transmission network at Penwortham in Lancashire. Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).
TA_0219_008_231123	S44	Email	Due to the effect that the southern route would have on the woodland habitat, sporting and drainage in a particularly low lying area within Parcel Number REDACTED our clients preference is for the northern route even though this passes close to the rear of REDACTED.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The Applicants through Dalcour Maclaren and appointed drainage specialists will engage with landowners regarding pre-construction and post-construction drainage, tying into existing infrastructure where possible. The Outline CoCP and outline surface water and groundwater management plan (document reference J1.9) includes measures in relation to drainage.
TA_0220_001_231123	S44	Email	I attended a briefing about the windfarm project at Fylde Rugby Club and my concerns were not allayed by what I heard there. I have a property on REDACTED which, apparently, may be affected by the project and there doesn't seem to be any firm conclusion about what will be happening around this area. In fact, despite the amount of printed information available, nobody could tell me about road closures or anything like that. The amount of uncertainty is worrying considering the size of the project. I have heard tales of a pipeline that would fit under a road, meaning just one lane closure and also other tales of a pipeline that's wider than the width of the M55! Which is it? There was also talk of a green area being developed to help the environment but we've heard all these things before (Deer park with the Queensway development??). These and many other concerns are very worrying...	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0221_003_231123	S44	Email	3 Substations these seem to have been overlooked last Novembers initial meeting , now they want 70 acres !!!! and 20ft tall!!!! and no drawings when all that was originally stated was cables to bring supply to Penwortham. We cannot allow these to be built , adjacent to rural villages and schools, what legacy will that leave for our younger generations, Surely with new technologies 'and advancements in science, these substations could also be sited offshore as well	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0222_010_231123	S44	Email	Question 12 Our clients consider that the outline code of construction practice lacks significant detail, particularly at a site specific level. The imposition of dual haul roads is considered excessive, as if the two schemes are conjoined, and constructed concurrently, a single haul road could be employed with say 3no. trenches on each side, rather than the proposed arrangement of dual haul roads with three pairs of trenches. This would reduce the proposed construction corridor, and therefore the impact on agricultural land.	The Outline Code of Construction Practice has been updated since PEIR and is outlined in document J1 (document reference J1).
TA_0225_019_231123	S44	Email	8. The footprint of the substation sites should be limited to that area absolutely necessary for transmission assets and absolutely necessary soft landscaping to meet any planning requirements.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects.
TA_0225_021_231123	S44	Email	High Voltage Cable Corridor Open cut trench method of laying high voltage cables with a 122m wide corridor for two independent projects is not feasible given the major disturbance and risks of staggered implementation. Open cut trenches plus haul roads will cause significant land damage by compaction of subsoil, contamination of topsoil, damage to land drains, significant disruption to farm grassland and livestock management, additional temporary gates and fences, temporary water troughs, limited crossing points, extra use of public highways, conflict between farm activities and contractor HGVs, loss of significant areas of silage and maize growing land. There is a Horizontal Directional Drill option which is capable of drilling up to 1000m below ground and at a reasonable depth to sit below land drainage systems. A further option is that as National Grid are due to upgrade their whole existing network in order to carry 400Kv in the very near future, there is existing National Grid infrastructure within Zone 1 which will soon be able to carry 400Kv which should also be given serious consideration. This may also provide an alternative to requiring substations.	The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0226_002_231123	S44	Email	Proposed Substation Footprints The proposed footprints of the Morgan and Morecambe permanent substation sites are approximately 30 acres and 18 acres respectively. These site areas are taken up by approximately 50% BNG (Biodiversity Net Gain). This information was provided by a Flotation Energy engineer. This is wholly unacceptable as in providing on-site BNG purely for financial savings has narrowed the substations site selection process to one only option for Morgan and two only options for Morecambe. It is clear that had the substation sites design concentrated on that area which was wholly necessary to transmission, ie approx. 15 acres for Morgan and 9 acres for Morecambe then suitable substation site locations could have been expanded to present more options and allowed for flexibility during this consultation process.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). As set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11), the Transmission Assets are not subject to a mandatory net gain requirement under the Environment Act 2021. Nevertheless, the Applicants have worked with statutory consultees to discuss the approach, and to develop the design, to allow the maximum benefit to biodiversity within the parameters of the project. For the Transmission Assets, biodiversity benefit will be delivered within identified biodiversity benefit areas within the Transmission Assets Order Limits: Onshore (referred to as the Onshore Order Limits). Further qualitative benefits to biodiversity are proposed via potential collaboration with stakeholders and local groups, contributing to existing plans and programmes, both within and outside the Onshore Order Limits. Further details of the approach to biodiversity benefit are provided in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11). The calculation undertaken for the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11) utilises the latest biodiversity metric published by Defra (4.0).
TA_0226_003_231123	S44	Email	Substation Site Layout, Design and Appearance There is no consultation information available showing cross-sections, block plans, landscaping, fencing, aircraft beacons etc of each proposed substation site therefore how could a public consultation exercise provide any useful feedback when essential details are not made available ?	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Wireline visualisations were made available at statutory consultation, showing the maximum parameters from various viewpoints. Visualisations are presented as part of the landscape and visual

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).</p>
TA_0226_007_231123	S44	Email	<p>Open Cut Trench Method My client objects to an open cut trench method of laying high voltage cables with a 122m wide corridor, if indeed cables cannot be carried on existing National Grid infrastructure.</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented. Dalcour McLaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).</p>
TA_0226_012_231123	S44	Email	<p>7. Up to 50% of each substation site is earmarked for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). BNG should not be sourced on the most productive Fylde grassland which is Grade 2 or 3. BNG should be sourced off-site and outside Zone 1 as this whole area is productive grassland or arable land.</p>	<p>As set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11), the Transmission Assets are not subject to a mandatory net gain requirement under the Environment Act 2021. Nevertheless, the Applicants have worked with statutory consultees to discuss the approach, and to develop the design, to allow the maximum benefit to biodiversity within the parameters of the project. For the Transmission Assets, biodiversity benefit will be delivered within identified biodiversity benefit areas within the Transmission Assets Order Limits: Onshore (referred to as the Onshore Order Limits). Further qualitative benefits to biodiversity are proposed via potential collaboration with stakeholders and local groups, contributing to existing plans and programmes, both within and outside the Onshore Order Limits. Further details of the approach to biodiversity benefit are provided in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11). The calculation undertaken for the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11) utilises the latest biodiversity metric published by Defra (4.0).</p>
TA_0226_013_231123	S44	Email	<p>8. The footprint of the substation sites should be limited to that area absolutely necessary for transmission assets and absolutely necessary soft landscaping to meet any planning requirements.</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects.
TA_0226_015_231123	S44	Email	High Voltage Cable Corridor Open cut trench method of laying high voltage cables with a 122m wide corridor for two independent projects is not feasible given the major disturbance and risks of staggered implementation. Open cut trenches plus haul roads will cause significant land damage by compaction of subsoil, contamination of topsoil, damage to land drains, significant disruption to farm grassland and livestock management, additional temporary gates and fences, temporary water troughs, limited crossing points, extra use of public highways, conflict between farm activities and contractor HGVs, loss of significant areas of silage and maize growing land. There is a Horizontal Directional Drill option which is capable of drilling up to 1000m below ground and at a reasonable depth to sit below land drainage systems. A further option is that as National Grid are due to upgrade their whole existing network in order to carry 400Kv in the very near future, there is existing National Grid infrastructure within Zone 1 which will soon be able to carry 400Kv which should also be given serious consideration. This may also provide an alternative to requiring substations.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented. Dalcour McLaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).
TA_0227_005_231123	S44	Email	Open Cut Trench Method My client objects to an open cut trench method of laying high voltage cables with a 122m wide corridor at a minimum depth of 1200mm which is both dangerous and will be impossible to include an effective field drainage system. The farm field drainage system will be damaged beyond repair given the scale of permanent and temporary disruption.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented. The Applicants through Dalcour McLaren and appointed drainage specialists will engage with landowners regarding pre-construction and post-construction drainage, tying into existing infrastructure where possible. The Outline CoCP and outline surface water and groundwater management plan (document reference J1.9) includes measures in relation to drainage.
TA_0227_006_231123	S44	Email	Proposed Substation Footprints The proposed footprints of the Morgan and Morecambe permanent substation sites are approximately 30 acres and 18 acres respectively. These site areas are taken up by approximately 50% BNG (Biodiversity Net Gain). This information was provided by a Flotation Energy engineer. This is wholly unacceptable as in providing on-site BNG purely for financial savings has narrowed the substations site selection process to one only option for Morgan and two only options for Morecambe. It is clear that had the substation sites design concentrated on that area which was wholly necessary to transmission, ie approx. 15 acres for Morgan and 9 acres for Morecambe then suitable substation site locations could have been expanded to present more options and allowed for flexibility during this consultation process.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). As set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11), the Transmission Assets are not subject to a mandatory net gain requirement under the Environment Act 2021. Nevertheless, the Applicants have worked with statutory consultees to discuss the approach, and to develop the design, to allow the maximum benefit to biodiversity within the parameters of the project. For the Transmission Assets, biodiversity benefit will be delivered within identified biodiversity benefit areas within the Transmission Assets Order Limits: Onshore (referred to as the Onshore Order Limits). Further qualitative benefits to biodiversity are proposed via potential collaboration with stakeholders and local groups, contributing to existing plans and programmes, both within and outside the Onshore Order Limits. Further details of the approach to biodiversity benefit are provided in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11). The calculation undertaken for the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11) utilises the latest biodiversity metric published by Defra (4.0).
TA_0227_007_231123	S44	Email	Substation Site Layout, Design and Appearance There is no consultation information available showing cross-sections, block plans, landscaping, fencing, aircraft beacons etc of	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Wireline visualisations were

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			each proposed substation site therefore how could a publicconsultation exercise provide any useful feedback when essential details are not made available ?	made available at statutory consultation, showing the maximum parameters from various viewpoints. Visualisations are presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage.The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0227_012_231123	S44	Email	7. Up to 50% of each substation site is earmarked for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). BNG shouldnot be sourced on the most productive Fylde grassland which is Grade 2 or 3. BNG should besourced off-site and outside Zone 1 as this whole area is productive grassland or arable land.	As set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11), the Transmission Assets are not subject to a mandatory net gain requirement under the Environment Act 2021. Nevertheless, the Applicants have worked with statutory consultees to discuss the approach, and to develop the design, to allow the maximum benefit to biodiversity within the parameters of the project. For the Transmission Assets, biodiversity benefit will be delivered within identified biodiversity benefit areas within the Transmission Assets Order Limits: Onshore (referred to as the Onshore Order Limits). Further qualitative benefits to biodiversity are proposed via potential collaboration with stakeholders and local groups, contributing to existing plans and programmes, both within and outside the Onshore Order Limits.Further details of the approach to biodiversity benefit are provided in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11).The calculation undertaken for the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11) utilises the latest biodiversity metric published by Defra (4.0).
TA_0227_013_231123	S44	Email	8. The footprint of the substation sites should be limited to that area absolutely necessary fortransmission assets and absolutely necessary soft landscaping to meet any planningrequirements.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects.
TA_0227_015_231123	S44	Email	High Voltage Cable CorridorOpen cut trench method of laying high voltage cables with a 122m wide corridor for two independentprojects is not feasible given the major disturbance and risks of staggered implementation.Open cut trenches plus haul roads will cause significant land damage by compaction of subsoil,contamination of topsoil, damage to land drains, significant disruption to farm grassland and livestockmanagement, additional temporary gates and fences, temporary water troughs, limited crossingpoints, extra use of public highways, conflict between farm activities and contractor HGVs, loss ofsignificant areas of silage and maize growing land.There is a Horizontal Directional Drill option which is capable of drilling up to 1000m below groundand at a reasonable depth to sit below land drainage systems.A further option is that as National Grid are due to upgrade their whole existing network in order tocarry 400Kv in the very near future, there is existing National	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented. Dalcour McLaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			Grid infrastructure within Zone 1 which will soon be able to carry 400Kv which should also be given serious consideration. This may also provide an alternative to requiring substations.	Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).
TA_0229_005_231123	S44	Email	Proposed Substation Footprints The proposed footprints of the Morgan and Morecambe permanent substation sites are approximately 30 acres and 18 acres respectively. These site areas are taken up by approximately 50% BNG (Biodiversity Net Gain). This information was provided by a Flotation Energy engineer. This is wholly unacceptable as in providing on-site BNG purely for financial savings has narrowed the substations site selection process to one only option for Morgan and two only options for Morecambe. It is clear that had the substation sites design concentrated on that area which was wholly necessary to transmission, ie approx. 15 acres for Morgan and 9 acres for Morecambe then suitable substation site locations could have been expanded to present more options and allowed for flexibility during this consultation process.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). As set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11), the Transmission Assets are not subject to a mandatory net gain requirement under the Environment Act 2021. Nevertheless, the Applicants have worked with statutory consultees to discuss the approach, and to develop the design, to allow the maximum benefit to biodiversity within the parameters of the project. For the Transmission Assets, biodiversity benefit will be delivered within identified biodiversity benefit areas within the Transmission Assets Order Limits: Onshore (referred to as the Onshore Order Limits). Further qualitative benefits to biodiversity are proposed via potential collaboration with stakeholders and local groups, contributing to existing plans and programmes, both within and outside the Onshore Order Limits. Further details of the approach to biodiversity benefit are provided in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11). The calculation undertaken for the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11) utilises the latest biodiversity metric published by Defra (4.0).
TA_0229_006_231123	S44	Email	Substation Site Layout, Design and Appearance There is no consultation information available showing cross-sections, block plans, landscaping, fencing, aircraft beacons etc of each proposed substation site therefore how could a public consultation exercise provide any useful feedback when essential details are not made available ?	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Wireline visualisations were made available at statutory consultation, showing the maximum parameters from various viewpoints. Visualisations are presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0229_011_231123	S44	Email	7. Up to 50% of each substation site is earmarked for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). BNG should not be sourced on the most productive Fylde grassland which is Grade 2 or 3. BNG should be sourced off-site and outside Zone 1 as this whole area is productive grassland or arable land.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. As set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11), the Transmission Assets are not subject to a mandatory net gain requirement under the Environment Act 2021. Nevertheless, the Applicants have worked with statutory consultees to discuss the approach, and to develop the design, to allow the maximum benefit to biodiversity within the parameters of the project. For the Transmission Assets, biodiversity benefit will be delivered within identified biodiversity benefit areas within the Transmission Assets Order Limits: Onshore (referred to as the Onshore Order Limits). Further qualitative benefits to biodiversity are proposed via potential collaboration with stakeholders and local groups, contributing to existing plans and programmes, both within and outside the Onshore Order Limits. Further details of

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				the approach to biodiversity benefit are provided in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11).The calculation undertaken for the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11) utilises the latest biodiversity metric published by Defra (4.0).
TA_0229_012_231123	S44	Email	8. The footprint of the substation sites should be limited to that area absolutely necessary for transmission assets and absolutely necessary soft landscaping to meet any planning requirements.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects.
TA_0230_010_231123	S44	Email	7. Up to 50% of each substation site is earmarked for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). BNG should not be sourced on the most productive Fylde grassland which is Grade 2 or 3. BNG should be sourced off-site and outside Zone 1 as this whole area is productive grassland or arable land.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. As set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11), the Transmission Assets are not subject to a mandatory net gain requirement under the Environment Act 2021. Nevertheless, the Applicants have worked with statutory consultees to discuss the approach, and to develop the design, to allow the maximum benefit to biodiversity within the parameters of the project. For the Transmission Assets, biodiversity benefit will be delivered within identified biodiversity benefit areas within the Transmission Assets Order Limits: Onshore (referred to as the Onshore Order Limits). Further qualitative benefits to biodiversity are proposed via potential collaboration with stakeholders and local groups, contributing to existing plans and programmes, both within and outside the Onshore Order Limits. Further details of the approach to biodiversity benefit are provided in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11). The calculation undertaken for the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11) utilises the latest biodiversity metric published by Defra (4.0).
TA_0230_011_231123	S44	Email	8. The footprint of the substation sites should be limited to that area absolutely necessary for transmission assets and absolutely necessary soft landscaping to meet any planning requirements.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects.
TA_0230_017_231123	S44	Email	Substation footprint doubled in size in order to provide on-site BNG should not be allowed as this completely restricts the potential substation site locations to unsuitable locations.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). As set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11), the Transmission Assets are not subject to a mandatory net gain requirement under the Environment Act 2021. Nevertheless, the Applicants have worked with statutory consultees to discuss the approach, and to develop the design, to allow the maximum

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				benefit to biodiversity within the parameters of the project. For the Transmission Assets, biodiversity benefit will be delivered within identified biodiversity benefit areas within the Transmission Assets Order Limits: Onshore (referred to as the Onshore Order Limits). Further qualitative benefits to biodiversity are proposed via potential collaboration with stakeholders and local groups, contributing to existing plans and programmes, both within and outside the Onshore Order Limits. Further details of the approach to biodiversity benefit are provided in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11). The calculation undertaken for the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11) utilises the latest biodiversity metric published by Defra (4.0).
TA_0231_003_231123	S44	Email	Open Cut Trench Method My client objects to an open cut trench method of laying high voltage cables with a 122m wide corridor, if indeed cables cannot be carried on existing National Grid infrastructure.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented.
TA_0231_009_231123	S44	Email	8. The footprint of the substation sites should be limited to that area absolutely necessary for transmission assets and any absolutely necessary soft landscaping in order to meet any planning requirements.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects.
TA_0231_011_231123	S44	Email	Proposed Substation Footprints The proposed footprints of the Morgan and Morecambe permanent substation sites are approximately 30 acres and 18 acres respectively. These site areas are taken up by approximately 50% BNG (Biodiversity Net Gain). This information was provided by a Flotation Energy engineer. This is wholly unacceptable as in providing on-site BNG purely for financial savings has narrowed the substations site selection process to one only option for Morgan and two only options for Morecambe. It is clear that had the substation sites design concentrated on that area which was wholly necessary to transmission, ie approx. 15 acres for Morgan and 9 acres for Morecambe then suitable substation site locations could have been expanded to present more options and allowed for flexibility during this consultation process.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). As set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11), the Transmission Assets are not subject to a mandatory net gain requirement under the Environment Act 2021. Nevertheless, the Applicants have worked with statutory consultees to discuss the approach, and to develop the design, to allow the maximum benefit to biodiversity within the parameters of the project. For the Transmission Assets, biodiversity benefit will be delivered within identified biodiversity benefit areas within the Transmission Assets Order Limits: Onshore (referred to as the Onshore Order Limits). Further qualitative benefits to biodiversity are proposed via potential collaboration with stakeholders and local groups, contributing to existing plans and programmes, both within and outside the Onshore Order Limits. Further details of the approach to biodiversity benefit are provided in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11). The calculation undertaken for the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11) utilises the latest biodiversity metric published by Defra (4.0).
TA_0231_012_231123	S44	Email	Substation Site Layout, Design and Appearance There is no consultation information available showing cross-sections, block plans, landscaping, fencing, aircraft beacons etc of each proposed substation site therefore how could a public consultation exercise provide any useful feedback when essential details are not made available ?	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Wireline visualisations were made available at statutory consultation, showing the maximum parameters from various viewpoints. Visualisations are presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).</p>
TA_0231_013_231123	S44	Email	<p>High Voltage Cable Corridor Open cut trench method of laying high voltage cables with a 122m wide corridor for two independent projects is not feasible given the major disturbance and risks of staggered implementation. Open cut trenches plus haul roads will cause significant land damage by compaction of subsoil, contamination of topsoil, damage to land drains, significant disruption to farm grassland and livestock management, additional temporary gates and fences, temporary water troughs, limited crossing points, extra use of public highways, conflict between farm activities and contractor HGVs, loss of significant areas of silage and maize growing land. There is a Horizontal Directional Drill option which is capable of drilling up to 1000m below ground and at a reasonable depth to sit below land drainage systems. A further option is that as National Grid are due to upgrade their whole existing network in order to carry 400Kv in the very near future, there is existing National Grid infrastructure within Zone 1 which will soon be able to carry 400Kv which should also be given serious consideration. This may also provide an alternative to requiring substations.</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented. Dalcour McLaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).</p>
TA_0233_003_231123	S44	Email	<p>Open Cut Trench Method My client objects to an open cut trench method of laying high voltage cables with a 122m wide corridor, if indeed cables cannot be carried on existing National Grid infrastructure due to similar construction concerns in construction traffic, noise, dust etc will be heard and seen on a daily basis for several years which is totally unacceptable in a residential area immediately next to protected countryside.</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented.</p>
TA_0233_009_231123	S44	Email	<p>7. Up to 50% of each substation site is earmarked for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). BNG should not be sourced on the most productive Fylde grassland which is Grade 2 or 3. BNG should be sourced off-site and outside Zone 1 as this whole area is productive grassland or arable land.</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. As set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11), the Transmission Assets are not subject to a mandatory net gain requirement under the Environment Act 2021. Nevertheless, the Applicants have worked with statutory consultees to discuss the approach, and to develop the design, to allow the maximum benefit to biodiversity within the parameters of the project. For the Transmission Assets, biodiversity benefit will be delivered within identified biodiversity benefit areas within the Transmission Assets Order Limits: Onshore (referred to as the Onshore Order Limits). Further qualitative benefits to biodiversity are proposed via potential collaboration with stakeholders and local groups, contributing to existing plans</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				and programmes, both within and outside the Onshore Order Limits. Further details of the approach to biodiversity benefit are provided in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11). The calculation undertaken for the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11) utilises the latest biodiversity metric published by Defra (4.0).
TA_0233_010_231123	S44	Email	8. The footprint of the substation sites should be limited to that area absolutely necessary for transmission assets and any absolutely necessary soft landscaping in order to meet any planning requirements.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects.
TA_0233_012_231123	S44	Email	Proposed Substation Footprints The proposed footprints of the Morgan and Morecambe permanent substation sites are approximately 30 acres and 18 acres respectively. These site areas are taken up by approximately 50% BNG (Biodiversity Net Gain). This information was provided by a Flotation Energy engineer. This is wholly unacceptable as in providing on-site BNG purely for financial savings has narrowed the substations site selection process to one only option for Morgan and two only options for Morecambe. It is clear that had the substation sites design concentrated on that area which was wholly necessary to transmission, ie approx. 15 acres for Morgan and 9 acres for Morecambe then suitable substation site locations could have been expanded to present more options and allowed for flexibility during this consultation process.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). As set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11), the Transmission Assets are not subject to a mandatory net gain requirement under the Environment Act 2021. Nevertheless, the Applicants have worked with statutory consultees to discuss the approach, and to develop the design, to allow the maximum benefit to biodiversity within the parameters of the project. For the Transmission Assets, biodiversity benefit will be delivered within identified biodiversity benefit areas within the Transmission Assets Order Limits: Onshore (referred to as the Onshore Order Limits). Further qualitative benefits to biodiversity are proposed via potential collaboration with stakeholders and local groups, contributing to existing plans and programmes, both within and outside the Onshore Order Limits. Further details of the approach to biodiversity benefit are provided in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11). The calculation undertaken for the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11) utilises the latest biodiversity metric published by Defra (4.0).
TA_0233_013_231123	S44	Email	Substation Site Layout, Design and Appearance There is no consultation information available showing cross-sections, block plans, landscaping, fencing, aircraft beacons etc of each proposed substation site therefore how could a public consultation exercise provide any useful feedback when essential details are not made available ?	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Wireline visualisations were made available at statutory consultation, showing the maximum parameters from various viewpoints. Visualisations are presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter,

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0233_014_231123	S44	Email	High Voltage Cable Corridor Open cut trench method of laying high voltage cables with a 122m wide corridor for two independent projects is not feasible given the major disturbance and risks of staggered implementation. There is a Horizontal Directional Drill option which is capable of drilling up to 1000m below ground and at a reasonable depth to sit below land drainage systems. A further option is that as National Grid are due to upgrade their whole existing network in order to carry 400Kv in the very near future, there is existing National Grid infrastructure within Zone 1 which will soon be able to carry 400Kv which should also be given serious consideration. This may also provide an alternative to requiring substations.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented.
TA_0234_002_231123	S44	Email	Proposed Substation Footprints The proposed footprints of the Morgan and Morecambe permanent substation sites are approximately 30 acres and 18 acres respectively. These site areas are taken up by approximately 50% BNG (Biodiversity Net Gain). This information was provided by a Flotation Energy engineer. This is wholly unacceptable as in providing on-site BNG purely for financial savings has narrowed the substations site selection process to one only option for Morgan and two only options for Morecambe. It is clear that had the substation sites design concentrated on that area which was wholly necessary to transmission, ie approx. 15 acres for Morgan and 9 acres for Morecambe then suitable substation site locations could have been expanded to present more options and allowed for flexibility during this consultation process.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). As set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11), the Transmission Assets are not subject to a mandatory net gain requirement under the Environment Act 2021. Nevertheless, the Applicants have worked with statutory consultees to discuss the approach, and to develop the design, to allow the maximum benefit to biodiversity within the parameters of the project. For the Transmission Assets, biodiversity benefit will be delivered within identified biodiversity benefit areas within the Transmission Assets Order Limits: Onshore (referred to as the Onshore Order Limits). Further qualitative benefits to biodiversity are proposed via potential collaboration with stakeholders and local groups, contributing to existing plans and programmes, both within and outside the Onshore Order Limits. Further details of the approach to biodiversity benefit are provided in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11). The calculation undertaken for the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11) utilises the latest biodiversity metric published by Defra (4.0).
TA_0234_003_231123	S44	Email	Substation Site Layout, Design and Appearance There is no consultation information available showing cross-sections, block plans, landscaping, fencing, aircraft beacons etc of each proposed substation site therefore how could a public consultation exercise provide any useful feedback when essential details are not made available ?	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Wireline visualisations were made available at statutory consultation, showing the maximum parameters from various viewpoints. Visualisations are presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0234_007_231123	S44	Email	Open Cut Trench Method My client objects to an open cut trench method of laying high voltage cables with a 122m wide corridor, if indeed cables cannot be carried on existing National Grid infrastructure.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented.
TA_0234_013_231123	S44	Email	7. Up to 50% of each substation site is earmarked for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). BNG should not be sourced on the most productive Fylde grassland which is Grade 2 or 3. BNG should be sourced off-site and outside Zone 1 as this whole area is productive grassland or arable land.	As set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11), the Transmission Assets are not subject to a mandatory net gain requirement under the Environment Act 2021. Nevertheless, the Applicants have worked with statutory consultees to discuss the approach, and to develop the design, to allow the maximum benefit to biodiversity within the parameters of the project. For the Transmission Assets, biodiversity benefit will be delivered within identified biodiversity benefit areas within the Transmission Assets Order Limits: Onshore (referred to as the Onshore Order Limits). Further qualitative benefits to biodiversity are proposed via potential collaboration with stakeholders and local groups, contributing to existing plans and programmes, both within and outside the Onshore Order Limits. Further details of the approach to biodiversity benefit are provided in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11). The calculation undertaken for the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11) utilises the latest biodiversity metric published by Defra (4.0).
TA_0234_014_231123	S44	Email	8. The footprint of the substation sites should be limited to that area absolutely necessary for transmission assets and absolutely necessary soft landscaping to meet any planning requirements.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects.
TA_0234_016_231123	S44	Email	High Voltage Cable Corridor Open cut trench method of laying high voltage cables with a 122m wide corridor for two independent projects is not feasible given the major disturbance and risks of staggered implementation. Open cut trenches plus haul roads will cause significant land damage by compaction of subsoil, contamination of topsoil, damage to land drains, significant disruption to farm grassland and livestock management, additional temporary gates and fences, temporary water troughs, limited crossing points, extra use of public highways, conflict between farm activities and contractor HGVs, loss of significant areas of silage and maize growing land. There is a Horizontal Directional Drill option which is capable of drilling up to 1000m below ground and at a reasonable depth to sit below land drainage systems. A further option is that as National Grid are due to upgrade their whole existing network in order to carry 400Kv in the very near future, there is existing National Grid infrastructure within Zone 1 which will soon be able to carry 400Kv which should also be given serious consideration. This may also provide an alternative to requiring substations.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented. Dalcour McLaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).
TA_0234_025_231123	S44	Email	Substation footprint doubled in size in order to provide on-site BNG should not be allowed as this completely restricts the potential substation site locations to unsuitable locations.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3:

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). As set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11), the Transmission Assets are not subject to a mandatory net gain requirement under the Environment Act 2021. Nevertheless, the Applicants have worked with statutory consultees to discuss the approach, and to develop the design, to allow the maximum benefit to biodiversity within the parameters of the project. For the Transmission Assets, biodiversity benefit will be delivered within identified biodiversity benefit areas within the Transmission Assets Order Limits: Onshore (referred to as the Onshore Order Limits). Further qualitative benefits to biodiversity are proposed via potential collaboration with stakeholders and local groups, contributing to existing plans and programmes, both within and outside the Onshore Order Limits. Further details of the approach to biodiversity benefit are provided in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11). The calculation undertaken for the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11) utilises the latest biodiversity metric published by Defra (4.0).
TA_0235_003_231123	S44	Email	Open Cut Trench Method My client objects to an open cut trench method of laying high voltage cables with a 122m wide corridor, if indeed cables cannot be carried on existing National Grid infrastructure due to similar construction concerns in construction traffic, noise, dust etc will be heard and seen on a daily basis for several years which is totally unacceptable in a residential area immediately next to protected countryside.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented.
TA_0235_008_231123	S44	Email	7. Up to 50% of each substation site is earmarked for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). BNG should not be sourced on the most productive Fylde grassland which is Grade 2 or 3. BNG should be sourced off-site and outside Zone 1 as this whole area is productive grassland or arable land.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. As set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11), the Transmission Assets are not subject to a mandatory net gain requirement under the Environment Act 2021. Nevertheless, the Applicants have worked with statutory consultees to discuss the approach, and to develop the design, to allow the maximum benefit to biodiversity within the parameters of the project. For the Transmission Assets, biodiversity benefit will be delivered within identified biodiversity benefit areas within the Transmission Assets Order Limits: Onshore (referred to as the Onshore Order Limits). Further qualitative benefits to biodiversity are proposed via potential collaboration with stakeholders and local groups, contributing to existing plans and programmes, both within and outside the Onshore Order Limits. Further details of the approach to biodiversity benefit are provided in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11). The calculation undertaken for the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11) utilises the latest biodiversity metric published by Defra (4.0).
TA_0235_009_231123	S44	Email	8. The footprint of the substation sites should be limited to that area absolutely necessary for transmission assets and any absolutely necessary soft landscaping in order to meet any planning requirements.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects.
TA_0235_011_231123	S44	Email	Proposed Substation Footprints The proposed footprints of the Morgan and Morecambe permanent substation sites are approximately 30 acres and 18 acres respectively. These site areas are taken up by approximately 50% BNG (Biodiversity Net Gain). This information was provided by a Flotation Energy engineer. This is wholly unacceptable as in providing on-site BNG purely for financial savings has narrowed the substations site selection process to one only option for Morgan and two only options for Morecambe. It is clear that had the substation sites design concentrated on that area which was wholly necessary to transmission, ie approx. 15 acres for Morgan and 9 acres for Morecambe then suitable substation site locations could have been expanded to present more options and allowed for flexibility during this consultation process.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). As set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11), the Transmission Assets are not subject to a mandatory net gain requirement under the Environment Act 2021. Nevertheless, the Applicants have worked with statutory consultees to discuss the approach, and to develop the design, to allow the maximum benefit to biodiversity within the parameters of the project. For the Transmission Assets, biodiversity benefit will be delivered within identified biodiversity benefit areas within the Transmission Assets Order Limits: Onshore (referred to as the Onshore Order Limits). Further qualitative benefits to biodiversity are proposed via potential collaboration with stakeholders and local groups, contributing to existing plans and programmes, both within and outside the Onshore Order Limits. Further details of the approach to biodiversity benefit are provided in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11). The calculation undertaken for the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11) utilises the latest biodiversity metric published by Defra (4.0).
TA_0235_012_231123	S44	Email	Substation Site Layout, Design and Appearance There is no consultation information available showing cross-sections, block plans, landscaping, fencing, aircraft beacons etc of each proposed substation site therefore how could a public consultation exercise provide any useful feedback when essential details are not made available ?	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Wireline visualisations were made available at statutory consultation, showing the maximum parameters from various viewpoints. Visualisations are presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0235_013_231123	S44	Email	High Voltage Cable Corridor Open cut trench method of laying high voltage cables with a 122m wide corridor for two independent projects is not feasible given the major disturbance and risks of staggered implementation. There is a Horizontal Directional Drill option which is capable of drilling up to 1000m below ground and at a reasonable depth to sit below land drainage systems. A further option is that as National Grid are due to upgrade their whole existing network in order to carry 400Kv in the very near future, there is existing National Grid infrastructure within Zone 1 which will soon be able to carry 400Kv which should also be given serious consideration. This may also provide an alternative to requiring substations.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0236_003_231123	S44	Email	Having worked the land on the proposed cable route for over 15 years I struggle to understand how the cables are going to be installed correctly and to a safe depth(stated at least 4ft deep) across the fylde basin which has a high water table and floods regularly(multiple time a year)	The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented.

E1.16.5 Site selection and consideration of alternatives table of responses

E1.16.5.1 Site selection and consideration of alternatives table of responses (via feedback form)

Table E1.16.5.1: Site selection and consideration of alternatives consultation responses (feedback form)

As set out in section 4.7.4 of the Consultation report (document reference E1). Responses have been allocated to the most appropriate topic(s). If a consultee did not provide a response for a question/sub-question this is not recorded. If a consultee included 'N/A', 'none', 'no comment', 'Nil', 'No', in response to a question, this has also not been recorded. Where a consultee provided a response which stated 'see response above' or similar, the response has been replicated in brackets and italics.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0050_009_231123	S42	Online feedback form	9		Seem to want a huge amount of space what is proposed to offset this green land take?	As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0050_010_231123	S42	Online feedback form	11		See previous comment on level of green land take <i>(Seem to want a huge amount of space what is proposed to offset this green land take?)</i>	As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0051_001_211123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.1	I strongly object to the proposals to route the transmission cable adjacent to land and properties on REDACTED, Blackpool. The suggested 100+ metre wide corridor, which it has been proposed would be necessary to lay the transmission cable, seems unduly large, and would have a negative effect on the land bordering our properties, with an impact on the already over-stretched natural drainage systems, disturbance during construction with traffic and noise pollution, and a permanent destruction of the natural habitat of the many animals and birds whose home is in the wooded areas surrounding our land.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets design has resulted in a reduced construction corridor width, as set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Details of the factors considered during the design evolution are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0052_001_131123	S44	Hardcopy feedback form	1		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environment - Great crested newts, bats, otters, foxes, birds, rabbits, hares, hedgehogs etc are going to be made homeless. What do you propose to do with them? 2. The easiest route is surely down the estuary, away from homes, farms, livelihoods. Why is this not an option? I knwo (sic) the river is tidal so would take longer and cost more but is MONEY really that much of a concern? It would appear it's not when it comes to compensating home owners who are going to lose value on their properties and affecting their childrens inheritances. 3. What do you propose to do to make the area more attractive (i.e. trees, hedges etc) 4. Lower Lane is a little lane and not suitable for heavy vehicles. How are you going to combat this? 5. In comparison to the grid at Howick Cross how big will these substations be? We note that there are no properties very close to the grid at Howick Cross and those closest can't see it as huge mounds have been built and grassed over. Is this something we can expect? 6. Are we going to have the constant humming even at 150m from the substation 24/7 so we can never open windows in our properties or sit out 	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					in our gardens during the summer? It was loud!!! 7. With regard to EMF emissions, can this be stated as 100% safe? If not why is this being located as down on the substation plan fig 4.25? 8. There are two local schools in the area close to the substations (Cornhill and Strike Lane). Have the schools been considered during th planning. 9. What is being considered (sic) with regard to screening the substations and not leaving them as a blot on the landscape!	
TA_0053_004_171123	S44	Online feedback form	2		Totally unacceptable see Q1 Land has remained in agriculture and not able to be built upon until this time,now to be used for unacceptable size of substations. Totally out of area characteristics.	The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.
TA_0053_005_171123	S44	Online feedback form	3		Totally unsuitable for this area	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0053_010_171123	S44	Online feedback form	4		As in Q1, totally unsuitable for the area	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0053_014_171123	S44	Online feedback form	7		Not suitable	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0053_016_171123	S44	Online feedback form	9		As previously stated totally unsuitable and too great an impact on local businesses and residents	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).
TA_0053_017_171123	S44	Online feedback form	10		None acceptable	The Applicants note your response.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0054_001_141123	S44	Online feedback form	1		living on coastal dunes how will it effect us	Details of the design of the Transmission Assets are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Cables will be installed beneath the sand dunes at Lytham St Annex by direct pipe techniques, which require no open cut trenches in the dunes area.
TA_0054_002_141123	S44	Online feedback form	2		drawing does not out line events	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0055_001_051123	S44	Online feedback form	3		The proposed siting of high voltage transmission assets (with voltage as per overhead pylons) close to permanent human habitation, with consequential impacts on health is of great concern. Much has been sited to accommodate nature reserve and marine ecology yet little to no information has been given with regards the protection of the families and households who will if this project were to proceed, will face significant health and wellbeing challenges. The clear and present danger in the form of terminal cancers and mental health are well known yet the emphasis has been on marine and environment and not on people within the community. This significant result and affect of the project on people is not addressed.	Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used. With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing. Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex. See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4).
TA_0055_005_051123	S44	Online feedback form	4		<p>There is a concern about the management of information. There has been considerable expense already incurred in this project with respect to planning, but the information being communicated is not crisp in setting out material implications. The information is high on features of the farm and promotion, but the actual onshore implications, although set out, are to some degree buried in a mass of other information.</p> <p>In short summary the onshore implications are a major power transmission trench of up to 25km together with a substation. This is not crisply set out and is almost in the margins of the material being communicated.</p> <p>It is also being communicated there is no preferred location as yet for on shore trench system. This is a challenge to believable given all the planning and effort that has gone into this project. There are an astonishing number of very lengthy & detailed reports on other features - it is almost inconceivable that there has not been effort to identify cable locations given these are central to the project</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information.</p> <p>The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor and onshore substations, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets - refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received. <p>Details of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						(document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3).
TA_0055_008_051123	S44	Online feedback form	5		<p>Despite the inland from Freckleton appearing to be a suitable location, from the extensive material sent out it is clear that Lytham St Annes, most likely the airport land, is the projects preferred location for a significant part of the onshore trench. Other possible locations are examined but it is very much apparent Lytham St Annes is the preferred location as it records as all green in the projects red/amber/green (RAG) analysis, with wording in the character of obstacles being overcome being commonplace. With other locations, issues are highlighted as almost being prohibitive. There does not appear to be equitable balance in the undertaking of the review.</p> <p>It is constantly cited that no plans have been finalised through the extensive material that has been sent through. This is a challenge to believe given the effort and cost that has gone into this project. Your representatives have already made it clear there have been extensive discussions with Blackpool airport. This leads to the understanding that there must be a number of options in a preference scaling for the location of the trench works. To argue contrary is challenging to believe.</p> <p>Whereas the project is not being open about the location of the planned trench works, from supposition (and not from clear communication) , as stated above, it is clear that a strong contender is for this to be sited directly adjacent to human habitation in the Lytham St Annes area, most likely through Blackpool Airport.</p> <p>Whereas the ideal location would appear to be closer to Freckleton to minimise disruption, if airport land is an option (argued against this for reasons below) it should not be adjacent to human habitation and should for example be considered at the far end of the airport, adjacent to the commercial/airport building zones. This should be achievable given representatives claims about horizontal drilling technology. However even this location is not optimal on health grounds as follows.</p> <p>EMC Radiation and Health Concerns</p> <p>By the material published it has been set out that an onshore cable corridor will be required of up to 25km in length and 70 metres wide.</p> <p>This cable corridor will be transmitting 400kV , akin to over ground pylon transmission levels (if only 2 metres underground, the transmission levels will be such that, if snowing, the cable trench will be visible overhead!)</p> <p>Numerous studies cite that transmission systems should be located at least 250 metres (ideally much further - 500 metres to 1 km)) from human habitation for health reasons.</p> <p>There are a high number of studies setting out the health impacts of high voltage transmission systems in terms of electromagnetic radiation , all most of which are negative. This may be suitable when the systems are located in the countryside but not when directly adjacent to human habitation.</p> <p>There are type types of radiation emitted from transmission systems , electrical and magnetic. One, electrical, can be inhibited to a degree by physical barrier but magnetic radiation is not inhibited by physical barriers. These radiations have significant impact on health and might be fine in a</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used.</p> <p>With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing. Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex.</p> <p>See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<p>field full of cows who can wander away to a barn at night, but not for adjacent to permanent human habitation.</p> <p>I expect you to counter citing reports which set out there are no health dangers associated with power transmission systems. Such reports do exist. But the key point is that knowledge on this matter is not conclusive and there is no absolute consensus. For every study setting out no harmful effects, another two can be cited setting out the harmful effects. And these harmful effects are not minor - what is being referenced is life ending cancer and leukaemia.</p>	
TA_0056_011_141123	S44	Online feedback form	2		Correspondence that you send out needs to be sent in plain English.	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).</p>
TA_0056_033_141123	S44	Online feedback form	10		<p>As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i></p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).</p>
TA_0056_034_141123	S44	Online feedback form	11		<p>As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i></p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						<p>with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).</p>
TA_0057_001_231123	S44	Online feedback form	2		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1,</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0057_002_231123	S44	Online feedback form	5		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1,</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0057_003_231123	S44	Online feedback form	6		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1,</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0057_004_231123	S44	Online feedback form	8		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1,</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0057_005_231123	S44	Online feedback form	9		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1,</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0057_006_231123	S44	Online feedback form	10		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1,</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0057_007_231123	S44	Online feedback form	11		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1,</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0057_008_231123	S44	Online feedback form	12		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1,</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0057_009_231123	S44	Online feedback form	14		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1,</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0057_010_231123	S44	Online feedback form	16		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1,</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0058_001_201123	S44	Online feedback form	3		<p>I attended one of the consultation meetings where I was informed that option 1 was your preferred choice and that meant no cables would be required to be laid along Blackpool road north. I live on REDACTED and having read a lot of the information I feel that we were misinformed. In short the cables will be laid down our road no matter which option is chosen. On this basis we fully object to the scheme coming through to st Anne's, it would create far to much disruption and I am agains it due to foundational problems that will be created, health issues that you are unable to give clear evidence that residents will not be affected.</p> <p>Overall there has to be an easier route in which you can connect to the national grid, have you explored other options?</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0059_001_151123	S44	Online feedback form	2		<p>I am against the offshore booster station being built on green belt land near my area. This will cause more flooding to the area. The more you build on the green belt land, the less land there is for the water to go. We have seen flooding in the area more since more houses have been built on flood land, this is disgusting and should not be allowed. There is also the damage to the near by properties. My house has been shook several times with the fracking, I don't want anymore damage to my property.</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE) which no longer includes any surface piercing structures. This includes the removal of the Morgan Booster Station and associated search areas. The OSPs are to be classed as part of the Generation Assets applications only. The assessment of the impact of increased flood risk arising from additional surface water runoff is presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase.</p> <p>The typical maximum depth of cable installation using trenching methodology is approximately 1.8m. Trenchless, drilling methodologies are to be used locally where crossings are required (e.g. beneath roads/rivers). The installation depths will generally be within shallower geological deposits rather than deep within the consolidated bedrock. The drilling methodologies to be used are designed to minimise the displacement of surrounding materials (therefore minimising instability) and do not involve the injection of significant volumes of liquid into fractured bedrock at depth under the</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						high-pressures that are often attributed to inducing tremors. The installation depths are shallower than those required for fracking. Further detail is provided in Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions (document reference F3.1) of the ES.
TA_0060_002_151123	S44	Online feedback form	2		<p>At the consultations the information was help back and fluffed over. Very unprofessional.</p> <p>Exactly where are these being placed?</p> <p>What sizes are these to be?</p> <p>What are their noise levels?</p> <p>Is it green belt land that you are using if so I wish to state my disprovel and I with it recorded that this is to be disallowed to take place.</p>	<p>Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Maximum parameters for the substation have been refined following statutory consultation. As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.</p>
TA_0060_012_151123	S44	Online feedback form	4		<p>Why is it not possible to run the pipeline along the river into another area closer to the national grid.?</p>	<p>The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0060_013_151123	S44	Online feedback form	5		The distances between the pipes is very wide so it is bound to affect someone somewhere. Is it not possible to lay them deeper on top of each other rather than side by side.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0060_016_151123	S44	Online feedback form	8		Why has it been placed there? Is this not green belt / farm land?	It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt. The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.
TA_251_001_231123	S44	Consult Online	NULL		Which side of the Coastal Dunes development will you be using. Nature reserve side, which is a SSSI. Or the airport land between the two estates. Does the airport land have the capacity to accommodate your works as I would image if you are directional drilling the cables a joining pit will be needed in this location. Also there will be the traffic issue along Clifton Road as you will need to build haul roads off this road to this area.	Details of the design of the Transmission Assets are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The Applicants have engaged with Blackpool Airport throughout the EIA process. Impacts and effects in relation to Blackpool Airport are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 11: Aviation and radar of the ES (document reference F3.11). Effects in relation to any changes in traffic are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 7 of the ES (document reference F3.7). It is noted that the option presented at PEIR (placement of cables in trenches within the highways) near Blackpool Airport is no longer required. Details of the current design are provided in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_251_004_231123	S44	Consult Online	NULL		<p>The impact this project will have over the next seven years on the environment and residential areas will be enormous. The infrastructure to service these works will be detrimental to the whole area affecting people's livelihood. Tourism will be affected which many people rely on in local businesses.</p> <p>I am totally against this project. I fully understand the need for a greener environment, but there must be a more suitable onshore landing area. Penwortham cannot be the only substation that can accommodate.</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0062_001_221123	S44	Online feedback form	1		<p>I Live on REDACTED, this is the single track road you intend to build your horrendous monstrosities.</p> <p>I have worked all my life to invest into my home for the future of my family and myself, like many other families on REDACTED.</p> <p>I have been assured that my investment would be safe, and under no circumstances would any development on our precious greenbelt ever be agreed to by the Fylde Borough Council.</p> <p>However the FBC supposedly now have no say in the matter.</p> <p>Well that's not good enough, you cannot simply change decisions that have been lawfully processed by our council and influenced the decisions that people have then made.</p> <p>There are other options available so I urge you to look at them rather than simply looking at maximising profits for already cash rich company's like BP.</p> <p>Your pathetic consultations are an insult to our intelligence.</p> <p>You have spent millions on investigating this project yet spent nothing on 3D cad artist impressions of what its going to like.</p> <p>Instead you feed us pathetic air brushed photos from miles away, showing absolutely nothing, because you don't want the local people to know what it is going to look like.</p> <p>It's a disgrace and your company is a disgrace.</p> <p>Wreck my life and my families life's and there will be consequences.</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.</p> <p>Host local authorities are all considered to be statutory consultees under the Planning Act 2008. As such, the Applicants consulted all local planning authorities including Fylde Council during the pre-application process.</p> <p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information.</p> <p>Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents.</p> <p>Wireline visualisations were made available at statutory consultation, showing the maximum parameters from various viewpoints.</p> <p>Visualisations are presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						<p>is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.</p>
TA_0062_002_221123	S44	Online feedback form	1		<p>I purchased my property back in August 2012, and have spent the last 11 years renovating the house and the grounds. My house will be almost directly opposite the Morecambe option 2 substation. Should option 2 go ahead this will totally devastate our lives. I will, object and campaign to exhaustion against this development ruining our lives.</p> <p>I am REDACTED this month, I had no intensions of moving again and have designed, together with my wife, the property to fulfil our needs for the rest our lives through retirement.</p> <p>I am too old to start all over again and all this is giving me mental health issues making me extremely ill.</p> <p>There is no other property I want to move to, this property is unique to us and there is no other property to replace it with in an area that I have spent my last 60 years, I do not want to move from my village.</p> <p>From the time I considered buying the property and right through to the present I have been assured by Fylde Borough Council that no development would ever be allowed on this greenbelt land, all my outbuildings have been developed from existing footprints of the previous farm, everything I have done has been allowed under the provision it is for private use only, I was not even allowed to rent out a stable as they said lower lane cannot sustain any more traffic so how can a development like this even be considered.</p> <p>We are not prepared to live next to a substation housed in what looks like one the biggest buildings ever constructed, I certainly have never come across a building of this magnitude, and all the noise, disruption, and EMF health issues that come with it.</p> <p>Another grave concern, even if option 1 goes ahead is the drainage problem. The back of my barn becomes flooded in heavy rain, with the dykes not being able to move the water fast enough through to the river. The erection of these two substations would be even more instrumental to this as they are taking over acres of arable land that acts as a soakaway during heavy rain.</p> <p>Another issue you may well have is the sand underneath the land, my single story side extension had to be piled to 10 metres for the footings. All of the money I have spent, the hard work and pain will have been in vain if this projects goes ahead and all my future plans are now on hold until a decision has been made between option 1 and option 2.</p> <p>I have now had to put on hold the final phase of my side extension, therefore cancelling the builders, plumbers, joiners, and bathroom fitters until further notice and it took a years planning to get them all together at the same time.</p> <p>I believe that I am of the same frame of mind as my local councillor and my MP Mark Menzies whom both assure me they are absolutely against this project being sited on our greenbelt.</p> <p>I would also like to comment on the mock photos asked for by Mark Menzies that when offered for viewing at the first consultation meeting did</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.</p> <p>Host local authorities are all considered to be statutory consultees under the Planning Act 2008. As such, the Applicants consulted all local planning authorities including Fylde Council during the pre-application process.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.</p> <p>With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing. Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex. See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4).</p> <p>An assessment on human health is provided at Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) of the ES.</p> <p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>An Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan for the substation site(s) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Operational Drainage Management Plan will include measures to ensure that existing land drainage is reinstated and/or maintained. This will include measures to limit</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<p>not show any views from REDACTED itself, which tells its own story, and the lame excuse by your representative at the consultation, and I quote, "we cannot be expected to take Photos from everywhere".</p> <p>This was a diabolical excuse and evidence of a complete lack of concern for the local residents, as well as a cover up, as both substations are going on the edge of REDACTED and it was blatantly obvious that the photographer would have had to travel down REDACTED in order to gain access to dirt tracks and fields in order to take some of the other photographs. One photo was taken from REDACTED looking over fields, a house, a large housing estate, and showing the Morgan substation slightly peering over the top on the horizon, this was a disgrace and an insult to us all.</p> <p>I would like a response please asap with regards to the choice of option 1 or option 2, and going forward I will be seeking advice from a solicitor and land agent.</p>	<p>discharge rates and attenuate flows to maintain greenfield runoff rates at the onshore substations It will also include measures to control surface water runoff, including measures to prevent flooding of the working areas or offsite and to ensure any runoff is treated appropriately.</p>
TA_0062_006_221123	S44	Online feedback form	8		<p>This is greenbelt, massively affecting local residents and should not be allowed.</p> <p>There must surely be other options that do not impact to this extent on local residents.</p>	<p>Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.</p>
TA_0062_008_221123	S44	Online feedback form	10		<p>Living opposite option 2, we would be devastated if this is selected, having said that, neither should be allowed and we would feel sorry for the people affected through option 1, however we feel it may be possible to stay in our home should option 1 go ahead.</p>	<p>Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Maximum parameters for the substation have been refined following statutory consultation.</p>
TA_0064_003_221123	S44	Online feedback form	2		<p>You have also not generated a separate box to comment here own impact of onshore works</p> <p>Please note that there are bats resident in properties and trees around REDACTED.</p> <p>I would love to see your project held up by years whilst that is investigated. We can keep requesting DEFRA come down and investigate their presence....again....and again.....and again. LOL</p> <p>Perhaps going across the north side of the airport and giving the Enterprise Authority a "big bung" might get the job done much quicker.</p>	<p>Surveys have been carried out in 2022, 2023 and 2024 in order to confirm the presence or indicate the likely absence of protected species. A precautionary approach to baseline characterization, impact prediction and mitigation has been taken in situations where it has not been possible to complete surveys. See Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).</p> <p>The Applicants will apply for mitigation licenses if it there are unavoidable impacts on fully protected species, with the information necessary to allow the application to be determined.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0064_010_221123	S44	Online feedback form	4		Across the north side of of the airport would be a much easier route.	It is noted that the option presented at PEIR (placement of cables in trenches within the highways) near Blackpool Airport is no longer required. Details of the current design are provided in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).
TA_0064_014_221123	S44	Online feedback form	7		Is there a third less disruptive alternative. If so take that	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0066_002_171023	S44	Online feedback form	2		The booster station should be barely visible from on-shore.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE) which no longer includes any surface piercing structures. This includes the removal of the Morgan Booster Station and associated search areas. The OSPs are to be classed as part of the Generation Assets applications only.
TA_0066_009_171023	S44	Online feedback form	5		The cables need to come onto land somewhere and siting that close to the most industrialised area (Squires Gate) makes sense. However, it is not clear from the documents (unless I have missed it) to what there may be a feasible alternative which takes the cables under the River Ribble. This would minimise the affect on traffic and disruption to residents.	The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0067_001_221123	S44	Online feedback form	1		I have read all the documents and attended one of the meetings. I am totally in favour of renewable energy but totally opposed to this project. How can I can comment all the various aspects when there is little detail available and the the stock answer from advisors is 'We don't know yet'. The documentation is probably the worst I have ever seen and my perception is that it is deliberately designed to confuse residents and hide all the unsavoury bits deep in the detail which consists of techno jargon and, at worst, gobbledegook. The choice of location where the cables are shown as coming ashore is probable the worst it could possibly be (though again I was told 'no-one really knows yet) as it would damage the fragile dune ecology, the nature reserve containing rare species part of a breeding program to try and save them, the environmental corridor behind my house (which no advisors knew existed) and wildlife area which is part of the runway approach to Blackpool airport. None of your advisors even knew the area, had never visited the site or had any knowledge of the environmental issues involved. It's difficult to comment on the level of detail you seen to require when you are not able to answer questions. A total disaster from start to finish!	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Maximum parameters for the substation have been refined following statutory consultation. As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						<p>mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents.</p>
TA_0067_002_221123	S44	Online feedback form	3		The whole proposed area where the cables may come onshore is unstable, shifting sand with vibrations and groundworks likely to disturb the sensitive environmental areas and the existing houses either side of the proposed area which are also build in an area predominantly sand. Yet again, as no advisors know the area they couldn't comment. A suggestion that if the project wanted to reach Penwortham then the easiest route would be along the coast and up the River Ribble to arrive directly at Penwortham was deemed 'unworkable' but yet again no specifics were able to be given.	The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0067_006_221123	S44	Online feedback form	4		A PR disaster from start to finish, worse it would seem that the most complicated and disruptive route has been selected with scant real information available from the plans or the consultants. A total re-think is necessary.	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.
TA_0067_007_221123	S44	Online feedback form	5		The worst possible site selected with major disruption, land values affected, serious environmental issues. There are many other less disruptive alternatives available but my impression was that this was a done deed and the consultation was a required formality to appease affected groups.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.
TA_0011_007_181023	S42	Online feedback form	3	3.3	Impact on agricultural land- Zones 3 and 4 highlighted in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives and in South Ribble appear to have been discounted for ecological reasons, but routes to Penwortham substation would cross through Grade 2 agricultural land (very good) and undoubtedly would impact upon such areas resulting from connection with Zone 1. Any loss, or severance of Grade 2 land is of concern BNG enhancement - this element appears to have been well documented, and subject to relevant enhancement and mitigation where appropriate, the Council has no objection to works in terms of BNG. Visual impact - the assumption on proposals within the South Ribble boundary is that subterranean works between Zone 1 infrastructure and Penwortham substation are likely to result in loss of visual amenity, but that this would be a relatively temporary disturbance, and that in time land remediation would occur as land restores. Although few details are available, works would be assumed to be of sufficient depth that use of open agricultural land would be possible in the long term, and that agricultural land would not be permanently sterilised by the development. Visual impact of the proposed infrastructure at Penwortham substation would be significant when viewed from neighbouring residential properties, and concerns have already been received from residents to the Council relating to the height and proximity of the same infrastructure to adjacent properties, including Grade II listed dwelling, REDACTED. That being said, the proposal does sit against a backdrop of existing substation equipment, and in an extremely secluded, otherwise rural locale. Consideration should however be given to loss of visual amenity generally, but particularly from residential premises.	The impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings, are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor and onshore substations, including - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets - refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received. Details of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Biodiversity benefit will be provided within the Transmission Assets Order Limits, details of which are set out within the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11).
TA_0011_009_181023	S42	Online feedback form	4		Upgrading of electricity works - concerns raised that works at Penwortham Substation would interfere with electricity provision from the existing substation, or would not be sufficient for the purpose required and may draw from existing supplies.	National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) are responsible for ownership of the electricity transmission network in England and Wales. NGET are also responsible for upgrading the electricity transmission network.
TA_0011_010_181023	S42	Online feedback form	11		Penwortham substation is a secluded, very rural locale, and other than sporadically placed dwellings is wholly inhabited by the existing substation. In addition it has planning approval for re-development of adjacent lands for the same purpose, and on balance this area of and which would not impact severely on the visual or residential amenity of a significant number	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					of people is felt to be appropriate. Access from Howick Cross Lane passes by denser residential but as maintenance is expected to be limited to emergency and essential works, amenity should only be affected during construction phases	4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).
TA_0069_001_201123	S44	Online feedback form	1		<p>The project is highly unsuitable for the Fylde area as a whole and nobody want to live near any electrical cables, buried or otherwise. Anybody needing to move house would be unable to sell their property.</p> <p>The construction period of several years would mean huge disruption to Blackpool Airport and the surrounding roads with road closures and huge tailbacks of traffic.</p> <p>The Nature Reserve on Clifton Drive North, Lytham St Annes is unsuitable for the location of the project landfall area and cable corridor as it is protected as a Site of Special Scientific Interest. The area is unable to accommodate the work involved in constructing temporary construction compounds and of the compounds themselves.</p>	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). The impact on the SSSIs has been provided in section 3.1.2 and section 3.11.3 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).
TA_0070_007_231123	S44	Online feedback form	4		<p>Lack of integration between projects or with National Grid.</p> <p>Lack of use of existing overhead lines.</p> <p>Small field of 35 turbines should be cancelled. Too small.</p> <p>Only one windfarm.</p>	Under the Offshore Transmission Network Review, the National Grid Electricity System Operator (NGESO) is responsible for assessing options to improve the coordination of offshore wind generation connections and transmission networks and has undertaken a Holistic Network Design Review (HNDR). A key output of the HNDR process was the recommendation that the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm should work collaboratively in connecting the two offshore wind farms to the National Grid electricity transmission network at Penwortham in Lancashire. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0070_002_231123	S44	Online feedback form	8		The Ribble route would be best but more expensive. Need more information about routes considered.	The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0070_004_231123	S44	Online feedback form	10		North station but given size of Morecambe wind farm -Cancel it.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0072_001_231123	S44	Consult Online	NULL		Terrible map, secretive, and you are crossing our land in a ziz zag manner, at REDACTED. You have taken no notice of our requests to either route in our land on the north side , or at least keep to a straight line and on our boundary. Your route will take out 40 acres, and render 20 acres unusable for grazing. Why are wildlife(which may or may not be there) be more important than our 270 dairy cows and youngstock, which are definitely here, and need our land to both graze, and produce their winter feed. Your attitude of putting several dairy farms in the area out of business is not acceptable. Our cows produce milk for Tesco. More of a neccessity than wild life. Take issue with Natural England and route up the south side of the Ribble.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Specifically, the potential impact of the Transmission Assets on the viability and operations of existing farming businesses has been considered in Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference: F3.6).
TA_0073_006_151123	S44	Online feedback form	8		No, but they are rather large and an eyesore, would not be happy if one was near me	An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects.
TA_0073_007_151123	S44	Online feedback form	9		Preferred route is the one the furthest away from the rear of our properties on REDACTED, which is considered one of the most expensive Lanes on the Fylde coast	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0074_002_211123	S44	Online feedback form	2		Not enough details given so I am totally against until full details given	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						<p>English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0074_010_211123	S44	Online feedback form	4		This area is not suitable for the cables to come ashore. The estuary should be considered.	<p>The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).</p>
TA_0074_013_211123	S44	Online feedback form	5		You should consider the estuary. I know it is more expensive but it is unacceptable to impact local residents in such a huge way. Our health and mental health will be adversely affected if landfall is in the airport area.	<p>The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						An assessment on human health is provided at Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) of the ES.
TA_0074_016_211123	S44	Online feedback form	16		I totally object to the project proposed landfall area and also think the lack of detail given has been deceitful.	Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Maximum parameters for the substation have been refined following statutory consultation.
TA_0075_002_071123	S44	Online feedback form	2		No, providing any habitat loss is reinstated or kept to a strict minimum.	Habitats within the Transmission Assets Order Limits have been subject to habitat surveys, where access has been possible. This is reported in section 3.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). Where there are impacts in relation to birds, these are set out in section 4.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).
TA_0075_003_071123	S44	Online feedback form	3		Because the exact location of onshore cables has not yet been determined, it's causing anxiety and worry, so the sooner the cable route is determined the better.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3).
TA_0075_008_071123	S44	Online feedback form	9		Can these be sited on a brownfield site?	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0076_004_091123	S44	Online feedback form	2		Do not want this to affect the views and the views and the area on the front and St Annes	An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects.
TA_0078_001_051123	S44	Online feedback form	1		Whilst I am generally in support of the development of wind farm technology, I feel that this is being proposed in totally the wrong location. There are many areas of coastline which are less populated and where there would be much less impact to communities and indeed wildlife.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0078_002_051123	S44	Online feedback form	2		I generally have no concerns about the siting of the offshore elements.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0078_003_051123	S44	Online feedback form	3		<p>These current proposals impact far too much on the local population and communities.</p> <p>This is a heavily populated area between two seaside towns. There is also a large influx of seasonal tourists.</p> <p>The siting of the onshore elements is totally unacceptable.</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p> <p>Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0078_005_051123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.7	<p>If the alternate route of using the roads in the Queensway area is used, this will create chaos.</p> <p>There is already a huge problem with traffic management on Queensway which is one of only two routes between Blackpool and Lytham St Annes. Traffic queues can be horrendous.</p> <p>From a personal viewpoint, Salisbury Ave (off Queensway) is the only entrance and exit from the Richmond Point development. This development is still being constructed and is continually expanding. It is very difficult even now to turn right onto Queensway and people are often queuing to get off the development. Similarly it is difficult to turn right into the development and can cause considerable hold up to the traffic on Queensway.</p> <p>This route would be hugely disruptive. We were sold these homes on the basis that they were going to be part of a beautiful nature reserve "Pride of Place on the Fylde"!</p>	<p>Traffic and transport impacts arising during the construction phase of the Transmission Assets have been fully assessed at section 7.11 Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference E3.7).</p> <p>Details of the operation and maintenance phases are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Onshore maintenance would be limited to essential maintenance and/or emergency works.</p> <p>Further details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8).</p>
TA_0078_008_051123	S44	Online feedback form	4	4.2	<p>We were told at the meeting that the airport were not wanting the cabling to go straight through over Queensway and across the open fields. (which is why the roads may have to be used)</p> <p>This is not acceptable. I don't believe the airport should be able to dictate where the cables are laid any more than we are.</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3).</p>
TA_0078_009_051123	S44	Online feedback form	5		<p>The obvious and least disruptive area for the landfall area would be the estuary of the River Ribble.</p> <p>Whilst I am sure this would present engineering, ecological and financial challenges , it would be infinitely more acceptable to the local communities</p>	<p>The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0078_010_051123	S44	Online feedback form	6		Not applicable as I disagree with the siting of the whole project	Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Maximum parameters for the substation have been refined following statutory consultation.
TA_0078_011_051123	S44	Online feedback form	8		<p>What was initially pitched as the laying of underground cables connecting to the National Grid at Penwortham, now includes proposals for two massive new substations in rural Fylde.</p> <p>The loss of grade A farmland and local greenbelt is wholly unacceptable and will cause massive damage to these communities. These are massive structures covering huge areas and will be a huge blot on the landscape.</p>	It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0078_012_051123	S44	Online feedback form	10		Both sites are disastrous choices for the communities concerned	Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Maximum parameters for the substation have been refined following statutory consultation.
TA_0078_014_051123	S44	Online feedback form	13		<p>Whilst ecology is obviously of vital importance, in this instance priority should be given to the impact to local residents and communities and they should not be having this forced upon them.</p> <p>I would suggest that wherever the work is completed the local ecology would no doubt return to its former state.</p>	The measures proposed to control effects on the environment and communities are set out in the ES (document reference F1 to F4).
TA_0078_015_051123	S44	Online feedback form	15		<p>This project is unlikely to gain support from any of the local residents or communities.</p> <p>WE DO NOT WANT IT IN OUR AREA!</p> <p>There are more suitable areas of coastline which are less populated.</p>	The Applicants note your response.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0079_002_131123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.3	I am also concerned about the impact this would have on the sand dunes along Clifton Drive North. Can the cables not be laid up the River Ribble ?	The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0079_004_131123	S44	Online feedback form	9		I think this green belt area is totally the wrong site for construction of this size and it will be a blight on the local area.	It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0079_005_131123	S44	Online feedback form	10		Neither is suitable.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0080_002_201123	S44	Online feedback form	2		Where will the booster station be?	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE) which no longer includes any surface piercing structures. This includes the removal of the Morgan Booster Station and associated search areas. The OSPs are to be classed as part of the Generation Assets applications only.
TA_0080_011_201123	S44	Online feedback form	16		A less developed area with less impact on housing, wildlife, tourism and aviation would be a better option for the development	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0081_002_201123	S44	Online feedback form	2		Absolutely opposed to this. The feedback procedure is purposely complicated and planning is vague. No real transparency - quite a common approach by construction companies.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The feedback form enabled respondents to provide feedback on specific aspects of the proposals. It was structured to allow the Transmission Assets team to accurately categorise and assess feedback in the design process.
TA_0081_003_201123	S44	Online feedback form	3		As mentioned, local residents including my family are totally opposed to this project. The damage and disruption to a local community is unacceptable. Our property values will plummet. A beautiful area will be destroyed. Lay your cables in a region where people's lives are not affected. Will fight this to the hilt!	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0081_006_201123	S44	Online feedback form	11		See previous comments. <i>("As mentioned, local residents including my family are totally opposed to this project. The damage and disruption to a local community is unacceptable. Our property values will plummet. A beautiful area will be destroyed. Lay your cables in a region where people's lives are not affected. Will fight this to the hilt!")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0082_004_151123	S44	Online feedback form	7		I am extremely concerned about the alternative cable corridor in the area to the south of Blackpool Airport. This is a residential area where residents will be subjected to noise, vibration, increased traffic, road closures, and temporary signals. My main concern regarding a cable corridor through a residential area is the impact on health. A search online suggests there is a relationship between the EMF's given off by the cables and health issues such as certain cancers and childhood leukemia. Whilst unproven the reports do suggest there is a risk to health with long-term exposure to EMF's. As a family with a 5 year old daughter, this is a real concern for us and also a concern for many other families who live on the REDACTED and the streets around REDACTED and REDACTED. The decision to route the cables via Queensway would result in us moving from REDACTED, a place we love to live having moved in just 4 years ago. I understand this cable route is a secondary option, only to be used if you face significant constraints with the route through Blackpool Airport however, the impact on airport operations should not be given a greater priority over residents. If airport operations were affected for a short period resulting in a commercial loss for the airport, I believe this pales into insignificance when compared to the possible health risks, noise, vibrations, and impact on traffic in this residential area and Queensway.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used. With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					Please do all you can to run these cables directly out of the airport and into the countryside.	exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing. Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex. See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4).
TA_0083_008_221123	S44	Online feedback form	2		I do not want or agree to this project to go ahead in my community	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_024_221123	S44	Online feedback form	10		I Do Not agree to project and planning permission as I live local to area	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0083_025_221123	S44	Online feedback form	11		Do Not go ahead with project	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0084_002_091123	S44	Online feedback form	2		Unsure what this will be? The size and position?	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE) which no longer includes any surface piercing structures. This includes the removal of the Morgan Booster Station and associated search areas. The OSPs are to be classed as part of the Generation Assets applications only.
TA_0085_011_191123	S44	Online feedback form	8		The proposed substations are enormous taking up the footprint of 13 football pitches as being 20 metres high. This will be an enormous blot on the landscape to our Fylde coast region not least the major impact on those living nearby. This region relies on tourists who will be severely put off by such eyesores on entering the Fylde area.	An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects. A full impact assessment on socio-economics is presented in Volume 4 Chapter 2 of the ES (document reference F4.2).
TA_0085_012_191123	S44	Online feedback form	9		See response to number 8 <i>(The proposed substations are enormous taking up the footprint of 13 football pitches as being 20 metres high. This will be an enormous blot on the landscape to our Fylde coast region not least the major impact on those living nearby. This region relies on tourists who will be severely put off by such eyesores on entering the Fylde area.)</i>	An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects. A full impact assessment on socio-economics is presented in Volume 4 Chapter 2 of the ES (document reference F4.2).
TA_0085_013_191123	S44	Online feedback form	10		See response to number 8 <i>(The proposed substations are enormous taking up the footprint of 13 football pitches as being 20 metres high. This will be an enormous blot on</i>	An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<i>the landscape to our Fylde coast region not least the major impact on those living nearby. This region relies on tourists who will be severely put off by such eyesores on entering the Fylde area.)</i>	Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects. A full impact assessment on socio-economics is presented in Volume 4 Chapter 2 of the ES (document reference F4.2).
TA_0087_001_191123	S44	Online feedback form	1		<p>Feedback on Transmission Assets Project</p> <p>I wish to object to the proposals for the following reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no explanation as to why zone 1 and zone 2 have been favoured and why they were chosen in the first place. There is no information about why any other areas might have been considered and discounted. - It feels like someone has just looked at a map and decided these are the easiest places, with little other consideration. - Your website is hard to navigate and does not provide large scale detailed maps. It is difficult to determine exact proposed areas. - There has been little consideration of potential flood risks and lack of information to local residents about how this would be managed. - There is no information about why any Fylde or Blackpool Council enterprise zones or brown field sites have not been considered. - It is still unclear where any sub station would actually be sited, and what it might look like. Surely artists impressions and scale models should have been provided for consultation too. There is no information about any screening, or how long the area would take to recover from any works. There is a lack of consideration of the visual impact and no transparency of information provided to local residents about this. - There is no information about how any access to the sites would be obtained, and no assessment about impact on local traffic and roads. - There is no easy to understand information about impact of noise and light. It is also not clear if there would be any disruption to the village during construction. All the professional reports are complicated and difficult to understand with no easy read or summary information. - This is an area of quite countryside and would involve significant loss of a local amenity and change to the local environment. - Potential loss of value to local property. - Two large sub stations are proposed quite near to each other, making a significant impact on the local amenity. - No consideration given about the impact of the Blue solar farm for the same area. Why has there been no discussion between the two projects - I have attended public consultation meetings which have been poorly presented with representatives being poorly prepared and unable to answer most questions 	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3)The Transmission Assets website included all consultation materials and maps to the level of details that was available at the time. This included a dedicated information hub for ease of access to specific consultation materials.</p> <p>The solar farm has been considered as part of the cumulative assessment for the onshore elements of the Transmission Assets. All schemes considered in the cumulative assessment are set out in Volume 1, Annex 5.5: Cumulative screening matrix and location plan of the ES (document reference F1.5.5). Bluefield solar farm has also been considered as a part of route planning and site selection process, documented in Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the ES: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4), with further detailed provided in Volume 1, Annex 4.3: Selection and Refinement of the Onshore Infrastructure (document reference F1.4.3).</p> <p>All schemes considered in the cumulative assessment are set out in Volume 1, Annex 5.5: Cumulative screening matrix and location plan of the ES (document reference F1.5.5).</p> <p>Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>The assessment of the impact of increased flood risk arising from additional surface water runoff is presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2).</p> <p>Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2).</p> <p>An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0088_001_301023	S44	Online feedback form	1		Using valuable farm land and building on green space.. not acceptable to have such a noisy eyesore so close to so many towns and villages. This is a mainly rural area and should not be used for such a purpose.	The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings. An assessment of noise and vibration impacts during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Transmission Assets is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.2: Construction Noise and Vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.2). This includes an assessment of all construction activities required, as well as noise impacts due to construction traffic on the local highway network.
TA_0088_002_301023	S44	Online feedback form	2		Proposals to locate this on land zoned green is not acceptable.. it will be noisy and unsightly and have a detrimental effect on all local residents.. it is close to two schools.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0088_003_301023	S44	Online feedback form	9		This should not be built on green field sites close to several towns and villages. It will have a detrimental effect on residents. We should keep our farms not build on the land.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0088_004_301023	S44	Online feedback form	11		An alternative site should be found well away from towns and villages which will be seriously impacted by this development.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0089_001_281023	S44	Consult Online	NULL		This building is going to be right in front of my house can you move to penworth I will object to it	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0090_001_221123	S44	Online feedback form	1		My ten acre field at the rear of properties on REDACTED is on the proposed route for the pipe work.I have just become aware that I would loose the use of my field for a number of years .I purchased the land to enable me to have grazing for my horses.My property is set up for multiple horses that require turnout on a daily basis.Should I loose this I would have to either give up the horses or move house and I don't want to do either .Also I have encouraged wildlife on my field with hares and barn owls both endangered species living there.No amount of compensation could encourage me to support the proposed devastation that would ensue should the project go ahead .	DM on behalf of the Applicants will work with the land interest to mitigate the impact of the interests enjoyment and use holding as far as reasonably possible.
TA_0091_004_111123	S44	Online feedback form	2		Need more exact details of the location and the size. Artistic impressions are needed.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE) which no longer includes any surface piercing structures. This includes the removal of the Morgan Booster Station and associated search areas. The OSPs are to be classed as part of the Generation Assets applications only.
TA_0091_006_111123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.2	Without specifying the actual corridor route, how can an assessment be made to flood risk?	The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor and onshore substations, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets - refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received. The assessment of the impact of increased flood risk arising from additional surface water runoff is presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						<p>An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase. Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2).</p> <p>An Outline CoCP (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase.</p>
TA_0091_015_111123	S44	Online feedback form	16		I'd like to understand how this is going to impact on me personally. My home, community and my life in general. I attended the consultation and asked lots of questions, most of which were answered vaguely. This is due to the lack of specific details about the corridor route. This must be known by now.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Applicants are working with affected parties to fully understand the impact that the Transmission Assets will have on them and their businesses and identify way to mitigate these. Amendments have been made to the routing following feedback gathered over the course of our landowner engagement meetings, as well as from feedback received throughout the pre- application stage. The Applicants will continue to engage with landowners as the Transmission Assets develops, as appropriate.
TA_0092__004_151123	S44	Online feedback form	10		It would be better to go with the option with the least impact to the environment - this would appear to be Option 1 that goes through the North of Ballam.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0093_006_211123	S44	Online feedback form	5		As a resident of REDACTED with a house on the main road, I (and my neighbours) have serious concerns about the proposed onshore location. The proposed locations between the two Coastal Dunes developments going past the airport or via nature reserve are both so close to our houses that we would find ourselves virtually living and working on a Construction site for the duration of the work. The houses already shake when lorries go past and are not sound-proofed, we hear every car that passes. I worry about serious damage being caused to the houses by the heavy construction traffic and by the drilling or similar activities needed to create the cable corridor. It is quite feasible that you would have to fund house maintenance or costly repairs for every house on the Coastal Dunes estate if cracks start to appear from subsidence. There are other areas along the coastline that are not so heavily populated, we urge you to choose an alternative. Whilst you say the Lytham St Annes Zone has 'less coastal residential density' you will still having a major impact on hundreds of families who live here as well as thousands of car drivers who rely on this road every day as their main route from Lytham or St Annes to Blackpool and vice versa.	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p> <p>Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0093_009_211123	S44	Online feedback form	16		My neighbours and I on REDACTED, Lytham St Annes Zone oppose the choice of landfall area for this project as we anticipate years of disruption affecting our health and wellbeing. Many people on this estate are elderly or retired and moved here especially for the peace and quiet. As a direct result of the project, they will now struggle to sell their homes to move to somewhere else less disruptive to enjoy the final years of life. Please reconsider.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0094_002_061123	S44	Online feedback form	2		Again, no issues.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0094_007_061123	S44	Online feedback form	4	4.2	I understand the airport have said no to using their land for the piping hence having to consider other routes. If it's not ok for them and they have wide open spaces then there can be no reason for it to be ok for local residents	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0094_008_061123	S44	Online feedback form	5		Advised at the meeting engineers didn't think access to Penwortham via the estuary was viable, but no detail as to why was given. If you can manage to work in the sea offshore surely you should manage in a less dangerous river area.	The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0094_009_061123	S44	Online feedback form	7		Not our area of residence, but I would have if I did!	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0094_012_061123	S44	Online feedback form	14		I understand if the golf course is going to be required you have given assurances underground tunnelling wont affect the use of the golf course. If this is the case I see no reason why the airport can't be used as the preferred route adopting the same tunnelling process.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0095_001_221123	S44	Online feedback form	1		<p>We have been to the Consultation Meetings and quite frankly, the situation is disgraceful and we are no wiser. There are no mock photographs to give any indication of the scale of the operation or any idea what the finished substations will look like, and therefore how do you expect constructive feedback for something so vague. We have requested this information to no avail.</p> <p>Our personal situation is with regard to the devaluation of our house if option 2 is chosen, and again no information can be given at present so we are all in limbo. Our house will be opposite the substation and all the building work, and our main objections are the proximity to our house, the loss of Greenbelt and the state of the lane with all the extra traffic that will be involved for such a huge operation on a one track road. Above all, we would have to endure years of stress living next to an enormous building sight and the possible health consequences of a magnetic field. We don't even know if we will receive any compensation for the devaluation of our property so we can escape the ensuing nightmare.</p> <p>To cause such upheaval to everyone's lives in this community will be devastating and unnecessary, as there must be other options. This will be a total disaster for the residents, wildlife, farmland, loss of countryside and we urge you to find alternative sites that will not cause as much harm to the environment, which we thought was the whole point of this project in the first place.</p>	<p>The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor and onshore substations, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets - refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received. <p>The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).</p> <p>Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0097_004_171123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.1	Is there any cause for concern with Salwick plant been so close	No interaction has been identified - this facility lies outside the Transmission Assets Order Limits.
TA_0170_001_151023	S44	Online feedback form	1		<p>We are horrified at the prospect of the three Morecambe proposed onshore substation sites especially option2 (south), as this is the first time we have heard of this project to build these substations and realised the impact this will have on our lives.</p> <p>Our house will be directly opposite the substation, and we are currently renovating the property, which has been ongoing over 10 years, to be our retirement property, which we thought was a safe undertaking on green belt land.</p> <p>If this project goes ahead you will ruin us in one full swoop, not only will our property not be worth a penny, but our health will be impacted living in this kind of environment.</p> <p>We are appalled we have not been consulted and just sent a brochure as if the impact on us is going to be the same as any other residents in surrounding villages! This is huge and we want to be contacted immediately to discuss the implications and options we face.</p> <p>It is just not true to state in your brochure you have looked at environmental sensitivities such as proximity to residential properties! Our house will be in the middle of years of building works and how will we cope with that. We will see the huge building from our front window and be impacted by possible cancer risks, and we cannot escape as nobody will ever buy our house with all that going on. Please contact us immediately.</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0170_002_151023	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.6	<p>As already advised <i>(We are horrified at the prospect of the three Morecambe proposed onshore substation sites especially option2 (south), as this is the first time we have heard of this project to build these substations and realised the impact this will have on our lives.</i></p> <p><i>Our house will be directly opposite the substation, and we are currently renovating the property, which has been ongoing over 10 years, to be our retirement property, which we thought was a safe undertaking on green belt land.</i></p> <p><i>If this project goes ahead you will ruin us in one full swoop, not only will our property not be worth a penny, but our health will be impacted living in this kind of environment.</i></p> <p><i>We are appalled we have not been consulted and just sent a brochure as if the impact on us is going to be the same as any other residents in surrounding villages! This is huge and we want to be contacted immediately to discuss the implications and options we face.</i></p> <p><i>It is just not true to state in your brochure you have looked at environmental sensitivities such as proximity to residential properties! Our house will be in the middle of years of building works and how will we cope with that. We will see the huge building from our front window and be impacted by possible cancer risks, and we cannot escape as nobody will ever buy our house with all that going on. Please contact us immediately.)</i></p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens.</p> <p>The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>
TA_0170_003_151023	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.7	<p>As already advised <i>(We are horrified at the prospect of the three Morecambe proposed onshore substation sites especially option2 (south), as this is the first time we have heard of this project to build these substations and realised the impact this will have on our lives.</i></p> <p><i>Our house will be directly opposite the substation, and we are currently renovating the property, which has been ongoing over 10 years, to be our retirement property, which we thought was a safe undertaking on green belt land.</i></p> <p><i>If this project goes ahead you will ruin us in one full swoop, not only will our property not be worth a penny, but our health will be impacted living in this kind of environment.</i></p> <p><i>We are appalled we have not been consulted and just sent a brochure as if the impact on us is going to be the same as any other residents in surrounding villages! This is huge and we want to be contacted immediately to discuss the implications and options we face.</i></p> <p><i>It is just not true to state in your brochure you have looked at environmental sensitivities such as proximity to residential properties! Our house will be in the middle of years of building works and how will we cope with that. We will see the huge building from our front window and be impacted by possible cancer risks, and we cannot escape as nobody will ever buy our house with all that going on. Please contact us immediately.)</i></p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens.</p> <p>The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.
TA_0170_004_151023	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.8	<p>As already advised <i>(We are horrified at the prospect of the three Morecambe proposed onshore substation sites especially option2 (south), as this is the first time we have heard of this project to build these substations and realised the impact this will have on our lives.</i></p> <p><i>Our house will be directly opposite the substation, and we are currently renovating the property, which has been ongoing over 10 years, to be our retirement property, which we thought was a safe undertaking on green belt land.</i></p> <p><i>If this project goes ahead you will ruin us in one full swoop, not only will our property not be worth a penny, but our health will be impacted living in this kind of environment.</i></p> <p><i>We are appalled we have not been consulted and just sent a brochure as if the impact on us is going to be the same as any other residents in surrounding villages! This is huge and we want to be contacted immediately to discuss the implications and options we face.</i></p> <p><i>It is just not true to state in your brochure you have looked at environmental sensitivities such as proximity to residential properties! Our house will be in the middle of years of building works and how will we cope with that. We will see the huge building from our front window and be impacted by possible cancer risks, and we cannot escape as nobody will ever buy our house with all that going on. Please contact us immediately.)</i></p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens.</p> <p>The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>
TA_0170_005_151023	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.9	<p>As already advised <i>(We are horrified at the prospect of the three Morecambe proposed onshore substation sites especially option2 (south), as this is the first time we have heard of this project to build these substations and realised the impact this will have on our lives.</i></p> <p><i>Our house will be directly opposite the substation, and we are currently renovating the property, which has been ongoing over 10 years, to be our retirement property, which we thought was a safe undertaking on green belt land.</i></p> <p><i>If this project goes ahead you will ruin us in one full swoop, not only will our property not be worth a penny, but our health will be impacted living in this kind of environment.</i></p> <p><i>We are appalled we have not been consulted and just sent a brochure as if the impact on us is going to be the same as any other residents in surrounding villages! This is huge and we want to be contacted immediately to discuss the implications and options we face.</i></p> <p><i>It is just not true to state in your brochure you have looked at environmental sensitivities such as proximity to residential properties! Our</i></p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<i>house will be in the middle of years of building works and how will we cope with that. We will see the huge building from our front window and be impacted by possible cancer risks, and we cannot escape as nobody will ever buy our house with all that going on. Please contact us immediately.)</i>	happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.
TA_0170_006_151023	S44	Online feedback form	5		This will also affect us as the cables will have to come through our land and we are totally against this project	The design of the Transmission Assets is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This includes details of the required joint bays and link boxes. Joint bays will be completely buried, with the land above reinstated. An inspection cover will be provided at the surface for link boxes for access during the operation and maintenance phase. The precise location of these will be identified during the detailed design phase.
TA_0170_007_151023	S44	Online feedback form	9		<p>We are horrified at the prospect of the three Morecambe proposed onshore substation sites especially option2 (south), as this is the first time we have heard of this project to build these substations and realised the impact this will have on our lives.</p> <p>Our house will be directly opposite the substation, and we are currently renovating the property, which has been ongoing over 10 years, to be our retirement property, which we thought was a safe undertaking on green belt land.</p> <p>If this project goes ahead you will ruin us in one full swoop, not only will our property not be worth a penny, but our health will be impacted living in this kind of environment.</p> <p>We are appalled we have not been consulted and just sent a brochure as if the impact on us is going to be the same as any other residents in surrounding villages! This is huge and we want to be contacted immediately to discuss the implications and options we face.</p> <p>It is just not true to state in your brochure you have looked at environmental sensitivities such as proximity to residential properties! Our house will be in the middle of years of building works and how will we cope with that. We will see the huge building from our front window and be impacted by possible cancer risks, and we cannot escape as nobody will ever buy our house with all that going on. Please contact us immediately.</p>	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0170_008_151023	S44	Online feedback form	10		<p>As already advised <i>(We are horrified at the prospect of the three Morecambe proposed onshore substation sites especially option2 (south), as this is the first time we have heard of this project to build these substations and realised the impact this will have on our lives.</i></p> <p><i>Our house will be directly opposite the substation, and we are currently renovating the property, which has been ongoing over 10 years, to be our retirement property, which we thought was a safe undertaking on green belt land.</i></p> <p><i>If this project goes ahead you will ruin us in one full swoop, not only will our property not be worth a penny, but our health will be impacted living in this kind of environment.</i></p> <p><i>We are appalled we have not been consulted and just sent a brochure as if the impact on us is going to be the same as any other residents in</i></p>	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<p>surrounding villages! This is huge and we want to be contacted immediately to discuss the implications and options we face.</p> <p>It is just not true to state in your brochure you have looked at environmental sensitivities such as proximity to residential properties! Our house will be in the middle of years of building works and how will we cope with that. We will see the huge building from our front window and be impacted by possible cancer risks, and we cannot escape as nobody will ever buy our house with all that going on. Please contact us immediately.)</p>	
TA_0097_002_171123	S44	Online feedback form	2		<p>I'm not sure of the full facts of what impact this has on the sea life this must be disruptive to their environment but I would prefer off shore power then building wind farms on shore close to peoples home and considering the list of ill effects this can cause on adults children and animals and the building, noise and eye sore on our country side. I do not want a on shore wind farm where I live in Newton.</p>	<p>An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken for the offshore topics of the Transmission Assets Application and is presented in Volume 2 of the ES (document reference F2). Specific examples relevant to marine life are listed below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2). - Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3). - Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4). - Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5). <p>Detailed assessments are provided within all onshore chapters within Volumes 3 and 4 of the ES (document reference F3 and F4). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets and will continue to work closely with all stakeholders.</p>
TA_0097_003_171123	S44	Online feedback form	3		<p>I totally oppose this project ! I do not want a wind farm sub station hub or cables near my home. Why can't it be done in a non residential area away from people or kept out in the sea</p>	<p>Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Maximum parameters for the substation have been refined following statutory consultation.</p>
TA_0097_013_171123	S44	Online feedback form	8		<p>This is literally the other side of my garden I do not want this building there and I don't think anyone else in the whole area is happy about it.</p>	<p>The Applicants note your response.</p>
TA_0097_0114_171123	S44	Online feedback form	9		<p>This is too close to my home I don't want the sub station here if it has to be done find somewhere else away from peoples homes</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0097_015_171123	S44	Online feedback form	10		Please do not have this onshore substation on Blackpool Road Newton please find alternative site	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3).</p> <p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0097_016_171123	S44	Online feedback form	11		I worry about the amount of power in this area. I hope you can come up with an alternative solution	<p>National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) are responsible for the electricity transmission distribution network in England and Wales. Both offshore wind farms will be responsible for ensuring the offshore system electrical infrastructure will operate within equipment ratings, and the ESO will ensure that equipment on the onshore transmission system is operated within limits.</p> <p>An Electro-Magnetic Fields (EMF) Compliance Statement (Volume 2, Annex 3.4 of the Environmental Statement) which provides further information on potential EMFs and the likely levels which may arise from the proposed development, has also been produced by the Applicants.</p>
TA_0097_017_171123	S44	Online feedback form	12		Do it somewhere else in the middle of know where miles away from houses	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0098_001_081123	S44	Online feedback form	3		It is not fair to dig up roads and fields from Blackpool all the way to Penwortham , disturbing residents lives and natural habitation of these areas .	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0098_016_081123	S44	Online feedback form	8		This area is vast and situated between Kirkham, Newton and Freckleton, and far too close to all three.	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<p>It will ruin the area completely with the disruption, noise, eyesore, cause of cancer, taking farmers land by compulsory purchase at a very low price.</p> <p>It is so unfair that huge powerful companies can just come in and ruin peoples lives who they dont know because it doesnt effect them.</p> <p>These farmers work hard for years and what for ?????</p> <p>For you all to come in and ruin everything ??</p> <p>All of the neighbours bought their houses looking over green belt fields.</p> <p>We are country people who work hard to pay for our houses in the country and keep them nice.</p> <p>Its just not fair.</p>	<p>(document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>
TA_0098_017_081123	S44	Online feedback form	9		<p>It is too big and in the wrong place. It needs to be down on Freckleton Marsh out of the way of everybody. Also see my comments above.</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0098_018_081123	S44	Online feedback form	10		<p>Hopefully none of them, but out of the two, the Newton site would be better as it is more out of sight, and you would have easier access from the A583.</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0099_001_081123	S44	Online feedback form	3		<p>I am a landowner bordering the edge of your transmission cable corridor. I have tried to digest some of the assets / volumes provided but find them terribly long and complicated. I have tried to attend one of your public consultations but was in a queue for 30 minutes and never reached the front so have not been able to get to ask a real person to summarise. I was unable to make the online webinar and have not seen a recording link posted, which would be very beneficial.</p> <p>I do not support your proposals for the onshore elements because I cannot understand what I am supporting and with the REDACTED areas bordering my land, being already underwater most of the winter months, I cannot understand if and how your project may impact this - I can only see it having a negative impact.</p> <p>When I originally spoke to one of your representatives on the phone to ask why we were sent so much paperwork, he told me that the transmission line would be buried under our road - the plans only a few months later look very different - I am not happy supporting anything that feels so fluid.</p>	<p>The statutory consultation ran for over six weeks, exceeding the 28 day statutory minimum requirement. Respondents could provide feedback at any time throughout this period. During this consultation, the Application held eight events both online and in-person. The online event was recorded and made available to view on the Transmission Assets website.</p> <p>In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information.</p> <p>The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).</p>
TA_0252_001_221123	S44	Online feedback form	1		<p>I feel the proposal for the cabling to run across the Fylde has been ill-conceived. Whilst I am not against the principle of having the windfarms in the Irish Sea, I am against the damage to be inflicted on local businesses and the environment.</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets and will continue to work closely with all stakeholders.</p>
TA_0252_004_221123	S44	Online feedback form	5		<p>I feel there are better options less disruptive to the environment, and local communities and businesses by either taking the cabling up the River Ribble to Penwortham or to Hesham Nuclear Processing Plant which is shortly to be decommissioned and has infrastructure already setup to supply electricity to the national grid.</p>	<p>The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						<p>designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).</p> <p>The connection location for the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Windfarms was determined by the Electricity System Operator's (ESO) Holistic Network Design (HND) process. The HND report was published in July 2022 and assessed potential connection locations and associated transmission network reinforcements for all The Crown Estate (TCE) Round 4 offshore wind lease areas. The Applicants do not have the detailed assessments that ESO produced, however the Heysham and Middleton Substations already connect a number of existing offshore windfarm and additional cabling would likely be difficult to this area.</p>
TA_0100_001_241023	S44	Online feedback form	1		<p>I live on REDACTED and see that your on shore cables look to be potentially running along our road. This is not acceptable it is already a busy road that floods due to building so any further cables will cause further issues. As far as I see it you can run the on land cables further down the coast passed freckleton where there is not much residential property.</p> <p>The only reason I can see you not doing this is cost because you have to run cables further along the sea, estuary bottom, but this should not be a factor in your consideration when it comes to disruption of residents buildings and environment.</p>	<p>The assessment of the impact of increased flood risk arising from additional surface water runoff is presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2).</p> <p>Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2).</p> <p>An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase.</p> <p>The Applicants through Dalcour Maclaren and appointed drainage specialists will engage with landowners regarding pre-construction and post-construction drainage, tying into existing infrastructure where possible. The Outline CoCP and outline surface water and groundwater management plan (document reference J1.9) includes measures in relation to drainage. The Operational Drainage Management Plan will be developed in line with the latest relevant drainage guidance notes in consultation with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority (Lancashire County Council).</p> <p>The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).</p> <p>The assessment of the impact of increased flood risk arising from additional surface water runoff is presented within section 2.11.4 of</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase.
TA_0100_002_241023	S44	Online feedback form	2		Yes select sites that do not need cables run in residential areas	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0100_003_241023	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.7	Not in residential areas when there are other options but are costlier Too much traffic and noise already here	Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed traffic and noise assessments are provided within ES Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport (document reference F3.7) and ES Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration (document reference F3.8). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0100_004_241023	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.8	As above <i>(Not in residential areas when there are other options but are costlier Too much traffic and noise already here)</i>	Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed traffic and noise assessments are provided within ES Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport (document reference F3.7) and ES Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration (document reference F3.8). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0100_005_241023	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.9	As above <i>(Not in residential areas when there are other options but are costlier Too much traffic and noise already here)</i>	Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed traffic and noise assessments are provided within ES Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport (document reference F3.7)

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						and ES Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration (document reference F3.8). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0100_006_241023	S44	Online feedback form	4	4.1	This will be a blot on our landscape , as it is the residents that suffer . I suggest half the profits from the selling of the power goes to the local authorities fir them to put into local council services for the benefit of the residents , which have to put up with this blot on the landscape.	An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects.
TA_0100_008_241023	S44	Online feedback form	8		Yes move the. Near penworthem	Ahead of the guidance being published we have been engaging with local people, <i>businesses and organisations to identify key themes and projects that will deliver strategic benefits and directly support the local community and local priorities.</i>
TA_0101_001_121123	S44	Online feedback form	1		I reject that this be built off the Queensway, this will have a detrimental effect on local wildlife and local residents.	Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets and will continue to work closely with all stakeholders.
TA_0101_002_121123	S44	Online feedback form	2		Yes - I don't have a clue where its going as your information is filled to confuse people and is not helpful at all.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0101_003_121123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.6	I reject that the green land around Kilnhouse Lane be used for storing of machinery as a dog walker I use this land daily and will have a huge impact.	The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets on recreational resources, including PRow are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES. Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of this chapter of the ES. This includes preparation of a PRow Management Strategy in general accordance with the Outline PRow Management Strategy (document reference J1.5) submitted with the DCO application. The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g. National Cycle Routes (NCRs), Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Transmission Assets.
TA_0101_008_121123	S44	Online feedback form	6		Yes. I reject. I as many others use the green land for dog walking several times a day, by doing this will have a huge impact on my daily routine.	The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets on recreational resources, including PRow are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES. Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of this chapter of the ES. This includes preparation of a PRow Management Strategy in general accordance with the Outline PRow Management Strategy (document reference J1.5) submitted with the DCO application. The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g. National Cycle Routes (NCRs), Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Transmission Assets.
TA_0102_001_211123	S44	Online feedback form	1		extremely concerned that i may lose land for my rescue horses that took years to find after many local stables, livery yards and riding schools being shut down and sold for building developments. we have worked hard to develop REDACTED and improve the grazing and natural habitats not only for horses but other wild life too. after seeing how much wildlife has been lost and displaced when the houses were built on oak lane it concerns me we are going to see destruction of more rural areas, green fields, habitat for these animals but also loss of land for country pursuits	The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets on recreational resources, including livery yards, stables and PRow are identified and assessed in Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). This includes preparation of a PRow Management Strategy in general accordance with the Outline PRow Management Plan (document reference J1.5) submitted with the DCO application. The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Plan seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g. NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Transmission Assets.
TA_0102_003_211123	S44	Online feedback form	2		i could not imagine anything worse than having a substation near the yard, it would massively impact the peace of the area but also the place is my families solace - we chose REDACTED because its rural, beautiful and peaceful to spend time outdoors with our animals doing the thing we love. the noise would also impact the horses as they have much more sensitive hearing than us. it took us 5 years to find and purchase REDACTED and currently there is nothing like it available on the market. there are very few other places to keep horses locally, most are over crowded have a lack of grazing per head and have long waiting lists so i cannot afford to lose REDACTED and neither can my horses. it is devastating to all local land and home owners in the area to think we might have to live by a horrid substation which would hugely impact our daily lives and health. i cant imagine losing any land to pipes etc, the land we are on is marshy	This consultee is no longer captured by the draft order limits. The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets on recreational resources, including livery yards, stables and PRow are identified and assessed in Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). This includes preparation of a PRow Management Strategy in general accordance with the Outline PRow Management Plan (document reference J1.5) submitted with the DCO application. The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Plan seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<p>as it is with very narrow access down the lane, if the land were to be dug up for laying cables etc it would be rendered useless as grazing land for years as once the soil is disturbed the microbiome/bacteria in it is completely altered and there is a huge risk of horses contracting grass sickness if the land is re used for grazing. it would take years for that risk to diminish.</p> <p>i could not more strongly oppose the development</p>	<p>promoted routes (e.g. NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Transmission Assets.</p>
TA_0102_010_211123	S44	Online feedback form	7		<p>yes extremely concerned this might ruin my land and all the work and money that has gone into creating an ideal living environment for our rescue horses over the years.</p> <p>not only that but if parrox lane is used for any form of access it will further damage an already fragile single track lane and cause excess traffic issues due to very limited passing places on the lane</p>	<p>The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets on recreational resources, including livery yards, stables and PRow are identified and assessed in Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6).</p> <p>Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). This includes preparation of a PRow Management Strategy in general accordance with the Outline PRow Management Plan (document reference J1.5) submitted with the DCO application. The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Plan seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g. NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Transmission Assets.</p> <p>Traffic and transport impacts arising during the construction phase of the Transmission Assets have been fully assessed at section 7.11 Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference E3.7).</p> <p>Details of the operation and maintenance phases are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Onshore maintenance would be limited to essential maintenance and/or emergency works.</p>
TA_0102_012_211123	S44	Online feedback form	9		<p>build it on brown belt or as far away from peoples homes and farms as possible !</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0102_013_211123	S44	Online feedback form	10		<p>if any option 2 as it is the furthest away from newton village and farms/ numerous stables in newton</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3).</p> <p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0104_001_101123	S44	Online feedback form	3		I Strongly Object to Option 1 (north of higher ballam) cable route on the lytham moss due to the major impact on my agricultural business, surrounding agricultural and equestrian businesses, the financial toll and damage it would have on these businesses and local residents on division lane and environmental damage and impact on green belt farm land. This area is protected green belt, development is damaging and harmful to the environment and in my opinion the option 2 cable route (south of higher ballam) would be preferable if this project ever happens.	The Applicants have made design changes since PEIR and the southern option (Option 2) which passed through to the south of Higher Balham has been removed, to mitigate potential impacts related to ornithology on the Farmland Conservation Area. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0104_001_101123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.3	Cable route option 1 in lytham moss (north of higher ballam) passes through green belt land and should be re routed or pass through option 2 (south of higher ballam)	It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0104_004_101123	S44	Online feedback form	16		I feel this is an extremely poorly thought out project, especially the onshore cable routing, having a grossly negative and damaging environmental impact on protected green belt farm land in essential areas for businesses and residents, also a poorly executed consultation period that expires long before the projects planning and routing is decided, this is a questionable way of using a feedback system on the most badly effected by this process, leaving A community who unequivocally objects to the project.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Maximum parameters for the substation have been refined following statutory consultation. It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0105_001_231123	S44	Online feedback form	1		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the proposed siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0105_002_231123	S44	Online feedback form	2		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0105_003_231123	S44	Online feedback form	5		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0105_004_231123	S44	Online feedback form	6		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						(document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0105_005_231123	S44	Online feedback form	7		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0105_006_231123	S44	Online feedback form	8		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.	<p>views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0105_007_231123	S44	Online feedback form	9		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0105_008_231123	S44	Online feedback form	10		I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0105_009_231123	S44	Online feedback form	11		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0105_010_231123	S44	Online feedback form	14		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0105_011_231123	S44	Online feedback form	16		<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's.</p> <p>This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.</p> <p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0106_001_281023	S44	Online feedback form	1		<p>This feedback (in this section) is more on shore related. Generally the proposed project has been high on promotional material for the project but oblique when it comes to meaningful information with respect to the community. Information is scattered in a number of volumes of material, as are figures. Maps are so generally represented as to almost be of no use. It is very clear that there will be major trench works or up to 25Km and either one or a number of sub stations. With the effort that has gone in to planning such a project, there is clearly contractor planned routes for the trench and the substation(s). You are kindly requested to be crisp in the provision of you information, noting the these underground cables will emit as much radiation as overhead power lines which are well known to have health impacts. Generally lines should be at least 250 metres away from residential housing, ideally far more. And there are drops of up to 30% in house values for properties within 500 metres. There has already been an incident of a house sale falling through as a result of the (unclear) plans demonstrating this impact.</p> <p>In addition, a proposed depth of under 2 metres is woefully inadequate for power lines of the voltage being set out. Electric radiation is inhibited to a degree by physical barrier but magnetic radiation much less so. Both of these radiations are perilous, it might be fine in a field full of cows that can go back to a barn but not permanently adjacent to residential properties. Further St Annes only has two main exit/entry roads and the councils & contractors have proven to be inept when it comes to traffic management (for even the smallest of changes), with significant impacts upon business and welfare (people have struggled when needing to get to the hospital sited in Blackpool)</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Further details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8). Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used. With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing. Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex. See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4).</p>
TA_0106_005_281023	S44	Online feedback form	2		it is clear that Lytham St Annes is the preferred routing and the RAG rating appears to be crafted to support this. promoting issues at other sites whilst downplaying challenges at Lytham St Annes. Whilst I am being informed no decision has been taken, this is disingenuous. Decisions have been taken to promote Lytham St Annes as the ideal site and the material is being gamed to support this.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0106_012_281023	S44	Online feedback form	4	4.2	Does the propose development impact ordinances concerning airport/greenbelt land and its use.	It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0106_013_281023	S44	Online feedback form	8		It appears the information is geared to promote Lytham St Annes and downplay other sites. Accordingly there appear bias in the evaluation. Lytham St Annes is a high occupancy residential zone and such developments are not considered suitable. There will be a number of impacts - traffic, noise, health and economic (dropping house prices)	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0106_014_281023	S44	Online feedback form	9		It appears the information is geared to promote Lytham St Annes and downplay other sites. Accordingly there appear bias in the evaluation. Lytham St Annes is a high occupancy residential zone and such developments are not considered suitable. There will be a number of impacts - traffic, noise, health and economic (dropping house prices)	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0106_015_281023	S44	Online feedback form	10		There is no information on the size and scale of the substation. Is it a green box or the size of a house?	Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage.
TA_0106_016_281023	S44	Online feedback form	16		Generally the proposed project has been high on promotional material for the project but oblique when it comes to meaningful information with respect to the community. Information is scattered in a number of volumes of material, as are figures. Maps are so generally represented as to almost be of no use. It is very clear that there will be major trench works or up to 25Km and either one or a number of sub stations. With the effort that has gone in to planning such a project, there is clearly contractor planned routes for the trench and the substation(s). You are kindly requested to be crisp in the provision of you information, noting the these underground cables will emit as much radiation as overhead power lines which are well known to have health impacts. Generally lines should be at least 250 metres away from residential housing, ideally far more. And there are drops of up to 30% in house values for properties within 500 metres. There has already been an incident of a house sale falling through as a result of the (unclear) plans	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3:

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<p>demonstrating this impact.</p> <p>In addition, a proposed depth of under 2 metres is woefully inadequate for power lines of the voltage being set out. Electric radiation is inhibited to a degree by physical barrier but magnetic radiation much less so. Both of these radiations are perilous, it might be fine in a field full of cows that can go back to a barn but not permanently adjacent to residential properties. Further St Annes only has two main exit/entry roads and the councils & contractors have proven to be inept when it comes to traffic management (for even the smallest of changes), with significant impacts upon business and welfare (people have struggled when needing to get to the hospital sited in Blackpool)</p>	<p>Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). An assessment on human health in relation to air quality impacts, including emissions associated with construction and decommissioning activities, has been undertaken (refer to Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1)). Operational air quality effects (e.g., maintenance vehicle emissions) are not anticipated to be of a scale, even accounting for non-threshold effects, that could affect population health.</p> <p>Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used. With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing. Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex. See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4). Details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8).</p>
TA_0107_001_221123	S44	Online feedback form	3		<p>Option 1 would be preferable so as not to impact my residence. As a young family we object to the cables being routed through or even near to an oversized family estate and one where a prospective school is planned.</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0107_005_221123	S44	Online feedback form	15		<p>Choose an alternative route away from people - i.e. the Ribble Estuary!</p>	<p>The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0107_006_221123	S44	Online feedback form	16		With a direct route from the Irish Sea up the River Ribble to Penwortham available, why drill through the Fylde affecting thousands of homes and local residents?	The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0108_011_231123	S44	Online feedback form	2		This should be located in a more appropriate area ie the land around Penwortham where there is an existing substation.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0111_001_131123	S44	Hardcopy feedback form	3		This is the wrong site for landfall. The proposal to go across the Nature Reserve which is an important SSSI is wrong and should not proceed. The impact on the Nature Reserve and the properties nearby is too damaging.	The approach to site selection has been based on avoiding damage to Important Ecological Features where practicable, as is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). In addition, during an iterative process of EIA, locations where trenchless techniques will be used to avoid impacts on IEFs. have been identified. Where temporary habitat loss is unavoidable, such as where construction accesses need to cross hedges, this will be rectified by reinstating habitats in accordance with the specifications provided in the Ecological Management Plan. An Outline Ecological Management Plan (document reference J6) is provided as part of the application for development consent. Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3) assesses the impacts on Lytham St. Anne's Dunes SSSI. Direct pipe trenchless installation is proposed in this location as it is the most appropriate for use in sensitive settings, in part because it reduces the risk of collapse that is associated with cable installation using horizontal directional drilling (HDD).
TA_0111_013_131123	S44	Hardcopy feedback form	5		This project should not use the proposed landfall site. It will disturb the habitat of the Nature Reserve (SSSI), the propoerties along the railway line (REDACTED) will have major cabilt (sic) at the end of their gardens with risk to health, property values and saleability will be badly affected.	Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3) assesses the impacts on Lytham St. Anne's Dunes SSSI. Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used. With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						<p>Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex. See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4). The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>
TA_0111_014_131123	S44	Hardcopy feedback form	6		Compound areas, both temporary and permanent, will cause problems for local (sic) residents. This Project is in the wrong area. The Ribble Estuary should be used direct to Penwortham Substation.	<p>The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).</p>
TA_0111_015_131123	S44	Hardcopy feedback form	12		It is not enough. The Proposal should NOT proceed at this site.	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0111_017_131123	S44	Hardcopy feedback form	16		The SSSI of Lytham St Annes Nature Reserve should NOT be involved in this Project. An alternative route should be used. The cabling proposed along the Railway line in REDACTED should not proceed. There are obvious health issues and a devaluation of property worth is inevitable. The Project should NOT go ahead using the proposed landfall site and route. Alternatives should once again be considered.	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). The impact on Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI is considered within section 1.11.9 of Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1) and in section 3.11 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).
TA_0112_003_231123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.3	See above, the natural dunes are a place of enjoyment for residents, attract tourists and host a number of biodiverse habitats. I am not in favour of Lytham St Annes as a landing site	The impact on Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI is considered within section 1.11.9 of Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1) and in section 3.11 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).
TA_0112_007_231123	S44	Online feedback form	4		As a resident living on a road you have marked in Lytham St Annes as a possible site. I'd like to strenuously object to plans to onshore the wind farm here. It is a quiet, residential neighbourhood that does not need an increased risk of flooding, noise, disruption and threat to local natural habitats such as the dunes. I would much prefer the you to move to areas already semi industrialised such as the airport.	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>The assessment of the impact of increased flood risk arising from additional surface water runoff is presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2).</p> <p>Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2).</p> <p>An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase.</p>
TA_0112_008_231123	S44	Online feedback form	5		I have already stated my opinion as to location. Please consider the impact on property owners in Lytham St Annes, residential areas with families and already heavy demands on the road infrastructure. Etc.	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p> <p>Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0112_009_231123	S44	Online feedback form	11		Can you be clear about the impact on residents in this location, especially disrupting travel etc and the disabled or elderly. What will it look like? Will it be very ugly? There is lots of information but little in the way of detail.	<p>Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1). Further details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8).</p> <p>Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage.</p>
TA_0113_004_151123	S44	Online feedback form	7		<p>I responded to the non statutory consultation regarding the totally inappropriate use of the Hillock Lane/ Kirkham Road area for the onshore export cable corridor and the temporary compound . I can see no reference in the PEIR to consideration of my previous comments. So I will reiterate that Hillock Lane and Kirkham Road (north of the by pass) are local routes for traffic between Warton/ Wrea Green and Freckleton.</p> <p>Hillock Lane is regularly blocked when larger than average vehicles try and use the lane at peak times - school times and going to a from work . It cannot cope with the current volume of traffic let alone traffic to support a large compound and associated vehicles.The area close to the vets is single track and car tracks will show that grass verges and farm gateways are frequently used to avoid vehicles as there are no designated passing places.</p> <p>It is incredulous that a project of this size and impact is relying on a narrow country lane to deliver the cable corridor to the onshore transmission assets.</p> <p>Kirkham Road from Hillock Lane to Freckleton is a long straight section of Road with speeding traffic and the junction of Hillock Lane and Kirkham Road is notorious for serious road traffic accidents including fatalities. The line of sight when emerging out of Hillock Lane onto Kirkham Road is very poor .</p> <p>The cable corridor should be alongside the A583 area/ local railway lines.This would provide better access and less disruption to local community traffic flows .</p> <p>In summary the prosed route alongside Hillock Lane and Kirkham Road is not safe.</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3).</p> <p>Traffic and transport impacts arising during the construction phase of the Transmission Assets have been fully assessed at section 7.11 Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference E3.7).</p> <p>Details of the operation and maintenance phases are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Onshore maintenance would be limited to essential maintenance and/or emergency works.</p> <p>Further details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8).</p>
TA_0113_005_151123	S44	Online feedback form	8		<p>The proposed area is green belt and the proposals are not in line with the Fylde Local plan. Local communities will be impacted severely by the huge substations in terms of the visual impact , noise and light pollution.</p> <p>An offshore wind farm project should be able to utilise the River Ribble to reach the national grid rather than creating large blots on the landscape.</p> <p>The current plans are impacting on the environment of local communities.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						<p>substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.</p> <p>The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).</p> <p>Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0113_006_151123	S44	Online feedback form	10		Option 1 North should be the preferred option. Closer to A583 access.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0115_001_051123	S44	Online feedback form	1		<p>I reside on REDACTED off REDACTED in St Annes. Whilst I am in support of increasing access to renewable energy, I am deeply concerned about the disruption this project will have on where I live, and the negative impact on the value of my property.</p> <p>We have had to endure 6 years of living on a building site whilst completing the estate on which I live (which should be complete by year end) to then hear we could be faced with further construction in the immediate area was very deflating. Not only that, but REDACTED has had relentless disruption over last few years with the expansion of the cycle lane etc and with clifton drive being just one of two entries into St Annes the impact to residents and tourism has been massive. So to hear drilling would have to go underneath (and therefore road closure) is just something that is going to cause immense frustration to the residents.</p>	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					My property overlooks the airport and an empty space between the 2 coastal dunes sites which was described as a no build zone because of the flight path from the airport. On the other side of our estate (towards St Annes) is a conservation area which we hope is not going to be disturbed. That on top of the sand dunes also being part of a conservation project, I cannot support the laying of the cables in the proposed area.	Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0115_002_051123	S44	Online feedback form	2		Honestly can't figure out where the proposed area is...	The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).

E1.16.5.2 Site selection and consideration of alternatives table of responses (via all other methods)

Table E1.16.5.2: Site selection and consideration of alternatives table of responses (via all other methods)

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0001_014_231123	S42	Email	<p>1.13 Volume 1, Chapter 3, 3.7.3.9</p> <p>Where the cable corridor crosses an area of high-density boulders and coarse material, we recommend the developer considers micro-siting if there is capacity within the planned cable corridor. We note that the developer has stated boulder clearance would occur within the footprint of installation activities. However, specific boulder clearance methodology and the location for boulder deposition should clearly be stated within the Application.</p> <p>Boulder clearance methodology and location of boulder deposition should be clearly stated within the ES along with further details for micro-siting of cables if applicable.</p>	<p>The description of seabed preparation including boulder clearance has been refined and is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Micrositing of cables around boulders would be onerous and impractical. Boulders pose a risk of damage and exposure to cables as well as an obstruction risk to the cable installation equipment. Therefore, any boulders identified as likely to impact installation will need to be moved to the side (side cast), away from the immediate location of the cable infrastructure. There are two key methods of clearing boulders, boulder plough and boulder grab. Where a high density of boulders is seen, the expectation is that a plough will be required to clear the cable installation corridor. Where medium and low densities of boulders are present, a subsea grab is expected to be employed. Boulder clearance will occur within the footprint of other site preparation activities. All boulders will remain in the vicinity (i.e. sidecast only) of the area they were cleared from. Sidecasting will not result in significant increases in SSC or changes to the seabed characteristics or physical processes.</p>
TA_0002_008_171123	S42	Email	<p>4. Scope of the Proposed Project and Selection of Possible Alternative Routes From the Consultation Events, the project has had quite a narrow scope imposed upon it, such that investigation of possible alternative routes was not able to be discussed properly or any relevant questions answered. For example, when questioned about the possibility of coming ashore at Heysham, where two nuclear plants are currently active, it was stated that this was out of scope and the capacity there was inadequate to deal with the output from the MMWF. This should be questioned, as Heysham 1 and 2 plants are capable of 6GW power generation, MMWF is planned at 4.5MW, but more significantly, Heysham is planned to commence decommissioning work in 2025/6 for Heysham 1, with Heysham 2 following in 2028. The build completion for the current project is currently planned for 2029, which would imply that the on-shore capacity at Heysham should be easily capable of taking the load into the National Grid – presumably at far lower cost to the public purse, even allowing for any infrastructure refurbishment. Equally, routing along the River Ribble to Penwortham has been dismissed rather too easily, despite the existence of other cables in the riverbed already.</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0002_010_171123	S42	Email	<p>6. Provided Information – Inadequacy As noted, the information provided was lacking in detail such that the landowners affected by the development could not fully appreciate the implications on their own businesses. The team responsible appeared to have little knowledge as to where the landowners are located, in relation to the proposed works on their properties, as reflected in the mess made of establishing the contacts and their addresses properly Experience garnered from those exposed to other developments of a similar nature highlights some of the dangers that have yet to be considered. For example, the proposed underground cable conduits are likely to require access manholes or inspection chambers along the route. In other examples, these have resulted in raised mounds as the disturbed land gradually sinks. This can result in damage to very expensive farm machinery that may be engaged in crop cutting, whether for silage or for arable crops. No definition of such obstacles has been provided as it is considered “premature at this stage”. The implication is that the overall design of the whole system has not yet achieved an adequate level of maturity to enable meaningful assessment of associated risks and costs of installation, ownership, and finally retirement of the system. Yet in other areas, the progress seems bogged down in unnecessary details, for examples challenges relating to ownership of small parcels of land identified on maps, which are gateways to the fields and properties where the actual gate may be set back from a road to allow a vehicle to stop and gain access to the field in question without blocking the roadway! This appears to be being used to obfuscate the real issues where decent design information is sadly lacking. A further example is the lack of forethought that relates to the predicted changes in sea levels that is the driver for the need for green energy. The Fylde and Ribble estuary are naturally low lying with the EA having provided forecasts of the changes in flood risk in the recent past. This does not appear to have been considered, to date.</p>	<p>Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the applicants, obtained landowner information and addresses through HMLR searches, in accordance with the land referencing methodology. Following the identification of landowners, meetings were offered and held where requested (as set on the Consultation Report document reference E1). The design of the Transmission Assets is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This includes details of the required joint bays and link boxes. Joint bays will be completely buried, with the land above reinstated. An inspection cover will be provided at the surface for link boxes for access during the operation and maintenance phase. The precise location of these will be identified during the detailed design phase. Flood risk, including allowances for sea level rise, has been considered in Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3).</p>
TA_0002_011_171123	S42	Email	<p>7. Observations on Funding, Compensation and Payment Issues They were unaware that the proposed sectioning of fields would render the remainder of many fields as unusable, as all</p>	<p>Field sizes and farm viability have been taken into consideration in the site selection process, as reported in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>access had been destroyed and the associated hedge boundaries destroyed. As an example, where the proposed development tracks across the road from Freckleton to Kirkham, at Hall Cross, many fields are being cut diagonally, leaving small triangular sections that are inaccessible and impossible to farm for anything that will be useful, but these areas remain outside of the proposed compensation schemes. On the eastern side of Kirkham Road, the possible site of one of the sub-stations, there is a dairy farm which has just received a UK silver award for best Grassland Farm and the proposed development will effectively destroy the lifetime of work that has gone into this, with that farm being divided into two parts and with significant permanent loss of land. How can anyone be compensated for this sort of loss, even on a temporary basis? The assumption that farms that rely on grazing can acquire their winter feed from outside is fundamentally flawed. Most of these farms grow their grass to provide their winter feed, so anything that takes these fields out of production automatically upsets the local ecosystem that supports the farm. There is an ecosystem here that has been in operation for years that produces the farm products in an eminently sustainable and self-sufficient way. This will be destroyed. Even after restoration, those fields with underground cables will fail to be as productive as they once were. It is still possible to see the impact of developments made by the Romans in the crop structures of the Fylde. This will be far more impactful. The consequence is that proposers appear to have grossly underestimated the costs of compensation that would associate with the land acquisition and the ability to return much of the land to productive use. Currently, they are not considering compensation for loss of earnings for anyone affected by their development from their pot of funds, at least.</p>	<p>consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). Details of effects in terms of agricultural land use are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 6: L:and use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). In the event that substantiated and tangible losses are incurred as a result of the Transmission Assets, they will be compensated for under the compensation code upon the implementation of the development consent order.</p>
TA_0002_015_171123	S42	Email	<p>9. Conclusions The overall conclusion that the Parish Council has reached is that, with the evidence and status presented, we must object to the proposals. The following reasons support this objection: 1) The consultation process has been flawed in its execution.2) Insufficient information has been provided to enable a proper assessment of the impact of the design on the total environment of the Fylde.3) Consequently, the proposed plan does not have a level of maturity commensurate with presentation for approval.4) The impact on individual landowners has not been determined, relating to both the development and implementation phase and the subsequent in-service life cycle of the system.5) Costs associated with levels of compensation appear to have been underestimated.6) The impression has been created that the programme is underfunded and that any additional costs would have to be sought by access to the public purse, a similar situation to that occurring with the HS2 project.7) The impact of the loss of amenity, for both residents and visitors, is considered too high a price to pay for the proposed development, when all possible alternatives have been summarily dismissed for reasons that are unclear.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes your response. Responses to detailed comments provided in turn associated to each topic raised (see unique reference TA_0002).</p>
TA_0003_003_221123	S42/S44	Email	<p>In addition to the lack of certainty regarding the scheme that is being consulted upon, the council is concerned that the consultation material has not contained sufficient detail to allow an assessment of potential impacts to be considered. In particular, based on the summary documents that have been produced it is difficult to understand the siting of infrastructure and cable routing. Whilst additional detail is contained in the on-line documentation, many members of the community have not been able to locate this information amongst the extensive documentation contained in the PIER.</p>	<p>The design of the Transmission Assets has been developed further since the statutory consultation (PEIR). This design evolution has taken into account the findings of the iterative EIA process and feedback from stakeholders. As such the location of key elements of the Transmission Assets and the Order Limits have been refined, as reflected in the application for development consent. Further targeted consultation has been undertaken, for example, for landowners where additional land interests have been identified. At the PEIR and ES stages, a non-technical summary has been provided to summarise the findings of the EIA process in non-technical language.</p>
TA_0003_005_221123	S42/S44	Email	<p>Planning Policy Green belt Details of the site selection process for the assets are addressed in the PEIR. Volume 1 Ch 4 Table 4.6 advises: "The site selection chapter (Sections 4.10, 4.11 and Table 4.12: Onshore Substations Search Area RAG Appraisal Rating of this chapter) has identified areas within the Green Belt and how the Transmission Assets have been sited to avoid such areas where practicable or identify the need for consultation with the local planning authority with respect to the development, and to minimise potential environmental impacts. Further assessment on geological assets is considered in in Volume 3; Chapter 1: Geology, Hydrogeology and Ground Conditions of this PEIR, with ecology considered in Volume 3; Chapter 3: Onshore Ecology and Nature Conservation of this PEIR, and potential landscape impacts considered in Volume 4; Chapter 1: Seascape, Landscape, and Visual Impact Assessment of this PEIR" Volume 1 Ch4 Table 4.13 – "A small western part of the zone is within the Green Belt under the Fylde Local Plan to 2032 Strategic Policy GD2; development must protect, enhance or restore landscape character, as appropriate." The Preferred Morgan and the Morecambe Option 2</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the Transmission Assets Order Limits pass through Green Belt land and that parts of the onshore cable routes and the onshore substations fall within the Green Belt. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). When assessed on the planning balance, in particular regarding the significant benefits of the Transmission Assets in relation to facilitating the connection of two nationally significant offshore wind farms to the national grid, this outweighs the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness or any other harm. The assessment also takes into account matters such as visual amenity impact and landscape character which relate to the openness of the Green Belt. The scheme design has been developed through an iterative process to achieve a design freeze, including consideration of alternative onshore substation location options.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			(South) onshore substation sites are both located entirely within the designated green belt. There is no evidence contained within the documentation that demonstrates how the site selection process has been carried out and why it is necessary to locate these very large structures in the greenbelt. On the contrary, the site selection criteria set out above has not been followed in selecting the site. Instead, there appears to be a reliance on being able to demonstrate very special circumstances, but before jumping to this justification, Fylde Council considers that alternative sites located outside the green belt must be first considered. The impact of development on the openness of the greenbelt is capable of having both spatial and visual aspects. The assessments that have been made appear to rely on the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the visual aspects of the substations. There is little, if any, assessment on the impact of the proposed development on the spatial impact of the development. The visual impact of the proposed substations is addressed further below, but it is considered that there needs to be further assessment of the spatial impact of the substations on the openness of the green belt and its policy objectives. An assessment of these two aspects of openness is required in order to fully inform the weight to be applied to very special circumstances in reaching the final decision.	Alternative designs and technology are considered in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0003_006_221123	S42/S44	Email	Wherever the substations are located, it is essential that the technology used minimises the need for the substations, the size of the structures required, and/or delivers the structures in a disaggregated form to minimise their visual impact in the landscape.	The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the onshore substations, including - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets- refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received. Details of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). In addition, an Outline Landscape Management plan (document reference J2) has been prepared as part of the ES to include measures to mitigate effects on landscape and visual receptors during construction, operation and maintenance of the Transmission Assets.
TA_0003_007_221123	S42/S44	Email	Area of Separation The area of separation (Policy GD3) in this part of the borough seeks to maintain the gap between the settlements of Kirkham and Newton. The policy seeks to exercise a greater control over the location of inappropriate development than in the wider countryside allocations set out under policy GD4. The Morecambe Option 1 (North) onshore substation site is located entirely within the area of separation. The location of this substation in an area intended to remain free of development would be contrary to the provisions of this policy. It would be necessary to demonstrate material planning considerations as to why this site is required for development having ruled out other potential locations. No attempt to demonstrate this site selection process is presented and so the documentation and this aspect of the proposal is flawed in that respect.	Land covered by the Area of Separation policy is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). When assessed on the planning balance, in particular regarding the significant benefits of the Transmission Assets in relation to facilitating the connection of two nationally significant offshore wind farms to the national grid, this outweighs the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness or any other harm. The assessment also takes into account matters such as visual amenity impact and landscape character which relate to the openness of the Green Belt. The scheme design has been developed through an iterative process to achieve a design freeze, including consideration of alternative onshore substation location options. Alternative designs and technology are considered in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0003_008_221123	S42/S44	Email	Sterilisation of Allocated Development Sites The proposed route of the cables in key locations, such as around Blackpool Airport, Queensway and to the east of Freckleton remains undefined. The route passes over or close by a number of sites that are allocated for development in the Fylde Local Plan to 2032 (incorporating Partial Review). There is, therefore, potential for the cables themselves and the required easement areas around them to sterilise the development potential of these allocated sites and so adversely impact the delivery of the development plan objectives. In addition to potential physical impacts, there is also potential for impacts from Electromagnetic Fields to adversely impact upon air navigation aids. It is noted that the proposed cable route runs in close proximity to both Blackpool Airport and Warton Aerodrome and the proposed substations sit beneath the approach to the main runway at Blackpool Airport and are relatively close to BAE System's Warton site. Both airfields contain active runways where such	The allocations designated in the Fylde Local Plan 2032 (incorporating Partial Review) have been taken into consideration as part of the cable corridor alternatives (document reference F1.4) in order to avoid and mitigate any potential impacts on these allocations. Commentary regarding the plan allocation and the relationship with the cable corridor is also made in the Planning Statement (document reference J28) which demonstrates how the Transmission Assets do not sterilize or jeopardize these allocations or the Local Plan aims and objectives. The effects of EMF on navigation aids are assessed in Volume 3, Chapter 11: Aviation and radar of the ES (document reference F3.11)

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			navigation aids are critical to their safe continued operation. In turn these sites provide a significant economic benefit to the borough and so any potential impact on air navigation and air safety must be ruled out to the satisfaction of the operators of those facilities.	
TA_0005_002_231123	S42	Email	As a result the programme design is considered to remain inadequately immature, the consultation is therefore premature and the programme, therefore, proposes unacceptable risk at this point. This Parish Council also shares the conclusions of its Ward partner of Newton with Clifton Parish Council as they have currently presented in their web-site. The programme issues raised need to be addressed with urgency. A reconsultation then needs to take place and any further feedback fully acted upon, before the development should progress any further. This Parish Council is most willing to be contacted should the developer wish further clarification, otherwise it will be assumed that these matters will be fully acted upon. Please email : parishclerk@trw-parishcouncil.org.uk If developer representatives do not engage with the Parish Council it will be assumed that revised designs will be developed, published and presented to fully address the issues raised in this feedback. If that is an incorrect assumption then the Parish Council would request that it is engaged to explain why that is not correct.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0005_003_231123	S42	Email	Programme Development Issues - 1 It is considered at this stage that the development and the approach being adopted proposes an unnecessary, inadequately mitigated blight of a massive industrial complex being chosen to dominate the heart of south Fylde countryside space. The approach will destroy the distinct character of rural communities including Newton, Kirkham, Freckleton and so the wider countryside environment. In addition, the scheme currently involves essentially, as yet, unmitigated disruption to local communities by contractor activity across at least two decades of the six decade life of the programme across the whole of the Fylde. This is both: directly through adjacency to construction activity; or through ineffective controls of contractor traffic. The programme as presented proposes gross industrial development in the countryside, without any apparent attempt to comply with the nationally authorised local development plans. Notably there appears to be no attempt to utilise land already allocated to support such industrial activities in those plans, nor to recognise and give weight to designated Areas of Separation and Green Belt. Nor does there appear to be engagement with the applicable regulators, including local planning, environmental control and National Grid connection bodies to secure mitigated options. This needs to be corrected, before the programme proceeds any further. This proposal, as currently framed, is already causing negative perspectives of the impacts on the health & well-being of the local: residents; communities; economies; and environments.	The Applicants note your response. The scheme design has been developed through an iterative process, collaborating with stakeholders, to achieve a design freeze, including consideration of alternative onshore substation location options. Alternative designs and technology are considered in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). The construction programme is set out within Volume 1, Chapter 3; Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The Planning Statement (document reference J28) discusses effects on the Green Belt/Areas of Separation. Effects on the environment and community receptors are set out in Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). This includes an assessment of the effects of construction traffic at section 7.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7). Effects in relation to health are set out in Volume 1, Annex 5.1: Human health of the ES (document reference F1.5.1)
TA_0005_004_231123	S42	Email	2The proposed programme remains inadequately immature. There are claimed to be no designs for 18 hectares of converter stations and a swathe of cable route corridors that still cover most of the south east Fylde. As a result the impacts can neither be presented, nor mitigated. It is therefore, an inadequate and premature consultation. The baseline programme & options need to be matured and a re-consultation needs to be taken. It can only be speculation that presumably the lack of acceptable consultation information is an attempt to try to maintain a schedule for interests other than to the benefit of local ones.	The design of the Transmission Assets has been developed further since the statutory consultation (PEIR). This design evolution has taken into account the findings of the iterative EIA process and feedback from stakeholders. As such the location of key elements of the Transmission Assets and the Order Limits have been refined, as reflected in the application for development consent.
TA_0005_007_231123	S42	Email	5. Nor is it presented how best practice has been adopted to take on the experience from other equivalent projects (e.g. Walney & Dogger) that appear to have adopted less impactful designs and approaches of greater than half the scale.	The Transmission Assets provide a connection to the National Grid for two nationally significant offshore wind farms, and therefore two sets of transmission infrastructure are required. Details of the site selection process and alternatives considered are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). The measures proposed to control effects on the environment and communities are set out in the ES (document reference F1 to F4).
TA_0005_008_231123	S42	Email	6. Nor has there been evidenced assessments consistent with the other options presented of what it would take to continue the tidal sea based cable routing to the National Grid specified substation connection at Penwortham via the various potential routes across the estuary. It is noted that the developers already propose ingress across the environmentally controlled estuary for the developers' proposed land fall at Blackpool Airport. No presentation is provided for adopting a route along the coastal littoral zone routing minimising access across special protection areas. This would involve the engagement of the applicable regulatory bodies to deliver solutions. These assessments	The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives. Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively.</p>
TA_0005_110_231123	S42	Email	<p>ii. The converter stations at 20 metres high will tower above the low lying, flat rural landscape, the harm to community is recognised in the brochure with a suggestion of mitigation. as per the brochure trees would be planted and in 20 years would reach maturity and provide some cover which is totally inadequate and just illustrates the inappropriateness of what is being planned in the location. These apparently effectively unmitigated features do not seem to have sought the best practice from comparable projects where equivalent converter substations seem to be of a much smaller footprint and in more discrete locations.</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets provide a connection to the National Grid for two nationally significant offshore wind farms, and therefore two sets of transmission infrastructure are required. Details of the site selection process and alternatives considered are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). The measures proposed to control effects on the environment and communities are set out in the ES (document reference F1 to F4). The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor and onshore substations, including - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets- refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received. Details of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). These are based on the project description set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This chapter sets out the approach to site selection, including the use of the Project Design Envelope or Rochdale envelope approach, in line with case law.</p>
TA_0005_114_231123	S42	Email	<p>3. Scope of the consultation was unclear. The brochures and information provided leads one to believe that the cable routing and general location of the converter stations is a "done deal".</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Transmission Assets is fully committed to delivering a community benefits scheme in line with UK Government guidance, which is due to be published later this year. Ahead of the guidance being published we have been engaging with local people, businesses and organisations to identify key themes and projects that will deliver strategic benefits and directly support the local community and local priorities. We welcome further input from the local community and encourage you to reach out to the project team in due course.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0007_017_231123	S42/S44	Email	<p>2. Flood Risk Existing drainage systems are often dominated by combined sewers. This method of sewer infrastructure is a result of the time it was constructed, with combined sewers taking both foul and surface water. If there is a consistent approach to surface water management, it will help to manage and reduce surface water entering the sewer network, decreasing the likelihood of flooding from sewers, the impact on residents and businesses, and the impact on the environment. Whilst we do all that we can to reduce the risk of sewer flooding, there remains a residual risk, which is a source of flooding that should be considered in your Environmental Statement (ES). National policy is clear that flood risk from all sources, including sewers, must be considered in the delivery of new development. As such, it is important to ensure that the assessment of flood risk includes sewer flood risk. It should be ensured that your proposed development does not result in an increase in flood risk from the public sewer as a result of: i) any proposed new drainage connections to the public sewer. This is considered in further detail below; ii) by altering any existing exceedance flood paths of losses from the public sewer; iii) by locating any above ground elements of your proposal in areas where there is an existing risk of sewer flooding. There are a number of locations within the scoping boundary where our modelling data indicates flood water exceedance paths from the public sewer and we would need to liaise with you to assess your proposals in relation to this point and point ii); iv) as a result of any diversions / works to watercourses or existing sewers which could materially affect hydraulic performance and therefore change / increase any risk of flooding; v) as a result of any changes in ground levels which could materially change existing sewer flood risk; or vi) as a result of any changes to land or property currently affected by existing hydraulic sewer flooding incidents. We therefore request the Environmental Statement considers flood risk from the public sewerage system in liaison with United Utilities so that the above matters are fully considered.</p>	<p>A flood risk assessment assessing all sources of flooding, including sewers is presented within Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3). The proposed permanent infrastructure associated with the Morgan and Morecambe substations are located within Flood Zone 1 and has a low risk of flooding from all other assessed sources. The conceptual surface water drainage strategy is included within Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3). Also refer to the Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan (document reference J10). There is no proposed discharge to public sewers. Where the project is identified to have the potential to impact an asset of interest, the Applicants will seek to consult with all interested parties. This is to be undertaken once the location and type of watercourse crossings are confirmed as well as surface water discharge locations from onshore substations which is to come forward at detailed design stage.</p>
TA_0007_018_231123	S42/S44	Email	<p>You should also consider the risk of flooding from reservoirs. You should seek to ensure that reservoir flood paths are avoided in the location of your development. United Utilities manages a large portfolio of statutory and non-statutory reservoirs in the north west of England. It is essential that the ES adequately presents the impact of the development upon dam breach flood inundation mapping, which may affect the statutory dam safety designation of our reservoir assets. UK reservoir safety is regulated by the EA / DEFRA, and consultation with the EA, our Dam safety management team, and any relevant local authorities is required to ensure that any changes to dam safety risk is fully understood, is appropriate and is approved by the regulator and ourselves as reservoir operator.</p>	<p>A flood risk assessment assessing flood risk from reservoirs is included within Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3).</p>
TA_0007_019_231123	S42/S44	Email	<p>Impact on Watercourses United Utilities wishes to liaise with you to confirm the impact on any watercourses that interact with our assets to ensure that there are no detrimental consequences of these works in terms of asset operation, flood risk and changes to fluvial geomorphological processes.</p>	<p>Where the project is identified to have the potential to impact an asset of interest, the Applicants will seek to consult with all interested parties. This is to be undertaken once the location and type of watercourse crossings are confirmed as well as surface water discharge locations from onshore substations which is to come forward at detailed design stage.</p>
TA_0007_020_231123	S42/S44	Email	<p>3. Drainage - Foul and Surface Water We would be grateful if you can provide details of any drainage proposals in respect of both foul and surface water. This should include rates of discharge, volumes of discharge, points of connection, the nature and extent of any contaminants, and details of any necessary pre-treatment prior to connection to the public sewer. We request that you provide details of drainage during operation of the windfarm and during the construction period. We request further details of any approach for the storage and disposal of any hazardous fluids. We wish to understand whether there is any intention to connect such flows to our public sewerage network and to ensure any potential impact on water supply assets, including the groundwater environment, is fully considered and mitigated.</p>	<p>The conceptual surface water drainage strategy is included within Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3). Also refer to the Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan (document reference J10). There is no proposed discharge to public sewers. Additional information will come forward with the progression of the detailed drainage design where infiltration testing will inform the discharge location of surface water from onshore substations. If surface water will be discharged to watercourse, the discharge point will be set out within the DCO. Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk (document reference F3.2). In addition, best practice with regard the use and storage of oils, chemicals and other wastes, to remove the risk of causing pollution during construction is outlined within Outline CoCP (document reference J1).</p>
TA_0007_021_231123	S42/S44	Email	<p>Surface Water Management Hierarchy We wish to highlight that consistent with the principles of the hierarchy for the management of surface water in national planning policy and the obligations of the Environment Act 2021, no surface water will be allowed to discharge to the existing public sewerage system. Surface water should instead discharge to more sustainable alternatives as outlined in the surface water management hierarchy. This will ensure the impact of development on public wastewater infrastructure, both in terms of the wastewater network and wastewater</p>	<p>The conceptual surface water drainage strategy is included within Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3) and includes assessment of the surface water management hierarchy. Additional information will come forward with the progression of the detailed drainage design where infiltration testing will inform the discharge location of surface water from</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			treatment works, is minimised. We adopt this position as surface water flows are very large when compared with foul flows. By ensuring that no surface water enters the public sewerage system, the impact on customers, watercourses and the environment will be minimised.	onshore substations. Refer to the Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan (document reference J10).
TA_0007_022_231123	S42/S44	Email	Please note, United Utilities is not responsible for advising on rates of discharge to the local watercourse system. This is a matter for discussion with the Lead Local Flood Authority and / or the Environment Agency (if the watercourse is classified as main river).	The conceptual surface water drainage strategy is included within Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3). Also refer to the Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan (document reference J10). There is no proposed discharge to public sewers. Additional information will come forward with the progression of the detailed drainage design where infiltration testing will inform the discharge location of surface water from onshore substations.
TA_0007_023_231123	S42/S44	Email	There should be no land drainage, including dewatering proposals, discharged to the public sewer.	There is no proposed discharge to public sewers.
TA_0007_024_231123	S42/S44	Email	Rights to Discharge to Watercourse or Other Receiving Water Body Given the importance of surface water discharging to an alternative to the public sewer, we request that all land that is necessary to facilitate a discharge to a watercourse is fully identified within the limits of the DCO. This will ensure the site benefits from the requisite rights to discharge to more sustainable alternatives than the public sewer for the management of surface water, e.g., a right to discharge to a watercourse or other water body. For clarity, the extent of land should be sufficient to facilitate a surface water discharge to a watercourse / water body for all elements of your proposal. Ensuring that the extent of land within the site and the supporting Environmental Statement is sufficient for the purposes of the discharge of surface water is important as a sewerage company has limited powers to acquire the right to discharge surface water to a water body under the Water Industry Act.	The conceptual surface water drainage strategy is included within Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3). Also refer to the Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan (document reference J10). There is no proposed discharge to public sewers. Updates to the Transmission Assets Order Limits at ES stage incorporates additional land up to the banks of the Dow Brook necessary to facilitate a discharge to the watercourse.
TA_0007_025_231123	S42/S44	Email	Multi-functional Sustainable Drainage Systems We request that surface water is only managed via sustainable drainage systems which are multi-functional and at the surface level in preference to conventional underground piped and tanked storage systems. Wherever practicable, Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be implemented in accordance with the CIRIA SuDS manual. Managing surface water through the use of SuDS can provide benefits in water quantity, water quality, amenity and biodiversity. If the applicant intends to offer wastewater assets forward for adoption by United Utilities, their proposed detailed design will be subject to a technical appraisal by our Developer Services team and must meet the requirements outlined in 'Sewers for Adoption and United Utilities' Asset Standards'. This is important as drainage design can be a key determining factor of site levels and layout.	Attenuation basins SuDS are proposed within the conceptual surface water drainage strategy, which is included within Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3). Also refer to the Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan (document reference J10). Additional information regarding SuDS will come forward with the progression of the detailed drainage design. SuDS will be in accordance with the CIRIA SuDS Manual (additional detail included within Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3)).
TA_0007_026_231123	S42/S44	Email	Acceptance of a drainage strategy does not infer that a detailed drainage design will meet the requirements for a successful adoption application. We strongly recommend that no construction commences until the detailed drainage design, has been assessed and accepted in writing by United Utilities. Any work carried out prior to the technical assessment being approved is done entirely at the developer's own risk and could be subject to change.	Works to be undertaken within proximity to United Utilities assets will be designed in accordance with the water authorities design standards and will require to be approved by United Utilities prior to the commencement of works (refer to Table 2.20 in Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2)).
TA_0007_027_231123	S42/S44	Email	Management and Maintenance of Sustainable Drainage Systems Without effective management and maintenance, sustainable drainage systems can fail or become ineffective. As a provider of wastewater services, we believe we have a duty to advise the determining authority of this potential risk to ensure the longevity of the surface water drainage system and the service it provides to people. We also wish to minimise the risk of a sustainable drainage system having a detrimental impact on the public sewer network should the two systems interact. We therefore recommend that you include details of a management and maintenance regime for any sustainable drainage system that is included as part of the proposed development. Please note that United Utilities cannot provide comment on the management and maintenance of an asset that is owned by a third party management and maintenance company. We would not be involved in the approval of the management and maintenance arrangements in these circumstances.	The conceptual surface water drainage strategy is included within Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3) and includes information regarding the management and maintenance of SuDS (also refer to Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan (document reference J10)).
TA_0007_031_231123	S42/S44	Email	Sustainable Drainage Systems The on-shore drainage from the proposed scheme should also be assessed within the Environmental Statement for the risk to groundwater abstractions (G11). G11 - Discharges from areas subject to contamination Discharges of surface water run-off to ground at sites affected by land contamination, or from sites used for the storage of potential pollutants are	Assessment of the impacts of contaminated runoff on the quality of surface waters and ground receptors is presented within section 2.11.2 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). The assessment of the impact of increased flood risk arising from additional surface water runoff is

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			likely to require an environmental permit. This applies especially to sites where storage, handling or use of hazardous substances occurs (for example, garage forecourts, coach and lorry parks/turning areas and metal recycling/vehicle dismantling facilities). These sites will need to be subject to risk assessment with acceptable effluent treatment provided.'	presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). In addition, best practice with regard to the use and storage of oils, chemicals and other wastes, to remove the risk of causing pollution during construction is outlined within the Outline CoCP (document reference J10). An Outline CoCP (document reference J1) will be prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP will include measures to maintain and address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • flood protection and control measures; • drainage; • pollution prevention; • geology and ground conditions; • ecology and nature conservation (including protected species and invasive species); • historic environment; • soil management; • traffic and transport; • noise management measures; • air quality and dust management; • landscape and visual; and • bentonite breakout plan. An Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan (document reference J10) for each substation will be prepared and will provide information regarding SuDS and their management and maintenance, surface water attenuation, surface water discharge rates and location. The document is to be submitted with the application for development consent.
TA_0007_032_231123	S42/S44	Email	Storage of Hazardous Substances The risks posed by storage and distribution of fuels, chemicals and wastes from the proposed development, should also be assessed for the risk to groundwater abstractions (Environment Agency Position Statement Section D). Confirmation is sought that no storage facilities are proposed within the Groundwater SPZs. Following confirmation from the applicant as to whether the high voltage cables will be filled with fluid, we will require an assessment of the hazards these substances pose to the environment, during installation and maintenance, and following any chemical alteration due to high-voltage use. The above Position Statements highlight the importance of including drainage information as part of the Environmental Statement.	Changes in groundwater quality through accidental release or spillage of potentially polluting substances is assessed in section 1.11.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1).
TA_0007_033_231123	S42/S44	Email	Significant earthworks and excavations The risks posed within a SPZ, by removing Made Ground/ Topsoil and Superficial Deposits from an area up to 120m wide during cable laying operations piling towards Rockhead, or by the tunnelling of the River Ribble should be considered. If these create significant new pathways to the aquifer, a Hydrogeological Risk Assessment may be required for the relevant section of the cable route.	This is secured by CoT41, which sets out that where required and practicable, a hydrogeological risk assessment will be undertaken. This Commitment is presented in section 1.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1).
TA_0007_034_231123	S42/S44	Email	Groundwater Control Short term dewatering or longer term Groundwater Control may pose a risk of contaminant movement towards aquifer Rockhead, particularly where superficial deposits are shallow, or granular. A desk study should be targeted on proposed areas of tunnelling and the crossings of soft and compressible deposits, sensitive to changes in groundwater levels. Assurance is sought that granular and permeable Artificial and Superficial Deposits do not provide pollutant pathways to the aquifer, for surface contamination. In particular, that Ground Investigation data indicates that Glacial Clay provides adequate protective cover over the abstracted aquifers.	This is secured by CoT41, which sets out that where required and practicable, a hydrogeological risk assessment will be undertaken. This Commitment is presented in section 1.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1).
TA_0007_035_231123	S42/S44	Email	Construction Environmental Management Plan The applicant should follow best practice in their use and storage of fuels, oils, chemicals and other wastes, to remove the risk of causing pollution during construction and operation of the scheme. This should be included in a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). This will need to be specific to the environmental setting of the area and should fully reflect the implications of a location within a SPZ.	This is considered within the Outline Pollution Prevention Plan, CoT04, (document reference J1.4) which is presented in section 1.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions (document reference F3.1) of the ES and forms part of the outline CoCP (document reference J1).
TA_0007_036_231123	S42/S44	Email	Contaminated Land United Utilities requests that the assessment of potential environmental impact from contamination fully considers the impact on our assets, water resources and water quality as a result of construction of the proposed development.	A Preliminary Risk Assessment is provided in Volume 3, Annex 1.1: Phase 1 Geo-Environmental Preliminary Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F3.1.1). A ground investigation will be completed with an assessment of the potential risks arising from any contamination identified and a remediation strategy prepared as necessary.
TA_0007_038_231123	S42/S44	Email	6. General Advice If you intend to request water and/or wastewater services from United Utilities, you should visit our website for advice. This includes seeking confirmation of the required metering arrangements for the proposed development. If any part of the proposed development site benefits from existing water and wastewater connections, you should not assume that the	The Applicants note your response.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			arrangements will be suitable for the new proposal. In some circumstances we may require a compulsory meter is fitted. For detailed guidance on whether the development will require a compulsory meter please visit 31Thttps://www.unitedutilities.com/my-account/your-bill/our-household-charges-20212022/31T and go to section 7.7 for compulsory metering. To avoid any unnecessary costs and delays being incurred by the applicant or any subsequent developer, we strongly recommend the applicant seeks advice regarding water and wastewater services, and metering arrangements, at the earliest opportunity. Please see 'Contacts' section below.	
TA_0009_001_231123	S44	Email	Cushman & Wakefield, on behalf of Ministry of Justice (MoJ), is instructed to respond to the statutory consultation exercise for the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms: Transmission Project ("the Project"). We note that consent to operate, maintain and decommission the Project will be sought via the Development Consent Order (DCO) process and that this consultation exercise will be followed by submission of the DCO application in due course. The MoJ does not object to the principle of the Project and supports the development of renewable energy schemes and their important contribution towards the UK being Net Zero by 2050	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0009_002_231123	S44	Email	Biodiversity Net Gain and Use of Land in the MoJ's Ownership The Project proposes the use of land in the ownership of the MoJ, opposite HMP Kirkham and to the south and east of Kirkham Road. The relevant parcels are identified in green below. (Photo in response document) From a review of the consultation material available for review, it appears that this land is proposed to be used for "biodiversity net gain, enhancement and / or mitigation areas". The MoJ object to their land being shown as to be used for this purpose and wish to make clear that they do not, and would not, provide consent for the use of any land in their ownership for any purpose associated with the Project. We therefore request that the scheme is revised to show alternative areas being used for biodiversity net gain, enhancement and/or mitigation.	The areas proposed for biodiversity benefit have been refined further since PEIR. The areas proposed are shown in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11).
TA_0009_003_231123	S44	Email	Construction and Operational Traffic We also note that the Project proposes 2 onshore substations on land further to the east of Kirkham Road, with 2 options being consulted on for the Morecambe onshore substation site. We note that onshore temporary construction compounds are indicatively shown adjacent to each onshore substation. We note the consultation documents reference temporary access tracks being required to each compound. Figure 1.2 in Annex 7.2 to PEIR Volume 3 presents the indicative onshore substation access points. S2 is of particular concern to the MoJ given its proximity to the access points into HMP Kirkham. HMP Kirkham is an operational Category D prison, with a range of traffic movements associated throughout the day in relation to staff, visitors and prisoners (who are on day release). It is important that these traffic movements are not subject to severe obstructions that impact on the smooth day-to-day running of the prison. We would therefore request that S2 is removed from consideration for a potential access, and to a lesser extent, S1 and S10. An assessment of the construction impacts on the operation of HMP Kirkham should be afforded careful consideration should either of these access points be pursued any further.	Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1). Further details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0009_004_231123	S44	Email	Conclusion This letter identifies, based on the information available at this time, the potential impacts on the MoJ and the operation of HMP Kirkham. We would welcome further discussions with the project team so each party can best understand the potential impacts and how these are best avoided and/or mitigated. I trust that the above is clear, however, should you have any questions or wish to discuss in more detail please do not hesitate to contact me. We have registered to be kept informed on the Project.	The Applicants note your response. Responses provided to detailed points in turn above.
TA_0012_002_221123	S42	Email	The proposals by Morgan and Morecambe however would have a serious and damaging impact upon the local communities in St Anne's and the surrounding environment, both in our town, but also in the wider Fylde.	The Applicants note your response. Effects on the environment and community receptors are set out in Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4).
TA_0012_003_221123	S42	Email	We have found the consultation meetings vague and lacking in detail on key aspects of this proposal. In particular there are grave concerns of the potential impact on people's homes in St Anne's and the possible negative impact it could have on Blackpool airport that is situated in St Anne's and the M55 link road which could also be affected by the proposed route of the cables. Issues regarding drilling techniques onshore and in residential areas have yet to be explained. There appears to be confusion over how this will be done.	Details of the Transmission Assets are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3), including details of the location and methodologies for trenchless cable installation (such as horizontal directional drilling). Impacts in relation to aviation, including Blackpool Airport, are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 11: Aviation and radar of the ES (document reference F3.11) and Volume 4, Chapter 2: Socio-economics of the ES (document reference F4.2). Impacts in terms of highways are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0012_004_221123	S42	Email	The two new electricity substations planned, although not directly in St Anne's, are so big, built on greenbelt land, near to two schools, and with a cable width of motorway proportions crossing the heart of Fylde, this will be a blight on our borough starting in St Anne's.	Details of the impacts and effects on the landscape and views are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES (document reference F3.10). This includes consideration of the proposed substations.
TA_0012_005_221123	S42	Email	Large numbers of residents in St Annes will potentially be affected by these proposals and some have had their homes listed as being of "interest", which serves only to worry people, thinking their homes may be compulsory purchased. Morgan and Morecambe must clarify their proposals to address these concerns.	No residential dwellings are included within the Transmission Assets Order Limits. No demolition is proposed.
TA_0012_008_221123	S42	Email	It is suggested that further thought should be given to alternative routes and how following the estuary seems to make sense to many in St. Annes	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0017_023_231123	S42/S44	Email	Avoidance of ecological impacts It needs to be demonstrated that measures have been taken to avoid detrimental impacts on sites, habitats, species and features of ecological value, including (but not limited to): • Statutory designated sites and functionally linked land • Non-statutory designated sites • Habitats of Principal Importance • Irreplaceable habitats • Protected species and their habitats • Species of principal importance and their habitats • Other notable species and their habitats (for example, red list species) • Habitat connectivity.	Where possible, designated sites, habitats, species and other features of ecological value have been avoided through the route selection process and through the use of direct pipe installation or other trenchless techniques. Unavoidable impacts that cannot be addressed through these approaches are subject to other forms of mitigation, or compensation as described in section 3.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).
TA_0017_024_231123	S42/S44	Email	The planning application needs to demonstrate that the location and design of all elements of the proposed development and associated works have been informed by the ecological surveys, in order to avoid or minimise ecological impacts. The planning submission will need to include information about the steps taken or to be taken to minimise the adverse effect of the development on the biodiversity of the onsite habitat and any other habitat. Any unavoidable impacts should be mitigated and compensation should be provided to achieve overall gains in biodiversity value	Where possible, designated sites, habitats, species and other features of ecological value have been avoided through the route selection process and through the use of direct pipe installation or other trenchless techniques. Unavoidable impacts that cannot be addressed through these approaches are subject to other forms of mitigation, or compensation as described in section 3.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). Further details of the site selection process are provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0017_025_231123	S42/S44	Email	The NPPF states that development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists. Irreplaceable habitats include habitats which would be technically very difficult (or take a very significant time) to restore, recreate or replace once destroyed, for example ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees, blanket bog, limestone pavement, sand dunes, salt marsh and lowland fen. A definition and definitive list are expected to be published in the near future	Irreplaceable habitats are now confirmed by The Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations 2024. Of these, coastal sand dunes, ancient woodland and ancient and veteran trees are potentially relevant to onshore ecology and nature conservation. Assessment of impacts is provided in section 3.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).
TA_0018_009_231123	S42/S44	Email	i) Given the lack of information for the exit route of the 400kv cables and the two different options for the Morecambe substations, the consultation has not met the necessary standards for it to be effective (EN-5, Horlock Rules, Rochdale Envelope case law). The date when the choice of options and cable exit route will be announced is unknown. This point was raised with the developer at the Thursday 26th October 2023 public consultation and is key information to enable informed observations to be made by those participating in the consultation	The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor and onshore substations, including - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets- refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received. Details of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). These are based on the project description set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This chapter sets out the approach to site selection, including the use of the Project Design Envelope or Rochdale envelope approach, in line with case law.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0019_012_231123	S42/S44	Email	The RAG system used in the down select from 4 zones to 1 zone is perceived as a presentation of a predetermined answer with Zone 1 being selected as being the only option with no reds when the others get two. On the non-statutory consultation there appeared to be an access track in Zone 1 on the map that has still to be explained by the developer. Residents are concerned that no information has been made available which identifies how the route selection from landfall to Penwortham and the substation search zones were defined. It is generally considered they are based on the least cost and therefore most profitable options.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0019_016_231123	S42/S44	Email	Need for low-carbon and renewable initiatives is understood, however the locations in Zone 1 for the two substations are considered inappropriate. i). RAG survey ratings are considered to be contradictory, inconsistent, incorrect factually and subjective;a) High Pressure gas main. The high-pressure gas main only touches the extreme eastern edge of Zone 2, this could be managed. This is not made clear.b) Flood Risk - Inspection of Flood Zone maps shows there little difference in flood risk between Zones 1 and 2. This is not made clear.c) Zone 1 and Zone 2 are roughly equidistant from a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and so not a factor to differentiate siting as claimed.d) Bluefield solar farm development is in Zone 1 and not in Zone 2. e) Inconsistent treatment of wild life concerns and surveys. Limited number of ornithological surveys used to inform RAG selection process for sites.f) Zone 1 lies within Kirkham/Newton Area of Separation and Fylde borough council Green Belt. This is not weighted appropriately in the RAG.g) Proximity to residential development is not factored in the RAG selection assessment for Zones.	The solar farm has been considered as part of the cumulative assessment for the onshore elements of the Transmission Assets. All schemes considered in the cumulative assessment are set out in Volume 1, Annex 5.5: Cumulative screening matrix and location plan of the ES (document reference F1.5.5). Bluefield solar farm has also been considered as a part of route planning and site selection process, documented in Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the ES: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4), with further detailed provided in Volume 1, Annex 4.3: Selection and Refinement of the Onshore Infrastructure (document reference F1.4.3).The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0019_017_231123	S42/S44	Email	RAG evaluation of the 4 zones indicate none are on poor agricultural land. Given that food security is also important why were alternatives, including brownfield sites, not an option? This point was also raised with the developer at the Thursday 26th October 2023 public consultation and it elicited the developer response that given the prevailing constraints no alternatives were large enough. Members consider this statement should be evidenced. Given that it is not yet known if the substations are to be gas or air cooled, and given the importance of securing the correct locations, it is reasonable to request that expert assurance is obtained that demonstrates the preferred location has been properly evaluated and it is evidenced that there are no suitable poor quality/brownfield sites, enterprise zones or areas of lower population density between landfall and Penwortham. Consultation documentation makes statements that are also of significant concern relating to the cable corridor widths and trench depths. As part of the suggested expert assurance trenchless technologies need to be assessed in preference to excavating farmland and grazing land. When cables are coming from offshore, and notwithstanding the associated ecological impacts it is considered an assessment should be made of cable installation beneath the River Ribble before connection at Penwortham with an evaluation analysis compared with the existing proposal that adversely impacts food production and security. On the National Grid Pathway to 2030 it was presumed the route would be south of the River Ribble. This lower population density route has been set aside and the north River Ribble route, with all of the complexities of having more commercial facilities, being more densely populated, together with equestrian, farm, and industrial facilities, has been chosen. It is necessary to be able to visibly demonstrate the rationalisation for this decision (e.g. community and environmental constraints, financial benefits etc). A suggested alternative is to expand the footprint of the existing Penwortham substation to accommodate new feeds and therefore require less acreage due to use of existing infrastructure. Land in Penwortham was specified in search Zones 3 & 4. There is great concern within the local farming community about the impact and future viability of farms in Zone 1 and it is unclear whether the viability of farms has been taken into consideration. It is claimed that significant loss of pasture land to dairy farms in Zone 1 will make at least one farm commercially unviable with consequently adverse socioeconomic impact.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0019_018_231123	S42/S44	Email	It is considered the RAGs are flawed in that they only appear to interpret the effect on certain landfall routes for the prevailing parameters. An analysis of mitigation schemes, and their costs, that could change the RAG profile (red to green, amber to green etc) of landfall, route and substation location zones is consequently omitted. This should be arranged and made visible to justify the chosen landfall, route, and substation locations. It is stated that land within an 8 kilometre radius of Penwortham substation was considered for the siting of the 2 substations. What was the rationale for 8 kilometres?1) Are there any regulations or guidelines that mandate or	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			suggest this distance be used?2) The siting of substations splits the cabling transmission assets into 2 runs. One from landfall too the substations, and the other from the substations to Penwortham. All variables being equal, which is the most expensive per kilometre? Landfall to substation or substation to Penwortham?3) To what extent, if any, is the chosen distance (8km) from Penwortham influenced by any economic considerations emanating from question 2 above?4) When choosing 8km as the maximum distance for substations from Penwortham was it realised, and/or considered, that this left large areas of relatively unpopulated areas between landfall and the recently down selected areas for the substations unexplored?5) The areas selected near Newton and Kirkham are the most densely populated areas of the Fylde other than Lytham St Annes on the coast. These is also potentially good road access. Have economic considerations of convenient road access overridden any concerns for effects on residents during both construction, and after commissioning? How have these issues been addressed with regard to benefits to the applicant?	
TA_0019_019_231123	S42/S44	Email	The character of Newton-with-Scales as a small rural village will be irreparably damaged if consent is given for the proposed development. The character of the village which should be protected was outlined by Fylde Borough Council in its opposition to the residential development at Woodlands Close. This initiative will have a greater impact. There are four Grade 2 listed heritage buildings along Grange Lane to the south of Newton-with-Scales. This would be a major change adversely impacting a rural setting by being surrounded by an industrial landscape. Some listed buildings will have an uninterrupted line of sight to the south substation option. The main footprint of the village will be reduced by the substations, and the construction phase will impact on the lives of villagers for a number of years. The AOS in the Fylde Local Plan was to help protect the character of the village. This large-scale industrial energy generation will indisputably have an adverse impact on the agricultural and rural character of the area.	Impacts and effects in relation to the historic environment, including listed buildings, are set out in section 5.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 5: Historic environment of the ES (document reference F3.5). No significant effects on listed building have been identified. Impacts and effects on landscape character and views are set out in section 10.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES (document reference F3.10). Land covered by the Area of Separation policy is no longer required for the onshore substations.
TA_0019_022_231123	S42/S44	Email	The RAG status used to down select the zones only takes into account the present flood levels zones. The Climate Change flood zone map for 2030 shows the southern Morecambe substation option in large part to be below the annual flood level. Given the operational life of the substation the RAG status should not be green. Given the long-life span of the proposed developments, the available flood level predictions for the next five decades should be used.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0024_001_201023	S42	Email	I have read the plans and documents you sent BUUK recently in regard to the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farm. Processing your plans and details I have deduced that some of your works may fall within the vicinity of GTC assets. Please study the attached the images showing your works locations and our corresponding network drawings for the relevant areas and decide if our assets are within the order limits of your proposed works.I have attached the requested plans to a folder on Owncloud, please use the link on the subsequent email and the password – windfarm to access the files.Once you have confirmed that your proposed works will have an impact on our network, please submit your C2/C3 diversion request along with a copy of this letter/email to Network_Variations@gtc-uk.co.uk or electricity.diversions@gtc-uk.co.uk. The following must be submitted in order for us to escalate this to our design team.- An outline of your proposed works.- Highlighted GTC drawing with the area in question. Our designer can then quote for costs for diversion works and respond back to you directly with the necessary information.We look forward to hearing from you.	The Applicant notes this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of Gas GTC in Schedule 10, Part 1 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1).
TA_0026_001_231123	S42/S44	Email	Consultation on Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms: Transmission Assets Introduction We act on behalf of Blackpool Airport Enterprise Zone and Blackpool Council (the owners of Blackpool Airport) and have been instructed to provide a formal response to the Consultation on Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms: Transmission Assets. In doing so we have reviewed the consultation documents provided to us.In making these comments it should be noted that the Airport and all of its safety assurance processes must take priority in any decisions made in respect to a proposed route across the site. In this respect, this includes but is not limited to an understanding that the airport cannot be closed for any period of time to accommodate the transmission assets of the windfarm development.Background to the Enterprise ZoneIn November 2015, Enterprise Zone status was approved for the wider Airport site, coming into force from April 2016. The Enterprise Zone status is valid for 25 years and in line with national policy on Enterprise Zones, business incentives are available.Following operational commencement of the Enterprise Zone, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was agreed between the then	The Applicants welcome Blackpool Airport's engagement. The Project will continue to engage with Blackpool Airport, in relation to potential impacts which may arise from the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Transmission Assets. Including where they may arise in relation to the Masterplan.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, Blackpool Borough Council, Fylde Borough Council and the Lancashire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). The MoU states that with respect to capital expenditure which can be funded by retained business rates growth this will include:•Relocation of critical Operational Airport Infrastructure – including control tower, apron, fire station, taxiway, fuel farm facilities and radarThe Enterprise Zone is also looking to target a wide range of sectors, including: food and drink manufacturers, energy, aviation, creative and digital, advanced manufacturing and professional services. It is envisaged within the Enterprise Zone Delivery Plan that the Enterprise Zone status will attract over 280 no. new businesses and create circa. 5,000 no. new jobs over its lifespan, in addition to the existing businesses and employees already based on the site.55% of the Enterprise Zone is located within Fylde and 45% in Blackpool. Blackpool Council is the major freehold landowner at the Airport and Enterprise Zone following the purchase of the Airport in September 2017.In total, the Enterprise Zone extends to 144 hectares of land. Over its lifetime, it is expected that it will:•Support 5,000 no. new jobs;•Attract £300m + of private sector investment;•Generate a cumulative Gross Value Added total over the first five years of £232m and £2.08bn over the Enterprise Zone's lifetime;•Assist in the diversification of the local economy, which relies heavily upon tourism and the public sector;•Seek a sustainable future for Blackpool Airport	
TA_0026_005_231123	S42/S44	Email	Issues and Concerns Blackpool Airport EZ and Blackpool Council have no objection in principle to the use of land within the airport being utilised as the route for transmission assets and cabling provide that it can be demonstrated that this is necessary to make the wind farm project viable and successful.	The Applicants have been in discussions with Blackpool Airport and have taken feedback into account in developing the design for the Transmission Assets. The options considered are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). Details of the proposed design are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).
TA_0026_006_231123	S42/S44	Email	However, before such a route can be agreed it is essential that the developers of the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms fully understand the issues and intentions of the EZ and Blackpool Council in respect of current operations and their future masterplan which is an essential element of the EZ programme. Without delivering the development outline in the evolving masterplan, the EZ will not be successful and the fundamental aims including the creation of 5,000 new jobs and the attraction of over £300m in private investment will not occur.This letter is the formal start of that process and we expect that discussions with the developers will take place whilst the route for the assets is finalised.	The Applicants welcome Blackpool Airport's engagement. The Project will continue to engage with Blackpool Airport, in relation to potential impacts which may arise from the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Transmission Assets. Including where they may arise in relation to the Masterplan
TA_0026_007_231123	S42/S44	Email	It is however essential that the route does not prejudice existing uses, future development proposals or the continued and future operation of the airport itself.The route for any cable is understood to require a corridor of some 122m to include the trenches, haul roads, sub soil and top soil storage. There will also be a requirement for temporary construction compounds and the operational area will be fenced off during construction.After construction is completed, the consultation documents indicate that the cables will occupy a permanent onshore export corridor of some 70m, although the fencing will be removed and soil or other material replaced.Sited in the wrong location such temporary corridors of 122m and a permanent corridor of 70m has the potential to be extremely disruptive to the EZ and airport.It is therefore essential that if any such corridors are proposed within the boundary of the airport, that they do not prejudice existing land uses or the proposals set out in the masterplan and any additional proposals that may come forward as the masterplan continues to evolve.This refers to not only assets of the EZ but also the operations of the airport and the proposed solar farm. The proposed route shall therefore avoid any potential development or operational areas unless acceptable safety and business related mitigations are approved by the airport management.	The Applicants have been in discussions with Blackpool Airport and have taken feedback into account in developing the design for the Transmission Assets. The options considered are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). Details of the proposed design are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).
TA_0026_008_231123	S42/S44	Email	It is also essential that a clear and robust timescale is set out that is adhered to and the construction period made as short as is reasonably possible.If there is the potential for a degree of disruption the Airport Management must be able to confirm that it can work around this without any detriment to operations, safety or business loss as any delays to the process may prejudice the ability of the EZ to fulfil its own aspirations for the airport in a manner that may well be prejudicial to the success of the EZ as a whole.	The Applicants welcome Blackpool Airport's engagement. The Project will continue to engage with Blackpool Airport, in relation to potential impacts which may arise from the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Transmission Assets. Including where they may arise in relation to the Masterplan
TA_0026_009_231123	S42/S44	Email	Conclusion To conclude, it is essential that the existing and future operation of the EZ and the airport are protected and are not prejudiced by the need for the development of a cable corridor between Morgan and Morecambe Wind Farm and Penwortham sub-station. However, the EZ and	We welcome Blackpool Airport's engagement on this matter.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			Blackpool Council are supportive of this scheme in principle and willing to work together to identify a suitable solution with this proviso in mind. Myself and my clients therefore welcome this opportunity to be involved in the statutory consultation process and look forward to discussing the matter in more detail in due course.	
TA_0029_013_231123	S42/S44	Email	Underground Cabling Based on the consultation brochure the cables would appear to be being installed via Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). The details describe that the corridor width will be 70m, with up to 18 cables. The trench depth would be 1.8m in depth (1.2m to top of the ducting). Given this suggested depth of 1.8m, this would not be suitable for the canal/brook crossings. In accordance with the Trust's Third Part\.) Works Code of Practice (CoP) Part 2 https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/business-and-trade/undertaking-works-on-our-property-and-our-code-of-practice we would expect any waterway crossing (pipes, cables etc) to be installed under the waterway and cross perpendicular to the waterway. We would normally expect such crossings to be constructed via trenchless techniques and the crown of the crossing would need to be at least 3.5m below hard bed level of the waterway to ensure any settlement does not impact the waterway. However, this could crossing require a greater depth, depending on the results of the borehole / geotechnical information provided. This would mean that the launch and reception pits would be set well away from the waterway to allow the Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) to achieve the required depth. The route and depth of any such crossing, method statements, construction techniques and associated ground investigations will need to be approved by the Trust's geotechnical specialists, all via the CoP process. We would welcome further discussion in relation to this matter.	Waterways belonging to the Canal and River Trust located within the Onshore Order Limits include the River Ribble and Ribble Link. As described in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES, several trenchless techniques remain under consideration for the 400 kV grid connection cable crossing of the River Ribble. In addition, trenchless techniques would also be utilised where the onshore export cable corridor and 400 kV grid connection cable corridor are required to cross watercourses, including Ribble Link. The commitment to utilise trenchless techniques during construction of the Transmission Assets would avoid potential impacts to the recreational usage of the River Ribble and Ribble Link (see CoT90 in Table 6.17 of Volume 3, Chapter r6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6)).
TA_0029_015_231123	S42/S44	Email	Operational requirements The Trust have critical monitoring equipment at Lock 9 and the Ribble Link Traffic Light, we would require 24/7 access here to ensure the safe operation and maintenance of the waterway assets/infrastructure and to be able to access the site in an emergency event. It will be critical that this access is not hindered during the construction or operation phase of the development. The land to the south-west of Lock 8 is used as a dredging tip by the Trust. Dredging of the Ribble Link generallyj takes place during February/March annually and it will be important that the proposed works do not hinder these operational requirements.	Any works that affect Canal and River Trust waterways or land will comply with the Canal & River Trust 'Code of Practice for Works affecting the Canal & River Trust'. This will be implemented through CoT87.
TA_0029_019_231123	S42/S44	Email	The Trust as Landowner The Trust has a duty under the Trusts Agreement with the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (28 June 2012) to operate and manage the waterway and towpaths for public use and enjoyment. Additionally, the Trust has a duty under SI05 of the Transport Act 1968 to maintain commercial and cruising waterway in a suitable condition for use b\:) the public. At this stage it is unclear which land parcels might be required in relation to the works and whether these are within the ownership of the Trust, or where we have land interests and rights. The Trust is a statutory undertaker which has specific duties to protect the waterways. Accordingly, we have a duty to resist the use of compulsory purchase powers which may negatively affect our land or undertakings. Alternatively, should any compulsory acquisition powers over the Trust's land be sought, such acquisition should only be with the voluntary consent of the Trust. The separate consent/agreement of the Trust would be required for the cable crossings. Separate discussions would need to take place between the Trust and the promoter, especially on the waterway undergrounding detailing, design, engineering and agreements to access/enter our land as necessary. We would require the Development Consent Order to include protective provisions for the Canal & River Trust and we would be happy to provide a draft of the provisions that we would likely require to be included. The above comments are based on the consultation materials. We would wish to provide more comments once the route has been finalised and the potential impact on our waterway at each crossing can be determined. The above comments do not prejudice any further matters that ma\:) be raised during the consenting process or by other parts of the organisation.	Any works that affect Canal and River Trust waterways or land will comply with the Canal & River Trust 'Code of Practice for Works affecting the Canal & River Trust'. This will be implemented through CoT87.
TA_0036_010_231123	S44	Email	Having received the e-mail from REDACTED on the 9th November as regards the project itself in the wider sense we have no comments upon it. Our concerns are simply the potential disruption to our activities and the possible impact of those upon the haulage contract that we have with Total Energies for the transport of bitumen to their Preston Facility. The area shown in the consultation documents shows our Railway at the very eastern edge of the land being considered on the north bank of the River Ribble.	The Applicants note your response.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0036_011_231123	S44	Email	One of my colleagues Mr REDACTED is a local resident and has attended one of your consultation meetings in that capacity. He has told me that the representative there indicated that the plan was to bore underneath the railway between Blackpool South & Kirkham at a point to be determined. Can you confirm that if it were the case these cables were to cross our Railway that this would be the method and not the large pathway shown on page 24 of the booklet. If there is any suggestion of serious disruption to our activities caused by this development then we would object to that and insist that suitable measures are put in place. As I say we are not just a seasonal heritage railway but also operate commercial freight services which could be jeopardised by a significant closure period putting large numbers of lorries onto local roads.	The Applicants note your response. The Ribble Steam Railway lies outside of the Transmission Assets Order Limits and no impacts are anticipated.
TA_0037_001_271023	S44	Email	We attended the drop-in event at Newton Village Hall yesterday, and I am afraid to say it was a total waste of time and energy and any feedback you are going to achieve will all be negative, divided between the residents affected by option 1 or option2. Therefore we can only assume you have already chosen the site for the substation and this is just a tick box exercise. The most important reason for us attending the meeting was to see how the impact of option 2 would affect our property. The photographs of the sites gave us no real indication of the visual effects the substation would have on the closest residents. In fact there was no mock photograph of the site directly opposite our house at all. When we queried this, we were told the photographer could not take photographs of every possible view, but to omit the closest and most obtrusive view of option 2 seems very strange to us. Especially when some of the photographs would have had to be taken by walking across fields with no road access or dwellings nearby, whereas our house is on a lane with easy access. The substation option 2 and the Morgan substation are both adjacent to Lower Lane, yet no photographs are taken from lower lane. Photographs have been taken from Kirkham road at ground level looking over fields and a housing estate with the substation in the distance beyond. This is totally unacceptable and dishonest to say the least. Nobody wants these substations, so to pretend the feedback is going to assist with your decision is just prolonging the agony for everyone. We need to know as soon as possible which option it is going to be so we can defend our rights, and there is nothing you can say or do to convince us this undertaking is anything other than disastrous for the whole area, and you will be wrecking people's lives and livelihoods with this decision. We had assurances from Fylde Borough Council during a building application process that made clear no development on the greenbelt land we live on would ever be accepted. I was informed my stables could only be used for domestic pleasure and could not be rented out commercially because Lower Lane could not handle any more traffic, and that my development was limited to existing footprints, yet here you are proposing to build some of the biggest building structures in the country. We will be in contact with our MP Mark Menzies regarding this intrusion of our greenbelt land and not least the photographic cover up that was on display at the statutory consultation in Newton on the 25th Oct. Option 2 would destroy 12 years of work to our property and land, destroy the final phase for completion of our house, destroy our dreams and wreck our lives. Has any of the initial development process considered the hurt and misery it will cause to human life, least of all the health impacts, I doubt it very much as we have not been part of any of the consultation process. There must surely have been other options on brown belt land that does not affect residential areas and one can only assume this was the cheapest option. You don't need residents to give you their reasons for the unsuitability of these sites, or you would not have gone this far with the project already, and we would ask that you announce the decision as soon as possible so we can plan for the future as far away from this nightmare as possible. Regards Mary and David Barlow	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Project has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Information was available at the statutory consultation, including the PEIR, providing details of the viewpoints agreed with stakeholders at that time, including details of the options available regarding the design of the Transmission Assets. Feedback has been considered at each stage of consultation, alongside a range of other factors including potential environmental constraints and engineering considerations. The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the onshore substations, including - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets- refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received. Details of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed designs will be developed post-consent. Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). Details of the landscape and visual impacts and effects are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES (document reference F3.10). This includes photography from viewpoints agreed with statutory consultees, as well as landscape visualisations of the proposed substations (Volume 3, Figure 10.5).
TA_0038_004_181123	S44	Email	4. The ESS selection process was not summarised in the consultation brochure.	The Applicants' site selection process was addressed throughout their statutory consultation brochure but was most concisely summarised on page 27. The brochure also pointed to where more information could be found in the PEIR (Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives).
TA_0038_006_181123	S44	Email	6. Is it acceptable to announce the results of Morecambe substation location i.e. option 1 or 2 after the statutory consultation period has ended? When & how will the announcement of option 1 or 2 for the Morecambe substation be made? And how will they public be able to comment on it?	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Our team have been carefully considering the feedback provided at our statutory and non-statutory consultations – alongside ongoing engineering,

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				and environmental work – as we refine our plans. If the application is accepted for examination, there will be an opportunity for people to register their interest in the application with the Planning Inspectorate. Anyone registering an interest will be kept informed of the progress of the application, including when and how they can provide comments. Following a preliminary meeting the Examining Authority will confirm the timetable for the examination.
TA_0038_009_181123	S44	Email	The preceding non-statutory consultation by M&M was flawed because: 1. No explanation was ever provided or presented as to how the four potential zones for the 2 ESSs were identified or selected.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0038_010_181123	S44	Email	2. The PIER appears to totally ignore the Fylde Borough Council (FBC) Local (development) Plan which had already identified Enterprise Zones and brown field sites as potential candidate location zones.	Other proposed developments, including allocated development sites, have been considered in the cumulative assessment of each onshore topic chapter (see Volume 3 of the ES, document reference F3).
TA_0038_011_181123	S44	Email	3. The PEIR shows evidence of developer predetermining outcome in favour of Zone 1; i.e. the Red Amber Green (RAG) colour coding assessment has bias in favour of Zone 1.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0038_012_181123	S44	Email	4. Unexplained (and unknown to local residents) routes for Zone 1 were presented on maps as part the non-statutory consultation sessions. Again, indicating a developer predetermination outcome in favour of Zone 1	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0038_013_181123	S44	Email	5. The logic in the PEIR in downsizing from four search zones to one is flawed because the RAG survey ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0038_014_181123	S44	Email	6. High Pressure gas main (used as one reason to eliminate search zone 2) only encroaches the extreme eastern edge of Zone 2, this could be managed. This minor encroachment is not made clear.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0038_015_181123	S44	Email	7. Inspection of Flood Zone maps (used as one reason to eliminate search zone 2) shows there is little difference in flood risk between Zones 1 & 2. This is not made clear.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0038_016_181123	S44	Email	8. Zones 1 and Zone 2 are roughly equidistant from a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) so cannot be used as a factor to differentiate zone 1 & 2 siting as claimed.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0038_017_181123	S44	Email	9. The Bluefield solar farm development is not in Zone 2, it is just in Zone 1.	The solar farm has been considered as part of the cumulative assessment for the onshore elements of the Transmission Assets. All schemes considered in the cumulative assessment are set out in Volume 1, Annex 5.5: Cumulative screening matrix and location plan of the ES (document reference F1.5.5). Bluefield solar farm has also been considered as a part of route planning and site selection process, documented in Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the ES: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4), with further detailed provided in Volume 1, Annex 4.3: Selection and Refinement of the Onshore Infrastructure (document reference F1.4.3). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0038_018_181123	S44	Email	10. There was an inconsistent treatment of wildlife concerns and surveys and only a limited number of ornithological surveys used to inform RAG selection process for sites.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0038_019_181123	S44	Email	11. Zone 1 lies within the FBC-defined Kirkham / Newton Area of Separation zone AND the FBC Green Belt. Development in this area was not to be supported by FBC. This is not weighted appropriately in the RAG.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0038_020_181123	S44	Email	12. The proximity of 2 very large ESSs (and their attached yards – same size and there for 60 months) to residential homes and 2 schools is not factored into the RAG selection assessment for Zones.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0038_021_181123	S44	Email	13. Can you actually provide examples of where you have taken public input (i.e. from the pre-statutory consultation) and amended your planning decisions or designs.	The Transmission Assets provide a connection to the National Grid for two nationally significant offshore wind farms, and therefore two sets of transmission infrastructure are required. Details of the site selection process and alternatives considered are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor and onshore substations, including - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets- refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received.
TA_0038_026_181123	S44	Email	4. The Bluefield solar farm is also planned for the same location compounding over development concerns. Not forgetting the 170 acre solar farm on nearby Clifton Marsh and the expansion of nuclear power generation in adjacent Clifton village.	The solar farm has been considered as part of the cumulative assessment for the onshore elements of the Transmission Assets. All schemes considered in the cumulative assessment are set out in Volume 1, Annex 5.5: Cumulative screening matrix and location plan of the ES (document reference F1.5.5). Bluefield solar farm has also been considered as a part of route planning and site selection process, documented in Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the ES: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4), with further detailed provided in Volume 1, Annex 4.3: Selection and Refinement of the Onshore Infrastructure (document reference F1.4.3). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1,

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0038_034_181123	S44	Email	In essence, the M&M proposal of two ESS sites in Zone 1 can be summed up as: 2 Big, 2 Close & 2 of 'em. Question: Too big and too close. These sites are vast. The Morgan site is 125,000m ² which is 17 ½ football pitches in size. The Morecambe site is 60,000m ² which is 8 ½ football pitches in size. That's a total of 26 football pitches in size. Each site has a temporary (!) (5 years) compound of the same size as it's site – that's a grand total of 52 football pitches in size. They will total dominate and overwhelm the adjacent village of Newton, which has a residential footprint of approx. 230,000m ² . Are there any other substations in England of this size and this close to residential areas?	The Transmission Assets provide a connection to the National Grid for two nationally significant offshore wind farms, and therefore two sets of transmission infrastructure are required. Details of the site selection process and alternatives considered are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor and onshore substations, including - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets- refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received.
TA_0039_001_201123	S44	Email	Further to previous correspondence and telephone calls, I write to confirm that I have spoken with my retained clients again with regard to the proposed Morgan and Morecambe transmission asset which will severely affect my client's land holding, as I have shown on the attached plan. As you can see, the proposed route effectively sterilises my client's complete land holding. My client uses the land for accommodating his livestock and therefore during construction the only part available will be a small area which I have highlighted circled red, which would be the remaining farm building, hardstanding and concrete yard area. If the northern route of the transmission is selected then we would suggest it would make practical sense to occupy the remaining severed area of my client's land holding for constructional compound facilities. I trust that you will find these comments to be of assistance and if you require any further information then please do not hesitate to contact me.	The Applicants will work with land interests to identify and agree suitable measures for severed land as a result of the project design. Compensation for any losses that arise as a direct result of the project will be provided for in accordance with the compensation code. The Applicants are engaging with the land interest and their agent for the land rights sought.
TA_0039_002_201123	S44	Email	Further to our previous correspondence, as you are aware, I act on behalf of the above landowner who is potentially impacted by the proposed transmission assets of Morgan and Morecambe Wind Farm. Please take this letter as an additional comment for the feedback contained within the Statutory Consultation and I would be grateful if you could acknowledge safe receipt and confirm that this will be put forward within the Statutory Consultations and fed through to the contract team. My client's land is identified on the attached plan, running south from Hillock Lane through sections identified as 10A and 10B running east to Kirkham Road. My client's land is contained within legal title LAN150285. The proposed cable route significantly impacts my client's high quality silage field, cutting diagonally across from Hillock Lane travelling south and then the cable route effectively taking the vast majority of the land. We note within the initial consultations there are potential compound areas identified as 11A and 11B with an access track leading off Hillock Lane through my client's land which obviously will be removing significant portion of well-established hedgerow. The loss of well-established hedgerow in our opinion is completely unnecessary. My client's land is going to be severed and the triangle portions between 10A and 10B are going to be effectively in-farmable during the constructional phase and therefore it makes practical sense for Morgan and Morecambe to occur the area cross-hatched blue for compound areas, rather than the areas identified 11A and 11B. Access would be directly off Hillock Lane through the pipeline route giving the contractors far greater flexibility and control. It was also noted at this stage that the land which immediately adjoins Kirkham Road is identified as longer-term land for alternate purposes – there is a linear residential development along Kirkham Road with the position of the proposed cables significantly, if not completely, sterilise my client's land holding for any future development which would have to be recognised in the statutory compensation procedures. I trust that you will find the above to be in order and I would be grateful if you could make the necessary amendments to ensure that our client's land is being used to mitigate the scheme and that Morgan and Morecambe will fully indemnify my clients for any severed unfarmable areas throughout the life of the constructional project.	Following route refinement, Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms to secure the rights for the cables and compound which will include provisions for compensation of severed land and impact on farming operations.
TA_0040_001_191123	S44	Email	My name is REDACTED, I am writing to you as Director of REDACTED, a farming business based at REDACTED on land directly based along your proposed cable route. This proposed	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			project would in any case, render my business unviable and unable to continue to operate, effectively closing my business down completely. This would obviously have a massive financial impact on myself and family. I would like to use the opportunity during this public consultation period, to unequivocally Object to your proposals and express my concerns over the proposed off shore Wind Farm cable routing and sub station locations within the fylde coast. I believe this would have a grossly negative impact on the Environment both physically, via the works proposed and Visually, damaging an untold amount of wildlife habitat and green belt protected land, conservation area's, highly productive farmland and have a hugely detrimental impact on the wider community and local economy, putting local business, land owners and Farmers out of business. I believe it would create an untold amount of suffering for residents within the fylde coast for years to come via flooding and disruption ie traffic. Your lack of detail on some of the proposed cable routes and sub stations at this late stage and at this public consultation point in proceedings, is most worrying as this shows either an unprofessional approach to the matter, or completely unprepared, or at worst, both. It is extremely concerning that at this late stage we are asked to submit our opinions on a body of work that is neither complete nor suggest the possible outcomes thereafter the point of consultation. I feel that you have shown disregard to the community of the fylde coast in your methods up to now. This lack of transparency on your part, sets a precedent when approaching future issues and has created a level of mistrust that is beyond repair. This is another reason why I must whole heartedly Object on all parts of your proposals.	1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Following route refinement and landowner engagement, the impact has been reduced on this holding and the Applicant through Dalcour Maclaren will work with the landowner to reduce the impact of construction on the holding and business. Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business.
TA_0042_001_191123	S44	Email	I am writing this email as the REDACTED of REDACTED, based on Marton Moss. Also user/owner of some of the land proposed to be affected by the cable route and surrounding bridle paths. If the route chosen includes my land on Division Lane, it would have a catastrophic and ruinous effect on my business. Therefore I am taking the opportunity during this public consultation period, to unequivocally Object to your proposals and express my concerns over the proposed off shore Wind Farm cable routing and sub station locations within the fylde coast. I believe this would have a grossly negative impact on the Environment both physically, via the works proposed and Visually, damaging an untold amount of wildlife habitat and green belt protected land, conservation area's, highly productive farmland and have a hugely detrimental impact on the wider community and local economy, putting local business, land owners and Farmers out of business. I believe it would create an untold amount of suffering for residents within the fylde coast for years to come via flooding and disruption ie traffic. Your lack of detail on some of the proposed cable routes and sub stations at this late stage and at this public consultation point in proceedings, is highly worrying as this shows either an unprofessional approach to the matter, or highly unprepared, or at worst, both. It is very concerning that at this late stage we are asked to submit our opinions on a body of work that is neither complete nor suggest the possible outcomes thereafter the point of consultation. I feel that you have shown disregard to the community of the fylde coast in your methods up to now. This lack of transparency on your part, sets a precedent when approaching future issues and has created a level of mistrust that is beyond repair. This is another reason why I must whole heartedly Object on all parts of your proposals.	The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets on recreational resources, including livery yards, stables and PRow are identified and assessed in section 6.6 and section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). This includes consideration of REDACTED. Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). This includes preparation of a PRow Management Strategy in general accordance with the Outline PRow Management Strategy (document reference J1.5) submitted with the application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g. NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Transmission Assets.
TA_0044_008_211123	S44	Email	8. We think BP, Morecambe and Morgan are being very economical with the truth, saying there will be no road closures and disruption will be minimal and trying to rush this application in, without looking at alternative, FOR THE ABOVE REASONS WE OBJECT TO THE MORECAMBE AND MORGAN PROJECT	The Applicants have committed that all road crossing will be undertaken using trenchless techniques, except for Leach Lane, however that can be trenched on a programmed basis and no road closures are expected. Traffic and transport impacts arising during the construction phase of the Transmission Assets have been fully assessed at section 7.11 Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference E3.7) with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8).
TA_0116_001_101123	S44	Email	I totally disagree with your proposed route to Penwortham substation. If the cables were to be laid on the south side of the river Rible there would be less distance through land. You would also not have the problem of crossing original water mains, cables, sewers, roads etc. I am very familiar with the land on the south side of the river as I have farmed the land and lived directly next door to Penwortham sub. I cannot see any restriction if you were to take a Southern route direct to Penwortham.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0117_001_271023	S44	Email	Yesterday I attended the first public meeting regarding the cable and substation network. It was quite informative, but left me in no doubt that the plan shown is the plan to be followed. No matter what. I and others have many concerns about the proposed project. Namely The two farms	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			earmarked to be affected to the point of being driven out of business. In conversations with other local people, we cannot understand how this particular land is the only option for the two substations. Many of us feel that the land to the south of the A584 would be more suitable due to the fact that it is already light industrial and a sewage plant established, and there would be no visual impact or taking away of top-class agricultural land. Plus it is on the way to Penwortham where we know the cables join the grid.	detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0117_003_271023	S44	Email	I believe there is a redundant substation, not too far from where the cable will be established, near Peel Corner in Blackpool. Is there no way this could be removed and one substation sited in its place?The second substation could be placed alongside it.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0117_004_271023	S44	Email	As a local resident and neighbour of one of the farmers REDACTED, we know how over the years he has developed a farm with many eco-credentials. These include 10 miles of hedge row, set aside, grassland with carbon capture He also has an established amount of great crested newt and we know that migrating eels travel along the river Dow and onward along the ditches where they spawn. He is also one of the last dairy farmers on our Fylde Coast. As I said before there must be an alternative route that can be explored otherwise what is the point of the costly consultation. We really hope that we are listened to.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0118_002_071123	S44	Email	What we fail to understand is why this area is under consideration when the site at Howick Cross at Penwortham seems a much better option in terms of access and less disruption to local residents. We support the drive for more sustainable energy but surely it cannot be at any cost. Please do the right and moral thing and consider the more sensible option and remove this dark shadow hanging over lots of local communities.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0119_001_071123	S44	Email	I am opposed to your plans to build two substations on greenbelt land in the local area around Freckleton.This surely cannot be the best option for the local environment, given the known flooding issues in the area, and the loss of high-quality farmland. It is also a valuable habitat to much wildlife including bats, newts, and various species of bird including curlews, lapwings, owls and oystercatchers to name but a few. The close proximity to Carr Hill and Strike Lane schools, will also be a major concern for the many parents in the area.I am not against wind farms and green energy, but this must be done in a respectful way for local residents and the community.Surely the land surrounding the existing substation in Penwortham, would be a more viable and appropriate option.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0120_001_121123	S44	Email	Whilst I still need a reply in order to be able to consider my full response to the consultation, I would like to ensure that these objections are logged: I object to the use of land within residential areas as construction compounds including the two indicated on Blackpool Rd North. The area with grass and trees must not be used for such a purpose. It would be an eye sore in such a prominent area as well as denying children and dog walkers a valuable green area. I object to any disruption to the use of Blackpool Rd North Playing Fields. These are a valuable community asset used by hundreds of people, including my son who volunteers as a coach for a local football club for children. I object to any trenches being dug or drilling conducted in residential roads. The cables must be installed in the open land of the airport, either by trenches or a continuation of the horizontal drilling. I have not been able to find an explanation as to why this method can be used to run cables under the sea, beach and sand dunes but not all the way to the eastern side of Queensway.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0121_001_171123	S44	Email	I object to this development of Morgan and Morecambe Offshore wind farms because I am a local resident and feel this will have significant detrimental impact to the area. I do not feel that there has been proper exploration of other sites. Also I feel it should be considered to bring ashore closer to Penwortham by travelling up the river, or it should come ashore where existing sites already come ashore. The proposed site would have a substantial flood risk, as I witness frequently, and would affect the farmers who use the land currently. It is also close to developed residential areas and local schools.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0118_004_171123	S44	Email	2) The substations will be far too close to properties, two schools, Carr Hill and Strike Lane plus a number of Nurseries and children's homes which after researching I have found no other areas with substations so close to residential properties, families, schools, etc. 3) It will cause noise pollution to the people living in the area and beyond for a great distance. This will inevitably impact people's mental health when all we can hear is a constant humming. 4) This will also impact people's general health myself for one as I am asthmatic and need to have my windows open 24/7. However, this will be impossible due to the constant humming again (24/75) People's health may also be impacted, myself included as I suffer from hypothyroidism and need access to Vitamin D via sunlight each day. Currently I do this by tending to my garden, fish pond and the wildlife that frequent my garden daily, however, with the constant humming in my ears it will be impossible for me to do so comfortably. 6) I understand that the noise levels will be 38db above ambient and approaching 70db, ear defence is required at 80db. Therefore, the constant humming will be torture. It will be like living in a concentration camp but with no means of escape as we will not be able to afford to move due to our property valuation plummeting massively.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0118_005_171123	S44	Email	7) I strongly object, also to you proposing to build 2 substations, one the size of 18 football pitches, the other the size of 9 football pitches and 20m in height plus a lightning mast as this will most certainly impact the environment and wildlife some of which is protected. If you aren't bothered about the wildlife put it down the estuary the most logical place for it to go.	The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0118_006_171123	S44	Email	8) Currently we live in an area of separation which you are going to destroy by industrialising the area.	It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0118_008_171123	S44	Email	10) We are by no means against alternative energy, I can't call it green because it's not and never can be but for you to create so much up-heavel to good agricultural land and farms for over a 30 mile stretch of land over 120m wide to link up to Penwortham is appalling and very wrong. You are going under peoples properties, land, roads, railways and the river when you could do as the National Grid suggested and use Heysham substation which is currently still in use until it is de-commissioned in 2028.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0118_011_171123	S44	Email	I am now reiterating that I strongly object to your proposals and I urge you to look again at other alternatives for the substations both at Penwortham next to the existing substation, Heysham or down the estuary. Oh yes you have stated you can't go the most satisfactory route down the estuary because of the wildlife, yet our human lives mean nothing. Are we really worth so little in your eyes? I guess the answer is yes. You could move the wildlife to other areas across Lancashire e.g Martin Mere rather than causing the issues with residents, schools, etc that you appear hell bent on doing. Very angry, upset, let down resident of Freckleton.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0122_001_171123	S44	Email	I wish to object against the proposals to build two hugh (sic) electricity substations at Kirkham/Newton/Freckleton. The reasons for the objection being that the proposed site is completely inappropriate being on top grade agricultural land, it is close to two schools, it would cause unacceptable noise pollution and would increase the flooding risk.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0123_001_171123	S44	Email	I have filled in the online forms and completed the paper form and returned. I just wanted to stress how much I object to this proposed project. I feel this is not been done in a safe proximity and is detrimental to the people and wildlife of our area. We chose to live in this area for the peace and quiet and country side. Not to be next to electromagnetic radiation. I hope an alternative site could be used.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				electricity is generated, transmitted or used. With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines and Government voluntary Code of Practice on EMF public exposure. Such considerations are inherent to the detailed engineering considerations of cable specification and routing. Relevant public EMF exposure guideline limits are noted in NPS EN-5 and would be complied with by the project. These guidelines are long standing and have a high safety margin. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex. See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4).
TA_0124_002_171123	S44	Email	Here are just some of the reasons I object:1.The consultation has not been properly explained to our MP or to the residents. We cant see a picture of the proposed substation and where we have independently checked these out, they are horrendous eyesores of gargantuan proportion. No detailed maps were made available to us. We don't know how you came to propose our lovely village, instead of out at Penwortham, as Mark Menzies suggested initially and has since been campaigning for	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).Detailed information on the Transmission Assets including an outline construction programme is provided within Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Views of the substations are assessed from publicly accessible viewpoints and are assessed in Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES (document reference F3.10) and visualisations are presented within Volume 3, Figures of the ES (Figure 10.5, Parts 1 to 5) (document reference F3.12). The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR.
TA_0124_003_171123	S44	Email	2.No explanation was given as to how the 4 location zones were identified or selected in the first place. PIER ignores FBC local plan identified enterprise zones and brown field sites as potential candidate zones	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0124_010_171123	S44	Email	11.There is no clear logic in the PIER as to why you have downsized from 4 zones to 1. RAG survey ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0125_001_181123	S44	Email	Substations at Freckleton, Kirkham and Newton. Reasons for objection to proposed route and substations from offshore wind farms.Take this email, as my strong objection to your proposals to build 2 substations in and around the Freckleton, Kirkham and Newton area. Reasons for Objection:- 1.These substations are proposed to be constructed on greenbelt land where there are many properties in very close proximity. This land is good grade A agricultural land which is	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			used by the local farmers to provide themselves with a living. 2.The substations will be extremely close to properties and two schools, Carr Hill and Strike Lane, plus a number of nurseries and children's homes. After research, I have found no other areas with substations so close to residential properties, schools, etc.	and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0125_004_181123	S44	Email	7.This will most certainly impact the environment and wildlife, some of which is protected. However it appears you are not bothered about this, in which case put it down the estuary the most logical place for it to go.	The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0125_006_181123	S44	Email	10.We are by no means against alternative energy, I can't call it green because it's not, however for you to create so much up-heavel to good agricultural land and farms, for over a 30 mile stretch of land over 120m wide just to link up to the National Grid substation at Penwortham is appalling and very wrong.	The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES. Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES. Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). This includes the preparation of a Soil Management Plan in general accordance with the Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference: J1.7), which has been submitted with the DCO application. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction of the Transmission Assets. These measures also comprise the preparation of a Code of Construction Practice in general accordance with the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) submitted with the DCO application. The measures to be implemented as part of the Code of Construction Practice seek to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.
TA_0125_010_181123	S44	Email	I strongly object to your proposals and I urge you to look again at other alternatives:- • Instead of using Penwortham use Heysham, surely this would also be more cost effective too.16. • Locate your 2 new substations at Penwortham next to the existing substation.16. • With the cables being laid from the wind turbines under the sea to landfall, carry them on up the estuary. No excuses about wildlife as you obviously don't really care and care even less about ruining human lives. Very angry, upset, let down resident of Freckleton.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0126_001_181123	S44	Email	1, Cannot find any explanation on how the four location search zones were identified or selected. Kirkham is currently being regenerated. Placing large scale industrial complexes on the edge of the town ruins the visual aspect of the area when clearly areas away from town could be considered.e.g closer to the estuary resulting in less impact on residents . 2. No detailed maps could be found ahead of the statutory consultation making the statutory consultation flawed. Site selection process not summarised in consultation brochure. Huge volume of information made the understanding of the overall proposals difficult.	Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Maximum parameters for the substation have been refined following statutory consultation. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. Visualisations have been presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage.
TA_0126_003_181123	S44	Email	4. The prelim environmental info report is biased to the developer favouring the outcome to zone 1.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0128_001_191123	S44	Email	Good morning, I am a resident of REDACTED freckleton, Preston, (REDACTED), and i am writing to you to let you know how utterly disgusted i am to find out that you are planning to erect two massive substations right near my house!! I bought this house 3 years ago, & was delighted with it, as it was in a peaceful semi rural location. Have you even considered (I think not), the noise, disruption, & the effect you will be putting on the wildlife, & also the increased traffic volumes & the devaluation of most, if not all the properties in the area. If you were to devalue my property, then I would have no other alternative than to seek compensation from yourselves, as, who would want to buy a property right next to two substations, which are going to be so huge. Why the hell would you want to build here in freckleton anyway, on the proposed sites as they are prone to flooding when we have a lot of rain. It doesn't make any sense! Why can't you build them in the fields adjacent to the A584, between Clifton fields & the Warton Airbase, where there are clearly no residential properties. I'm asking you, as one human being to another, to please reconsider building in this idyllic green belt land & destroying not only the landscape but people's livelihoods, & their way of life.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0129_002_191123	S44	Email	The selection of the zones does not seem logical or balanced and seems to have had a predetermined answer. Often exaggerating impacts to achieve the 'desired result', ie Zone 1. For example, stating a high pressure gas main is located in Zone 2, when it is only present in the extreme eastern edge. Similarly for flood risks and assessment of impact on wildlife. The whole scheme goes against strategic development plans for Fylde green belt and the Kirkham separation zone. These are huge structures and will fundamentally change the area from being farming and rural to industrial. This is clearly against the culture of the area and will impact the lives of many, many residents and business owners in the region. Why can't the cables be run further down the estuary and then use brown field sites near the proposed connection point to the national grid, at Pemwortham. In short, building these structures and running associated cables will have a massive detrimental effect on the area and is against the existing democratically agreed development plans for the area and the consultation has not been impartial and considered all factors equally. In short flawed and hence should be disregarded as incomplete and the plan rejected.	The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0131_003_191123	S44	Email	4) The possible negative effect of my house value with proposed works which are long term, if I decide to move during this period. The property would be harder to sell with long term works continuing locally. Who would buy a house where as soon as you turn off the estate, you are constantly stuck in a traffic jam? You need to come up with a better solution which would have a lesser impact on the land, travel and the local residents. Why not run the cable along the estuary? I like the idea of wind farms and the clear benefits they bring, but the installation plan needs to be better than this.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). Further details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8).
TA_0133_001_191123	S44	Email	We oppose the following: 1. THE ONSHORE TEMPORARY COMPOUND - AT REDACTED We join all our neighbours in opposing this compound (i) The Compound would affect 2 Horse Riding Schools* The compound would remove the landing site for the Air Ambulance in cases of accident The Compound would affect the day to day running of the Horse Riding Schools- Affect the Indoor Riding School- Affect the Outdoor Riding Paddock The Compound would affect the financial viability of the Horse Riding Schools- Raising Insurance Premiums* The Compound would affect Riding for the Disabled Lessons at REDACTED - Any noise would severely disrupt these lessons in both the Indoor School and the Outdoor Paddock- *The Compound would remove the landing site for the Air Ambulance - which is more acute in accidents involving Riding for the Disabled clients (ii) The Compound would affect 2 Farms The Compound would affect the day to day operation The Compound would affect the financial viability	Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss impacts to any businesses. As part of the ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP). In assessing the impact of noise and vibration, ES Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration (document reference F3.8) will provide further detailed information on that assessment.
TA_0134_001_191123	S44	Email	I am writing to express my personal views on the proposed Morecambe & Morgan Windfarms, proposed to be in my local area. As a starting point I would like to express that I do not consent to the proposed project. When I first saw a flyer I didn't feel that the information provided reflected the work that will be carried out. I travel daily through the fylde as I work in St Annes and live in Newton with Scales. The problems that I regularly face travelling to & from work are traffic congestion (there are not alternative routes) and the conditions of the road e.g. flooding, the fylde coast regularly gets areas of high water on the roads. Without the farmers regularly maintaining the dykes in this area will most definitely see more flooding.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).</p>
TA_0134_005_191123	S44	Email	<p>The whole consultation has not been properly explained to our MP or our local residents and lengthy reports , & feedback form written in language that is not fully understood by residents , i feel its written like this to overwhelm, and confuse the public , key points are missed out , how did you decide the 4 zones and why have you picked a location so near to a community . Why isn't this been done offshore?</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The feedback form enabled respondents to provide feedback on specific aspects of the proposals. It was structured to allow the Transmission Assets team to accurately categorise and assess feedback in the design process. Throughout the development of the Project, the Applicants have aimed to be open and transparent with all stakeholders, including Mark Menzies as the MP for the constituency at the time. Please see section 3 of the Consultation report (document reference E1) for information on the early engagement undertaken by the Applicants from Spring/summer 2021 in regards to the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Mona Offshore Wind Project, which included notifying Mark Menzies MP; a member of his team attended the consultation event at Lytham Assembly Rooms on 21 November 2022. A subsequent meeting took place with Mr Menzies on 18 December 2022. Section 3 of the Consultation report also provides details on follow up meetings with elected representatives, including Mark Menzies MP, between 2022 and 2023. A further meeting with a representative of Mr Menzies' office took place on 1 March 2023 which was subsequently followed up with an email update on 28 March 2023. As a section 47 consultee, Mark Menzies MP received notification of the launch of statutory consultation and also attended stakeholders briefings in September and October 2023. See section 4 of the Consultation report for further details.</p>
TA_0135_001_191123	S44	Email	<p>I wish to express my objections in the strongest terms, to the suggestion that land between Kirkham and Newton is an appropriate site for the development of 2 huge substations . I have lived on the Fylde Coast most of my life and currently live very close to this proposed site on REDACTED. I am appalled that this has been even permitted to get to this stage without prior consultation of the residents and only found out about this in the past week. The late notification of the process is most underhand especially when it also comes with the short time scale to raise any objections. Why has this proposal to erect substations estimated to be 60ft high and the size of 9 to 13 football pitches within close proximity of a residential area , not been ridiculed and thrown out at a much earlier stage in the process?-The proposals set out in the publicity pamphlet seem incomplete, with no indication as to how the power will be taken forward from the substations to it's destination across the Ribble Estuary in Penwortham. The vague drawings and maps, do not clearly identify the actual impact on the surrounding area.-I will also call upon the Planning Department at Fylde Borough Council to block this proposal with the strongest possible response. This has no place in Rural Fylde.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants issued a consultation newsletter to the consultation mailing zone using translucent envelopes during statutory consultation. These envelopes were selected for sustainability and practicality reasons, with the intention of allowing the recipients to see that the information inside related to the Transmission Assets and associated consultation.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				The consultation mailing zone was consistently reviewed throughout the pre-application process and was expanded between the non-statutory and statutory periods of consultation to ensure the local community were made aware of upcoming consultation activity. Full details of the consultation mailing zone can be found in the Consultation report (document reference E1); for the statutory consultation a total of 52,587 properties and businesses we sent a newsletter to advertise the consultation. This was also sent to 22,814 properties and businesses on the Isle of Man. The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included local media advertising (online and offline) and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers.
TA_0135_004_191123	S44	Email	There is no clear indication of what alternatives have been considered. This sort of development is only suitable for brownfield sites away from a residential area. There has to be a more appropriate site within Lancashire, eg the power station at Heysham that is about to be decommissioned.-I therefore call upon you at Morecambe and Morgan to stop this discussion immediately , be honest and open about who is involved , provide more detailed information and to investigate alternative site for these substations.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0136_002_201123	S44	Email	As you will not really have much of an idea about the traffic chaos around St Anne's , believe me , having lived in this area all my life , as soon as there is even small roadworks - there becomes only one route in and out of St Anne's to Blackpool - this causes absolute carnage on the roads and is certainly not bareable , nor acceptable for a long period of time . There are better routes and options surely .	Traffic and transport impacts arising during the construction phase of the Transmission Assets have been fully assessed at section 7.11 Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference E3.7) with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8).Details of the operation and maintenance phases are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Onshore maintenance would be limited to essential maintenance and/or emergency works. Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0138_002_201123	S44	Email	At the consultation, the plans were vague, but it was clear there is an alternative option - to run the cables through the airport. This absolutely has to be the solution for the sake of our community. Since COVID, St Annes has been busier than ever with tourists and it seems crazy to ruin our town and community at a time when it is being regenerated. On a personal level, I am also very concerned about the work devaluing my home, as well as significantly disrupting my family's life for a significant period of time.	It is noted that the option presented at PEIR (placement of cables in trenches within the highways) near Blackpool Airport is no longer required. Details of the current design are provided in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Potential indirect impacts on tourism associated with potential changes to visual amenity of local areas has been assessed within Volume 4 Chapter 2: Socio-economics of the ES (document reference F4.2). Other potential impacts on local amenity and indirect impacts on residents and visitors have been assessed in Volume 1, Annex 5.1: Human health of the ES (document reference F1.5.1), Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8) and Volume 3, Chapter 9: Air quality of the ES (document reference F3.9). The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens.The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.
TA_0139_001_201123	S44	Email	I would like to use the opportunity during this public consultation period, to unequivocally Object to your proposals and express my concerns over the proposed off shore Wind Farm cable routing and substation locations within the Fylde coast. I believe this would have a grossly negative impact on the Environment both physically, via the works proposed and Visually, damaging an	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>untold amount of wildlife habitat and green belt protected land, conservation areas, highly productive farmland and have a hugely detrimental impact on the wider community and local economy, putting local business, land owners and Farmers out of business. I believe it would create an untold amount of suffering for residents within the Fylde coast for years to come via flooding and disruption i.e. traffic. - Accompanying documentation. https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Fylde-Biodiversity-SPD-Adopted-11-September-2019-FINAL.pdf http://www.stannesonthesea-tc.gov.uk/documents/(12)%20150612-St.%20Anne%27s%20NDP%20Main%20Document%20Pre%20Submission%20Final.1.pdf https://www.birdguides.com/sites/europe/britain-ireland/britain/england/lancashire/lytham-moss/ https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/EL6.020b-vi-Matter-6-Appendix-CA4-part-1-Oyston-Estates-050-.pdf We as residents look forward to your response in writing to these questions and look forward to your site visit.</p>	<p>2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0139_004_201123	S44	Email	<p>In additional to the above questions still not answered in writing as of 9th November the residents would like to ask the following questions after Monday 6th November Webinar. 14.) Why was the first route for the substations and cables axed, I believe Penwortham was not the first option? 15.) How wide is the Indicative onshore export cable corridor? (Light purple on Lytham Moss) and where is it going on an Ordnance Survey map. If it is 122m wide, where will it be crossing Queensway? Our questions have not been adequately answered on this. 16.) What size are the substations and is there only 4? Will there definitely not be a Substation, Booster stations in Blackpool or Lytham St Anne's? If Morecambe substation Sub Station 12500 sq metres roughly 30 acres max height 20 Metres, and Morgan substation is 15 acres max height 20 Metres is the sites in Kirkham where they will be located? 17.) If your proposed route is a Biologic Heritage Site for migrating birds would the project be stopped during migration? There are great crested newts, otters, bats, water voles, etc. as well as migrating birds such as pink foot geese and Whooper Swans. 18.) Why have you asked some residents on the same street of Division Lane for details of people or organisations have interest in the land/ property, Mortgage / Charge, name of lender and mortgage reference and not others? Several residents own more than one piece of land and they have received 2 different letters why when these are generic letters? Is this because you are thinking of using your compulsory acquisition powers to acquire Land/Properties/Part of land in Blackpool, Lytham Moss, Lytham St Anne's? In the webinar on 6th November you stated you have to inform all interested parties but yet you are not asking all residents the same questions, is the mortgage question because you want to come to a voluntary agreement to purchase land or property? 19.) Will the cabling create noise for residents similar to pylons? 20.) How will you mitigate raising the water table? 21.) There are only 3 routes in and out of Lytham St Annes from Blackpool and when one is shut you can sit in 45 minutes to an hour each way in delays if the Promenade or Queensway is shut affecting residents and businesses. If you are now proposing using Kilnhouse Lane, Leach Lane, Queensway and Blackpool Road North to install cable ducts, how long do you believe this work will take and how</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE) which no longer includes any surface piercing structures. This includes the removal of the Morgan Booster Station and associated search areas. The OSPs are to be classed as part of the Generation Assets applications only. Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Properties on Division Lane border the draft Order Limits and so the Project has a duty to consult with those legal interests as part of the DCO application. To ensure the Applicant has consulted with all land interests, Dalcour Maclaren undertake land referencing to identify these interests through HMLR searches and Land Interest Questionnaires. This includes in some circumstances requesting information for any third-party interests in the land, details of which are outlined in the land referencing methodology. Some parties are asked to provide information about their interest prior to the project order limits being refined. This captures a wider area than ultimately necessary. Being asked for this information does not mean that you will be</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>much disruption will it cause to residents and businesses. Queensway - Traffic management. This is the main arterial route into St Annes from Blackpool, extremely busy 40mph road.22.)How will you communicate with residents during construction? Please consider social media for project updates.23.) Can you guarantee Midgeland Road will not be used to import Cable/equipment?24.) Will bridal paths be out of use while installing the cable corridor?25.) Blackpool Council are also doing lots of alterations on Common Edge Road (EZ Zone https://blackpoolez.com), the drainage off these works are to go into a attenuation basin alongside Blackpool Airport, has this been considered in your planning for the cable corridor (https://pa.fylde.gov.uk/Planning/Display/23/0758).26.) The Lytham moss land is wet and very low lying. - could cause flooding to us on Division Lane how will this be combated.27.) What is the proximity of the cable corridor to properties on Division Lane.28.) How will you stop settlement on properties adjacent to the projects, path?29.) Fylde size of Division Lane is not connect to main drains and has Dykes and Septic Tanks either on our adjacent to properties, how will these be protected.30.) Is there a provision for cleaning Dykes once the project is finished, as when other project have been completed this has caused problems for residents and we as riparian owners have a responsibility to clear dykes, but we should not be expect to clear your waste into these dykes.On behalf of residents of REDACTED.</p>	<p>directly affected. Interest are identified by plot rather than address so any off lying land will be covered. We have a duty to consult all parties with an interest in land, a mortgage is effectively an interest and entitled to notification.</p>
TA_0140_005_201123	S44	Email	<p>I believe that the substations are going to be on green belt and are absolutely huge.They are going to be close to schools which is appalling.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0141_001_201123	S44	Email	<p>I object to the above proposal. Kirkham is a small market town , the market square has already been ruined by a party of people who have removed a fully functional and well used car park by shop owners, people shopping, people visiting doctors surgeries. To create a wind farm just outside kirkham is not a good idea, the impact on farmers land could be terrible, the local prison have livestock in certain fields, there are many private properties in the proposed area , many of which are young families, elderly people, people with disabilities, the wind farm would not only be an eye sore but could cause noise pollution, it's vicinity to local schools and nurseries, the local prison, there is also a flooding risk which could cause major problems . Plans for such wind farms should be looked at in far bigger desolate areas of land, not within close proximity to a local town.</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0142_002_201123	S44	Email	<p>And after speaking with my MP, Mr Menzies,we (the residents of Freckleton),agree that these super structures should be built elsewhere & the cabling should be plumbed in at Penwortham. Freckleton also suffers from flooding,so why on earth would you want to build structures like you plan to here?It makes no sense at all.</p>	<p>The assessment of the impact of increased flood risk arising from additional surface water runoff is presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2).Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase. An Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan (document reference J10) for the substation site(s) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Operational Drainage Management Plan will include measures to ensure that existing land drainage is</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				reinstated and/or maintained. This will include measures to limit discharge rates and attenuate flows to maintain greenfield runoff rates at the onshore substations. It will also include measures to control surface water runoff, including measures to prevent flooding of the working areas or offsite and to ensure any runoff is treated appropriately. The Operational Drainage Management Plan will be developed in line with the latest relevant drainage guidance notes in consultation with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority (Lancashire County Council).
TA_0143_001_201123	S44	Email	My name is REDACTED of REDACTED and REDACTED. I have lived in Newton for 28 years, my husband and late father-in-law owned and operated a dairy farm on the site of REDACTED, Grange Lane, Newton. I chose to live/reside in this location because it is rural and should remain rural. The siting of the substation on Zone 1 or any one of the proposed locations is extremely worrying. My concerns regarding these proposals are as follows:-Green Belt landPrime agricultural land, potentially rendering the land uselessIn an area of separationWay too close to two schoolsWay too close to residential propertiesFloodingVisual impactNoise, light, vibrationWildlifeCongestionDecreasing the value of land and propertySafety hazard Surely there must be other options available with far less intrusion on the whole of the Fylde.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0145_002_201123	S44	Email	The non statutory consultation is also flawed. There was no information as to how the four location search zones were identified or selected. You have also not considered identified enterprise zones and brown field sites as identified by Fylde Borough Council. The PEIR obviously shows that you have predetermined the outcome in favour of zone 1, the RAG assessment is biased in favour of zone 1, with the rating being inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect. Below are some of the points which demonstrate this. High pressure gas main. The high pressure gas main only touches the extreme eastern edge of zone 2, this could be managed. This is not made clear. Flood risk – Inspection of flood zone maps shows there is little difference in flood risk between zones 1 and 2. This is not made clear. Zone 1 and zone 2 are roughly equidistant from SSSI so not a factor to differentiate siting as claimed. Bluefield solar farm development is not in zone 2, it is just in zone 1. Inconsistent treatment of wildlife concerns and surveys. Limited number of ornithological surveys used to inform RAG selection process for sites. Zone 1 lies within Kirkham/Newton area of separation zone and FBC green belt. This is not weighted appropriately in the RAG. Proximity to residential development is not factored in the RAG selection assessment for zones.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0145_006_201123	S44	Email	In summary the consultation process has not been transparent, the correct information has not been provided and you have selected the zone 1 site without proper consideration of the other sites or alternative solutions such as using the Ribble estuary to link directly into the Penwortham substation. I hope you will reconsider your proposal and find a solution that, while it might not be as cost effective, will be more suitable to the environment and residents of the Fylde coast.	The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0147_001_201123	S44	Email	My name is REDACTED of REDACTED. I have lived in Newton all of my life (24 years) and have adored the rural setting. The siting of the substation on Zone 1 or any one of the proposed locations causes me great anxiety. Here is a list of my concerns regarding these proposals:- Green Belt land- Prime agricultural land, potentially rendering the land useless- In an area of separation- Much too close to two schools and residential properties- Flooding- Visual impact- Noise, light, and vibration problems- Wildlife disturbance due to the destruction of habitats- Safety	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			hazard- Traffic congestion in the areas surrounding the potential site. I am sure there must be other places this substation could be built within Fylde that would have considerably less impact on people's livelihoods.	1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0148_001_201123	S44	Email	My name is REDACTED of REDACTED and REDACTED. I have lived in Newton for 48 years, dairy farming with my father on the site of REDACTED. The siting of the substation on Zone 1 or any one of the proposed locations is extremely worrying. My concerns regarding these proposals are as follows:-Green Belt landPrime agricultural land, potentially rendering the land uselessIn an area of separationFar too close to two schools and residential propertiesFloodingVisual impactNoise, light, vibrationWildlifeCongestionDecreasing the value of land and propertySafety hazardSurely there must be other options with far less intrusion on the whole of the Fylde.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0149_002_201123	S44	Email	I object to any disturbance of local wildlife as there are clearly alternatives available which seem to be ignored due to additional costs. For example, why not continue horizontal drilling further inland? Why not use the soon to be decommissioned power station to the north as a connection point to the national grid?	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0150_003_201123	S44	Email	The Non-statutory consultation was also flawed and, therefore, should be ignored as there was no explanation as to how the four search zone locations were identified in the first place. The PIER overlooks Fylde Borough Council's local plan, identifying Enterprise Zones, brownfield sites, and potential candidate zones. FBC should, therefore, refute the current plans and force them to be reconsidered in line with their strategy for the region.The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1—no consideration of locale to residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones.The RAG survey ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0150_006_201123	S44	Email	People invest their money to live in a semi-rural environment for mental health and wellbeing. This development promises to devalue their assets and destroy their chosen quality of life. There are alternative options laid out by the initial studies and FBCs plans, which should be reconsidered and different decisions made.	An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the WorldHealth Organisation definition of health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing. Any effects are assessed to be not significant and appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards. The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0150_008_201123	S44	Email	I am not opposing green energy, but the infrastructure in the proposed plans is not acceptable when there are more sensitive and responsible alternatives. Repurposing of existing assets (Heysham power station) or routes like Ribble Estuary have been ignored.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0151_003_201123	S44	Email	No explanation as how the 4 identified zones were selected in the first place. The PIER has ignored FBC's local plan regarding the possibility of enterprise zones and brown field sites as potential candidate zones. RAG survey report ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0152_005_201123	S44	Email	The cable corridors to Penwortham should be sent down the river rather than across prime pasture land . Both areas have significant wildlife and sites of special scientific interest which ideally should not be disturbed but I feel the river would be less obtrusive. Why do we need such large substations in such close proximity on green pasture land when there are FBC Enterprise Zones and brown field sites which could be considered ?	The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0153_002_201123	S44	Email	I am aware and support that environmental factors have to be considered, this is presumably why the river is not being used . Whichever route is chosen it will have an effect but a balance of risk has to be applied and all possible routes considered, including the use of Heysham substation, in order to minimise risks to humans ,livelihoods' and impact on the environment , including prime agricultural land. I do not feel real balance has been considered and made evident. This scheme	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			should not go ahead without further consultation and evidence presented as to the various choices ,cost and practicality of each one.	and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0154_002_201123	S44	Email	My second objection is the sites proposed sit on an area of grade A agricultural land loss of this seems to be at odds with the need for green energy, particularly when there seems to be no reasons that can be given as to why existing sites at Heysham and Penwortham cannot be used , limiting loss of green field site and minimising community disruption. The lad to be built on represents demarcation land between local villages and parishes. Losing this and effectively placing industrial units between then will not only join these villages but cause the loss of "rural fylde" , angin at odds with the green agenda.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. The Planning Statement (document reference J28) sets out an assessment on the impact on the countryside and location of the substations. The Applicants have made design changes since the PEIR and further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has included refinements of the location and design of the onshore substations, including - selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets - refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received. Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES.
TA_0155_002_211123	S44	Email	I understand from the event that the substation in operation will emit a continuous noise and that the level is currently indeterminate. The current plans identify the potential proximity of the installation to a number of properties. This proximity looks wholly unnecessary but is allegedly due to geology, topography, number of landowners and other considerations. I assume this means cost?	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). An assessment of the noise and vibration impacts due to the Transmission Assets are presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.2: Construction Noise and Vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.2) and Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational Noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3). The cumulative noise and vibration impacts with other proposed developments is considered in section 8.13 of Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8).
TA_0155_009_211123	S44	Email	Were alternative routings for cables considered, and if they were, what criteria made them unsuitable? Grateful for an appropriate response to these issues.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0156_004_211123	S44	Email	The Non-statutory consultation was also flawed and, therefore, should be ignored as there was no explanation as to how the four search zone locations were identified in the first place. The PIER overlooks Fylde Borough Council's local plan, identifying Enterprize Zones, brownfield sites, and potential candidate zones. FBC should, therefore, refute the current plans and force them to be reconsidered in line with their strategy for the region. The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1— no consideration of locale to residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones. The RAG survey ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0156_009_211123	S44	Email	I am not opposing green energy, but the infrastructure in the proposed plans is not acceptable when there are more sensitive and responsible alternatives. Repurposing of existing assets (Heysham power station) or routes like Ribble Estuary have been ignored.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0157_002_211123	S44	Email	I understand from the event that the substation in operation will emit a continuous noise and that the level is currently indeterminate. The current plans identify the potential proximity of the installation to a number of properties. This proximity looks wholly unnecessary but is allegedly due to geology, topography, number of landowners and other considerations. I assume this means cost?	An assessment of the noise and vibration impacts due to the Transmission Assets are presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.2: Construction Noise and Vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.2) and Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational Noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3). The cumulative noise and vibration impacts with other proposed developments is considered in section 8.13 of Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0157_009_211123	S44	Email	Were alternative routings for cables considered, and if they were, what criteria made them unsuitable? Grateful for an appropriate response to these issues.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0158_011_211123	S44	Email	2.The non-statutory consultation is also flawed. No explanation was provided on how the four zones were selected. Preliminary Environmental Information Report ignores the Fylde Borough Council Enterprise Zones and brown field sites as options.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0158_012_211123	S44	Email	3.PEIR shows evidence of the developer predetermining outcome in favour of Zone 1. Unexplained routes for Zone 1 were presented on maps as part of the non-statutory consultation sessions.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0158_013_211123	S44	Email	4.Logic in the PEIR to downsizing from four to one search zones if flawed. The RAG ratings are inconsistent, subjective, factually incorrect and contradictory:	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>a.Does not explain how the High Pressure Gas Main will be managed safely</p> <p>b.Not clear about the flood risk, in an area already well-known for flooding as the drains are inadequate</p> <p>c.Zones 1 and 2 are roughly the same distance from the SSSI so not a factor to differentiate siting as claimed</p> <p>d.The Bluefield solar farm is in Zone 1, not in Zone 2</p> <p>e.Wildlife concerns and surveys are inconsistent</p> <p>f.Zone 1 lies in the Kirkham and Newton Area of Separation AND FBC Green Belt – not weighted properly in the RAG</p> <p>g.Proximity of residential development not factored into the RAG selection assessment for Zones</p>	<p>Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0158_018_211123	S44	Email	<p>9. Apparently the original site chosen was in Penwortham, near the current substation at Howick and out of view from the public, yet the people of Penwortham rejected this sound proposal. In Newton it will be stand out as a massive blot on our greenbelt! I urge you to reconsider the location of this substation to somewhere more appropriate.</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.</p>
TA_0159_001_211123	S44	Email	<p>Good afternoon I am writing with regard to the above proposed Wind Farm. I have no objection to wind farming in general as I believe this is a sustainable source of clean renewable energy. However, as a resident of REDACTED which is halfway between Kirkham & Freckleton, I do have an objection to the route the cables are being laid to the proposed Sub-Stations and to the siting of said sub-stations in our locality to service this Wind Farm. I do not understand why the route for the cables for this wind farm are coming through this locality when your information states that the wind farm will be located in Morecambe Bay some 21 miles away or more. It seems from the scant information received to-date that there has been little or no consideration for the local residents. There will be a detrimental impact and prolonged severe disruption caused by digging up the fields and numerous roads which will have an effect on local schools, nurseries and cause traffic obstructions. Not to mention the impact this will have on the local wildlife.</p>	<p>The siting and design of the substations has been developed through an iterative design process, e.g., the Morgan substation has been moved eastwards since submission of the PEIR to increase the distance between it and residential properties on Lower Lane. In addition, direct impacts are avoided on the public right of way and the footprint seems to respect field boundaries. Similarly, the Morecambe substation has also been located further away from a number of residential receptors. This is described in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). An Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2) has been developed and is provided within Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register (document reference F1.5.3) which sets out details of mitigation planting at the onshore substations, including the number, location, species and details of management and maintenance of planting. Where practical, landscape mitigation planting will be established as early as reasonably practicable in the construction phase</p>
TA_0159_002_211123	S44	Email	<p>I am very keen that the impact on local wildlife is kept to a minimum but I fail to understand why these cables cannot be sent down the Ribble Estuary which, although I know there will be some impact on the wildlife, it seems to me that this will be a lesser impact than that caused by the proposals as mentioned above both in the short term and long term.</p>	<p>The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0159_003_211123	S44	Email	I cannot find anything like the size of these Sub-Stations near to a residential area anywhere else in the UK. Would this type of structure be better placed away from a residential area on brownfield land as opposed to running through/on greenfield land?	Justification for the location of the Project, including a description of the design and/ or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Maximum parameters for the substation have been refined following statutory consultation . Consideration of proximity to residential areas and receptors was a key constraint. Following design refinements, Morgan substation has moved further away from residential receptors and Morecambe option south moved further away from Newton and out of greenbelt.
TA_0160_004_211123	S44	Email	The proposed locations are opposite a large residential area.I have not found an existing one like it in the UK so close to a residential area to obtain any facts. We have no idea what it will look like, as we are told you have no design / artist impressions or similar to show the residents it will affect. We just have a square meterage.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Visualisations have been presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage.
TA_0160_007_211123	S44	Email	I believe the Estuary option has been looked at (but the report has not been made public) needs investigating further. Suggestions are that this is not viable due to environmental impact, however, this must have a less environmental impact than fetching a cable corridor / complete with accessible Transition joint Bays , wider than the M55 motorway from Blackpool to Freckleton, desecrating the environment / the people who work and live on the land and all the wild life that thrives off it. The documentation supplied on page 14 shows an indicative diagram showing the cable leaving the proposed substations to Penwortham also being underground, but there is no proposal for this that the general public have been made aware of yet.Following the consultation, and yourselves relooking at the option of going down the Estuary to Penwortham, the proposed Substations can be removed / repositioned to vacant Brown Field sites making a less impact on the area and environment.I also believe that Heysham power station is due to be decommissioned in 2028, surely this would be an ideal option to bring the cables to shore and access the National Grid utilising the existing infrastructure with minimal if any impact to the local communities.	The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0161_002_211123	S44	Email	I have been unable to find an example of another enormous substation built so close to communities. Is this setting an unwelcome national precedent?	Justification for the location of the Project, including a description of the design and/ or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Maximum parameters for the substation have been refined following statutory consultation . Consideration of proximity to residential areas and receptors was a key constraint. Following design refinements, Morgan substation has moved further away from residential receptors and Morecambe option south moved further away from Newton and out of greenbelt.
TA_0161_007_211123	S44	Email	B)Route/Site Selection This is also flawed and needs to be revisited. Ba) Selection of 4 search zones•There has been no explanation about how the four search zones were identified and selected from landfall to Penwortham and how the substation search zones were chosen. What is the explanation for the selection of the four search zones?•National Grid Planning for Offshore Wind Farms and their connection to the National Grid The Pathway to 2030 Holistic Network	The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>Design ESO (nationalgrideso.com) shows an offshore set of connections that appear to go South of the Ribble and link to Penwortham. However, routes south of the Ribble or under the Ribble have been eliminated for this project causing the whole scheme to move closer to communities. Have other options been considered – what about the brownfield site at Heysham which is shortly to be decommissioned? What about land in Penwortham that is already owned by the National Grid? Why was going down the River Ribble discounted so readily? Why have brownfield sites not been chosen over greenbelt land? Why is good agricultural land being chosen? What about land in Penwortham already owned by the National Grid? What about land at Heysham which is shortly to be decommissioned? Why are the substations so large? Is this to meet current need or future? We were told that the Morgan substation was so large that its proposed location was the only possible spot. Why could the existing substation in Penwortham not be expanded to make use of the infrastructure there?</p>	<p>Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).</p>
TA_0161_008_211123	S44	Email	<p>Bb) The down select from four zones to one zone. This feels like a predetermined decision. Has the Amber, Green (RAG) Report report being used as a mechanism to work backwards i.e. The answer is Zone one – now how do we set the criteria to produce that answer? Some of the RAG ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect, and the scoring system lacks rigour. Why has the Fylde Local Plan not been taken into consideration ie the Area of Separation between Newton and Kirkham and greenbelt status of land in Zone 1, the identified brownfield Warton Enterprise Zone. There is no attempt to consider mitigation which would change judgements and hence move the substations into another zone eg the high pressure gas main only touches the edge of Zone 2. Could this have been managed? Flood Zone maps indicate that there is little difference between Zone 1 and Zone 2. Zone 1 and Zone 2 are roughly equally distant from an SSSI. Bluefield Solar Farm development is only in Zone 1 – not in Zone 2. Proximity to homes and businesses and population density has also not been factored in. Destruction of farms and businesses has not been factored in. Zone 3 and 4 had red ratings for ecology because they were 1km and 2.5 km from the River Ribble and SPAs, but Zone 1 is less than 2.5km from Newton Marsh SS1. The RAG appears to weight scoring in favour of birdlife rather than the lives and livelihoods of local people. (Then conversely the project team seem to disregard the needs of animals by failing to connect the potential bio-diversity net gain area providing no suitable corridors for wildlife). In addition, unexplained routes for Zone 1 were shown on maps as part of the non-statutory consultation process. What is the significance of the 8kilometre rule? Magically all of the proposed sites fit just within this. Is 8kilometres always applied in these projects? How much has the RAG criteria been influenced by cost/profit margins?</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0161_009_211123	S44	Email	<p>Substations & Cabling. Two large substations in close proximity will result in over intensive development and industrialisation of Zone 1. This will have a significantly adverse impact to local amenity and a change of character from rural/agricultural to industrial, especially when compounded with the proposed Bluefield Solar Farm. The visual and audible intrusions on peoples lives by having not just one, but two substations will be unbearable. Why does the project need two substations? Why are they so vast? Why can they not be co-located? Most other substations in the UK appear to be much further away from communities – this scheme appears to be setting an unwelcome precedent in terms of proximity to residential areas. Why are you now considering building so close o a community?</p>	<p>The Electricity System Operator (ESO) is responsible for planning and operation of the transmission system and ensuring the balance of electricity generation with electricity demand. The Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm were scoped into the Pathway to 2030 workstream of the UK Government's Offshore Transmission Network Review (OTNR). As part of the OTNR, the ESO assessed options to improve the coordination offshore wind farm connections and associated transmission networks. In July 2022, the UK Government published the Pathway to 2030 Holistic Network Design (HNDR) Report which set out the results of the OTNR. A key output of the HNDR process was the recommendation that the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm should work collaboratively in connecting the two offshore wind farms to the National Grid electricity transmission network at Penwortham in Lancashire. The Transmission Assets provide a connection to the National Grid for two nationally significant offshore wind farms and contribute to the UK Government's ambition to deliver 50 GW offshore wind by 2030 in order to achieve net zero by 2050. The need for Transmission Assets is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 2: Policy and legislation context (document reference F1.2) of the ES. Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0161_013_211123	S44	Email	<p>•The substations and the cabling routes will cut into large areas of good quality farmland that will in turn affect food security and the livelihoods and lifestyle of our traditional farming community. If the farms are taken or made financially unviable this area will be losing its rural/ agricultural identity. Some of the farms provide income via the Hornbies Trust for Newton Bluecoat School. What impact will the drop in income have on these children? How can the farmers sustain their farms and families, grow crops and keep cattle?• The substations and cabling routes impact on amenity and leisure activity e.g. walking the existing Public Rights of Way and rural lanes and tracks. Sightlines from historic sites will also be adversely impacted. Why are you using green areas rather than brownfields sites?</p>	<p>The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets on recreational resources, including PRow are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES. Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of this chapter of the ES. This includes preparation of a PRow Management Strategy in general accordance with the Outline PRow Management Strategy (document reference J1.5) submitted with the DCO application. The measures to be implemented as part of the PRow Management Strategy seek to minimise impacts on public footpaths, bridleways and other promoted routes (e.g. National Cycle Routes (NCRs), Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Transmission Assets.</p>
TA_0161_014_211123	S44	Email	<p>•No route has yet been declared for the 400kV cables from the substations to Penwortham. It is still showed as a large tract of land that is potentially impacted. There is still no information about how the cables will cross the River Ribble, though the project team said verbally that there would be no infrastructure above ground. How can you guarantee there will be no further infrastructure above ground for the Ribble crossing if you do not yet know the route or the engineering challenges faced?•All cabling being put in place via wide 120m trenches apart from when crossing the river and major roads. Why can't trenchless technology be used along the whole route? This would be less intrusive and disruptive to the farmers and livestock. Farmers are saying that the land would take tens of years to recover and become productive again after being displaced during trench digging. •There is much talk in the press after the Winsor report about the move to overhead cables to speed the delivery of additional electricity into the National Grid. Is there a possibility that the underground cables will be changed to overhead cables?</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets design has resulted in a reduced construction corridor width, as set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Details of the factors considered during the design evolution are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). Direct pipe or microtunnelling is proposed beneath the River Ribble to ensure that there would be no direct impacts on the river habitats. As set out in Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3), Crossing techniques are set out within Volume 1, Annex 3.2: Onshore Crossing Schedule of the ES (document reference F1.3.2) which is submitted as part of the application for development consent. Further information on the proposed approach to construction is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES. The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6).</p>
TA_0162_002_211123	S44	Email	<p>There appears to have been a number of alternative proposals dismissed based on cost and nothing more.</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0162_004_211123	S44	Email	<p>I am heavily in favour of affordable green energy, but the infrastructure in the proposed plans are not acceptable when there are more sensitive and responsible alternatives. Repurposing of existing assets (Heysham power station) or routes like Ribble Estuary have been ignored. Also we have seen in recent times that companies like BP charge extortionate amounts for their energy and rake in obscene profits for what are essential services. They are a major factor in today's cost of living crisis. BP are pushing through these decisions, seemingly with the backing of decision-makers already in the bag. I oppose the development for all the above reasons.</p>	<p>The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).</p>
TA_0163_003_211123	S44	Email	<p>The Non-statutory consultation was also flawed and, therefore, should be ignored as there was no explanation as to how the four search zone locations were identified in the first place. The PIER overlooks Fylde Borough Council's local plan, identifying Enterprise Zones, brownfield sites, and potential candidate zones. FBC should, therefore, refute the current plans and force them to be reconsidered in line with their strategy for the region.>>>> The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1—no consideration of locale to residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones.>>>> The RAG survey ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0163_006_211123	S44	Email	<p>People invest their money to live in a semi-rural environment for mental health and wellbeing. This development promises to devalue their assets and destroy their chosen quality of life. There are alternative options laid out by the initial studies and FBCs plans, which should be reconsidered and different decisions made.</p>	<p>An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the WorldHealth Organisation definition of health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing. Any effects are assessed to be not significant and appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards. The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0163_008_211123	S44	Email	<p>I am not opposing green energy, but the infrastructure in the proposed plans is not acceptable when there are more sensitive and responsible alternatives. Repurposing of existing assets (Heysham power station) or routes like Ribble Estuary have been ignored.</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0164_001_211123	S44	Email	I think you need to look at an alternative route, I went to your explanation at the Cricket Club with your employees who couldn't answer certain questions, took e mail addresses and didn't get in touch. What I want to know is who is going to pay for damage to properties, who is going to make sure my company vehicle stays outside my house and as I am 60 years old and my husband is 65 years old who is going to carry our shopping to our house. I will be supporting any objection this brings about and I am fed up of being told B.S just so you get your own way and making our lives a misery .	Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicant spoke with the interest at the consultation event and understood all the queries raised to be answered at the time. The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.
TA_0165_002_211123	S44	Email	Additionally, there has been no clear explanation provided as to why this particular location was chosen for the construction of the transformer. It is essential for the residents to understand the reasoning behind this decision and to be assured that the chosen site is the most suitable option with minimal impact on the community.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0166_001_131123	S44	Email	I am totally opposed to the project that has the intention of landfall through the Fylde coast with Land based stations. The transmission cables are expected to join at the National Grid in Penwortham, Preston which is south of the River Ribble. I strongly suggest the River Ribble is used for channeling of the transmission cables or the land south of the River Ribble. This will avoid channeling through the Fylde's Road, footpaths and agricultural network. Rooting the cables south of the river will avoid human habitation, roads and foot paths and will not interfere with the daily lives of residents. Animal and bird life will recover quickly from trenching of transmission cables south of the River Ribble which will be done easier than by trenching through urban areas. I reject the wind farms proposals please acknowledge receipt of my email in opposition to your plans.	The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0167_004_171023	S44	Email	I am not sure how many of those who attended the consultation events appreciated the size and weight of the short section of High Voltage cable on display. The prospect of installing eighteen of these for approximately 25km with a contiguous work area of 120m implies a massive civil engineering project causing significant disruption over a prolonged period of time. The precise location of the onshore assets where they leave the sea bed is not identified nor the specific infrastructure required at this point of entry. You simply state that these underground transition joint bays (presumably on the landfall area beyond the high tidemark) will be located in the vicinity of Blackpool Airport. This is insufficient information to expect a considered response as it is simply too vague.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0118_012_151123	S44	Email	I am writing this email to let you know I was informed at one of your consultation events that the National grid suggested 2 options to you one at Penwortham and one at Heysham. I strongly oppose your choice of Penwortham due to you causing major disruptions from Lytham to Freckleton and then onwards to Penwortham when you could use the substation due to end in 2028 in Heysham. If you use Heysham one you will not be using good agricultural land which is currently used by local farmers to make a living, you will not be disrupting homes and families in	Under the Offshore Transmission Network Review, the National Grid Electricity System Operator (NGESO) is responsible for assessing options to improve the coordination offshore wind generation connections and transmission networks and has undertaken a Holistic Network Design Review (HNDR). A key output of the HNDR process was the recommendation that the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm should work collaboratively in connecting

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>the process, you will not be deliberately killing wildlife and you will not need to build 2 substations in a rural part of Freckleton one of which is the size of 13 football pitches and 70ft high overlooking peoples properties. Your proposals for doing this are totally unaccepttable and in my view immoral when you can use Heysham and save a lot of time and money.</p>	<p>the two offshore wind farms to the National Grid electricity transmission network at Penwortham in Lancashire. Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0183_006_221123	S44	Email	<p>There are far more responsible alternatives which don't involve a blatant disregard for people businesses or ecosystems. The repurposing of existing assets, such as Heysham Power Station, or alternate routes, such as down the Ribble Estuary, have been completely ignored.</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). The Electricity System Operator (ESO) is responsible for planning and operation of the transmission system and ensuring the balance of electricity generation with electricity demand. The Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm were scoped into the Pathway to 2030 workstream of the UK Government's Offshore Transmission Network Review (OTNR). As part of the OTNR, the ESO assessed options to improve the coordination offshore wind farm connections and associated transmission networks. In July 2022, the UK Government published the Pathway to 2030 Holistic Network Design (HNDR) Report which set out the results of the OTNR. A key output of the HNDR process was the recommendation that the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm should work collaboratively in connecting the two offshore wind farms to the National Grid electricity transmission network at Penwortham in Lancashire.</p>
TA_0183_007_221123	S44	Email	<p>We unequivocally OBJECT to these proposals and implore you to look at alternate routes.</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0188_007_221123	S44	Email	<p>Impact on wildlife We have had numerous ecological surveys carried out across our land and, whilst we have not had any feedback on the findings of these yet (despite this being promised at the time when the surveys were being carried out), we know for a fact that the land supports a huge number of bird species and varied wildlife. We regularly see barn owls, bats, swans, geese, brown hares and huge numbers of wild birds, and the destruction of all their habitats will be devastating. We will lose many of our ponds, ditches and hedges, all of which are a haven for wildlife. Whilst I appreciate that remedial work will take place after the building work is completed, I fear that it will be too late and many of these species will never return. When we suggested the viability of using the River Ribble estuary or the adjacent marshland as the cable route we were</p>	<p>The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets on protected species and protected habitats are considered in Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES. Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on onshore ecology and nature conservation are provided in section 3.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference: F3.3). The ES includes an assessment of the Transmission Assets alone in section 4.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4). Details on the impacts on European sites from the Transmission Assets are</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			told that it cannot even be considered due to its status as a SSSI. Are the animals and birds that live at our farm less important than the birds living near the river?	contained within the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (ISAA) report (document reference E2.1, 2.2, 2.3). Both the ES and the ISAA consider construction impacts, including impacts on functionally linked land. The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0188_008_221123	S44	Email	Questions that need to be answered Why exactly was this site was chosen for the substation? Are there detailed feasibility studies for all other potential sites that were considered? I believe that Heysham Power Station is due to be decommissioned in 2026. Could this site not be used, along with the existing infrastructure? Why can overhead power cables not be used to transmit the power? Whilst pylons are unsightly, I feel they are an infinitely preferable option to having the cables buried in valuable farmland.	Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3).
TA_0189_002_221123	S44	Email	My general objections to the siting of the Morgan and Morecambe substations, which seem to have been totally ignored, are: 1. Dangerously close proximity to a large housing estate on REDACTED and to many individual homes. It won't be more than 100 metres away from some of these and also very close to the large village of Newton with Scales	Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3).
TA_0189_014_221123	S44	Email	It is becoming increasingly obvious the massive disruption that this proposed development is going to cause to the lives of residents on the Fylde coast, and if you want to get this project off the ground with the support of the locals then it is going to have to be radically changed. There are many alternatives that seem to have been ruled out for ridiculous reasons. It is obvious to me that it would be far better to use overhead cables than going underground, causing far less disruption to everyone and also being a much cheaper alternative for yourselves. Other alternatives that I believe should be considered are: · Bring the cables along the River Ribble as this is a much more direct route to the substation at Penwortham. · Develop the new substations next to the sewage works on Freckleton Marsh. This is a brownfield site as opposed to greenbelt, it is built up so there is no risk of flooding, it is well away from all housing and schools and there are already good access roads directly off the A584. · Kirkham Prison is not in the greenbelt and there is a large brownfield site behind the prison buildings which is large enough for the substations. There is also good access to the site. · Heysham Power Station is set to be decommissioned in 2026/2028. All the infrastructure is in place there for the transmission of electricity above ground and after the power station ceases operating this could surely be used as a more viable alternative. I hope that when you have considered all the points raised in this letter you will reconsider the ridiculous and flawed proposals to ruin the Fylde.	Under the Offshore Transmission Network Review, the National Grid Electricity System Operator (NGESO) is responsible for assessing options to improve the coordination offshore wind generation connections and transmission networks and has undertaken a Holistic Network Design Review (HNDR). A key output of the HNDR process was the recommendation that the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm should work collaboratively in connecting the two offshore wind farms to the National Grid electricity transmission network at Penwortham in Lancashire. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological designations protected by national and international legislation. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt Estuary Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in extremely long construction timeframes and risk extensive, and potentially long-term damage to sensitive and protected habitats that support smelt and protected bird species, whilst also presenting unsafe working conditions during construction. The approach to site selection has been

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				based on avoiding damage to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0190_001_221123	S44	Email	<p>I am writing to you on behalf of the above-named client to make formal representation in relation to the proposed offshore wind farm, which proposes to transport electricity to the National Grid power station at Penwortham. As part of the consultation map, part of [REDACTED] farm has been allocated for providing a cable corridor of 122m and subsequent easement. The land take when measured on your scaled plans extends to circa 46,761.34 sqm (11.56 acres) or thereabouts for the easement. In addition to this, [REDACTED] land has been allocated as a potential compound site to facilitate the construction phase, extending to 15,238.59 sqm (3.77 acres) or thereabouts (denoted REDACTED on the 'Work Plans'). Finally, another smaller section of land appears to show a road widening scheme, denoted 12A on your plans and extending to approximately 1,096.04 sqm (0.27 acres) or thereabouts. Final measurements for all of the above are yet to be determined and could be in excess of these figures. Please provide clarification as to the section denoted REDACTED on your plan (attached herewith for your convenience). This scheme poses a significant risk to the viability of the farming operation at [REDACTED]. It involves taking approximately 15.60 acres of high-quality productive land used in connection with the dairy and sheep farm. The land is designated as Grade 2 on the Agricultural Land Classification Map for England. The total landholding extends to 150.90 acres or thereabouts, the loss of land represents a loss of 10% of the total farm holding for an extended period of time, whether that be temporary or permanent in nature.</p> <p>Agricultural Enterprise: The farming enterprise is a mixed dairy and sheep farm. Current numbers on the farm are as follows:- Dairy Cows - 80- Youngstock - 80- Breeding ewes – 280- Lambs - 300As stated above, the landowner has a number of major concerns with the project, namely:- The land being taken is some of the best and most versatile land (grade 2) on the holding but also more widely in Lancashire and around the country.- Slurry Regulations – in the very near future, the legal requirement of all farms on slurrybased systems will be to have 6 months storage. The land forming part of the scheme provides an extremely valuable outlet for slurry due to it being well drained and therefore dry all year round. The loss of this land will be very detrimental to slurry storage requirements on the holding, as the landowner loses the ability to spread on this land, leading to great volume in the store all year round.- Loss of vital mowing and grazing land – as stated above, approximately 15.60 acres of land used for summer silaging and winter sheep grazing will be lost for the duration of the scheme, some of which in perpetuity.- Additional feed requirements – as a result of losing land, the landowner will be required to purchase additional fodder and bedding, the cows will have to be supplementary fed.- The landowner has existing arrangements in place to sell hay/haylage to equestrian suitors. This arrangement is at risk due to losing land.- The landowner also allows horse grazing on fields adjacent to the scheme. The presence of contractors/construction workers is likely to make this arrangement redundant, leading to loss of earnings.- Noise, dust, artificial light and impact on residential amenity are all major concerns due to the proximity of the scheme to the farmhouse.- There are some concerns over the existing agri-environmental scheme located on the land. There is an existing Countryside Stewardship agreement, which incorporates the management of hedgerows option and gapping-up existing hedgerow, amongst other options. The landowner has incurred costs in instructing a land agent to prepare and submit the application. There are concerns in being able to manage the hedgerows as agreed with the Rural Payments Agency and therefore likely to incur payment reductions. Potential loss of BPS.- Reinstatement – the landowner is concerned about the stripping of the topsoil and subsequent reinstatement following the completion of the scheme. A common problem encountered is the mixing of subsoil (clay) and topsoil, resulting in a requirement for significant reinstatement and lower crop yields for a number of years thereafter. Fencing, hedging and drainage will require full and proper reinstatement. The landowner has major concerns around the disturbance of existing land drains, the problem only likely to become apparent months after the scheme is complete.- The landowner understandably wants to understand what he will be left with once works have been completed. Will there be any above ground structures on his land? E.g manholes.- The landowner is adamant that no access is to be taken through the farmyard. This would cause major disturbance/intrusion on the farming enterprise.- Compensation – the landowner is not impressed with his most recent dealings with the developers, who have not paid previously agreed compensation for a nominal sum. This does not bode well for future payments, which are likely to be much more significant.- Biosecurity – the developers use of contractors is considered a risk to biosecurity. People, machinery and materials</p>	<p>Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			will be brought on site, adding a significant risk to biosecurity and potential contamination risks. - Future access – the land where the scheme is proposed forms part of an access for larger contracting equipment (forager) to the landholding. - Road widening scheme – the landowner has major concerns over the potential 'road widening scheme' shown as REDACTED on the attached plan. This would make an already dangerous road even more so. This section of road is already In accident hotspot. - Severance – the impact of the land taken being severed to that of the remainder of farm land holding. - Injurious affection – significant concerns of the land lost impact on the remaining value of the holding. Potential road widening scheme in close proximity to farm dwelling will detract from dwellings value. We also wish to know further information in relation to on what basis the land will be acquired for the purposes of the scheme.	
TA_0191_001_221123	S44	Email	we refer to the above matter and confirm that REDACTED act on behalf of [REDACTED] as per the attached Land Registry Plans for your point of reference. For the avoidance of doubt our clients have asked us to confirm that their land is not available for any use other than what our clients own planned use and aspirations for the future entail. Therefore, none of the land as identified is available for biodiversity net gain, enhancement and/or mitigation associated with the aforementioned project. Our client's land initiatives are contiguous to the existing urban settlement and provide scope for a natural extension of the same in the short to medium term. We would respectively request that you concentrate your efforts on land that is more suitable possibly within Green Belt. We trust the above is sufficient for your present purposes but if you require any further confirmation please do not hesitate to contact the writer.	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.
TA_0192_002_221123	S44	Email	In terms of limited practical observations at this early stage: The location of the substation is impractical; REDACTED, whilst being a public adopted highway is narrow in parts and would not be sufficient to allow any construction of such infrastructure. The location of the compound, identified as REDACTED, bears no practical relation to the property. Indeed, access to the compound area is restricted	Construction and operational access for the Morgan onshore substation will be taken from a new road access of the Kirkham Bypass. There will be a requirement for access from Lower Lane to facilitate some works in relation to the Morgan mitigation land. Traffic and transport impacts arising during the construction phase of the Transmission Assets have been fully assessed at section 7.11 Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference E3.7). Details of the operation and maintenance phases are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Onshore maintenance would be limited to essential maintenance and/or emergency works.
TA_0193_002_221123	S44	Email	There has been no justification, reasoning, or validity as to why the cable route is shown through my clients which creates two sharp 90 degree turns, increasing the land affected by the cable route. By straightening the cable it could potentially reduce the impact on my client's farming business and allow for more appropriate crossing points and reduce the amount of small severed parcels of fields as the route at the moment not only takes up large portions of the field but leaves small severed areas that are too small to be actively farmed for grazing and silage, increasing the impact.	Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Following route refinement, Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms to secure the rights for the compound which will include provisions for compensation of severed land and impact on farming operations. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).
TA_0194_001_221123	S44	Email	Thank you for attending my client's property on Monday afternoon – my clients are grateful for your time and consultation in relation to the Morgan and Morecambe onshore transmission assets and how they will potentially impact my client's farming business. My clients will be making their own representations within the Statutory Consultation feedback form and I believe they have also given to you in hard copy their background information on their farming system. At our meeting my clients highlighted that they farm in total 350 acres of intensive grassland with a further 40 acres of low input rough grazing which accommodates and carries 250 dairy cows with 430 youngstock and beef cattle, producing in excess of 2,250,000 litres of milk sold on a supermarket contract. The beef cattle are also reared on to finishing weight and sold on dead weight system. The proposed route of the transmission cable cuts through a large proportion of land that my clients occupy under a Farm Business Tenancy with the landlords [REDACTED]. I have assumed the [REDACTED] may make separate representations with regards to the actual route of the cables but my clients wish to put on record their objections to the Morgan and Morecambe transmission cable, as highlighted on the attached plan. The route of the transmission cable goes through some of the most difficult agricultural terrain within the locality. Whilst the agricultural land is high	The Applicants note your response and through Dalcour Maclaren will be in touch with interests and their appointed agents to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business and practical elements of the construction. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>quality Grade 2 productive land, it is moss land which means that the stability of any operations and field work cannot be taken too lightly. The proposed route seemed yet again to prioritise ecological surveys rather than the practicalities of the landowners and the farming operations that it affects.</p>	<p>as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0194_004_221123	S44	Email	<p>In general, the cable route is objected to in the strongest terms. The route has been poorly researched with the lack of communication and ability for landowners to communicate their concerns and practical issues in relation to the proposed route. Our clients reserve the right for further representations when more detailed modelling occurs. Given the lack of detailed modelling and information within the Statutory Consultation, our clients have questioned the validity of the consultation. I trust that you will acknowledge receipt for the Statutory Consultation within the appropriate timeframes.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business and practical elements of the construction.</p>
TA_0195_001_221123	S44	Email	<p>Land Affected: Land forming part of [REDACTED].I am writing to you on behalf of the above-named client to make formal representation in relation to the proposed offshore wind farm, which proposes to transport electricity to the National Grid power station at Penwortham.As part of the consultation map, part of [REDACTED] has been allocated for providing a cable corridor of 122m and subsequent easement. The land take when measured on your scaled plans extends to circa 46,761.34 sqm (11.56 acres) or thereabouts for the easement. In addition to this, [REDACTED] land has been allocated as a potential compound site to facilitate the construction phase, extending to 15,238.59 sqm (3.77 acres) or thereabouts (denoted REDACTED on the 'Work Plans'). Finally, another smaller section of land appears to show a road widening scheme, denoted 12A on your plans and extending to approximately 1,096.04 sqm (0.27 acres) or thereabouts. Final measurements for all of the above are yet to be determined and could be in excess of these figures.Please provide clarification as to the section denoted REDACTED on your plan (attached herewith for your convenience).This scheme poses a significant risk to the viability of the farming operation at REDACTED. It involves taking approximately 15.60 acres of high-quality productive land used in connection with the dairy and sheep farm. The land is designated as Grade 2 on the Agricultural Land Classification Map for England. The total landholding extends to 150.90 acres or thereabouts, the loss of land represents a loss of 10% of the total farm holding for an extended period of time, whether that be temporary or permanent in nature.Agricultural Enterprise:The farming enterprise is a mixed dairy and sheep farm. Current numbers on the farm are as follows:- Dairy Cows - 80- Youngstock - 80- Breeding ewes – 280- Lambs - 300As stated above, the landowner has a number of major concerns with the project, namely:- The land being taken is some of the best and most versatile land (grade 2) on the holding but also more widely in Lancashire and around the country.- Slurry Regulations – in the very near future, the legal requirement of all farms on slurrybased systems will be to have 6 months storage. The land forming part of the scheme provides an extremely valuable outlet for slurry due to it being well drained and therefore dry all year round. The loss of this land will be very detrimental to slurry storage requirements on the holding, as the landowner loses the ability to spread on this land, leading to great volume in the store all year round.- Loss of vital mowing and grazing land – as stated above, approximately 15.60 acres of land used for summer silaging and winter sheep grazing will be lost for the duration of the scheme, some of which in perpetuity.- Additional feed requirements – as a result of losing land, the landowner will be required to purchase additional fodder and bedding, the cows will have to be supplementary fed.- The landowner has existing</p>	<p>Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>arrangements in place to sell hay/haylage to equestrian suitors. This arrangement is at risk due to losing land.- The landowner also allows horse grazing on fields adjacent to the scheme. The presence of contractors/construction workers is likely to make this arrangement redundant, leading to loss of earnings.- Noise, dust, artificial light and impact on residential amenity are all major concerns due to the proximity of the scheme to the farmhouse.- There are some concerns over the existing agri-environmental scheme located on the land. There is an existing Countryside Stewardship agreement, which incorporates the management of hedgerows option and gapping-up existing hedgerow, amongst other options. The landowner has incurred costs in instructing a land agent to prepare and submit the application. There are concerns in being able to manage the hedgerows as agreed with the Rural Payments Agency and therefore likely to incur payment reductions.Potential loss of BPS.- Reinstatement – the landowner is concerned about the stripping of the topsoil and subsequent reinstatement following the completion of the scheme. A common problem encountered is the mixing of subsoil (clay) and topsoil, resulting in a requirement for significant reinstatement and lower crop yields for a number of years thereafter.Fencing, hedging and drainage will require full and proper reinstatement. The landowner has major concerns around the disturbance of existing land drains, the problem only likely to become apparent months after the scheme is complete.- The landowner understandably wants to understand what he will be left with once works have been completed. Will there be any above ground structures on his land? E.g manholes.- The landowner is adamant that no access is to be taken through the farmyard. This would cause major disturbance/intrusion on the farming enterprise.- Compensation – the landowner is not impressed with his most recent dealings with the developers, who have not paid previously agreed compensation for a nominal sum. This does not bode well for future payments, which are likely to be much more significant.- Biosecurity – the developers use of contractors is considered a risk to biosecurity.People, machinery and materials will be brought on site, adding a significant risk to biosecurity and potential contamination risks.- Future access – the land where the scheme is proposed forms part of an access for larger contracting equipment (forager) to the landholding.- Road widening scheme – the landowner has major concerns over the potential 'road widening scheme' shown as 12A on the attached plan. This would make an already dangerous road even more so. This section of road is already an accident hotspot.- Severance – the impact of the land taken being severed to that of the remainder of farm land holding.- Injurious affection – significant concerns of the land lost impact on the remaining value of the holding. Potential road widening scheme in close proximity to farm dwelling will detract from dwellings value.We also wish to know further information in relation to on what basis the land will be acquired for the purposes of the scheme.</p>	
TA_0197_003_221123	S44	Email	<p>The Non-statutory consultation was also flawed and, therefore, should be ignored as there was no explanation as to how the four search zone locations were identified in the first place. The PIER overlooks Fylde Borough Council's local plan, identifying Enterprize Zones, brownfield sites, and potential candidate zones. FBC should, therefore, refute the current plans and force them to be reconsidered in line with their strategy for the region.The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1—no consideration of locale to residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones.The RAG survey ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect.</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0197_006_221123	S44	Email	<p>People invest their money to live in a semi-rural environment for mental health and wellbeing. This development promises to devalue their assets and destroy their chosen quality of life. There are alternative options laid out by the initial studies and FBCs plans, which should be reconsidered and different decisions made.</p>	<p>An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the WorldHealth Organisation definition of health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing. Any effects are assessed to be not significant and appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards. The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0197_009_221123	S44	Email	<p>I am not opposing green energy, but the infrastructure in the proposed plans is not acceptable when there are more sensitive and responsible alternatives. Repurposing of existing assets (Heysham power station) or routes like Ribble Estuary have been ignored.</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).</p>
TA_0199_001_221123	S44	Email	<p>I am writing to you on behalf of the above-named client to make formal representation in relation to the proposed offshore wind farm, which proposes to transport electricity to the National Grid power station at Penwortham. As part of the consultation map, a large proportion of land from REDACTED farm has been allocated for biodiversity net gain. Approximately 36.14 hectares (89.30 acres) or thereabouts is designated under 16A16B allocation on your proposed work plans. This land is designated as Grade 2 on the Agricultural Land Classification Map for England. This scheme poses a significant risk to the viability of the farming operation at REDACTED. It involves the best and most versatile agricultural land. The land allocated services an intensive dairy farm. It is the best on the holding and is impossible to replace. Some of the land is used to grow maize and is essential for providing feed for stock, meaning that feed would have to be sourced from elsewhere. The total solely owned landholding extends to 40.29 hectares (99.55 acres) or thereabouts, the landowner jointly owns an additional 15.45 hectares (38.17 acres) of land located circa 5 miles from the farm holding with two other parties. The remainder of farmed land is rented and is also located away from the farm holding. The loss of land at the farm holding represents a loss of 64.83% of the total owned land and 89.70% of the land that forms the farm holding. If this land were to be acquired compulsorily it would destroy this farming business and the livelihoods of REDACTED and his family. A number of generations have farmed/do farm at REDACTED. Additionally, there would be a significant diminution in value of land as a result of achieving biodiversity net gain. Agricultural Enterprise: The farming enterprise is a mixed dairy and youngstock farm. Current numbers on the farm areas follows:- Dairy Cows - 160- Youngstock - 160 As stated above, the landowner has a number of major concerns with the project, namely:- The land being taken is some of the best and most versatile land (grade 2) on the holding but also more widely in Lancashire and around the country. Alternative land is impossible to come by in the locality and will not serve the holding as this land does, with it being adjacent to the farmyard. Alternative land will need to be sourced.- Loss of vital maize ground, approximately 16.94 hectares (41.85 acres) of this land is used for maize production and forms a vital part of the feed for the dairy cows. Losing this would have catastrophic effects on milk production, animal</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>health and welfare and ultimately the businesses earnings. This would lead to the business providing a loss on the profit-loss accounts.- Slurry Regulations – in the very near future, the legal requirement of all farms on slurry based systems will be to have 6 months storage. The land forming part of the scheme provides an extremely valuable outlet for slurry. The loss of this land will be very detrimental to slurry storage requirements on the holding, as the landowner loses the ability to spread on this land, leading to greater volume in the store all year round.</p> <p>The proposed biodiversity designation will see restrictions on spreading of slurry and farmyard manure. A major concern for a well-stocked farm.- In the winter months, a westerwold grass is sown onto the maize ground to provide additional fodder in the New Year. Again, this would be lost due to the scheme.- Loss of vital mowing and grazing land – the remainder of the land within the biodiversity allocation is used for silage production and/or cattle grazing. Absolutely vital to the farming business.- Additional feed requirements – as a result of losing land, the landowner will be required to purchase additional fodder and bedding, the cows will have to be supplementary fed.- There are some concerns over the existing agri-environmental scheme located on the land. There is an existing Countryside Stewardship agreement, which incorporates the management of hedgerows option, enhanced management of maize and low input grassland, amongst other options. The landowner has incurred costs in instructing a land agent to prepare and submit the application. There are concerns in being able to manage the hedgerows as agreed with the Rural Payments Agency and therefore likely to incur payment reductions. Potential loss of BPS.- Reinstatement – what does the allocation entail, will it impact fencing, hedging and drainage? It will require full and proper reinstatement. The landowner has major concerns around the disturbance of existing land drains, the problem only likely to become apparent months after the scheme is complete.- The landowner understandably wants to understand what he will be left with once works have been completed. How will this land be managed?- The landowner is adamant that no access is to be taken through the farmyard. This would cause major disturbance/intrusion on the farming enterprise.- Biosecurity – the developers use of contractors is considered a risk to biosecurity. People, machinery and materials will be brought on site, adding a significant risk to biosecurity and potential contamination risks.- Future access – how and when will access be taken onto the land in the future. How will the land be managed?- Severance – the impact of the land taken being severed to that of the remainder of farm land holding.- Injurious affection – significant concerns of the land lost impact on the remaining value of the holding. Significant diminution in value as a result of the scheme.- The impact of the land being taken would destroy the business and livelihood – farming dairy will be made unviable as a result of the scheme. We also wish to know further information in relation to on what basis the land will be acquired for the purposes of the scheme.</p>	
TA_0200_001_221123	S44	Email	<p>i am sending this email to object to the proposed windfarm at Freckleton/Newton/Kirkham, Please find attached a list of Questions and key points.</p> <p>REDACTED</p> <p>Windfarm Substation Key Points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How, Who & where was the location of the sites determined 	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3).</p>
TA_0200_011_221123	S44	Email	<p>Where is the cabling going to run</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0201_007_221123	S44	Email	<p>To cause such upheaval to everyone's lives in this community will be devastating and unnecessary, as there must be other options. This will be a total disaster for the residents, wildlife, farmland, loss of countryside and we urge you to find alternative sites that will not cause as much harm to the environment, which we thought was the whole point of this project in the first place.</p>	<p>An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects. Detailed assessments are provided within all onshore chapters within Volumes 3 and 4 of the ES (document reference F3 and F4). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets and will continue to work closely with all stakeholders.
TA_0202_001_221123	S44	Email	<p>REDACTED Dear Sirs The photos are of recent accidents and floods this year. The video contains footage regarding the state of all minor roads I have attended your consultation meetings, and may I firstly say we support green energy whether it be wind farm or solar, but this scheme coming on shore in the Fylde Basin is absolutely ludicrous in this area and I believe you do not understand the type of land or infrastructure you are dealing with. In other words, I am not for this proposal at all. Myself I am a farmer's wife who farms with my husband and son. I also care for my husband with severe Multiple Sclerosis and is wheelchair bound, though he still has his wits about him. I have been on various meetings and flooding groups relating to serious flooding issues since 2013 and most folk relating to these matters know who I am. I am currently on a working group with Fylde Borough Council because of my local knowledge of flood and land issues. I have held various meetings with the MP's due to my position with the National Farmers Union as REDACTED and I am a member of the local community within Fylde, Ballam and the surrounding areas of Lytham and Fylde both rural and urban. Our Farm We have a 270-acre farm with a head of 240 cattle at one time and rear beef for Morrisons. We also have planning with Sonnindex for a solar farm taking up 70 acres of our land so we thought would be future proofing our income because we are losing the basic payment income from the Rural Payments agency because we have left Europe. This would give us 200 acres left for cattle grazing making silage, growing cereals to feed our cattle and meet the demands of traceability with feeding the cattle. We need these 200 acres to survive otherwise we cannot farm. We also winter sheep and grow Nordmann Fir Christmas Trees which have a variety of sizes in the ground, and we have just replanted one main area related to this project. The tree sector is a mainstream income for our farm as we have developed this good liaison with the area over the last 20 years and this project will affect our business and cause severe disruption. Points to raise. Options The options for the cable route are daft. Why not take it down the far side of River Ribble to Penwortham causing less disruption and build the substations at Penwortham. Secondly it could go straight across to Heysham where there is a corridor with out any SSSI attached to it. Lack of communication and clarity. We first had the letter of the surveys saying that you would give us £250 per survey and if we did not agree it read that you would still come on the land anyway. This is uncourteous and appalling type of behaviour and shows us just what we are dealing with. The pretty literature and displays from your consultation meetings do not clarify exactly where the cable route, land and accesses are going to be, or the impact on the road systems in the area, so what is going to happen is polished over. That is not good enough. Seeing that the route and compounds may be using this farmland to go through we are totally dismayed that nobody has been to see us yet regarding any of this and demand that somebody who knows what they are talking about visit our farm. Tomorrow's generation of farmers My son is 29 years of age and has vested his future in agriculture and is very passionate about land issues and how we move forward. Since joining us he must be fully commended for making the farm profitable during the days of my husband's illness. He works on his own on the farm with the help of contract labour when required and contractors. In this area there are several young men who are succeeding in agriculture and wishing to carry on with their young families. It is lovely to see, and everyone helps each other out. He has re-drained a lot of the farm himself by hiring a draining machine and sorting out some of the fields that were flooded. Where he has done this operation, it has been successful for our purposes. Your proposals would ruin every drain we have and displace the water table and flood the rest of the fields we have. This would also cause mental health issues for this young rural community. Land Issues and water table infrastructure</p>	<p>The Applicants note your response and through Dalcour Maclaren will be in touch with interests and their appointed agents to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business and practical elements of the construction. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0202_007_221123	S44	Email	<p>Impact on the farm • It would ruin growing cereals to feed our cattle and for biscuit/bread making. • Reduce the number of head of cattle we would be able to keep on the farm • It would ruin growing enough grass crops for silage for winter rations and the summer grazing that is needed for our herd. • It would stop us entering any government schemes because we do not know how long this project is going to take. • Travelling to the fields to work the fields, cattle, sheep and crop work would become impossible. • A great mega loss of Income for what will be by then 2</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Following route refinement, Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>families/households. • 122 metres if approximately the length of our farm stading, It is even wider than the M55 motorway this going through our land and through the Fylde will finish a lot of businesses and most likely ruin this farm. Are you going to buy us a new Farm to replace 60 years of this family farming here and making plans to future proof it so that our family can go forward? • Loss of Christmas Tree land • We can't farm around the proposal and there will not be enough land to fulfil our enterprises. This proposed plan will impact every local business in both rural and urban communities. What you are proposing is nothing short of bonkers and will not benefit anybody. Surely you have not looked at other direct routes. It will leave a scar through the Fylde and the fact that one company could put their cables in tomorrow and the other company a few years later is beyond belief. There would be years and years of disruption, it must be done together if you proceed. This will be far worse than an HS2 or a Cuadrilla rolled into one and would devastate the area. If it was just a small cable one could accept it may be, but this is a horrendous proposal. This family has been custodian of this land for the last 65 years and have tried our best to keep the land in good heart, but this is just reckless. Why should we suffer and wreck our family business when there is an alternative route??????</p>	<p>Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms to secure the rights for the compound which will include provisions for compensation of severed land and impact on farming operations. The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code.</p>
TA_0203_003_231123	S44	Email	<p>The Non-statutory consultation was also flawed and, therefore, should be ignored as there was no explanation as to how the four search zone locations were identified in the first place. The PIER overlooks Fylde Borough Council's local plan, identifying Enterprise Zones, brownfield sites, and potential candidate zones. FBC should, therefore, refute the current plans and force them to be reconsidered in line with their strategy for the region. The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1—no consideration of locale to residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones. The RAG survey ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0203_006_231123	S44	Email	<p>People invest their money to live in a semi-rural environment for mental health and wellbeing. This development promises to devalue their assets and destroy their chosen quality of life. There are alternative options laid out by the initial studies and FBCs plans, which should be reconsidered and different decisions made.</p>	<p>An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the WorldHealth Organisation definition of health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing. Any effects are assessed to be not significant and appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards. The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0203_007_231123	S44	Email	<p>I am not opposing green energy, but the infrastructure in the proposed plans is not acceptable when there are more sensitive and responsible alternatives. Repurposing of existing assets (Heysham power station) or routes like Ribble Estuary have been ignored.</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).</p>
TA_0204_003_231123	S44	Email	<p>The Non-statutory consultation was also flawed and, therefore, should be ignored as there was no explanation as to how the four search zone locations were identified in the first place. The PIER overlooks Fylde Borough Council's local plan, identifying Enterprize Zones, brownfield sites, and potential candidate zones. FBC should, therefore, refute the current plans and force them to be reconsidered in line with their strategy for the region. The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1—no consideration of locale to residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones. The RAG survey ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0204_006_231123	S44	Email	<p>People invest their money to live in a semi-rural environment for mental health and wellbeing. This development promises to devalue their assets and destroy their chosen quality of life.</p>	<p>An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the WorldHealth Organisation definition of health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing. Any effects are assessed to be not significant and appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards. The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0204_007_231123	S44	Email	<p>I am not opposing green energy, but the infrastructure in the proposed plans is not acceptable when there are more sensitive and responsible alternatives which have been ignored.</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).</p>
TA_0206_001_231123	S44	Email	<p>Thank you for your correspondence. At the consultation event at Newton what was discussed with your engineering and consents colleagues was that : none of the issues given in the programme documentation set as the reasons for not continuing the tidal route to a land fall adjacent to the National Grid specified connect point at Penwortham, were insurmountable with appropriate best practice. They agreed. Your colleagues also indicated that this would be the preferable route - if a Heysham connection was not available - rather than a land route across the Fylde. They also seemed to be of the view, in line with the documentation set, that regulatory authorities had not been engaged to determine what it would take to obtain permission to extend the tidal cable route with a landfall at Penwortham, nor to secure converter substation sites on land already allocated by Local Planning Authorities for industrial uses such as those converter substations. I provided further information, which I include references to below. They agreed to find that out and reply to me. I undertook then to discuss this with government representatives to determine how that should be used to engage & influence those authorities in coordination with the Morgan & Morecambe (M&M) developers to deliver a less impactful and more efficient development options for assessment. Obviously your reply has not yet addressed that. Indeed, your reply seems to allude to a greater level of disruption and adverse impact to the environment not declared for the sea and land borne routes that are being proposed. How are the impacts being mitigated in the approach you are proposing? You have a significant programme that could endure the rest of this century, beyond most of our lifetimes, so it is important that the best practice approach is adopted from the outset. If you could provide a full, first time complete reply that would be very much appreciated. I have copied in Parish, District and County Council representatives. I will seek their advice as to where else we should share these ideas. In that way representations can be made to local and national regulators, including government, to jointly develop lower impact and more effective solutions in delivering offshore wind generated energy to the National Grid specified connection at Penwortham. I look forward to hearing from you.</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The Electricity System Operator (ESO) is responsible for planning and operation of the transmission system and ensuring the balance of electricity generation with electricity demand. The Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm were scoped into the Pathway to 2030 workstream of the UK Government's Offshore Transmission Network Review (OTNR). As part of the OTNR, the ESO assessed options to improve the coordination offshore wind farm connections and associated transmission networks. In July 2022, the UK Government published the Pathway to 2030 Holistic Network Design (HNDR) Report which set out the results of the OTNR. A key output of the HNDR process was the recommendation that the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm should work collaboratively in connecting the two offshore wind farms to the National Grid electricity transmission network at Penwortham in Lancashire. The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological designations protected by national and international legislation. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt Estuary Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in extremely long construction timeframes and risk extensive, and potentially long-term damage to sensitive and protected habitats that support smelt and protected bird species, whilst also presenting unsafe working conditions during construction. The approach to site selection has been based on avoiding damage to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).</p>
TA_0206_005_231123	S44	Email	<p>5. A possible set of risk mitigations in response to the issues given as reasons not to adopt and consistently assess routes across and along the littoral coastal zones might include: the developers will access global best practice for cable laying in tidal & environmentally protected estuaries; secure one or more appropriately sized cable laying vessels & world-class delivery organisation for this type of work; and establish a safe way of working for all staff and involved stakeholders. This will be agreed with the applicable regulatory bodies. This can then be taken into the option assessment.</p>	<p>The majority of the route is buried cable, thus whilst there is an inevitable amount of disruption during construction the land will be returned to agricultural use post construction maintaining the agricultural units. Where practical and possible the projects sought to align the cable route with field boundaries to help lessen the impact of the temporary works on their farming business. We have sought to work with landowners affected by the proposed to understand their current farming operations and mitigate the impacts along with discussing their future development proposals and avoiding those wherever practicable, in some cases prior to their developments being consented. Direct pipe or microtunnelling is proposed beneath the River Ribble to ensure that there would be no direct impacts on the river habitats. As set out in Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3), Crossing techniques are set out within Volume 1, Annex 3.2: Onshore Crossing Schedule of the ES (document reference F1.3.2) which is submitted as part of the application for development</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0208_001_231123	S44	Email	<p>We have two sections of land that will potentially be affected by the cable installations. We would like to lodge our objection to the routing of the power cables. We obviously would prefer that the cables did not come across our land - we have listed our objections below; 1/ They will disrupt our usage of the land. Downtime for our projects and general usage could be quite considerable - none of us will live for ever 2/ Access will suffer due to work in progress. 3/ If cables are installed on the land it will put severe restrictions on any future development / planning permissions with regards to the land. I know there are no permissions at this moment in time but land on the south side of the airport has been developed for housing in very recent years. This would therefore make limitations on values of the land in the future. 4/ Although we have been told to carry on with projects until we are told of the final outcome, would you invest in a project that might be closed down beyond your control. 5/ Concerns over traffic flow - access routes are very limited to start with. 6/ Although you say we won't be affected by cable noise / ems - would you want these cables passing through or under your house - I somewhat doubt it.</p>	<p>consent. Further information on the proposed approach to construction is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES.</p> <p>Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP). Details of the operation and maintenance phases are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Onshore maintenance would be limited to essential maintenance and/or emergency works. An assessment of the noise and vibration impacts due to the Transmission Assets are presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.2: Construction Noise and Vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.2) and Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational Noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3). The cumulative noise and vibration impacts with other proposed developments is considered in section 8.13 of Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8). Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used. The levels of exposure that they require would not pose a risk to public health. Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) has had regard to the risk perceptions associated with EMFs of the Transmission Assets on the local area and this is presented in section 1.11.9 of the Annex.</p>
TA_0211_001_231123	S44	Email	<p>I am against the proposed route for cable laying cutting across my prime agricultural land based in Warton as part of the infrastructure supporting the Morgan and Morecambe Bay Wind Farm for the following reasons. 1 My parents bought and moved to REDACTED in Warton in 1952 to provide their adult children with greater scope to develop a larger number of acres, having previously farmed at the REDACTED in Freckleton. 2 My parents and I worked hard to improve the quality of the farmland at REDACTED over a number of years prior to their retirement. Upon their move out of the farmhouse, I moved with my wife into the farmhouse and continued to cultivate and increase the original acreage which came with the farm. I continued to expand the dairy herd and develop my business further, hopeful that my son REDACTED would take over the farming once he came of age. My son and I worked in partnership for a number of years before my wife and I retired and moved out of the farmhouse. 3 My son REDACTED and his wife moved into the farmhouse with their two young children, continuing to expand the acreage and further improve the quality and productivity of the farm. 4a The decades of careful farm management have produced some quality herbal and grassland leys. The heavy clay soil has been significantly improved by establishing, maintaining, and increasing drainage systems. Crop production has been maximised by careful land management programmes. Decades of investment of time, money and hard work will be destroyed by the proposed digging of 125-metre-wide trenches to lay the cables for the proposed Wind farm project. It will simply not be possible to reinstate the land as it was. We have previous experience of smaller trenches being dug by other contractors and the damage to the drainage, soil quality and crop production is evident for decades afterwards. 4b I understand there will be a number of large manhole covers facilitating regular inspection and cable maintenance. These will make ploughing, drilling or generally working the farmland in the future even more difficult as thousands of pounds of damage could be caused to expensive farm machinery if these are encountered. Contractors are understandably reluctant to work in fields where there are such obstacles. The diagonal proposed route of the cable will significantly impact the viability of my farm as we could be left having to farm the 'offcuts' of oddly shaped fields. The current field lay out has been developed over decades to facilitate maximum grass/crop production whilst maintaining careful environmental stewardship. 5 Farming livestock requires great flexibility - working with challenging weather conditions. The harvesting of crops is very much weather dependent as to when they are ripe, when field conditions are suitable for heavy machinery to drive across the land or when contractors are available. We rely heavily on the main access tracks that we have established to access our land on a 24/7 365 basis. In Winter months these provide a network to access and fields for routine, seasonal work such as hedge cutting and fence maintenance as well as daily regular checks of sheep. 6 Our cows graze the</p>	<p>Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			land for 9 months of the year or so- crossing Hillock Lane which divides our farmland several times a day. This grazing is an important part of our animal welfare policy on several levels.	
TA_0211_008_231123	S44	Email	13. My father, my son and I have all worked hard over generations to create this prime, productive farmland and the infrastructure facilitating 24/7 365 access for our machinery. Our ethos has been, and continues to be to expanding our acreage and further improving and investing in our farmland, buildings, milking parlour and machinery in order to feed our ever growing population by employing local staff, securing British food security and reducing food miles. Our viable farming business supports and feeds many people. REDACTED as it is today is the legacy of several generations of the REDACTED family and those who farmed here before us. The emotional impact our seeing this legacy mutilated, the business made unviable for future generations of REDACTED should not be underestimated. I object to your proposed project for the above reasons and look forward to receiving a written response to my questions at my above address.	Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).
TA_0212_001_231123	S44	Email	I am writing to you to protest the proposed route/s of the onshore assets of the above. I don't see how the years of groundwork that are proposed, will be sympathetic to and not detrimentally impact the dune system the nature reserve and the wildlife thereon. I also cannot see how this work will not impact on Blackpool Airport also the proposed line of the cable along the railway will impact the whole of Fylde from Squires Gate to Kirkham and beyond. I also wish to protest at your preferred sites for substations as these will have a detrimental effect on 2 schools and will also impact good quality farmland. You need to put forward a proposal that will minimise disruption and destruction of local assets and that will not have a detrimental impact on local amenities, wildlife, farmland, AOSI and the quality of life of local residents.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Direct pipe trenchless installation is proposed beneath the sand dunes. This technology will ensure there is no open trenching through the dunes. This will avoid any direct loss of vegetation and habitats. Instead, the drill will pass beneath the dunes at depth. Where necessary consideration of any indirect effects on the habitat and measures to avoid, minimise or mitigate these is provided in section 3.11 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).
TA_0213_001_231123	S44	Email	I am writing to you on behalf of the above-named client to make formal representation in relation to the proposed offshore wind farm, which proposes to transport electricity to the National Grid power station at Penwortham. As part of the consultation map, a large proportion of land from REDACTED farm has been allocated for biodiversity net gain. Approximately 35.82 hectares (88.51 acres) or thereabouts is designated under REDACTED allocation on your proposed work plans. This land is designated as Grade 2 on the Agricultural Land Classification Map for England. The majority of which is in arable production, yielding high quality crops, such as wheat and barley. The total landholding extends to 53.35 hectares (131.82 acres) or thereabouts, 5.93 hectares of which is located 8 miles away from the holding by way of the local road network. The land take allocated encompasses the majority of the farm holding at 35.82ha (88.51 acres) of land. The land take, whether permanent or temporary represents a 67.14% loss of productive arable land. This scheme poses a significant risk to the viability of the farming operation at REDACTED. It involves a large proportion of high-quality land and allocated for Biodiversity Net Gain. The land is of exceptional quality and the value of it being adjacent to the farm cannot be recreated by land elsewhere. Agricultural Enterprise: The farming enterprise services an existing beef farm. Current numbers on the farm are as follows: - Beef Cattle - 150As stated above, the landowner has a number of major concerns with the project, namely: - The total landholding extends to 53.35 hectares (131.82 acres) or thereabouts, the loss of land represents a loss of 67.14% of the total farm holding for an extended period of time, whether that be temporary or permanent in nature. - The land being taken is of excellent quality and impossible to replace. It is some of the best and most versatile land (grade 2 and 3) on the holding but also more widely in Lancashire and around the country. Alternative land nigh on impossible to come by in the locality and will not serve the holding as this land does, with it being adjacent to the farmyard. Alternative land will need to be sourced. - Slurry Regulations – in the very near future, the legal requirement of all farms on slurry based systems will be to have 6 months storage. The land forming part of the scheme provides an extremely valuable outlet for slurry. The loss of this land will be	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>verydetrimental to slurry storage requirements on the holding, as the landowner loses theability to spread on this land, leading to greater volume in the store all year round. Theproposed biodiversity designation will see restrictions on spreading of slurry andfarmyard manure. A major concern for a well-stocked farm. How can the landownermeet these regulations?- Loss of vital mowing and grazing land – the remainder of the land within thebiodiversity allocation is used for silage production and/or cattle grazing. Absolutelyvital to the farming business.- Additional feed requirements – as a result of losing land, the landowner will be requiredto purchase additional fodder and bedding, the cows will have to be supplementary fed.- Biodiversity agreements could be agreed with third party developers - These are likelyto be much more lucrative than the compensation to be offered. There must beenvironmental value or this land would not have been selected.- How will this 'biodiverse' land be managed?- Impact on land value- How can the business plan / further investments be implemented with so muchuncertainty?- There are some concerns over the existing agri-environmental scheme located on theland. There is an existing Countryside Stewardship agreement, which incorporates thecapital items such as fencing and management options such as over winter stubble. Thelandowner has incurred costs in instructing a land agent to prepare and submit theapplication. There are concerns in being able to manage the hedgerows as agreed withthe Rural Payments Agency and therefore likely to incur payment reductions. Potentialloss of BPS.- Reinstatement – what does the allocation entail, will it impact fencing, hedging anddrainage? It will require full and proper reinstatement. The landowner has majorconcerns around the disturbance of existing land drains, the problem only likely tobecome apparent months after the scheme is complete.- The landowner understandably wants to know what he will be left with once workshave been completed. How will this land be managed?- The landowner is adamant that no access is to be taken through the farmyard. Thiswould cause major disturbance/intrusion on the farming enterprise.- Biosecurity – the developers use of contractors is considered a risk to biosecurity.People, machinery and materials will be brought on site, adding a significant risk tobiosecurity and potential contamination risks.- Future access – how and when will access be taken onto the land in the future. How willthe land be managed?- Severance – the impact of the land taken being severed to that of the remainder offarm holding.- Injurious affection – significant concerns of the land lost impact on the remaining valueof the holding. Significant diminution in value as a result of the scheme.- The impact of the land being taken would destroy the business and livelihood – withoutthe land, feed cannot be produced for the livestock. The farming operation will be madeunviable as a result of the scheme.We also wish to know further information in relation to on what basis the land will be acquiredfor the purposes of the scheme.</p>	
TA_0214_003_231123	s44	Email	<p>I object to any disturbance of local wildlife as there are clearly alternatives available which seem to be ignored due to additional costs. For example, why not continue horizontal drilling further inland? Why not use the soon to be decommissioned power station to the north as a connection point to the national grid?</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets on protected species and protected habitats are considered in Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES.Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on onshore ecology and nature conservation are provided in section 3.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference: F3.3). The onshore export cable corridor will cross existing infrastructure and obstacles such as roads, railways and rivers. All major crossings, such as major roads, river and rail crossings will be undertaken using trenchless techniques, such as auger boring or micro-tunnelling, where practicable. Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).</p>
TA_0214_006_231123	s44	Email	<p>I object to any trenches being dug or drilling conducted in residential roads. The cables must be installed in the open land of the airport, either by trenches or a continuation of the horizontal drilling. I have not been able to find an explanation as to why this method can be used to run cables under the sea, beach and sand dunes but not all the way to the eastern side of Queensway.</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				and F1.4.3). The proposed works would not restrict access and measures to control impacts are set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8). The Applicants have committed that all road crossing will be undertaken using trenchless techniques, except for Leach Lane, however that can be trenched on a programmed basis and no road closures are expected.
TA_0218_001_231123	S44	Email	I act for REDACTED My clients are extremely concerned about the impact that the scheme will have on their farming business.They run successful dairy farm and operate a closed herd with high health cattle and high biosecurity.The information available is limited, save as the order limits include the whole of my clients landholding. The whole of the land is also highlighted for REDACTED something my clients is simply unwilling to discuss. His farming system operates on the acreage available and losing land to REDACTED would make the system unviable and my client would be forced out of business. Current stocking levels are 120 cattle milking and 100 followers with land ownership of 100 acres all classified as grade 2/3 land which is majority in grassland and part arable.Furthermore, the order limits as they stand are far to wide and it is unclear why this needs to be so wide, numerous surveys have been undertaken and the developers should now have a proposed route which can be provided to landowners, a detailed design should be made available along with details of any permeant easement width. The development is for cables rather than pipes which are far more durable and can follow contours of land and field boundaries to mitigate impact.My clients at this stage are not willing to discuss the works further until the developers can provide detailed plans of how their land will be affected.The family have recently undertaken improvements to the farmyard and buildings, a significant investment has gone into the farm. If all this land is taken, this would end any prospect of a viable business and destroy my clients livelihood. Further concerns are set out below:Loss of land used as part of the dairy enterprise.Loss of development of the landSeverance of parcels of land Drainage impacts on the wider farmImpacts on any potential solar schemesLack of correspondence with agents and landownersInjurious affection over the remaining land Quality of any reinstatementFinally, as yet it is unclear if agents fees will be met and I seek confirmation that these will be met by the Developer.We feel the lack of information provided is unacceptable and until further detail is provided the project will not be deliverable.	Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business.As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3)The Applicants through Dalcour Maclaren and appointed drainage specialists will engage with landowners regarding pre-construction and post-construction drainage, tying into existing infrastructure where possible. The Outline CoCP and outline surface water and groundwater management plan (document reference J1.9) includes measures in relation to drainage.
TA_0219_005_231123	S44	Email	Land at REDACTED This area is affected by both the proposals for the northern and southern route and we would specifically identify the following:- Severe effect on the sporting on the property especially if the southern route is chosen.	The Applicants have made design changes since PEIR and the southern cable route option (Option 2) which passed through to the south of Higher Balam has been removed, to mitigate potential impacts related to ornithology on the Farmland Conservation Area. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0219_007_231123	S44	Email	Possible loss of building plots at the northern end of Parcel Number REDACTED.	The Applicants have made design changes since PEIR and the southern cable route option (Option 2) which passed through to the south of Higher Balam has been removed, to mitigate potential impacts related to ornithology on the Farmland Conservation Area.
TA_0219_010_231123	S44	Email	We believe that there is a better route which will be shorter have one less road crossing and therefore has the potential to save the scheme substantial sums of money. We suggest that at the point where the route veers from an east west orientation taking a turn of almost 90 degrees to the south to the north of Pegs Lane that the route continues in an east west direction and crosses Saltcotes Road close to but to the north of Pegs Lane. This will save a crossing of Pegs Lane. The route can then continue in an easterly direction crossing under the railway and then either crossing under the pylons and passing round to the north or Wrea Brook Barn before turning slightly south east and re-joining the existing route or carrying on parallel to the electricity pylons and re-joining the existing route just to the south of Wrea Brook Barn before then passing under the electricity pylons. The former of these two routes will save a crossing of Huck Lane but clearly either of them will require a crossing of Cartmel Lane. We believe this route will pass through lower quality agricultural land which is classified Grade 3 on the Agricultural Land	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3) The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>Classification mapping.</p> <p>This route will also avoid the location of the telecommunications mast which is shown on the plans being adjacent to the railway.</p> <p>The proposed access for Parcel Number REDACTED is directly in front of the dwelling house at REDACTED and will have a substantial effect on the occupiers of the dwelling house.</p> <p>The alternative we suggest has several additional benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will not affect any proposed potential planned expansions of the caravan holiday park or touring field • would eliminate the noise and dust pollution on the caravan park within the construction period • will occupy less agricultural land and we believe that there may well be less disturbance to drainage etc. • shorter distance with potential saved costs 	<p>alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0221_001_231123	S44	Email	<p>As a farmer and a landowner in the Fylde, who will be affected by the proposed plan, I write with further objections/ observations that make this project unworkable to me to be told by Dalcour Maclaren that 'our business wont be severely impacted, because we are only tenants, and for the time being carry on farming like its not going to happen. , and if it does go ahead you will be given adequate notice' to suddenly give up a 7 grass fields (according to your agent we save on rent)but that's Not what will happen, we lose a well established grass swards at maximum output, a grass crop is established for a minimum of 5-8 years and up to permanent grassland, and is not an annual crop like cereals, where will our cattle graze? and make our winter forage?, our herd is a closed herd so we rear everything from birth to slaughter, stock numbers need to be maintained to keep our high herd health status and biosecurity, to find new land to farm and establish a grass crop needs forward planning, and needs to be close to our existing buildings for economical management. How many hectares of farm land will farmers on the Fylde be losing? and where are the temporary hectares we can rent?</p>	<p>Dalcour McLaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).</p>
TA_0221_003_231123	S44	Email	<p>3 Substations these seem to have been overlooked last Novembers initial meeting, now they want 70 acres !!!! and 20ft tall!!! and no drawings when all that was originally stated was cables to bring supply to Penwortham. We cannot allow these to be built, adjacent to rural villages and schools, what legacy will that leave for our younger generations, Surely with new technologies 'and advancements in science, these substations could also be sited offshore as well</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0221_006_231123	S44	Email	<p>A lot more research into alternative routes need to be explored, making better use of the access of the River Ribble, where acres of out marsh, could be used productively and even dredging the river would also benefit the Fylde, by reducing the flood risk. bringing heavy cables up the river on a boat seems to make alot more sense to me than trying to get them up temporary haul roads and narrow rural roads Technology is improving all the time, why not use it to make a difference, and whist wind power is a green energy with low carbon footprint, , this proposed route to Penwortham just seems to be a big expensive blot on the landscape that needs a lot more thought and research before getting public support For these reasons i am against the planned project</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0222_001_231123	S44	Email	Our clients are farmers, with land within the proposed "400Kv grid connection cable corridor search area". Due to the potential impact on their land, our clients have instructed REDACTED to make initial submissions to the statutory consultation in respect of the following questions, numbered as per the consultation feedback form: Question 3 Lack of Information: Our clients hold land at Clifton within the 400Kv grid connection cable corridor search area, and to date, our client have not had any direct engagement from Morecambe & Morgan regarding the proposed routing in this area, and therefore the potential impact upon their land. As such, it is difficult for our clients to make any definitive comment, as the potential impact on their business is unknown. Due to the undefined route of the proposed cable in the area of the 400Kv grid connection cable corridor search area, it is considered that this consultation is premature, and denies our clients the opportunity to make proper representations.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0222_008_231123	S44	Email	Question 6 It is not possible to provide any specific comments in the respect of proposed compound areas, or temporary and permanent access areas, in the vicinity of our clients' property, as none are defined within the 400Kv grid connection cable corridor search area. The decision to proceed with this consultation, ahead of the route being defined within the 400Kv grid connection cable corridor search area, has denied our clients the opportunity to properly consider the proposals, and contribute fully to this consultation. It is again suggested that the proposed route in this area should be made available, and a further round of consultation undertaken ahead of any draft DCO being finalised.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)
TA_0222_009_231123	S44	Email	Question 11 Given the lack of any definitive information regarding the proposed location of the grid connection, it is difficult for our clients to make any definitive comment in this respect. We would further draw your attention to the comments made above, that the proposed route of the grid connection should be defines, and further consultation undertaken once this has been provided. Notwithstanding the above, it is considered that care should be taken in planning the grid connection, to cause as little disturbance to, and permanent loss of, agricultural land, as is possible in the delivery of the scheme.	The Electricity System Operator (ESO) is responsible for planning and operation of the transmission system and ensuring the balance of electricity generation with electricity demand. The Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm were scoped into the Pathway to 2030 workstream of the UK Government's Offshore Transmission Network Review (OTNR). As part of the OTNR, the ESO assessed options to improve the coordination offshore wind farm connections and associated transmission networks. In July 2022, the UK Government published the Pathway to 2030 Holistic Network Design (HNDR) Report which set out the results of the OTNR. A key output of the HNDR process was the recommendation that the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm should work collaboratively in connecting the two offshore wind farms to the National Grid electricity transmission network at Penwortham in Lancashire. Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)
TA_0222_014_231123	S44	Email	Our clients are the developers of REDCATED, a residential development scheme of 1,150 dwellings, and associated school, nature park and farmland conservation area, parts of which are included in the scheme. REDACTED are instructed to make initial submissions to the statutory consultation in respect of the following questions numbered as per the consultation feedback form: Question 3 Information As landowners and developers with land potentially impacted by the scheme, our clients have only had the information available within the public domain to consider provided as to the potential impact on their property and development. Insufficient information has been provided to properly assess the impact of the proposed project on their property, development and the undertakings which they have given to support this. It is therefore difficult to make definitive comment as to the impact on our client and the true effect of these schemes on them. It is considered that this consultation is premature, and that significant further information is required by landowners before they can properly contribute to such a consultation. Corridor Options Based on the limited information provided, our client favours the proposed "Indicative Onshore Export Cable Corridor Option 1 (north)* as this route, on prima facie evidence, presents less potential impact to their property and development. General Disturbance Due to the lack of proper landowner engagement by Morecambe & Morgan prior to this consultation, and therefore a lack of information to accurately assess the potential impact of the scheme on our client, it is essential that the proposed Morecambe & Morgan scheme must not interfere with the ability of our client to pursue their development deliver their planning obligations, or impact upon their ability to sell completed residential units.	The Applicants have made design changes since PEIR and the southern option (Option 2) which passed through to the south of Higher Balham has been removed and Option 1 taken forward. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024) as well as ongoing landowner liaison following route refinements (further details are outlined within the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.
TA_0222_015_231123	S44	Email	Questions 3.3 The unilateral undertakings made in respect of our client's development require the provision and maintenance of an approved nature park forming part of the development. Nothing in the construction of the scheme, or the BNG associated therewith, must be allowed to prejudice the ability of our client to deliver the required nature park in accordance with agreed Nature Park Management Plan (or any revision thereof agreed in writing by Council and Natural England). No more specific comment can be made on the potential impact, due to the lack of site specific information and engagement provided by the Morecambe & Morgan schemes to date. The unilateral undertakings in respect of our client's development also requires the provision and maintenance of an approved Farmland Conservation Area to form part of the development. Nothing in the construction of the project, or the BNG associate therewith, must be allowed to prejudice the ability of our client to deliver the Farmland Conservation Area in accordance with the	The Applicants have made design changes since PEIR and this interests owned land is no longer within the draft Order Limits.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			agreed FCA Management Plan (or any revision thereof agreed in writing by the Council and Natural England). No more specific information and engagement provided by the Morecambe & Morgan schemes to date.	
TA_0222_016_231123	S44	Email	Question 3.4 Our client's development incorporates an undertaking to implement, or procure the implementation of, the Queensway Bird Hazard and Control Plan, mitigating the risk of hazardous bird activity in the flight path of Blackpool Airport. It is considered that the proposed construction of the scheme, and/or the BNG requirements resulting therefrom must not adversely impact on the ability of our clients to deliver their undertakings under the Queensway Bird Hazard and Control Plan, or place additional burden on them in doing so.	The Transmission Assets design has resulted in a reduced construction corridor width, as set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Details of the factors considered during the design evolution are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0223_001_231123	S44	Email	I am writing to lodge my objection to this proposed development which will have a massively detrimental impact on the local area around Blackpool and St Anne's. This consultation appears to be nothing more than a sham and I have huge concerns concerning the siting of the two enormous substations which it is proposed to establish within close proximity to two local schools. Moreover there will be a loss of grade A farmland which is at the heart of the local Greenbelt. Your proposals will have an extremely lasting and damaging impact on this area, and I really do think you need to have a rethink.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0225_001_231123	S44	Email	This consultation feedback is made on behalf of [REDACTED] who are the owners of [REDACTED] which is tenanted by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] is occupied under the terms of an Agricultural Holdings Act 1986 tenancy, it is a highly productive grassland dairy farm of approximately 200 acres of Grade 2 to Grade 3 land which has a predominantly level aspect which runs north/south over a linear distance of about 1.8 km from the farmstead which is situated at the most southerly end of the farm abutting the A584, to its most northerly extent of farmland which adjoins REDACTED. At its narrowest point which is west from [REDACTED] to its east boundary is about 100m. [REDACTED] has a current milking herd of 300 dairy cows plus followers. The tenant has invested significantly over recent years in constructing a 1km farm cow track infrastructure which provides direct access from the farmstead to the most northerly block of land which not only improves cow foot health but saves man hours, improves grassland management and prevents any need to use the public highway. In addition, batches of dairy followers as and when required at the farm are walked along the cow track from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] is	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>significantly affected by the Morecambe substation Option 2 site which is proposed to be situated in the middle of the holding, completely severing the farmstead from a large block of land lying to the north of the proposed substation. In addition, there are two temporary construction compounds proposed to facilitate the construction of Morecambe substation Option 2 also wholly located within the farm holding. This Option 2 location abuts the narrowest point of the holding and therefore completely severs the farm in half with no direct access to the northerly block which this substation proposal would create. Morecambe substation Option 2 occupies approx. 16 acres plus approx. 13 acres of temporary construction compound and is wholly within [REDACTED]. In addition to the proposed Morecambe substation Option 2 site the holding is also significantly affected by the proposed Morgan Substation site which permanently takes an additional 15 acres of land from the holding. If my client would have been asked to provide Flotation Energy and BP Morgan with a worse case scenario then this proposed location would be it ! In summary [REDACTED] is a 200 acre of which about 170 acres is ring fenced farm with direct internal track access to all fields from the farmstead. If the projects go ahead with Morgan and Morecambe 2 option then [REDACTED] will become a 169 acres farm of which about 64 acres adjoining the farmstead, 74 acres north of Morecambe 2 and 31 acres on the [REDACTED] This is of course less any additional land required for permanent access. During the construction phase [REDACTED] Would loose approx. 42 acres for cable corridor laying plus 13 acres of temporary construction compound, therefore an additional 55 acres out of production for a minimum of 3 years, plus additional land recovery years. During construction [REDACTED] will become about 114 acres, of which approximately 100 acres farmable which takes half the farm out of production and therefore unviable as a dairy farm. It is wholly unacceptable to consider Morecambe substation Option 2 site in this location as it will completely devastate [REDACTED] and will not be viable as a dairy farm either during the construction phases or thereafter.</p>	<p>and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). In particular, The assessment of the impact of increased flood risk arising from additional surface water runoff is presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase. An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects. Socio-economics is assessed at Volume 4, Chapter 2 of the ES (document reference: F4.2). Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will continue discussions and negotiations with regards to any impacts to the farming business. Whilst it is acknowledged that there will be disturbance, it is through this discussion and negotiation that Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will seek to mitigate impacts to the farming business.</p>
TA_0225_010_231123	S44	Email	<p>[REDACTED] is located within the yet to be identified cable corridor route when it leaves Zone 1 heading in an east direction towards Penwortham. This route will completely sever the main block of silage grassland towards the south end of the farm,</p>	<p>Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will continue discussions and negotiations with regards to any impacts to the farming business. Whilst it is acknowledged that there will be disturbance, it is through this discussion and negotiation that Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will seek to mitigate impacts to the farming business. Transmission Asset routing can be found within the Works Plans (document reference B7, B8) and the Land Plans (document reference B10). Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms and as part of those discussions and negotiations detailed information will be provided to confirm the rights sought and required easement widths.</p>
TA_0225_028_231123	S44	Email	<p>Morecambe substation Option 2 siting is approx. 800m from Newton Marsh SSSI. This should not be allowable given the permanent disturbance to rare ground nesting birds during construction and operation of a substation.</p>	<p>Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3) has been prepared and will be submitted as part of the application for development consent. The impact on the SSSIs has been provided in section 3.1.2 and section 3.11.3 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken within the ES, including the following with reference to ornithology:- Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5)- Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0225_030_231123	S44	Email	<p>The site selection for Morecambe substation Option 2 has been refined to within one landownership boundary (including temporary compound areas) being [REDACTED] which is</p>	<p>The Applicants note your response.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			clearly for the convenience of only having to disturb one farm and in doing so will completely sever and ruin a 200 acre dairy farm.	
TA_0226_001_231123	S44	Email	<p>"This consultation feedback is made on behalf of [REDACTED] who hold a leasehold interest in the holding known as [REDACTED], together with other rented land and land within their ownership also situated at [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] is occupied under the terms of an Agricultural Holdings Act 1986 tenancy, it is a highly productive grassland dairy farm of approximately 200 acres of Grade 2 to Grade 3 land which has a predominantly level aspect which runs north/south over a linear distance of about 1.8 km from the farmstead which is situated at the most southerly end of the farm abutting the [REDACTED], to its most northerly extent of farmland which adjoins [REDACTED]. At its narrowest point which is running east from [REDACTED] to its east boundary is about 100m. [REDACTED] has a current milking herd of 300 dairy cows plus followers. The dairy followers are contract reared at [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] has invested significantly over recent years in constructing a 1km farm cow track infrastructure which provides direct access from the farmstead to the most northerly block of land which not only improves cow foot health but saves man hours, improves grassland management and prevents any need to use the public highway. In addition, batches of dairy followers as and when required at the farm are walked along the cow track from [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] is significantly affected by the Morecambe substation Option 2 site which is proposed to be situated in the middle of the holding, completely severing the farmstead from a large block of land lying to the north of the proposed substation. In addition, there are two temporary construction compounds proposed to facilitate the construction of Morecambe substation Option 2 also wholly located within the farm holding. This Option 2 location abuts the narrowest point of the holding and therefore completely severs the farm in half with no direct access to the northerly block which this substation proposal would create. Morecambe substation Option 2 occupies approx. 16 acres plus approx. 13 acres of temporary construction compound and is wholly within [REDACTED] boundaries. If my client would have been asked to provide Flotation Energy with a worse case scenario then this proposed location would be it! In addition to the proposed Morecambe substation Option 2 site the holding is also significantly affected by the proposed Morgan Substation site which permanently takes an additional 15 acres of land from the holding. In summary [REDACTED] is a 200 acre of which about 170 acres is ring fenced farm with direct internal track access to all fields from the farmstead. If the projects go ahead with Morgan and Morecambe 2 option then [REDACTED] will become a 169 acres farm of which about 64 acres adjoining the farmstead, 74 acres north of Morecambe 2 and 31 acres on the east side of [REDACTED]. This is of course less any additional land required for permanent access. During the construction phase [REDACTED] would lose approx. 42 acres for cable corridor laying plus 13 acres of temporary construction compound, therefore an additional 55 acres out of production for a minimum of 3 years, plus additional land recovery years. During construction [REDACTED] will become about 114 acres, of which approximately 100 acres farmable which takes half the farm out of production and therefore unviable as a dairy farm. It is wholly unacceptable to consider Morecambe substation Option 2 site in this location as it will completely devastate [REDACTED] and will not be viable as a dairy farm either during the construction phases or thereafter."</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). In particular, The assessment of the impact of increased flood risk arising from additional surface water runoff is presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase. An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects. Socio-economics is assessed at Volume 4, Chapter 2 of the ES (document reference: F4.2). Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will continue discussions and negotiations with regards to any impacts to the farming business. Whilst it is acknowledged that there will be disturbance, it is through this discussion and negotiation that Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will seek to mitigate impacts to the farming business. As part of the Heads of Terms and ongoing discussions and negotiations, the safety and welfare of all those working on or within proximity to the works, as well as any livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).</p>
TA_0226_024_231123	S44	Email	The site selection for Morecambe substation Option 2 has been refined to within one landownership boundary (including temporary compound areas) being [REDACTED] which is clearly for the convenience of only having to disturb one farm and in doing so will completely sever and ruin a 200 acre dairy farm.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0230_018_231123	S44	Email	The substation site is far too close to dwelling houses and my client's dwelling in particular with health, visual and noise in mind.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). The impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets in terms of noise are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 8 : Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8). Visual effects, including effects arising from lighting, are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES (document reference F3.10).An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the World Health Organisation definition of health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing. Any effects are assessed to be not significant and appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards.</p>
TA_0231_019_231123	S44	Email	<p>The Morgan project has targeted [REDACTED] without any consultation nor prior consultation with the land interests over site selection. There has been one meeting only regarding the Morgan substation siting and this was during the statutory consultation period which was held with an inexperienced BP Morgan representative and with the majority of questions answered by a representative of Flotation Energy who has no interest in the scheme proposal on my client's land. The fact that the statutory public consultation documentation includes false statements of prior landowner consultation in the substation site selection process renders the statutory consultation as flawed and my client requires a formal written apology together with a public statement to rectify this untruthful reporting. The statutory consultation has not complied with statutory planning law requirements as necessary under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 as amended. We reserve our position to make further representations if/when information is made available and in so doing so we question the validity of the current statutory consultation process.</p>	<p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience.</p>
TA_0234_009_231123	S44	Email	<p>Our significant concerns relating to the public consultation process are as follows; 1. No information whatsoever relating to the proposed substation locations until circulation of an engagement map 3 days before the opening of the statutory consultation on 12 October 2023. 2. No landowner consultation whatsoever within Zone 1 prior to the opening of the statutory consultation on 12 October 2023. 3. A complete lack of consultation over the proposed siting of the substation proposals within Zone 1. This has led to misinformation within the public consultation documents which incorrectly advises that substation site selection process included landowner consultation. 4. The projects have not carried out any ecology, groundwater, soil surveys etc on land proposed to site Morecambe 2 substation until surveys commenced August 2023 and a Magnetometer Survey has not been carried out therefore no survey data was available prior to deciding on the proposed sites as presented at public consultation. This has led to misinformation within the public consultation documents which incorrectly advises that substation site selection process included detailed land surveys. There was no prior communication, correspondence, meetings to discuss these proposals whatsoever. My first knowledge of the proposed substation locations was over a Teams meeting on 6 October 2023 where I was shown a screenshot of a Zone 1 map known as the "Morgan and Morecambe Engagement Map" classified as CONFIDENTIAL as Dalcour Maclaren (DM) were under instruction not to release this map. On Monday 9 October 2023 DM advised that they now had consent to release the substation locations map just three days prior to the opening of the public consultation period. This Morgan and Morecambe Engagement Map had clearly been produced for some time prior to the start of the public consultation period however for reasons unbeknown to myself or my clients they projects did not wish to engage with the affected landowners prior to public consultation. The poor landowner consultation coupled with public consultation documents advising the public that substation sites selection process included landowner consultation is dishonest and has led to some public anger towards an affected landowner who is presented by the projects to have been consulted and implied as being complicit in substation siting.</p>	<p>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which the Applicants take seriously to engage and understand community views. The Applicants submitted a Consultation Report (document reference E1) that explains how the Applicants complied with the pre-application consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted. The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants are confident that the detail they provided on all the maps that were shown during the consultation process, in public consultation materials and in communications with landowners illustrated a level detail that was appropriate both to the status of the Transmission Assets and to the intended audience. Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms which will include compensation provisions to address any impacts to the farming business including any severance and injurious affection. The matters raised in feedback will be included within those negotiations and discussions to progress the land agreements.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0234_024_231123	S44	Email	The site selection for Morecambe substation Option 2 has been refined to within one landownership boundary (including temporary compound areas) being REDACTED which is clearly for the convenience of only having to disturb one farm and in doing so will completely sever and ruin a 200 acre dairy farm.	Your feedback has been noted.
TA_0236_001_231123	S44	Email	I writing to state my strong objection to the current proposals being put forward regarding the Morecambe and Morgan wind farm. Firstly I want to state I'm in-favour of the wind farms and the generation of greener electric. However I believe the current cable route and proposed substation locations will have a grossly negative impact on rural Fylde's residents, ecology and farming businesses for generations to come.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0236_006_231123	S44	Email	I strongly disapprove of the proposed location of the substations in the picturesque green belt heart between freckleton, Kirkham and newton. I strongly believe that the lack of design information regarding the substion is intentional to deceive the public! 45acre 20meters tall this fill be a eyesore on the environment. Also the close location to 2 schools I believe the associated noise(buzzing) of such substations will be damaging to the health of my children when they attend these schools in the future. I believe the highlight option for it to be located next to the existing penwortham substitution would be far more appropriate.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).It is acknowledged that the proposed cable route passes through Green Belt land and the proposed onshore substations also fall within Green Belt. A consideration of alternative routes and substation siting is made as part of the Site Selection chapter of the ES (Volume 1, chapter 4, document reference F1.4) which concluded this is the preferred route and location for the cable and the substations. Land within the Area of Separation is no longer required for the onshore substations. An assessment regarding the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt, alongside a Very Special Circumstances assessment is set out within the Planning Statement (document reference J28). The Applicants consider that when assessed on the planning balance that the significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.
TA_0236_007_231123	S44	Email	Finally I would like to reiterate my objection to morecambe and Morgan's proposed cable route. I believe if the cables traveled up the ribble estuary and made land fall close to the final destination. It would have a far lower impact on the population, businesses and environment of the fylde coast and surrounding areas.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).
TA_0240_001_231123	s44	Email	<p>Land Affected: REDACTED I am writing to you on behalf of the above-named client to make formal representation in relation to the proposed offshore wind farm, which proposes to transport electricity to the National Grid power station at Penwortham. This scheme poses a significant risk to the viability of the farming operation at REDACTED. It involves a large proportion of good quality land which is vital to the farming operation. The Land allocated potentially encompasses the whole of the farm holding 15.50ha (38.30acres) of land. Without this, the farming business cannot survive. Agricultural Enterprise: The farming enterprise services an existing beef farm. Current numbers on the farm are as follows: - Beef Cattle - 80As stated above, the landowner has a number of major concerns with the project, namely: - The land being taken is some of the best and most versatile land (grade 3) on the holding but also more widely in Lancashire and around the country. - Impact on land value - there would be a significant diminution in value of land as a result of biodiversity. - Loss of vital mowing and grazing land – the remainder of the land within the biodiversity allocation is used for silage production and/or cattle grazing. Absolutely vital to the farming business. - Additional feed requirements – as a result of losing land, the landowner will be required to purchase additional fodder and bedding, the cows will have to be supplementary fed. - There are some concerns over the existing agri-environmental scheme located on the land. There is an existing Countryside Stewardship agreement, which incorporates the management of hedgerows option amongst other options. The landowner has incurred costs in instructing a land agent to prepare and submit the application. There are concerns in being able to manage the hedgerows as agreed with the Rural Payments Agency and therefore likely to incur payment reductions. Potential loss of BPS. - Reinstatement – what does the allocation entail, will it impact fencing, hedging and drainage? It will require full and proper reinstatement. The landowner has major concerns around the disturbance of existing land drains, the problem only likely to become apparent months after the scheme is complete. - The landowner understandably wants to understand what he will be left with once works have been completed? On what basis will the land be acquired? - The landowner is adamant that no access is to be taken through the farmyard. This would cause major disturbance/intrusion on the farming enterprise. - Biosecurity – the developers use of contractors is considered a risk to biosecurity. People, machinery and materials will be brought on site, adding a significant risk to biosecurity and potential contamination risks. - Future access – how and when will access be taken onto the land in the future. How will the land be managed? - Severance – the impact of the land taken being severed to that of the remainder of farm land holding. - Injurious affection – significant concerns of the land lost impact on the remaining value of the holding. Significant diminution in value as a result of the scheme. - The impact of the land being taken would destroy the business and livelihood – farming dairy will be made unviable as a result of the scheme. - Severance and Injurious affection – significant concerns of the land lost impact on the remaining value of the holding. - There would be additional feed requirements We also wish to know further information in relation to on what basis the land will be acquired for the purposes of the scheme.</p>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0242_001_231123	s44	Email	<p>I am writing to you on behalf of the above-named client to make formal representation in relation to the proposed offshore wind farm, which proposes to transport electricity to the National Grid power station at Penwortham. This scheme poses a significant risk to the viability of REDACTED equestrian operation. It involves taking approximately 10 acres of high-quality productive land used in connection with the production of hay for horses. As stated above, the landowner has a number of major concerns with the project, namely: - The land being taken is some of the best and most versatile land (grade 3) on the holding but also more widely in Lancashire and around the country. - Impact on land value - there would be a significant diminution in value of land as a result of biodiversity. - Loss of vital mowing and grazing land – the remainder of the land within the biodiversity allocation is used for silage production and/or cattle grazing. Absolutely vital to the farming business. - Additional feed requirements – as a result of losing land, the landowner will be</p>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>required to purchase additional fodder and bedding, the cows will have to be supplementary fed.- Reinstatement – what does the allocation entail, will it impact fencing, hedging and drainage? It will require full and proper reinstatement. The landowner has major concerns around the disturbance of existing land drains, the problem only likely to become apparent months after the scheme is complete.- The landowner understandably wants to understand what he will be left with once works have been completed? On what basis will the land be acquired?- The landowner is adamant that no access is to be taken through the farmyard. This would cause major disturbance/intrusion on the farming enterprise.- Biosecurity – the developers use of contractors is considered a risk to biosecurity. People, machinery and materials will be brought on site, adding a significant risk to biosecurity and potential contamination risks.- Future access – how and when will access be taken onto the land in the future. How will the land be managed?- Severance – the impact of the land taken being severed to that of the remainder of farm land holding.- Injurious affection – significant concerns of the land lost impact on the remaining value of the holding. Significant diminution in value as a result of the scheme.- The impact of the land being taken would destroy the business and livelihood – farming dairy will be made unviable as a result of the scheme.- Severance and Injurious affection – significant concerns of the land lost impact on the remaining value of the holding.- There would be additional feed requirements We also wish to know further information in relation to on what basis the land will be taken for the purposes of the scheme.</p>	
TA_0243_004_231123	S44	Email	<p>The Non-statutory consultation was also flawed and, therefore, should be ignored as there was no explanation as to how the four search zone locations were identified in the first place. The PIER overlooks Fylde Borough Council's local plan, identifying Enterprise Zones, brownfield sites, and potential candidate zones. FBC should, therefore, refute the current plans and force them to be reconsidered in line with their strategy for the region. The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1 – no consideration of locale to residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones. The RAG survey ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect.</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0243_007_231123	S44	Email	<p>People invest their money to live in a semi-rural environment for mental health and wellbeing. This development promises to devalue their assets and destroy their chosen quality of life. There are alternative options laid out by the initial studies and FBC's plans, which should be reconsidered and different decisions made.</p>	<p>An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the World Health Organisation definition of health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing. Any effects are assessed to be not significant and appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards. The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0243_009_231123	S44	Email	<p>I am not opposing green energy, but the infrastructure in the proposed plans is not acceptable when there are more sensitive and responsible alternatives. Repurposing of existing assets (Heysham power station) or routes like Ribble Estuary have been ignored.</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>and F1.4.3). The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).</p>
TA_0244_004_231123	S44	Email	<p>The Non-statutory consultation was also flawed and, therefore, should be ignored as there was no explanation as to how the four search zone locations were identified in the first place. The PIER overlooks Fylde Borough Council's local plan, identifying Enterprize Zones, brownfield sites, and potential candidate zones. FBC should, therefore, refute the current plans and force them to be reconsidered in line with their strategy for the region. The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1—no consideration of locale to residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones. The RAG survey ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect.</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0244_007_231123	S44	Email	<p>People invest their money to live in a semi-rural environment for mental health and wellbeing. This development promises to devalue their assets and destroy their chosen quality of life. There are alternative options laid out by the initial studies and FBCs plans, which should be reconsidered and different decisions made.</p>	<p>An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the WorldHealth Organisation definition of health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing. Any effects are assessed to be not significant and appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards. The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out the parameters and evidence needed to substantiate a claim for diminution in value and when this happens. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate. The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0244_009_231123	S44	Email	<p>I am not opposing green energy, but the infrastructure in the proposed plans is not acceptable when there are more sensitive and responsible alternatives. Repurposing of existing assets (Heysham power station) or routes like Ribble Estuary have been ignored.</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).</p>
TA_0246_001_231123	S44	Email	<p>We remain concerned that there does not appear to be a plan we can look at, that shows us the complete route of the cables to Penwortham. We also do know that the protected river will still have to be crossed at some point! It still seems to me that you should be using Heysham Power Station instead of Penwortham. Can you please answer my questions.</p>	<p>The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Direct pipe or microtunnelling is proposed beneath the River Ribble to ensure that there would be no direct impacts on the river habitats. As set out in Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3), Crossing techniques are set out within Volume 1, Annex 3.2: Onshore Crossing Schedule of the ES (document reference F1.3.2) which is submitted as part of the application for development consent. Further information on the proposed approach to construction is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES.</p>
TA_0248_001_231123	S44	Email	<p>I am putting my feedback/objections to the Wind Farm Project in writing. I am not prepared to complete your paper feedback form as I strongly believe this has been made as difficult as possible for people to complete. You are asking for feedback on technical reports which are fact. Without reading all of your documents in full it would be impossible to comment on them nor would I be qualified to do so. I have attended a number of your consultation events, a Newton with Scales Parish council meeting where a project representative was in attendance and now 2 of your Statutory consultations and also had two site visits to my property. All I can say is that they were all a waste of time. All information provided is available on your web site. This project has been fed piecemeal and lacks transparency. There is no evidence of how the four possible areas for substations were arrived at and how this has now been reduced to Zone 1. All you are doing is fulfilling your statutory obligations without giving vital information to land owners and the general public. Your information has been sketchy, and changes without notification.. There has been a total lack of consideration for land owners, house owners, wildlife, the risk of severe flooding and environmental damage. Your two companies act like bullies who intimidate those possibly in danger of losing their land, their lifestyle taken away from them, reduction in property prices due to this ugly, noisy and unwanted development in the area. No other alternatives have been put forward and it would appear that Zone one has been chosen as the only site. In addition to my objections with regard to our land for which we have worked hard to initially acquire but also to develop it into a useable stable yard and small holding I also live on REDACTED in St Annes. We only found out about the proposed cable route through St Annes about three weeks before this round of statutory consultations and only via a mail shot. This has given little time for residents to assimilate their objections.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0248_003_231123	S44	Email	<p>I suspect decisions being made based on cost and what is most convenient to the project with environmental, local community, sensitivity for agriculture and wildlife, FBC strategy, noise pollution, community health and other critical factors being pushed aside. The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1—no consideration of local residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones has been given. No clear justification has been given for choosing Zone 1 and until very recently the residents of Newton were virtually unaware of the proposed project and the implications for them as a rural community, the effect on wildlife habitat and the reduction in the value of their properties. Serious repurposing of existing assets (Heysham power station) or routes like Ribble Estuary does not seem to have been serious consideration.</p>	<p>Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES. The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological designations protected by national and international legislation. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt Estuary Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in extremely long construction timeframes and risk extensive, and potentially long-term damage to sensitive and protected habitats that support smelt and protected bird species, whilst also presenting unsafe working conditions during construction. The approach to site selection has been based on avoiding damage to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).</p>
TA_0249_001_231123	S44	Email	<p>I am putting my feedback/objections to the Wind Farm Project in writing. I am not prepared to complete your paper feedback form as I strongly believe this has been made as difficult as possible for people to complete. You are asking for feedback on technical reports which are fact. Without reading all of your documents in full it would be impossible to comment on them nor would I be qualified to do so. I have attended a number of your consultation events, a Newton with Scales Parish council meeting where a project representative was in attendance and now 2 of your Statutory consultations and also had two site visits to my property. All I can say is that they were all a waste of time. All information provided is available on your web site. This project has been fed piecemeal and lacks transparency. There is no evidence of how the four possible areas for substations were arrived at and how this has now been reduced to Zone 1. All you are doing is fulfilling your statutory obligations without giving vital information to land owners and the general public. Your information has been sketchy, and changes without notification. There has been a total lack of consideration for land owners, house owners, wildlife, the risk of severe flooding and environmental damage. Your two companies act like bullies who intimidate those possibly in danger of losing their land, their lifestyle taken away from them, reduction in property prices due to this ugly, noisy and unwanted development in the area. No other alternatives have been put forward and it would appear that Zone one has been chosen as the only site. In addition to my</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>objections with regard to our land for which we have worked hard to initially acquire but also to develop it into a useable stable yard and small holding I also live on REDACTED in St Annes. We only found out about the proposed cable route through St Annes about three weeks before this round of statutory consultations and only via a mail shot. This has given little time for residents to assimilate their objections.</p>	<p>that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0249_003_231123	S44	Email	<p>I suspect decisions being made based on cost and what is most convenient to the project with environmental, local community, sensitivity for agriculture and wildlife, FBC strategy, noise pollution, community health and other critical factors being pushed aside. The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1—no consideration of local residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones has been given. No clear justification has been given for choosing Zone 1 and until very recently the residents of Newton were virtually unaware of the proposed project and the implications for them as a rural community, the effect on wildlife habitat and the reduction in the value of their properties. Serious repurposing of existing assets (Heysham power station) or routes like Ribble Estuary does not seem to have been serious consideration.</p>	<p>Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES. The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological designations protected by national and international legislation. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt Estuary Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in extremely long construction timeframes and risk extensive, and potentially long-term damage to sensitive and protected habitats that support smelt and protected bird species, whilst also presenting unsafe working conditions during construction. The approach to site selection has been based on avoiding damage to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).</p>
TA_0250_001_231123	S44	Email	<p>We are land owners on the proposed route through sluice lane title no. REDACTED We strongly object to this proposal as we are land locked and our only access is along sluice lane to our land and stables... we need access daily to feed animals and maintain stables etc.. it would be absolutely devastating if you didnt listen to our concernswe object totally ..there are lots of other reasons for you not to encroach onto our land ...one is paramount that my parents ashes have buried under a tree and it has been blessed by the vicar of the white church in fairhaven and it is very personal and important to us to honour their memory....nevermind the wildlife we have in the field ...from barn owls to bats and occasionally we get the odd deer, we have planted hundreds and hundreds of plants trees and hedgerows to encourage wildlife ..we urge you to listen to the people on the mossdont destroy something so natural and intact....</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest's holding is no longer within the draft order limits. The proposed works would not restrict access and measures to control impacts are set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8) The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets on protected species and protected habitats are considered in Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES. Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on onshore ecology and nature conservation are provided in section 3.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference: F3.3)</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_255_001_241123	S44	Email	Thank you for forwarding the more detailed land parcels with the indicative 400KVA cable corridor and compounds. My client wishes to object for the reasons detailed below: My client intensively farms 150-180 dairy cows with followers. The main farm buildings are located at REDACTED and the land holding is clearly shown edged and coloured black. The proposed cable corridor route goes through some of the most productive pasture and meadow land that is required for the dairy herd. The proposed route significantly severs the southern land which is going to impact on the ability for the farm to carry the dairy herd and youngstock. The route cuts through at least 5 open ditches which carry all surface water and the drainage system within the area, including surface water from Newton village and surrounding areas. Any damage to the drainage system is going to have a huge impact on the retained land and the surrounding area. The proposed route appears to diagonally cut through the majority of my client's central holding. There does not appear to be any weight given to impacting client holding and it seems to be that the route has been chosen for ecological purposes rather than practical purposes. If the route is required from Newton to Penwortham then it seems to take a far more practical route to follow indicative lines as I have suggested, which whilst still travelling through my client's land holding, severely reduces the impact and also reduces the length of the cable route. The compound located north of plot 1132 can then be incorporated into 1132 which then minimises the impact and frees up that field completely undisturbed. The drainage system in the area is very complex and therefore it would be strongly recommended that an independent drainage consultant is employed at the earliest opportunity as it will be likely that directional drilling is required for the whole area to ensure that the drainage system is not affected. A directional drill will also mitigate the need to provide for daily crossing point for my client who will need access to the south land for grazing and mowing throughout the season therefore minimising the impact and inconvenience to the scheme.	Following route refinement, Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms to secure the rights for the compound which will include provisions for compensation of severed land and impact on farming operations. The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). The Applicants through Dalcour Maclaren and appointed drainage specialists will engage with landowners regarding pre-construction and post-construction drainage, tying into existing infrastructure where possible. The Outline CoCP and outline surface water and groundwater management plan (document reference J1.9) includes measures in relation to drainage.
TA_256_001_201223	S44	Email	Further to REDACTED email with attached plans, I did speak with my client briefly last week and I think probably the best thing is to arrange for a meeting in the New Year, which would probably cover REDACTED who have affected land holdings. My clients' over-riding concern is to the viability and the impact of running their equestrian and small holding and how they will be able to continue during the constructional phase as the cable route severs their holding in half and it would be extremely difficult to access the southern area, meaning my client will not be able to accommodate the horses that they have. I would be grateful at this early stage if Dalcour Maclaren, your clients, will provide for assurances that where there are equestrian and smallholding properties that these are dealt with on special circumstances and all costs for the relocation of horses and animals will be met in full. As you can appreciate, finding alternative livery facilities within the area is difficult and my clients will need a suitable time period to find alternative accommodation, so the sooner that your clients are able to commit the better. My clients have also suggested that the cable route be swung further south so it then tries to mitigate the impact on their land holding and I have attached a plan for this. You will also be aware of the significant low-lying nature of the land, certainly my client's land holding and the surrounding area is regularly affected by ground water. Any open cut trenching will exacerbate the problems in the area, and also could severely impact the drainage of the local Newton and surrounding area. There are a number of important Environment Agency ditches, and main water courses which affect the area, so I would strongly recommend to your clients that they investigate the idea of directional drilling along this whole stretch running from Dow Brook eastwards. This which would alleviate a number of the practical problems of the equestrian and smallholder land-owners, but more importantly, the drainage and water issues within the wider area. No doubt we will discuss in the New Year.	Following route refinement, Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms to secure the rights for the compound which will include provisions for compensation of severed land and impact on farming operations. The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). The Applicants through Dalcour Maclaren and appointed drainage specialists will engage with landowners regarding pre-construction and post-construction drainage, tying into existing infrastructure where possible. The Outline CoCP and outline surface water and groundwater management plan (document reference J1.9) includes measures in relation to drainage.
TA_257_001_201223	S44	Email	Thank you for forwarding the indicative plans, these have been sent to my client for their benefit however I would make the comments for feedback purposes on the consultation in relation to the 275KV indicative corridor route. It again appears that the ecology has far outweighed the practical landowner impact. There seems to be no practical reason why the cable route should be split into two and effectively cut my client's holding in half during the constructional phase. It would make far more practical sense for the cable route to follow the indicative dash line that I have indicated for the Morecambe proposed sub-station Option 2. Obviously the comments are dependant as to the substation location but trust these comments will be heard.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3).
TA_258_001_201223	S44	Email	Thank you for sending across the plans showing the indicative cable routes. My client obviously objects to the proposed scheme on a number of reasons being that it will severely impact her	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>equestrian facilities and the cable route will then mean they are not able to accommodate the horses and livestock on the property requiring alternative accommodation. It severs a small area to the south. If there was a way of mitigating losses then the cable route should really follow the track that therefore doesn't require any crossing points and maximises the availability of the land holding. No doubt you will be raising this issue as a wider observation and no doubt you will report back in due course.</p>	<p>1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Following route refinement, Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms to secure the rights for the compound which will include provisions for compensation of severed land and impact on farming operations. The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code.</p>
TA_259_001_121223	S44	Email	<p>Land Affected: Land forming part of REDACTED I am writing to you on behalf of the above-named client to make formal representation in relation to the proposed offshore wind farm, which proposes to transport electricity to the National Grid power station at Penwortham. As part of the consultation map, a large proportion of land from REDACTED has been allocated for biodiversity net gain. Approximately 36.14 hectares (89.30 acres) or thereabouts is designated under REDACTED allocation on your proposed work plans. This land is designated as Grade 3 on the Agricultural Land Classification Map for England but is in close proximity to residential dwelling. This scheme poses a significant risk to the property value at REDACTED. The land is used in connection with the owners personal horses. The land is irreplaceable from an exercise, grazing and baling perspective. As stated above, the landowner has a number of major concerns with the project, namely:- Loss of vital mowing and grazing land – the remainder of the land within the biodiversity allocation is used for hay production and/or horse grazing. Absolutely vital to the equestrian operation.- Additional feed requirements – as a result of losing land, the landowner will be required to purchase additional fodder and bedding, the horses will have to be supplementary fed.- Reinstatement – what does the allocation entail, will it impact fencing, hedging and drainage? It will require full and proper reinstatement. The landowner has major concerns around the disturbance of existing land drains, the problem only likely to become apparent months after the scheme is complete.- The landowner understandably wants to understand what he will be left with once works have been completed. How will this land be managed?- The landowner is adamant that no access is to be taken through the farmyard. This would cause major disturbance/intrusion on the dwelling.- Biosecurity – the developers use of contractors is considered a risk to biosecurity. People, machinery and materials will be brought on site, adding a significant risk to biosecurity and potential contamination risks.- Future access – how and when will access be taken onto the land in the future. How will the land be managed?- Severance – the impact of the land taken being severed to that of the remainder of farm land holding.- Injurious affection – significant concerns of the land lost impact on the remaining value of the holding. Significant diminution in value as a result of the scheme.- The impact of the land being taken would destroy the business and livelihood – the equestrian operation would be made unviable as a result of the scheme. We also wish to know further information in relation to on what basis the land will be acquired for the purposes of the scheme.</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.</p>

E1.16.6 Environmental Impact Assessment methodology (via all methods)

Table E1.16.6: Environmental Impact Assessment methodology table of responses (via all other methods)

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0001_030_231123	S42	Email	1.29 Volume 2, Chapter 1, Table 1.19 We note that Westminster Gravels will be renewing their aggregate extraction licence in Area 457 in Liverpool Bay (please see: EIA/2023/00003). Currently this proposal is in early EIA scoping stages, the ES is expected to be submitted in Q2 2024. Consideration may need to be given to this proposal in the submitted CEA.	The list of projects considered within the CEA has been updated in line with updates from PEIR to ES, and the application progress of other developments. The revised CEA list for each offshore topic is presented in the list of other projects, plans and activities considered within the CEA in each chapter of the ES. The screening matrix used within the CEA can be found in Volume 1, Annex 5.5: Cumulative screening matrix and location plan of the ES (document reference: F1.5.5). Aggregate extraction licence in Area 457 in Liverpool Bay is included as a Tier 2 project in the CEA.
TA_0001_031_231123	S42	Email	1.3 Volume 2, Chapter 1, Table 1.19 We note that the Mersey Tidal Power Project has been scoped out in the screening matrix of the PEIR. However, this may need to be given further consideration as the project progresses. Consideration may need to be given to this proposal in the submitted CEA.	The list of projects considered within the CEA has been updated in line with updates from PEIR to ES, and the application progress of other developments. The revised CEA list for each offshore topic is presented in the list of other projects, plans and activities considered within the CEA in each chapter of the ES. The screening matrix used within the CEA can be found in Volume 1, Annex 5.5: Cumulative screening matrix and location plan of the ES (document reference: F1.5.5). The Mersey Tidal Power Project is included as a Tier 3 project in the CEA.
TA_0001_045_231123	S42	Email	1.44 Volume 1, Chapter 5/Volume 2, Chapter 1 Section 1.9 (general) Natural England broadly agree with the EIA methodology for the assessment of Physical Processes. However, as discussed previously we advise that the full suite of model outputs for the Transmission Assets are presented in the ES. We advise that the full suite of model outputs for the Transmission Assets are presented in the ES.	Model outputs used to support the ES can be found within the technical annex, Volume 2, Annex 1.1: Physical Processes Associated Modelling Studies (document reference F2.1.1). This includes both the Mona Offshore Wind Project, Environmental Statement, Volume 6, Annex 1.1: Physical processes technical report; and Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets, Environmental Statement, Volume 4, Annex 1.1: Physical Processes Technical Report.
TA_0001_046_231123	S42	Email	1.45 Volume 2, Chapter 1, Section 1.10 We note that the tiered system used within the cumulative impact assessment is based on a three-tier approach. Natural England and JNCC (2022) has developed a tiered approach for scoping projects into cumulative/in-combination assessments. Please see Natural England's Best Practice Guidance Phase III.	The list of projects considered within the CEA has been updated in line with developments three months prior to application submission. The revised CEA list is presented in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), section 1.11 Cumulative effect assessment methodology, and Table 1.18: List of other projects, plans and activities considered with the CEA.
TA_0001_133_231123	S42	Email	Identified impacts 4.18 Table 4.16 Natural England have concerns regarding the assessment matrix and double outcome categories of significance. Such approach needs further justification with explanation on how the conclusions of the assessment are reached especially in scenarios where non-significant and significant effects can result from the same combination of magnitude and sensitivity (e.g. high sensitivity and low magnitude result in minor and moderate effects). It is generally accepted that the assessment should follow the precautionary principle in which case moderate effects should be concluded unless a robust evidence and strong justification is provided to argue on contrary. Revise the assessment matrix in the submitted ES to reflect the precautionary principle unless there is strong evidence to indicate otherwise.	The EIA methodology is set out within Volume 1, Chapter 5: Environmental assessment methodology of the ES. The chapter describes how significance of effects has been assessed. Professional judgement is used to define the magnitude of impact and receptor sensitivity. The matrix is then used, together with professional judgement, to evaluate the significance of effect. The significance may be one, or a range of, no change, negligible, minor, moderate or major. In general, a significance of effect of moderate or greater is considered 'significant' in EIA terms. For each topic chapter, what is considered 'significant' has been clearly defined. Where further mitigation is not possible a residual significant effect may remain. Within the assessment chapters the justification for determining the significance of effect is described. Where a range is given, the assessment chapter details the reason for the significance that has been concluded.
TA_0001_275_231123	S42	Email	Matrix to Determine Effect Significance We acknowledge that a matrix approach to determining the significance of effects on ecological features, is commonly used. However, this method often relies on value- rather than evidence-based judgements. The subjective evaluation of magnitude of impact and sensitivity/importance of receptors through expert judgement has led to many impact magnitudes and receptor importance/sensitivities being downgraded across topics in the PEIR. We also note that any effect that is concluded to be of moderate or major significance in the PEIR, is deemed to be 'significant' in EIA terms, whereas effects concluded to be of negligible or minor significance, are deemed 'not significant' in EIA terms. This cut-off could exclude any effect concluded to be less than moderate, in turn, this could lead to errors in assessing cumulative effects adequately.	Clarification with respect to determination of magnitude of cumulative impacts and how this has informed evaluation of the significance of effect has been added into the cumulative effect assessment methodology of each offshore topic chapter, within the CEA methodology section. Assessments utilise the most recent relevant science and evidence, accompanied with expert judgement, which is applied in all cases to ensure the level of significance identified by the matrix approach is correct and is considered to provide a robust consideration of the likely significance of impact on receptors. The significance of effect for cumulative impacts is determined by considering the magnitudes of projects together and

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				assessing against the sensitivity of receptors, and not by adding the significance of individual projects.
TA_0003_015_221123	S42/S44	Email	Cumulative Impact In addition to the cumulative impact of the infrastructure required to service the two wind farms, there are a number of development commitments in the locality of the proposed substation sites that need to be taken into consideration in an assessment of cumulative impact on the local community. There are several large scale solar farms which have been constructed recently or have planning permission and are awaiting project initiation. These facilities are generally located in the countryside and their impacts on the local landscape have been carefully assessed. The impact of further large scale utilities will add to that impact. It is considered that the assessment of the visual interrelationship of the proposed substation sites to these neighbouring facilities needs to be developed further.	All chapters of the ES have considered other developments relevant to that topic. In particular, Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES (document reference F3.10) includes an assessment of cumulative effects on landscape character and visual amenity as a result of other planned development, including solar farm schemes.
TA_0003_018_221123	S42/S44	Email	Fylde Council has significant concerns regarding the potential impact of the proposed development on the local area and regarding the lack of detail available to inform their assessment of the impacts of the development at this stage. Council officers and elected members will be happy to engage with the development team to discuss any of the aspects set out above, but at this time and having considered the wider benefits of the proposal, the council objects to the proposed development.	The Applicants note your response. Fylde Council has been invited to form part of the Evidence Plan Process steering group and a number of Export Working Groups throughout the EIA process.
TA_0005_001_231123	S42	Email	In summary, from the information provided with the consultation process to date, the programme as presented, as yet, fails to demonstrate that :-• the adverse impacts on the local resident individuals, communities, economies and environments have been adequately represented and so insufficient weight has been given in comparisons of options considered;• not all options considered have been objectively, consistently, nor adequately assessed. This particularly relates to options involving the continuation of the sea borne routes to the Penwortham National Grid connection via estuarial and coastal littoral zones, including with reference to mitigations possible through engagement with applicable regulatory bodies. This would avoid land based impacts by employing what is claimed to be a less disruptive, narrower, shorter sea based routing approach;• there has been appropriate engagement with applicable regulatory bodies including local planning, environmental control, National Grid, etc. and other best practice enterprises to develop mitigations and efficiencies to address the adverse impacts of above and below surface infrastructure route & location options; • options have been reassessed with and without mitigations incorporated.	The design of the Transmission Assets has been developed further since the statutory consultation (PEIR). This design evolution has taken into account the findings of the iterative EIA process and feedback from stakeholders. As such the location of key elements of the Transmission Assets and the Order Limits have been refined, as reflected in the application for development consent. Engagement through the Evidence Plan Process has continued throughout the EIA process, including Expert Working Groups attended by local planning authorities. Further targeted consultation has been undertaken, for example, for landowners where additional land interests have been identified. Details of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0005_007_231123	S42	Email	5. Nor is it presented how best practice has been adopted to take on the experience from other equivalent projects (e.g. Walney & Dogger) that appear to have adopted less impactful designs and approaches of greater than half the scale.	The Transmission Assets provide a connection to the National Grid for two nationally significant offshore wind farms, and therefore two sets of transmission infrastructure are required. Details of the site selection process and alternatives considered are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4). The measures proposed to control effects on the environment and communities are set out in the ES (document reference F1 to F4).
TA_0017_011_231123	S42/S44	Email	GuidelinesThe planning application should demonstrate that the proposed development will comply with recognised guidelines, including (but not limited to):• National Infrastructure Planning guidance and advice notes including for example:• Advice Note Seven: Environmental Impact Assessment• Advice Note Ten: Habitats Regulations Assessments• Government Circular: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation – Statutory Obligations and their impact within the planning system (ODPM 06/2005, DEFRA 01/2005).• Planning for Biodiversity and Geological Conservation: A Guide to Good Practice (March 2006). • Relevant Planning Practice Guidance, including (but not limited to) Environmental Impact Assessment and Natural	The guidance documents that have informed the assessment are set out in section 3.2.5 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). The application of relevant guidance to the assessment of impacts on onshore ecology and nature conservation is demonstrated through the evaluation and identification of important ecological features, as set out in section 3.6.4. The assessment of impacts is provided in section 3.11. Information on biodiversity net gain is provided in the Onshore

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			Environment. https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance • CIEEM Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment, 2018;• Ecological Impact Assessment Checklist (CIEEM & ALGE, 2019);• BS42020 Biodiversity – Code of Practice for Planning and Development.• Biodiversity net gain. Good practice principles for development - CIEEM, IEMA & CIRIA (2019).• Recognised survey and mitigation guidelines, including (but not limited to) current Natural England standing advice, guidelines and Technical Information Notes. • Any emerging guidelines relating to compliance with the requirements of the Environment Act 2021.	Biodiversity Benefits Statement (document reference J11) and biodiversity benefit in the Outline Ecological Management Plan (document reference J6).
TA_0017_012_231123	S42/S44	Email	<p>Consultees</p> <p>The Planning application should demonstrate that issues raised by consultees have been addressed. This includes (but is not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England • The Environment Agency • Marine Management Organisation • Local Planning Authorities 	Meetings were held on the scope, methodology and findings of surveys. Details were discussed and agreed with stakeholders via regular Expert Working Group (EWG) meetings. Refer to the Technical Engagement Plan (document reference E5) for all details of technical stakeholder consultation.
TA_0019_007_231123	S42/S44	Email	There are several proposed energy projects, solar and wind, at various pre-application stages of consideration that combine to significantly impact on Newton-with-Clifton parish, the Rural East ward of Fylde and the Lancashire county council Fylde East division. The singular or cumulative effects on the countryside, the character of the landscape, townscape, visual amenity, and the adverse impact on local residents arising from noise and other public nuisance issues result in a loss of amenity. It is recognised that while each application must be assessed on its own merits, and that none have been implemented to date it is unclear whether implementation of one affects whether other proposals will receive necessary development consents and permissions	Other proposed developments, including allocated development sites, have been considered in the cumulative assessment of each onshore topic chapter (see Volume 3 of the ES, document reference F3).
TA_0019_016_231123	S42/S44	Email	Need for low-carbon and renewable initiatives is understood, however the locations in Zone 1 for the two substations are considered inappropriate. i). RAG survey ratings are considered to be contradictory, inconsistent, incorrect factually and subjective;a) High Pressure gas main. The high-pressure gas main only touches the extreme eastern edge of Zone 2, this could be managed. This is not made clear.b) Flood Risk - Inspection of Flood Zone maps shows there little difference in flood risk between Zones 1 and 2. This is not made clear.c) Zone 1 and Zone 2 are roughly equidistant from a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and so not a factor to differentiate siting as claimed.d) Bluefield solar farm development is in Zone 1 and not in Zone 2. e) Inconsistent treatment of wild life concerns and surveys. Limited number of ornithological surveys used to inform RAG selection process for sites.f) Zone 1 lies within Kirkham/Newton Area of Separation and Fylde borough council Green Belt. This is not weighted appropriately in the RAG.g) Proximity to residential development is not factored in the RAG selection assessment for Zones.	The solar farm has been considered as part of the cumulative assessment for the onshore elements of the Transmission Assets. All schemes considered in the cumulative assessment are set out in Volume 1, Annex 5.5: Cumulative screening matrix and location plan of the ES (document reference F1.5.5). Bluefield solar farm has also been considered as a part of route planning and site selection process, documented in Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the ES: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4), with further detailed provided in Volume 1, Annex 4.3: Selection and Refinement of the Onshore Infrastructure (document reference F1.4.3).The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0019_020_231123	S42/S44	Email	There is a large potential cumulative effect on the village of Newton-with-Scales as the proposal states that the Bluefield solar farm development is accommodated by the selection of substation locations. In the interests of transparent consultation there should have been an outline of the potential Bluefield solar farm on the maps/ diagrams as well. Many residents on the west of the village are potentially viewing a large solar farm, and also windfarm substations with a permanent footprint of 185000m2 in total (size of approximately thirty adult size football pitches) and approximately twenty five metres in height, rather than the Best and Most Versatile (BMV) good quality agricultural land they view now. With the 170-acre solar farm on Clifton Marsh and the expansion of Westinghouse in Clifton and other solar farm developments the area appears to be disproportionately affected. The map below illustrates the point, with Newton-with-Scales outlined in green. The Red lines are existing pylon and overhead cable routes. Existing solar farms and nuclear sites in pale blue (with potential expansion), new proposed solar farms in dark blue, and the substations in orange and yellow. Depending on the option chosen for the Morecambe substation (south or north) one yellow and orange box will no longer be relevant.	The solar farm has been considered as part of the cumulative assessment for the onshore elements of the Transmission Assets. All schemes considered in the cumulative assessment are set out in Volume 1, Annex 5.5: Cumulative screening matrix and location plan of the ES (document reference F1.5.5). Bluefield solar farm has also been considered as a part of route planning and site selection process, documented in Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the ES: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4), with further detailed provided in Volume 1, Annex 4.3: Selection and Refinement of the Onshore Infrastructure (document reference F1.4.3).The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0026_002_231123	S42/S44	Email	MasterplanIn 2017, the Blackpool, Fylde and Wyre Economic Development Company commissioned the production of a Development Masterplan for the Enterprise Zone, to provide a framework for shaping the future delivery of the site. The original Masterplan was approved and adopted by both Blackpool and Fylde Council in 2018. This is a live and ever-evolving document which has, and will continue to be, updated as development works at the Enterprise Zone are	The Applicants welcome Blackpool Airport's engagement. The Project will continue to engage with Blackpool Airport, in relation to potential impacts which may arise from the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Transmission Assets. Including where they may arise in relation to the Masterplan

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>brought forward.6 no. character areas within the Enterprise Zone were identified within the 2018 Masterplan document. These character areas were originally known as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Knowledge Quarter – home of business, research and development and education •Airport Zone – for the relocation and consolidation of airport operations to the south •Business Hub – delivery of high-quality development and optimisation of the existing business operation on Amy Johnson Way •Innovation Gateway – a new gateway will be created off Squires Gate Lane with advanced manufacturing and businesses located at the primary entrance to the Enterprise Zone •Industrial Heart – the location of manufacturing, light industry and logistics units •Third Space – to contain a new sports hub, high street with café and retail frontage, sports pitches and leisure-based uses to supplement the businesses within the site <p>A revised version of the Masterplan was prepared in 2020, with the revised draft version approved at Blackpool's Executive Committee in December of that year. As the Masterplan is a live document, it is frequently updated to reflect changes in ownership, economic circumstances and new opportunities as they arise. Reflecting this, the names of the character areas were updated to suit current intentions. At the Airport, the emphasis is now on reusing as much of the original runway infrastructure as possible and ensuring that new facilities can be constructed without having any direct impact upon the ongoing operational capability of existing facilities. Other facilities will be provided in the central areas once the control tower has been relocated with existing taxiways being upgraded and new aircraft parking ramps provided. Land ultimately released for new development north of the existing control tower will be targeted at the data industries and larger footprint buildings, and the frontage will include higher value uses including vehicle sales. An associated phasing plan has also been prepared to reflect the changes to the Masterplan with the focus for the first phase of delivery at the Enterprise Zone being its eastern sector, for which planning permission has already been granted for the relocation of sporting facilities and subsequent redevelopment of the land for employment uses and the second phase focussing on the Airport side. The new Transatlantic Telecommunications fibre optic cable, which provides communication to the United States in less than 0.64 milliseconds, also makes the Enterprise Zone an extremely attractive location for digital and data industries and supports the extensive local fast fibre network that has been installed at the existing business park. This will ultimately allow for key exchanges to Manchester, London, Newcastle and onward to the Nordics and mainland Europe. The interdependence between the operational area of Blackpool Airport, current land holdings and the Enterprise Zone is key with regard to the objectives of the Enterprise Zone and the ambitions to improve, grow and develop a sustainable airport. The Delivery Plan acknowledges that there are existing airport operational facilities which require modernisation and relocation closer together and closer to the runway to improve operational efficiency. This would in turn enable land currently occupied for airport operations fronting Squires Gate Lane to be released for redevelopment to support the objectives of the Enterprise Zone. Continued support for an operational airport will also act as a significant marketing attraction for businesses moving to the Enterprise Zone.</p>	
TA_0038_017_181123	S44	Email	<p>9. The Bluefield solar farm development is not in Zone 2, it is just in Zone 1.</p>	<p>The solar farm has been considered as part of the cumulative assessment for the onshore elements of the Transmission Assets. All schemes considered in the cumulative assessment are set out in Volume 1, Annex 5.5: Cumulative screening matrix and location plan of the ES (document reference F1.5.5). Bluefield solar farm has also been considered as a part of route planning and site selection process, documented in Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the ES: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4), with further detailed provided in Volume 1, Annex 4.3: Selection and Refinement of the Onshore Infrastructure (document reference F1.4.3). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).</p>
TA_0038_026_181123	S44	Email	<p>4. The Bluefield solar farm is also planned for the same location compounding over development concerns. Not forgetting the 170 acre solar farm on nearby Clifton Marsh and the expansion of nuclear power generation in adjacent Clifton village.</p>	<p>The solar farm has been considered as part of the cumulative assessment for the onshore elements of the Transmission Assets. All schemes considered in the cumulative assessment are set out in Volume 1, Annex 5.5: Cumulative screening matrix and location plan of the ES (document reference F1.5.5). Bluefield solar</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				farm has also been considered as a part of route planning and site selection process, documented in Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the ES: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4), with further detailed provided in Volume 1, Annex 4.3: Selection and Refinement of the Onshore Infrastructure (document reference F1.4.3).The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0047_005_251023	S42	Email	Consideration of risk assessmentsRegulation 5 4 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 requires the assessment of significant effects to include, where relevant, the expected significant effects arising from the proposed development's vulnerability to major accidents HSE's role on NSIPs is summarised in the following Advice Note 11 Annex on the Planning Inspectorate's website Annex G The Health and Safety Executive This document includes consideration of risk assessments on page 3	The Scoping Report considered the potential for significant effects to arise from the vulnerability of the Transmission Assets to major accidents and disasters relevant to the physical, biological and human environment. The Planning Inspectorate confirmed that this aspect does not need to be assessed within a standalone chapter, but that, where relevant, major accidents and disasters are referenced within the relevant ES chapters and cross references are made where appropriate. Note that the scoping response did require accidents and disasters to be mentioned in Project description chapter and for Applicants to confirm whether the onshore site boundary for the Proposed Development crosses the consultation zones of Major Accident Hazard sites. It also requested the project consider the risks and vulnerability of the Springfields Works nuclear licensed site - ensure this is mentioned in site selection chapter.
TA_0049_014_231123	S42	Email	<u>Volume 1, Annex 5.3 Commitments Register</u> We understand that the Commitments Register present measures (primary, secondary and tertiary) to be adopted during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the proposed project. We appreciate that they reflect the present state of design of the proposed development and they will receive more attention in the ES and at application in an accompanying draft DCO. Therefore, for the "offshore topic" marine archaeology we note the following commitment, in summary:- CoT63 – 'primary' a marine outline WSI to be developed in consultation with Historic England, the use of AEZs, application of a reporting system for archaeological discoveries and incorporation of marine archaeology specification and analysis in further geophysical and geotechnical preconstruction surveys.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0136_001_201123	S44	Email	I am opposed to the development for the following reasons: Destruction and disruption of important wildlife habitats on Lytham Moss and beyond for birds, bats, newts, deer etc. Destruction and disruption to public rights of way and Bridleways on Lytham Moss and beyond. Major disruption to very busy highways and access routes, including but not limited to Queensway , Kilnhouse Rd and the new Moss Road that is currently under construction. Destruction and disruption to private residences along the route, including potential compulsory purchase of private gardens and grazing land. The devaluing of private dwellings along and surrounding the development, spoiling green views and acreage.	Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0145_003_201123	S44	Email	The PEIR is flawed. Visual impacts grossly understated. No renderings provided to give residents a reasonable impression of the substation appearance and scale. You have proposed two very large substations in close proximity, this will result in over intensive development and industrialisation of zone 1. This will have a significantly adverse impact to local amenity and change the character from rural/agricultural to industrial. Bluefield solar farm is also planned for the same location, compounding over development concerns.	Wireline visualisations were made available at statutory consultation, showing the maximum parameters from various viewpoints. Visualisations are presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within the ES at Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 3). Photomontages have been produced for each of the representative viewpoints identified and are presented (see Volume 3, Figures). Viewpoints have been selected in consultation with relevant statutory consultees and stakeholders prior to submission of the DCO application, including the EIA Scoping Stage. Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).The solar farm has been considered as part of the cumulative assessment for the onshore elements of the Transmission Assets. All schemes considered in the cumulative assessment are set out in Volume 1, Annex 5.5:

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				Cumulative screening matrix and location plan of the ES (document reference F1.5.5). Bluefield solar farm has also been considered as a part of route planning and site selection process, documented in Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the ES: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4), with further detailed provided in Volume 1, Annex 4.3: Selection and Refinement of the Onshore Infrastructure (document reference F1.4.3).
TA_0150_003_201123	S44	Email	The Non-statutory consultation was also flawed and, therefore, should be ignored as there was no explanation as to how the four search zone locations were identified in the first place. The PIER overlooks Fylde Borough Council's local plan, identifying Enterprize Zones, brownfield sites, and potential candidate zones. FBC should, therefore, refute the current plans and force them to be reconsidered in line with their strategy for the region. The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1—no consideration of locale to residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones. The RAG survey ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0150_007_201123	S44	Email	Decisions are being made based on cost and nothing more. Environmental, local community, sensitivity for agriculture and wildlife, FBC strategy, noise pollution, community health and other critical factors are being pushed aside for BP's profits.	Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0150_010_201123	S44	Email	BP is bullying through these decisions, seemingly with the backing of decision-makers already in the bag. This process is a sham, and I oppose the development for all the above reasons, including BP's obnoxious approach, assuming it can do whatever it wants with the Fylde's communities and landscape. It's a no from me.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents. The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included, but not limited to, local media advertising (online and offline), social media and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers. The EIA methodology is set out within Volume 1, Chapter 5: Environmental assessment methodology of the ES. The chapter describes how significance of effects has been assessed. Professional judgement is used to define the magnitude of impact and receptor sensitivity. The matrix is then used, together with professional judgement, to evaluate the significance of effect. The significance may be one, or a range of, no change, negligible, minor, moderate or major. In general, a significance of effect of moderate or greater is considered 'significant' in EIA terms. For each topic chapter, what is considered 'significant' has been clearly defined. Where further mitigation is not possible a residual significant effect may remain. Within the assessment chapters the justification for determining the significance of effect is described. Where a range is given, the assessment chapter details the reason for the significance that has been concluded.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0154_004_201123	S44	Email	Fourthly the health and safety analysis of the impact of the substation seem s to be based on data from fylde Council. This data covers the hole of Fylde not just the kirkham/ Freckleton/Newton area and as such this is flawed. The social economic and health date for this are is significantly different to that of Lytham and St Annes which sques the information used for analysis. I note separate areas of preston were taken into account. This need reanalysis using specific local data to assess the social, economic and health effects tonthe area which will be negative in a rural area dependant on tourism and agriculture. Further issues center around the noise generation and health effects of having a substation close to schools and housing. This will have a significantly negative effect.on both causing stress loss of outdoor living space ans well as economic losing decreases in housing price. The sub stations at both Penwortham and Heysham are built at significant distances form housing and schools but the noise generation can be heat when passing them. It is not appropriate to build 2 substations near housing and schools. This is before any consideration on the EMF field generation and long term health effects on young people and residents. We fully object to the plans as outlined above	An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence populationhealth has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the World Health Organisation definition of health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing.Any effects are assessed to be not significant and appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards.
TA_0156_004_211123	S44	Email	The Non-statutory consultation was also flawed and, therefore, should be ignored as there was no explanation as to how the four search zone locations were identified in the first place. The PIER overlooks Fylde Borough Council's local plan, identifying Enterprize Zones, brownfield sites, and potential candidate zones. FBC should, therefore, refute the current plans and force them to be reconsidered in line with their strategy for the region.The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1—no consideration of locale to residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones.The RAG survey ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0156_008_211123	S44	Email	Decisions are being made based on cost and nothing more. Environmental, local community, sensitivity for agriculture and wildlife, FBC strategy, noise pollution, community health and other critical factors are being pushed aside for BP's profits.	Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0156_010_211123	S44	Email	Large employers will have difficulties attracting people to work in the area, workers already in the area will have major disruptions getting to work, emergency services will be affected, businesses will be affected, and people's mental health will be affected.	An Outline Employment and Skills Plan has been prepared and submitted as part of the application for development consent (document reference J31). This will be developed further post-consent to detail how the Applicants will engage with local workers and training providers for anticipated employment opportunities associated with the Transmission Assets.An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the World Health Organisation definition of health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing. Any effects are assessed to be not significant and appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence tohealth protection standards. Traffic and transport impacts arising during the construction phase of the Transmission Assets have been fully assessed at section 7.11 Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference E3.7) Further details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8). Details of the operation and maintenance phases are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Onshore maintenance would be limited to essential maintenance and/or emergency works. Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).
TA_0158_011_211123	S44	Email	2.The non-statutory consultation is also flawed. No explanation was provided on how the four zones were selected. Preliminary Environmental Information Report ignores the Fylde Borough Council Enterprise Zones and brown field sites as options.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0158_013_211123	S44	Email	4.Logic in the PEIR to downsizing from four to one search zones if flawed. The RAG ratings are inconsistent, subjective, factually incorrect and contradictory:a.Does not explain how the High Pressure Gas Main will be managed safelyb.Not clear about the flood risk, in an area already well-known for flooding as the drains are inadequatec.Zones 1 and 2 are roughly the same distance from the SSSI so not a factor to differentiate siting as claimedd.The Bluefield solar farm is in Zone 1, not in Zone 2e.Wildlife concerns and surveys are inconsistentf.Zone 1 lies in the Kirkham and Newton Area of Separation AND FBC Green Belt – not weighted properly in the RAGg.Proximity of residential development not factored into the RAG selection assessment for Zones	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).
TA_0158_015_211123	S44	Email	6.The PEIR proposes two very large substations resulting in over intensified development and industrialisation in Zone 1, which is currently farm land. Furthermore, Bluefield solar farm is also planning for the same location, increasing over-development concerns.	The solar farm has been considered as part of the cumulative assessment for the onshore elements of the Transmission Assets. All schemes considered in the cumulative assessment are set out in Volume 1, Annex 5.5: Cumulative screening matrix and location plan of the ES (document reference F1.5.5). Bluefield solar farm has also been considered as a part of route planning and site selection process, documented in Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the ES: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4), with further detailed provided in Volume 1, Annex 4.3: Selection and Refinement of the Onshore Infrastructure (document reference F1.4.3).All schemes considered in the cumulative assessment are set out in Volume 1, Annex 5.5: Cumulative screening matrix and location plan of the ES (document reference F1.5.5).
TA_0161_003_211123	S44	Email	I agree with the principles of green energy, however, this can not be at the cost of the countryside and the people who live there. Our rural parish is already home to the large Westinghouse nuclear/clean energy site and has a solar farm in Clifton (which has plans for an increase in size). There are also applications being processed for further solar farms (within Zone 1, in the fields next to the proposed substations) and also on Clifton Marsh. Our village is being dwarfed by these green energy projects. Are you considering the cumulative effect of these green energy projects on a small rural village and the way in which they will be compounded by the Morgan and Morecambe proposals?	The list of projects considered within the CEA has been updated in line with updates from PEIR to ES, and the application progress of other developments. The revised CEA list for each topic is presented in the list of other projects, plans and activities considered within the CEA in each chapter of the ES. The screening matrix used within the CEA can be found in Volume 1, Annex 5.5: Cumulative screening matrix and location plan of the ES (document reference: F1.5.5)
TA_0161_008_211123	S44	Email	Bb) The down select from four zones to one zone•This feels like a predetermined decision. Has the Amber, Green (RAG) Report report being used as a mechanism to work backwards i.e. The answer is Zone one – now how do we set the criteria to produce that answer? Some of the RAG ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect, and the scoring system lacks rigour. •Why has the Fylde Local Plan not been taken into consideration ie the Area of Separation between Newton and Kirkham and greenbelt status of land in Zone 1, the identified brownfield Warton Enterprise Zone •There is no attempt to consider mitigation which would change judgements and hence move the substations into another zone eg the high pressure gas main only touches the edge of Zone 2. Could this have been managed? •Flood Zone maps indicate that there is little difference between Zone 1 and Zone 2. •Zone 1 and Zone 2 are roughly equally distant from an SSSI. •Bluefield Solar Farm development is only in Zone 1 – not in Zone 2 •Proximity to homes and businesses and population density has also not been factored in. •Destruction of farms and businesses has not been factored in. •Zone 3 and 4 had red ratings for ecology because they were 1km and 2.5 km from the River Ribble and SPAs, but Zone 1 is less than 2.5km from Newton Marsh SS1. •The RAG appears to weight scoring in favour of birdlife rather than the lives and livelihoods of local people. (Then conversely the project team seem to disregard the needs of animals by failing to connect the potential bio-diversity net gain area providing no suitable corridors for wildlife). •In addition, unexplained routes for Zone 1 were shown on maps as part of the non-statutory consultation process. •What is the significance of the	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			8kilometre rule? Magically all of the proposed sites fit just within this. Is 8kilometres always applied in these projects?•How much has the RAG criteria been influenced by cost/profit margins?	
TA_0161_009_211123	S44	Email	Substations & Cabling•Two large substations in close proximity will result in over intensive development and industrialisation of Zone 1. This will have a significantly adverse impact to local amenity and a change of character from rural/agricultural to industrial, especially when compounded with the proposed Bluefield Solar Farm. The visual and audible intrusions on peoples lives by having not just one, but two substations will be unbearable. Why does the project need two substations? Why are they so vast? Why can they not be co-located?•Most other substations in the UK appear to be much further away from communities – this scheme appears to be setting an unwelcome precedent in terms of proximity to residential areas. Why are you now considering building so close o a community?	The Electricity System Operator (ESO) is responsible for planning and operation of the transmission system and ensuring the balance of electricity generation with electricity demand. The Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm were scoped into the Pathway to 2030 workstream of the UK Government's Offshore Transmission Network Review (OTNR). As part of the OTNR, the ESO assessed options to improve the coordination offshore wind farm connections and associated transmission networks. In July 2022, the UK Government published the Pathway to 2030 Holistic Network Design (HNDR) Report which set out the results of the OTNR. A key output of the HNDR process was the recommendation that the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm should work collaboratively in connecting the two offshore wind farms to the National Grid electricity transmission network at Penwortham in Lancashire. The Transmission Assets provide a connection to the National Grid for two nationally significant offshore wind farms and contribute to the UK Government's ambition to deliver 50 GW offshore wind by 2030 in order to achieve net zero by 2050. The need for Transmission Assets is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 2: Policy and legislation context (document reference F1.2) of the ES. Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0163_003_211123	S44	Email	The Non-statutory consultation was also flawed and, therefore, should be ignored as there was no explanation as to how the four search zone locations were identified in the first place. The PIER overlooks Fylde Borough Council's local plan, identifying Enterprize Zones, brownfield sites, and potential candidate zones. FBC should, therefore, refute the current plans and force them to be reconsidered in line with their strategy for the region.>>>> The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1—no consideration of locale to residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones.>>>> The RAG survey ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0163_007_211123	S44	Email	Decisions are being made based on cost and nothing more. Environmental, local community, sensitivity for agriculture and wildlife, FBC strategy, noise pollution, community health and other critical factors are being pushed aside for BP's profits.	Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0163_009_211123	S44	Email	Large employers will have difficulties attracting people to work in the area, workers already in the area will have major disruptions getting to work, emergency services will be affected, businesses will be affected, and people's mental health will be affected.	An Outline Employment and Skills Plan has been prepared and submitted as part of the application for development consent (document reference J31). This will be developed further post-consent to detail how the Applicants will engage with local workers and training providers for anticipated employment opportunities associated with the Transmission Assets.An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health has been undertaken and reported at Volume 1 Annex 5.1 of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). This includes changes to the social, economic and bio-physical environment and is informed by the results of other assessments as reported in the ES. This assessment utilises the World Health Organisation definition of health and wellbeing, which includes mental wellbeing. Any effects are assessed to be not significant and appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence tohealth

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>protection standards. Traffic and transport impacts arising during the construction phase of the Transmission Assets have been fully assessed at section 7.11 Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference E3.7) Further details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8). Details of the operation and maintenance phases are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Onshore maintenance would be limited to essential maintenance and/or emergency works. Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).</p>
TA_0163_010_211123	S44	Email	<p>>> BP is bullying through these decisions, seemingly with the backing of decision-makers already in the bag. This process is a sham, and I oppose the development for all the above reasons, including BP's obnoxious approach, assuming it can do whatever it wants with the Fylde's communities and landscape.>>>> I have also copied in our local MP, the Secretary of State, and our Prime Minister. I am also writing a letter to HRH King Charles, who recently awarded Friends of Newton Community Park (FoNCP) The King's Award for Voluntary Service. I'm sure His Royal Highness would oppose the community he awarded this prestigious honour to, having that community put at risk and all that great work he recognises being dismissed by BP for profits.>>>> Also, I have copied in the new Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, who was appointed on the 13th of November; Mr Barclay would no doubt have an interest in such destruction of what he has been tasked with protecting especially as he was born in Lytham St.Annes, whose tourism and businesses will be massively affected.>>>> It's a no from me.</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information.Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents.The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included, but not limited to, local media advertising (online and offline), social media and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers.The EIA methodology is set out within Volume 1, Chapter 5: Environmental assessment methodology of the ES. The chapter describes how significance of effects has been assessed. Professional judgement is used to define the magnitude of impact and receptor sensitivity. The matrix is then used, together with professional judgement, to evaluate the significance of effect. The significance may be one, or a range of, no change, negligible, minor, moderate or major. In general, a significance of effect of moderate or greater is considered 'significant' in EIA terms. For each topic chapter, what is considered 'significant' has been clearly defined. Where further mitigation is not possible a residual significant effect may remain.Within the assessment chapters the justification for determining the significance of effect is described. Where a range is given, the assessment chapter details the reason for the significance that has been concluded.</p>
TA_0167_005_171023	S44	Email	<p>You have stated that (4.3.1.2 of the Non Technical Summary) that the cable (surely youmean the eighteen High Voltage cables) is to be installed beneath the sand dunes and theGolf Course using HDD or other trenchless techniques. Even if this is possible how deep willthis tunnelling be and what is the effect of vibration or subsidence in what is already a fragilegeological area (e.g. the effects of fracking when previously carried out nearby)?Subsidence is an issue in Lytham St Annes and none of the properties in the area proposedfor the onshore assets were built to deal with excessive vibration or soil movement. Are you to be responsible, as the Coal Authority is, for compensating any and all of the propertyowners adversely affected by your works in respect of subsidence or other detrimental effects? You state that you will simply use HDD or other trenchless methodologies but leaveopen the possibility of open excavation where this is not possible but give no further detail ofthe impact of this should it be necessary.I am unconvinced by the statement in 8.9.5.3 of the Non-Technical Summary that effects ofnoise and vibration,</p>	<p>The EIA methodology is set out within Volume 1, Chapter 5: Environmental assessment methodology of the ES. The chapter describes how significance of effects has been assessed. Professional judgement is used to define the magnitude of impact and receptor sensitivity. The matrix is then used, together with professional judgement, to evaluate the significance of effect. The significance may be one, or a range of, no change, negligible, minor, moderate or major. In general, a significance of effect of moderate or greater is considered 'significant' in EIA terms. For each topic chapter, what is considered 'significant' has been clearly defined. Where further mitigation is not possible a residual significant effect may remain.Within the assessment chapters the justification for determining the significance of effect is described. Where a range is given, the assessment chapter details the reason for the significance that has been</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>which you admit will occur, may be reduced via the implementation of abespoke method statement to limit noise and vibration. You give little detail of what or how effective this will be and blandly state with such measures in place no significant effects are predicted. How do you define significant? Where is the evidence showing how such method statements have been used and how effective they have proved? These are almost throwaway statements on the very issues that are likely to cause the most significant upset to residents in all areas of the proposed works. Where are the details of your contingency plans if open excavation becomes necessary and how do you intend to carry this out given that the Sand Dunes and the Nature Reserves are all, or in part, Sites of Special Scientific Interest? Are you proposing to excavate the Golf Course if tunnelling is not practical. Have the owners of members of this Club agreed to this or even to the tunnelling if that takes place?</p>	<p>concluded. The typical maximum depth of cable installation using trenching methodology is approximately 1.8m. Trenchless, drilling methodologies are to be used locally where crossings are required (e.g. beneath roads/rivers). The installation depths will generally be within shallower geological deposits rather than deep within the consolidated bedrock. The drilling methodologies to be used are designed to minimise the displacement of surrounding materials (therefore minimising instability) and do not involve the injection of significant volumes of liquid into fractured bedrock at depth under the high-pressures that are often attributed to inducing tremors. Further detail is provided in Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions (document reference F3.1) of the ES. An assessment of the noise and vibration impacts due to the Transmission Assets are presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.2: Construction Noise and Vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.2) and Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational Noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3). The cumulative noise and vibration impacts with other proposed developments is considered in section 8.13 of Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8).</p>
TA_0185_011_221123	S44	Email	<p>Finally, the appointment of the locations of the substations has been sited even though the full environmental surveys have not been completed. I have recently, on the 8th November, been contacted to allow site access for further ecological access surveys which appear to contravene the consultation process. I would anticipate that these points are reviewed, and I would like a response to each one.</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0197_003_221123	S44	Email	<p>The Non-statutory consultation was also flawed and, therefore, should be ignored as there was no explanation as to how the four search zone locations were identified in the first place. The PIER overlooks Fylde Borough Council's local plan, identifying Enterprise Zones, brownfield sites, and potential candidate zones. FBC should, therefore, refute the current plans and force them to be reconsidered in line with their strategy for the region. The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1—no consideration of locale to residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones. The RAG survey ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect.</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0197_007_221123	S44	Email	<p>Decisions are being made based on cost and nothing more. Environmental, local community, sensitivity for agriculture and wildlife, FBC strategy, noise pollution, community health and other critical factors are being pushed aside for BP's profits.</p>	<p>Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0197_010_221123	S44	Email	<p>BP is bullying through these decisions, seemingly with the backing of decision-makers already in the bag. This process is a sham, and I oppose the development for all the above reasons, including BP's obnoxious approach, assuming it can do whatever it wants with the Fylde's communities and landscape. I have also copied in our local MP, the Secretary of State, and our Prime Minister. I am also writing a letter to HRH King Charles, who recently awarded Friends of Newton Community Park (FoNCP) The King's Award for Voluntary Service. I'm sure His Royal Highness would oppose the community he awarded this prestigious honour to, having that community put at risk and all that great work he recognises being dismissed by BP for profits. Also, I have copied in the new Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			Affairs, who was appointed on the 13th of November; REDACTED would no doubt have an interest in such destruction of what he has been tasked with protecting especially as he was born in Lytham St.Annes, whose tourism and businesses will be massively affected.	person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information.Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents.The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included, but not limited to, local media advertising (online and offline), social media and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers.The EIA methodology is set out within Volume 1, Chapter 5: Environmental assessment methodology of the ES. The chapter describes how significance of effects has been assessed. Professional judgement is used to define the magnitude of impact and receptor sensitivity. The matrix is then used, together with professional judgement, to evaluate the significance of effect. The significance may be one, or a range of, no change, negligible, minor, moderate or major. In general, a significance of effect of moderate or greater is considered 'significant' in EIA terms. For each topic chapter, what is considered 'significant' has been clearly defined. Where further mitigation is not possible a residual significant effect may remain.Within the assessment chapters the justification for determining the significance of effect is described. Where a range is given, the assessment chapter details the reason for the significance that has been concluded.
TA_0201_007_221123	S44	Email	To cause such upheaval to everyone's lives in this community will be devastating and unnecessary, as there must be other options. This will be a total disaster for the residents, wildlife, farmland, loss of countryside and we urge you to find alternative sites that will not cause as much harm to the environment, which we thought was the whole point of this project in the first place.	An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects.Detailed assessments are provided within all onshore chapters within Volumes 3 and 4 of the ES (document reference F3 and F4). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets and will continue to work closely with all stakeholders.
TA_0203_003_231123	S44	Email	The Non-statutory consultation was also flawed and, therefore, should be ignored as there was no explanation as to how the four search zone locations were identified in the first place. The PIER overlooks Fylde Borough Council's local plan, identifying Enterprize Zones, brownfield sites, and potential candidate zones. FBC should, therefore, refute the current plans and force them to be reconsidered in line with their strategy for the region.The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1—no consideration of locale to residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones.The RAG survey ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0203_008_231123	S44	Email	Decisions are being made based on cost and nothing more. Environmental, local community, sensitivity for agriculture and wildlife, FBC strategy, noise pollution, community health and other critical factors are being pushed aside for BP's profits.	Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0203_010_231123	S44	Email	BP is bullying through these decisions, seemingly with the backing of decision-makers already in the bag. This process is a sham, and I oppose the development for all the above reasons,	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			including BP's obnoxious approach, assuming it can do whatever it wants with the Fylde's communities and landscape	periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024) as well as ongoing landowner liaison following route refinements (further details are outlined within the Consultation Report (document reference E1). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents. The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included, but not limited to, local media advertising (online and offline), social media and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers. The EIA methodology is set out within Volume 1, Chapter 5: Environmental assessment methodology of the ES. The chapter describes how significance of effects has been assessed. Professional judgement is used to define the magnitude of impact and receptor sensitivity. The matrix is then used, together with professional judgement, to evaluate the significance of effect. The significance may be one, or a range of, no change, negligible, minor, moderate or major. In general, a significance of effect of moderate or greater is considered 'significant' in EIA terms. For each topic chapter, what is considered 'significant' has been clearly defined. Where further mitigation is not possible a residual significant effect may remain. Within the assessment chapters the justification for determining the significance of effect is described. Where a range is given, the assessment chapter details the reason for the significance that has been concluded.
TA_0204_003_231123	S44	Email	The Non-statutory consultation was also flawed and, therefore, should be ignored as there was no explanation as to how the four search zone locations were identified in the first place. The PIER overlooks Fylde Borough Council's local plan, identifying Enterprize Zones, brownfield sites, and potential candidate zones. FBC should, therefore, refute the current plans and force them to be reconsidered in line with their strategy for the region. The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1—no consideration of locale to residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones. The RAG survey ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0204_008_231123	S44	Email	Decisions are being made based on cost and nothing more. Environmental, local community, sensitivity for agriculture and wildlife, FBC strategy, noise pollution, community health and other critical factors are being pushed aside in favour of profits.	Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0204_0010_231123	S44	Email	BP is bullying through these decisions, seemingly with the backing of decision-makers already in the bag. This process is a sham, and I oppose the development for all the above reasons, including BP's obnoxious approach, assuming it can do whatever it wants with the Fylde's communities and landscapelt's a definite no from me!	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website,

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<p>newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents. The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included, but not limited to, local media advertising (online and offline), social media and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers. The EIA methodology is set out within Volume 1, Chapter 5: Environmental assessment methodology of the ES. The chapter describes how significance of effects has been assessed. Professional judgement is used to define the magnitude of impact and receptor sensitivity. The matrix is then used, together with professional judgement, to evaluate the significance of effect. The significance may be one, or a range of, no change, negligible, minor, moderate or major. In general, a significance of effect of moderate or greater is considered 'significant' in EIA terms. For each topic chapter, what is considered 'significant' has been clearly defined. Where further mitigation is not possible a residual significant effect may remain. Within the assessment chapters the justification for determining the significance of effect is described. Where a range is given, the assessment chapter details the reason for the significance that has been concluded.</p>
TA_0206_002_231123	S44	Email	<p>By way of further information :- 1. It is noted that the current proposed M&M cable landfall requires the crossing of protected estuary area. With that principle established, presumably the mitigations have been agreed with the applicable environmental regulatory bodies and so there are further mitigations open to other areas of the estuary.</p>	<p>The onshore export cable corridor will cross existing infrastructure and obstacles such as roads, railways and rivers. All major crossings, such as major roads, river and rail crossings will be undertaken using trenchless techniques, such as auger boring or micro-tunnelling, where practicable. Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Measures to control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).</p>
TA_0212_001_231123	S44	Email	<p>I am writing to you to protest the proposed route/s of the onshore assets of the above. I don't see how the years of groundwork that are proposed, will be sympathetic to and not detrimentally impact the dune system the nature reserve and the wildlife thereon. I also cannot see how this work will not impact on Blackpool Airport also the proposed line of the cable along the railway will impact the whole of Fylde from Squires Gate to Kirkham and beyond. I also wish to protest at your preferred sites for substations as these will have a detrimental effect on 2 schools and will also impact good quality farmland. You need to put forward a proposal that will minimise disruption and destruction of local assets and that will not have a detrimental impact on local amenities, wildlife, farmland, AOSI and the quality of life of local residents.</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Direct pipe trenchless installation is proposed beneath the sand dunes. This technology will ensure there is no open trenching through the dunes. This will avoid any direct loss of vegetation and habitats. Instead, the drill will pass beneath the dunes at depth. Where necessary consideration of any indirect effects on the habitat and measures to avoid, minimise or mitigate these is provided in section 3.11 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).</p>
TA_0225_001_231123	S44	Email	<p>This consultation feedback is made on behalf of [REDACTED] who are the owners of [REDACTED] which is tenanted by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] is occupied under the terms of an Agricultural Holdings Act 1986 tenancy, it is a highly productive grassland dairy farm of approximately 200 acres of Grade 2 to Grade 3 land which has a predominantly level aspect which runs north/south over a linear distance of about 1.8 km from the farmstead which is situated at the most southerly end of the farm abutting the A584, to its most northerly extent of</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>farmland which adjoins REDACTED. At its narrowest point which is west from [REDACTED] to its east boundary is about 100m. [REDACTED] has a current milking herd of 300 dairy cows plus followers. The tenant has invested significantly over recent years in constructing a 1km farm cow track infrastructure which provides direct access from the farmstead to the most northerly block of land which not only improves cow foot health but saves man hours, improves grassland management and prevents any need to use the public highway. In addition, batches of dairy followers as and when required at the farm are walked along the cow track from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] is significantly affected by the Morecambe substation Option 2 site which is proposed to be situated in the middle of the holding, completely severing the farmstead from a large block of land lying to the north of the proposed substation. In addition, there are two temporary construction compounds proposed to facilitate the construction of Morecambe substation Option 2 also wholly located within the farm holding. This Option 2 location abuts the narrowest point of the holding and therefore completely severs the farm in half with no direct access to the northerly block which this substation proposal would create. Morecambe substation Option 2 occupies approx. 16 acres plus approx. 13 acres of temporary construction compound and is wholly within [REDACTED]. In addition to the proposed Morecambe substation Option 2 site the holding is also significantly affected by the proposed Morgan Substation site which permanently takes an additional 15 acres of land from the holding. If my client would have been asked to provide Flotation Energy and BP Morgan with a worse case scenario then this proposed location would be it! In summary [REDACTED] is a 200 acre of which about 170 acres is ring fenced farm with direct internal track access to all fields from the farmstead. If the projects go ahead with Morgan and Morecambe 2 option then [REDACTED] will become a 169 acres farm of which about 64 acres adjoining the farmstead, 74 acres north of Morecambe 2 and 31 acres on the [REDACTED] This is of course less any additional land required for permanent access. During the construction phase [REDACTED] would lose approx. 42 acres for cable corridor laying plus 13 acres of temporary construction compound, therefore an additional 55 acres out of production for a minimum of 3 years, plus additional land recovery years. During construction [REDACTED] will become about 114 acres, of which approximately 100 acres farmable which takes half the farm out of production and therefore unviable as a dairy farm. It is wholly unacceptable to consider Morecambe substation Option 2 site in this location as it will completely devastate [REDACTED] and will not be viable as a dairy farm either during the construction phases or thereafter.</p>	<p>and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). In particular, The assessment of the impact of increased flood risk arising from additional surface water runoff is presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase. An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The design at the onshore substations is set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2). The ES describes effects on landscape character and visual resources during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning during the day and at night and winter/summer without mitigation and residual effects with mitigation. The landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects. Socio-economics is assessed at Volume 4, Chapter 2 of the ES (document reference: F4.2). Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will continue discussions and negotiations with regards to any impacts to the farming business. Whilst it is acknowledged that there will be disturbance, it is through this discussion and negotiation that Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will seek to mitigate impacts to the farming business.</p>
TA_0236_007_231123	S44	Email	<p>Finally I would like to reiterate my objection to morecambe and Morgan's proposed cable route. I believe if the cables traveled up the Ribble estuary and made land fall close to the final destination. It would have a far lower impact on the population, businesses and environment of the Fylde coast and surrounding areas.</p>	<p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological statutory designations protected nationally and internationally. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt. Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in significantly protracted construction timeframes, and potentially long-term impacts to sensitive and sensitive features associated with the designated features, whilst also presenting higher risk and potentially unsafe working conditions. As such, the approach to site selection has been based on avoiding direct impacts to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0243_004_231123	S44	Email	The Non-statutory consultation was also flawed and, therefore, should be ignored as there was no explanation as to how the four search zone locations were identified in the first place. The PIER overlooks Fylde Borough Council's local plan, identifying Enterprize Zones, brownfield sites, and potential candidate zones. FBC should, therefore, refute the current plans and force them to be reconsidered in line with their strategy for the region. The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1—no consideration of locale to residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones. The RAG survey ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect.	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0243_008_231123	S44	Email	Decisions are being made based on cost and nothing more. Environmental, local community, sensitivity for agriculture and wildlife, FBC strategy, noise pollution, community health and other critical factors are being pushed aside for BP's profits.	Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0243_011_231123	S44	Email	BP does not appear to have acted in an ethical or moral manner, seemingly pushing through these decisions, with the backing of decision-makers already in the bag. This process is a sham, and I oppose the development for all the above reasons. Also, I have copied in the new Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, who was appointed on the 13th of November; REDACTED would no doubt have an interest in such destruction of what he has been tasked with protecting especially as he was born in Lytham St. Annes, whose tourism and businesses will be massively affected.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents. The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included, but not limited to, local media advertising (online and offline), social media and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers. The EIA methodology is set out within Volume 1, Chapter 5: Environmental assessment methodology of the ES. The chapter describes how significance of effects has been assessed. Professional judgement is used to define the magnitude of impact and receptor sensitivity. The matrix is then used, together with professional judgement, to evaluate the significance of effect. The significance may be one, or a range of, no change, negligible, minor, moderate or major. In general, a significance of effect of moderate or greater is considered 'significant' in EIA terms. For each topic chapter, what is considered 'significant' has been clearly defined. Where further mitigation is not possible a residual significant effect may remain. Within the assessment chapters the justification for determining the significance of effect is described. Where a range is given, the assessment chapter details the reason for the significance that has been concluded.
TA_0244_004_231123	S44	Email	The Non-statutory consultation was also flawed and, therefore, should be ignored as there was no explanation as to how the four search zone locations were identified in the first place. The PIER overlooks Fylde Borough Council's local plan, identifying Enterprize Zones, brownfield sites, and potential candidate zones. FBC should, therefore, refute the current plans and force them to be reconsidered in line with their strategy for the region. The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone	The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (document reference F1.4). Further information on the offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the project, can be found in Volume 1, Annex 4.1; Annex 4.2, and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter,

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			1—no consideration of locale to residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones. The RAG survey ratings are inconsistent, contradictory, subjective and factually incorrect.	mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0244_008_231123	S44	Email	Decisions are being made based on cost and nothing more. Environmental, local community, sensitivity for agriculture and wildlife, FBC strategy, noise pollution, community health and other critical factors are being pushed aside for BP's profits.	Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0244_011_231123	S44	Email	BP does not appear to have acted in an ethical or moral manner, seemingly pushing through these decisions, with the backing of decision-makers already in the bag. This process is a sham, and I oppose the development for all the above reasons. Also, I have copied in the new Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, who was appointed on the 13th of November; REDACTED would no doubt have an interest in such destruction of what he has been tasked with protecting especially as he was born in Lytham St. Annes, whose tourism and businesses will be massively affected.	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents. The Applicants also undertook significant levels of advertising and promotion to ensure local people were aware of the consultation and understood how to take part. This included, but not limited to, local media advertising (online and offline), social media and the publishing of section 47 and section 48 notices in local and national newspapers. The EIA methodology is set out within Volume 1, Chapter 5: Environmental assessment methodology of the ES. The chapter describes how significance of effects has been assessed. Professional judgement is used to define the magnitude of impact and receptor sensitivity. The matrix is then used, together with professional judgement, to evaluate the significance of effect. The significance may be one, or a range of, no change, negligible, minor, moderate or major. In general, a significance of effect of moderate or greater is considered 'significant' in EIA terms. For each topic chapter, what is considered 'significant' has been clearly defined. Where further mitigation is not possible a residual significant effect may remain. Within the assessment chapters the justification for determining the significance of effect is described. Where a range is given, the assessment chapter details the reason for the significance that has been concluded.
TA_0248_001_231123	S44	Email	I am putting my feedback/objections to the Wind Farm Project in writing. I am not prepared to complete your paper feedback form as I strongly believe this has been made as difficult as possible for people to complete. You are asking for feedback on technical reports which are fact. Without reading all of your documents in full it would be impossible to comment on them nor would I be qualified to do so. I have attended a number of your consultation events, a Newton with Scales Parish council meeting where a project representative was in attendance and now 2 of your Statutory consultations and also had two site visits to my property. All I can say is that they were all a waste of time. All information provided is available on your web site. This project has been fed piecemeal and lacks transparency. There is no evidence of how the four possible areas for substations were arrived at and how this has now been reduced to Zone 1. All you are doing is fulfilling your statutory obligations without giving vital information to land owners and the general public. Your information has been sketchy, and changes without notification. There has been a total lack of consideration for land owners, house owners, wildlife, the risk of severe flooding and environmental damage. Your two companies act like bullies who intimidate those	The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>possibly in danger of losing their land, their lifestyle taken away from them, reduction in property prices due to this ugly, noisy and unwanted development in the area. No other alternatives have been put forward and it would appear that Zone one has been chosen as the only site. In addition to my objections with regard to our land for which we have worked hard to initially acquire but also to develop it into a useable stable yard and small holding I also live on REDACTED in St Annes. We only found out about the proposed cable route through St Annes about three weeks before this round of statutory consultations and only via a mail shot. This has given little time for residents to assimilate their objections.</p>	<p>proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0248_003_231123	S44	Email	<p>I suspect decisions being made based on cost and what is most convenient to the project with environmental, local community, sensitivity for agriculture and wildlife, FBC strategy, noise pollution, community health and other critical factors being pushed aside. The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1—no consideration of local residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones has been given. No clear justification has been given for choosing Zone 1 and until very recently the residents of Newton were virtually unaware of the proposed project and the implications for them as a rural community, the effect on wildlife habitat and the reduction in the value of their properties. Serious repurposing of existing assets (Heysham power station) or routes like Ribble Estuary does not seem to have been serious consideration.</p>	<p>Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES. The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological designations protected by national and international legislation. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt Estuary Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in extremely long construction timeframes and risk extensive, and potentially long-term damage to sensitive and protected habitats that support smelt and protected bird species, whilst also presenting unsafe working conditions during construction. The approach to site selection has been based on avoiding damage to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).</p>
TA_0249_001_231123	S44	Email	<p>I am putting my feedback/objections to the Wind Farm Project in writing. I am not prepared to complete your paper feedback form as I strongly believe this has been made as difficult as possible for people to complete. You are asking for feedback on technical reports which are fact. Without reading all of your documents in full it would be impossible to comment on them nor would I be qualified to do so. I have attended a number of your consultation events, a Newton with Scales Parish council meeting where a project representative was in attendance and now 2 of your Statutory consultations and also had two site visits to my property. All I can say is that they were all a waste of time. All information provided is available on your web site. This project has been fed piecemeal and lacks transparency. There is no evidence of how the four possible</p>	<p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024). The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>areas for substations were arrived at and how this has now been reduced to Zone 1. All you are doing is fulfilling your statutory obligations without giving vital information to land owners and the general public. Your information has been sketchy, and changes without notification.. There has been a total lack of consideration for land owners, house owners, wildlife, the risk of severe flooding and environmental damage. Your two companies act like bullies who intimidate those possibly in danger of losing their land, their lifestyle taken away from them, reduction in property prices due to this ugly, noisy and unwanted development in the area. No other alternatives have been put forward and it would appear that Zone one has been chosen as the only site. In addition to my objections with regard to our land for which we have worked hard to initially acquire but also to develop it into a useable stable yard and small holding I also live on REDACTED in St Annes. We only found out about the proposed cable route through St Annes about three weeks before this round of statutory consultations and only via a mail shot. This has given little time for residents to assimilate their objections.</p>	<p>Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets. As the proposals develop further, any ideas for potential community benefits are appreciated. We will continue our engagement with the relevant communities in due course. The Applicants provided maps as part of the consultation materials that clearly set out the elements of the Transmission Assets in relation to settlements, roads and geographic features. All maps also included a key to highlight the proposed use of different areas and the relevant aspects of the Transmission Assets' design. The materials were proportionate to the level of information and design detail at the time of consultation, reflecting the information available in the PEIR. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0249_003_231123	S44	Email	<p>I suspect decisions being made based on cost and what is most convenient to the project with environmental, local community, sensitivity for agriculture and wildlife, FBC strategy, noise pollution, community health and other critical factors being pushed aside. The PIER shows evidence of a predetermined outcome in favour of Zone 1. The RAG assessment has a bias favouring Zone 1—no consideration of locale residential properties, greenbelt, light pollution or separation zones has been given. No clear justification has been given for choosing Zone 1 and until very recently the residents of Newton were virtually unaware of the proposed project and the implications for them as a rural community, the effect on wildlife habitat and the reduction in the value of their properties. Serious repurposing of existing assets (Heysham power station) or routes like Ribble Estuary does not seem to have been serious consideration.</p>	<p>Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES. The Ribble estuary has numerous ecological designations protected by national and international legislation. These include the Liverpool Bay Special Protection Area, Ribble and Alt Estuary Special Protection Area, the Ribble and Alt Estuary Ramsar site (a wetland of international importance under the Ramsar Convention), and the Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest, Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone and Ribble Estuary National Nature Reserve. The tidal nature and shallow water depths of the estuary also create heightened risk to construction as the unstable riverbed conditions are unsuitable for trenching/ cable laying vessels to access. As such, cabling through the estuary would result in extremely long construction timeframes and risk extensive, and potentially long-term damage to sensitive and protected habitats that support smelt and protected bird species, whilst also presenting unsafe working conditions during construction. The approach to site selection has been based on avoiding damage to Important Ecological Features (IEFs) where practicable, further details can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4).</p>

E1.16.7 Physical processes table of responses

E1.16.7.1 Physical processes table of responses (via feedback form)

Table E1.16.7.1: Physical processes (PP)

As set out in section 4.7.4 of the Consultation report (document reference E1). Responses have been allocated to the most appropriate topic(s). If a consultee didn't provide a response for a question/sub-question this is not recorded. If a consultee included 'N/A', 'none', 'no comment', 'Nil', 'No', in response to a question, this has also not been recorded. Where a consultee provided a response associated with this sub-question (1.1; Physical processes) but was not related to this topic, this has been included below, as well as against any other appropriate topic(s). Where a consultee provided a response which stated 'see response above' or similar, the response has been replicated in brackets and italics.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0050_001_231123	S42	Online feedback form	1		Document states that transport of sedimentation based on desktop study and existing information, what if any, modelling of net effects of the installation is proposed to be undertaken. In addition what, if any, monitoring is proposed to determine the net effect on the sea bed, sediment transportation, and fisheries habitat and ecology.	An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken for the offshore topics of the Transmission Assets Application and is presented in Volume 2 of the ES (document reference F2). Specific examples relevant to marine life are listed below. - Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2). - Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3). - Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4). - Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5). Benthic monitoring has been considered in the outline In Principle Monitoring Plan (IPMP) (document reference J20) and will consider whether existing asset integrity surveys can have scope added to cover benthic monitoring (e.g. of recovery of seabed topography after trenching/sand wave clearance). Monitoring will focus on the Fylde MCZ. Physical processes modelling as applied to the Transmission Assets is details in Volume 2, Annex 1.1: Physical processes modelling studies of the ES (document reference F2.1.1).
TA_0050_006_231123	S42	Online feedback form	3	3.8	Nature of superficial deposits contributes to these issues	The Applicants note your response. Impacts and effects in relation to geology are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1).
TA_0053_002_171123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.1	Totally unacceptable in every aspect	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0056_002_141123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.1	As stated above. <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1)). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0066_001_171023	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.1	The impact on local residents (traffic, noise, dust etc.) of the transportation of materials should be minimised and carried out in one short timeframe rather than dragged out over a long period.	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Table 3.4 presented within Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3)

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						details the overall construction programme durations. Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Further details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7), with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8).
TA_0076_002_091123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.1	Do not want this to harm the St Annes pier of the views	This response appears to relate to the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and/or the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (the generation assets), which are subject to separate applications for development consent.
TA_0083_002_221123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.1	I do not agree to this project going ahead	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0092_009_151123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.1	Need to understand the impact on the local community/area surrounding B&FC LEHQ (Energy) Campus based at the Blackpool Enterprise Zone, Squires Gate Lane.	This area lies outside the Transmission Assets Order Limits and no impacts are predicted.
TA_0102_002_211123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.1	the noise, disruption to traffic in already busy local area, destruction of countryside,	Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0106_002_281023	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.1	Generally intimates there is considerable planning being underway but this is not reflected don the information that is being made available publicly. This needs to be remedied.	The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the SoCC).
TA_0108_002_231123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.1	Loss of high quality farmland. Known flood areas. Devastating consequences for Newton, Kirkham and Freckleton	The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.

E1.16.7.2 Physical processes table of responses (via all other methods)

Table E1.16.7.2: Physical processes table of responses (via all other methods)

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0001_001_231123	S42	Email	<p>1.1 Fylde MCZ – concerns relating to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Cable installation · Sandwave clearance · Cable protection · O&M activities <p>Further recommendation to mitigate impacts for permanent habitat loss We advise that where possible, the avoid, reduce, mitigate hierarchy should be employed to reduce environmental impacts (please see: Environmental considerations for offshore wind and cable projects - 52965454Nature conservation considerations and environmental best practice for subsea cables for English Inshore and UK offshore waters, Sept 22.pdf - All Documents (sharepoint.com)). We advise that if the level of interaction with Fylde MCZ cannot be avoided, the next stage of the mitigation hierarchy would be for the project to minimise the amount of cable protection within the designated site. We highlight that other projects such as the original Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon OWF did not require cable protection, therefore further exploration of cable protection requirements is needed within Fylde MCZ, as well as development of design and installation measures that will increase the likelihood of successful burial. A Cable Burial Risk Assessment (CBRA) should be developed and submitted at the time of Application to understand the level of risk and inform those design and installation measures. If the project cannot avoid or reduce the level of interaction with Fylde MCZ, we strongly advise that the developer takes all feasible steps to reduce the level of cable protection and embeds the need to mitigate for processes impacts in the project design. We also advise that the submitted Environmental Statement (ES) should include a commitment to remove cable protection from the MCZ as part of the decommissioning plan. At present there are existing methodologies in the market, which with refinements in the future should allow the recovery of external cable protection. These were explored for the Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon Offshore Windfarm Extension Projects, further details can be found here - EN010109-000218-9.7.3 Cable Protection Decommissioning Feasibility.pdf (planninginspectorate.gov.uk) Further recommendation to mitigate impacts for sandwave clearance The area impacted by sandwave clearance within Fylde MCZ is large. We recommend the use of best practice methods to reduce the area impacted by disposal including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · All efforts to avoid areas of sandwaves or minimise the need for sandwave clearance by micrositing should be explored. · Disposal of sediment should be within an area of similar sediment type and remain in the same sediment system. · The use of a fall pipe (also referred to as a downpipe) to dispose of material as close to the sea bed as possible to increase accuracy of disposal compared to surface release. 	<p>The Applicants note Natural England's concerns relating to impacts to the Fylde MCZ and would highlight that the mitigation hierarchy has been considered at every stage in the design and development of the project. The Stage 1 MCZ Assessment for the final application has been updated to make this clearer (document reference E4). In summary;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid - There are a number of offshore constraints (detailed in the Site Selection chapter) including designated sites and existing infrastructure that makes an overlap with the Fylde MCZ unavoidable. • Minimise: - as part of the initial site selection process, the route was chosen to cross the MCZ at its the narrowest point and to reduce the number of cable crossings within the site. • Minimise - in acknowledgment of the mitigation hierarchy, and to incorporate feedback from Natural England a number of PDE refinements have been made between the PEIR and to final application. These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for cable protection (and associated long term habitat loss) within the Fylde MCZ. Project engineers have refined the cable protection parameters in the Fylde MCZ from 20% to 3% contingency for the Morgan export cables and from 15% to 3% contingency for the Morecambe export cables. It should be noted that the aim is to bury all cables in the first instance and only where this is unsuccessful would cable protection be required. Cable protection within the MCZ will very much be a contingency measure. • Minimise - on the point of decommissioning, the project has committed to ensuring that all external cable protection used within the MCZ will be designed to be removable on decommissioning with the requirement for removal agreed with stakeholders and regulators at the time of decommissioning. <p>An outline Cable Burial Risk Assessment and Burial Assessment Study has been developed, which forms part of the outline CSIP (document reference J15). Commitments relating to the usage and scale of cable protection are included in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments Register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). With further project definition, the potential impacts relating to activities such as seabed preparation have been refined as presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The assessment methodology in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1) and Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) includes assessment of activities where likely significant effects may occur. With respect to comments relating to sandwave clearance, a number of PDE refinements have been made between the PEIR and final application. These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for sandwave clearance (and associated temporary habitat disturbance) within the Fylde MCZ. Project engineers have refined the parameters for sandwave clearance in the Fylde MCZ from 60% to 5% for the Morgan export cables and from 30% to 5% for the Morecambe export cables. It should also be noted that sandwave clearance is an important tool to facilitate the successful burial of cables and to minimise the requirements for external cable protection.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dispose of material up drift of the cable route to allow infill to occur as quickly as possible following cable route installation. 	
TA_0001_002_23112 3	S42	Email	<p>1.2 The Maximum Design Scenario's (MDS) for sandwave clearance and other seabed preparation activities (within and outside of protected areas) is large. While we support the use of sandwave levelling as a form of mitigation measure to reduce the likelihood of using cable protection; there is a considerable amount of sandwave clearance and seabed preparation footprint proposed. We advise that all efforts should be made to avoid areas of sandwaves or minimise the need for clearance by micro- routing cables. Therefore, we encourage refinement of the MDS as much as possible using project specific acoustic data. Full consideration should also be given to relocation of any disposal material and impacts that may have. We advise where possible disposal is within area of similar sediment type and within the same sediment system.</p>	<p>A number of PDE refinements have been made between the PEIR and final application with further detail presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for sandwave clearance (and associated temporary habitat disturbance) within the Fylde MCZ. Project engineers have refined the parameters for sandwave clearance in the Fylde MCZ from 60% to 5% for the Morgan export cables and from 30% to 5% for the Morecambe export cables. It should also be noted that sandwave clearance is an important tool to facilitate the successful burial of cables and to minimise the requirements for external cable protection. The techniques used for sandwave clearance will be undertaken with the aim of depositing material in the direct vicinity of its original location, with no sediment being removed from the sediment cell.</p>
TA_0001_003_23112 3	S42	Email	<p>1.3 Where the cable corridor crosses an area of high-density boulders and coarse material, we recommend the developer considers micro-siting if there is capacity within the planned cable corridor. We note that the developer has stated boulder clearance would occur within the footprint of installation activities. All efforts to avoid areas of boulders or minimise the need for boulder clearance by micro-siting should be explored through a boulder clearance methodology and stated within the Application. Placement of boulders should be carefully considered to minimise impact on sediment movement.</p>	<p>Micrositing of cables around boulders would be onerous and impractical. Boulders pose a risk of damage and exposure to cables as well as an obstruction risk to the cable installation equipment. Therefore, any boulders identified as likely to impact installation will need to be moved to the side (side cast), away from the immediate location of the cable infrastructure. There are two key methods of clearing boulders, boulder plough and boulder grab. Where a high density of boulders is seen, the expectation is that a plough will be required to clear the cable installation corridor. Where medium and low densities of boulders are present, a subsea grab is expected to be employed. Boulder clearance will occur within the footprint of other site preparation activities. All boulders will remain in the vicinity (i.e. sidecast only) of the area they were cleared from. As boulder clearance is anticipated to take the form of sidecasting, the activity will not result in significant increases in SSC or changes to the seabed characteristics or physical processes.</p>
TA_0001_004_23112 3	S42	Email	<p>1.3 MCZ Assessment 1.5.4.15 - "It should be noted that boulder clearance will occur over the same location as the sandwave clearance." We advise that the removal of large boulders along the cable corridor could represent a significant alteration to the composition of the seabed. We also note that the developer will include a dredging and disposal site characterisation report (MCZ Assessment 1.5.4.16). We recommend that the dredging and disposal site characterisation includes an analysis of geophysical data to establish with a better degree or certainty the areas where boulder and sandwave clearance would be necessary.</p>	<p>Any boulders identified as likely to impact installation will need to be moved to the side (i.e. side cast), away from the immediate location of the cable infrastructure. There are two key methods of clearing boulders, boulder plough and boulder grab. Where a high density of boulders is seen, the expectation is that a plough will be required to clear the cable installation corridor. Where medium and low densities of boulders are present, a subsea grab is expected to be employed. Boulder clearance will occur within the footprint of other site preparation activities. All boulders will remain in the vicinity (i.e. sidecast only) of the area they were cleared from and therefore there will be no significant alteration to the composition of the seabed in the MCZ. As boulder clearance is anticipated to take the form of sidecasting it will not result in significant increases in SSC or changes to the seabed characteristics for physical processes.</p>
TA_0001_005_23112 3	S42	Email	<p>1.4 Natural England have concerns relating to the lack of future data analysis to test predictions made within the impact assessment. 1.8.2.8 of the Physical Processes Chapter states following seabed preparation and cable installation, the sediment is expected to recover to its baseline state through wave and tidal action, which would also allow the associated communities to recover into these areas. However, 1.8.2.14 states recovery of sediments will be site specific and will be influenced by currents, wave action and sediment availability (Desprez, 2000). Concern about impacts on key receptors Given</p>	<p>The dynamic nature of sediment transport and sandwave movement within the study area has been described and supported by relevant desk studies in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F1.3), Table 1.5: Summary of desk study sources used. One such supporting document is the project specific 'Assessment of Seabed Level Vertical Variability for Morgan Offshore Wind Farm, Morphodynamic Characterisation, Morphological Analysis and Prediction of Future Seabed Levels.' (ABPmer (2023). Post construction monitoring undertaken for the Barrow Offshore</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			recoverability is site specific, the geophysical survey reports should review whether the seabed has recovered from cabling work. We advise that the project should have adequate scope to include long term impact monitoring in order to monitor recovery of the seabed. Appropriate survey design and power analysis should be conducted to ensure that adequate data is collected for long term comparisons of the effect of change compared to baseline data.	Wind Farm, also located in the East Irish Sea, examined natural trench infill, one year post construction. The conclusion of the monitoring report with respect to cable trenching presented that within one year of construction, the cable trench had almost completely infilled through natural processes (BoWind, 2008).
TA_0001_006_231123	S42	Email	1.5 Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the PEIR, outlines that the offshore export cable will be installed by Horizontal Directional Drilling, or equivalent trenchless technique. Concerns about impacts on potential key receptors/Appropriate of analysis From experience on other windfarms HDD can fail on occasion, the applicant should ensure that the worst case scenario at landfall takes this into consideration. This should consider impacts on Lytham St. Annes Dunes SSSI with a sufficient baseline collected to assess impact post construction and identify remedial measures where needed.	Cable installation at landfall does not rely solely on successful HDD, at this stage both open-cut trenching and trenchless techniques are being considered. Further information regarding landfall is included within Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).
TA_0001_008_231123	S42	Email	1.7 N/A Typos-- Figure 4.16 labels show "MCA"s instead of MCZs. There are a number of tables which say 'Morgan Offshore Wind Project' instead of offshore e.g. Table 1.1 p3 of the Physical Processes Chapter. p 57 of Physical Processes Ch refers to Shell Flat SAC - it is Shell Flat and Lune Deep SAC, suggest change to 'referring to the Shell Flat component of the Shell Flat and Lune Deep SAC' Amend	The Applicants note your response and this has been corrected in the final application.
TA_0001_009_231123	S42	Email	1.8 Vol 2, Ch3 The developer states that models and data from the Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets PEIR have been used to infer the Transmission Assets PEIR. However, modelling output results and schematics have not been included in this Assessment, despite the transmission assets being subject to a separate application. We advise that the developer provides the model outputs for The Morgan and Morecambe Transmission Assets, either within the text or as a separate Annex.	Model outputs used to support the ES can be found within Volume 2, Annex 1.1: Physical Processes Associated Modelling Studies (document reference F2.1.1). This includes both the Mona Offshore Wind Project, Environmental Statement, Volume 6, Annex 1.1: Physical processes technical report and Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets, Environmental Statement, Volume 4, Annex 1.1: Physical Processes Technical Report.
TA_0001_010_231123	S42	Email	1.9 Volume 1, Chapter 3 (general) Some key parameters for Morgan and Morecambe Transmission Assets are clearly defined, while others are vaguely defined due to the lack of technical annexes and/or supporting information from modelling outputs for Morgan and Morecambe Transmission. We advise that parameters and MDS are clearly defined in the final ES, and that model outputs for The Morgan and Morecambe Transmission Assets are provided, either within the text or as a separate Annex.	The assessment undertaken was an evidence-based conceptual study, as agreed through the scoping process. Therefore, modelling of the Transmission Assets was not undertaken. Model outputs used to support the ES can be found within Volume 2, Annex 1.1: Physical Processes Associated Modelling Studies (document reference F2.1.1). This includes both the Mona Offshore Wind Project, Environmental Statement, Volume 6, Annex 1.1: Physical processes technical report; and Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets, Environmental Statement, Volume 4, Annex 1.1: Physical Processes Technical Report. The project description has been refined with respect to further project definition as presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This refinement includes that the OSPs relating to the Generation Assets and are not included in the Transmission Assets Application as outlined in the MDS table presented in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), Table 1.13: Maximum design scenario considered for assessment of impacts.
TA_0001_011_231123	S42	Email	Volume 1, Chapter 3, 3.5.1.5 We note that there is a possibility that all or part of the Offshore Service Platforms (OSPs) could be classed as part of the Generation Assets or the Transmission Assets. We advise that this optionality should ideally be resolved prior to the application and assessed within the relevant ES. The applicant to clarify which aspect of the proposed	The Applicants note your response. The OSPs are to be classed as part of the Generation Assets Applications only, and have been removed from the Transmission Assets Application.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			project the OSPs fall under (i.e. Generation or Transmission Assets), this should then be refined and assessed within the relevant ES.	
TA_0001_012_231123	S42	Email	1.11 Volume 1,Chapter 3,3.7.3Natural England acknowledges that the developer will submit a UXO clearance method statement once UXO surveys are complete.Applications should provide sufficient information to assess the size and depths of craters within the ES and commit to avoiding sensitive benthic receptors. This is especially important where UXO clearance may affect designated sites or features.A more detailed assessment of potential crater impacts should be included within the final application.	Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) has been updated to include an assessment of temporary habitat disturbance associated with potential UXO detonation. An assessment of the clearance of the largest anticipated UXO is provided within Volume 1, Annex 5.2: Underwater Sound Technical Report of the ES (document reference F1.5.2).
TA_0001_014_231123	S42	Email	1.13 Volume 1,Chapter 3,3.7.3.9Where the cable corridor crosses an area of high-density boulders and coarse material, we recommend the developer considers micro-siting if there is capacity within the planned cable corridor. We note that the developer has stated boulder clearance would occur within the footprint of installation activities. However, specific boulder clearance methodology and the location for boulder deposition should clearly be stated within the Application.Boulder clearance methodology and location of boulder deposition should be clearly stated within the ES along with further details for micro-siting of cables if applicable.	The description of seabed preparation including boulder clearance has been refined and is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Micrositing of cables around boulders would be onerous and impractical. Boulders pose a risk of damage and exposure to cables as well as an obstruction risk to the cable installation equipment. Therefore, any boulders identified as likely to impact installation will need to be moved to the side (side cast), away from the immediate location of the cable infrastructure. There are two key methods of clearing boulders, boulder plough and boulder grab. Where a high density of boulders is seen, the expectation is that a plough will be required to clear the cable installation corridor. Where medium and low densities of boulders are present, a subsea grab is expected to be employed. Boulder clearance will occur within the footprint of other site preparation activities. All boulders will remain in the vicinity (i.e. sidecast only) of the area they were cleared from. Sidecasting will not result in significant increases in SSC or changes to the seabed characteristics or physical processes.
TA_0001_015_231123	S42	Email	1.14 Volume 1,Chapter 3,3.7.3.10It is noted that if offshore infrastructure crosses existing out of service cables, the developer intends on removing these. We advise that the specific methodology for the proposed cable removal along with any associated impacts should be stated in the Application. We agree that this should also be undertaken in consultation with the asset owner and in accordance with the International Cable ProtectionCommittee guidelines (2011).The proposed cable removal methodology for existing out of service cables should be clearly stated within the submitted ES and undertaken in consultation with the asset owner and the International Cable Protection Committee guidelines (2011)	The methodology for cable removal is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).
TA_0001_016_231123	S42	Email	1.15 Volume 1,Chapte r 3,3.7.3.12We note that the MDS for sandwave clearance is based on the assumption that up to 60% of the cable route and 60% of foundation locations may require sandwave clearance. These are exceptionally large areas when compared to other offshore windfarm projects.We strongly recommend effort is taken to refine down this substantial MDS for sandwave clearance in the final application. We advise that site-specific geophysical survey data should be used to refine the MDS. The extent and location of sediment disturbance (area, volume) should be provided for affected MPAs/features (e.g. Fylde MCZ). Natural England also queries how will the sediment be retained within designated sites to ensure that the subtidal mud and sand will fully recover i.e., have the samestructure and function.	PDE refinements have been made between the PEIR and final application using the available geophysical survey data. These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for sandwave clearance (and associated temporary habitat disturbance) within the Fylde MCZ. Project engineers have refined the parameters for sandwave clearance in the Fylde MCZ from 60% to 5% for the Morgan export cables and from 30% to 5% for the Morecambe export cables. It should also be noted that sandwave clearance is an important tool to facilitate the successful burial of cables and to minimise the requirements for external cable protection.The techniques used for sandwave clearance will be undertaken with the aim of depositing material in the direct vicinity of its original location, with no sediment being removed from the sediment cell. Further information has been provided within Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), section 1.10: Assessment of effects, to characterise the recoverability of sandwave features within the physical processes study area.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0001_017_23112 3	S42	Email	1.16 Volume 1, Chapter 3, Table 3.5 It seems that some parameters associated with sandwave clearance have not been included, without these it is not clear how the figures for sandwave clearance and seabed preparation were derived. The developer mentions 60% of the cable route and 60% of the foundations may need sandwave clearance. We suggest all parameters (i.e. length/width/area/depth) should be included in the MDS tables. We advise the developer to consider additional parameters for inclusion in Table 3.5 to provide clarity around the sandwave volume MDS figures, namely:- Length of cable route requiring sandwave clearance (km)- Width of sandwave clearance disturbance corridor (m)- Indicative depth of sandwave clearance dredging (m)- Area of seabed disturbed by sandwave clearance (m2)- Seabed preparation areas for foundations (m2).36	PDE refinements have been made between the PEIR and final application. These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for sandwave clearance (and associated temporary habitat disturbance) within the Fylde MCZ. Project engineers have refined the parameters for sandwave clearance, using the available geophysical survey data, in the Fylde MCZ from 60% to 5% for the Morgan export cables and from 30% to 5% for the Morecambe export cables. Further information has been provided within Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), section 1.10, Assessment of effects, to characterise the recoverability of sandwave features within the physical processes study area. Parameters such as length, width, depth and volume of sandwave clearance have been included within Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), Table 1.13: Maximum design scenario considered for the assessment of impacts. Full details of the refined MDS applicable to fish and shellfish ecology are outlined within section 3.9.1 of Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3).
TA_0001_018_23112 3	S42	Email	1.17 Volume 1, Chapter 3, Table 3.6 The MDS for OSPs is high when compared to other projects of a similar scale (i.e. 6 x OSPs, 1 booster station). We advise that this is refined. We note that for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project, the developer has included two different MDS options for OSPs. Natural England advise that the preferred option would be to have 1 large OSP rather than 4 small OSP as this will have a smaller footprint and therefore least impact on the seabed. Clarify and refine OSP parameters for the ES submission. Include seabed preparation parameters for the areas for foundations (as mentioned above).	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications.
TA_0001_019_23112 3	S42	Email	1.18 Volume 1, Chapter 3, Tables 3.9 – 3.14 The MDS for boulder clearance has not been defined, it has been assumed this falls within the seabed preparation footprint. However, MDS for boulder clearance should also include consideration for the fate of removed boulders. For example, location of deposits, boulder size. We advise that acoustic data should allow for specific locations requiring boulder clearance and refinement of the MDS. The total area of impact presented in the submitted ES should consider where the boulders are placed, as well as where they are removed from.	The description of seabed preparation including boulder clearance has been refined and is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Any boulders identified as likely to impact installation will need to be moved to the side (i.e. side cast), away from the immediate location of the cable infrastructure. There are two key methods of clearing boulders, boulder plough and boulder grab. Where a high density of boulders is seen, the expectation is that a plough will be required to clear the cable installation corridor. Where medium and low densities of boulders are present, a subsea grab is expected to be employed. Boulder clearance will occur within the footprint of other site preparation activities. As boulder clearance is anticipated to take the form of sidelaying, the activity will not result in significant increases in SSC, significant alteration to the composition of the seabed or physical processes.
TA_0001_020_23112 3	S42	Email	1.19 Volume 1, Chapter 3, Table 3.10 It is not clear how the MDS for Scour Protection Area has been calculated for the Array Foundations. Please provide a rationale for the MDS Scour Protection Area for Array Foundations in the submitted ES.	The Applicants note your response and the OSPs and Array Foundations are to be classed as part of the Generation Assets DCO Applications only. They have been removed from the Transmission Assets DCO Application.
TA_0001_021_23112 3	S42	Email	1.2 Volume 1, Chapter 3, Tables 3.9 – 3.14 It is not clear whether secondary scour has been included in the project description and MDS parameters. The project description only refers to scour protection. We advise that secondary scour protection impacts are scoped in and included in the MDS parameters. If they are included within the project description, this should be clearly stated and defined in the submitted ES.	Secondary scour has been considered within the assessment and CEA of the ES, as seen within Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), section 1.10 Assessment of effects and section 1.12 Cumulative effects assessment. Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) has been updated to include an assessment of secondary scour which draws on the

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				assessment presented in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1).
TA_0001_022_23112 3	S42	Email	1.21 Volume 1, Chapter 3, Table 3.18 The MDS for width of export cable protection is 10m, is this per cable or in total (i.e. 6 cables)? Please clarify.	Clarification that export cable widths are per cable now added. The MDS for width of export cable, as found in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES, Table 1.13: Maximum design scenario considered for assessment of impacts, now states a value of 10 m and 10 m per cable for the Morgan export cables and Morecambe export cables, respectively.
TA_0001_023_23112 3	S42	Email	1.22 Volume 1, Chapter 3, Section 3.7.9.3 The parameters for cable crossings have not been defined in this Chapter, NE acknowledges the developer needs to confirm crossings with the asset owner. However, when this information is known, please provide further information on MDS parameters for cable crossing (i.e. indicative number of crossings, specific locations, overlap with MPAs etc) and methodology in line with best practise guidance. The potential interruption of sediment transport and resulting morphological change due to the presence of cable crossings near sensitive receptors and pathways should also be considered in the ES. Please provide further information on cable crossings in the submitted ES, in line with best practice guidance as set out in Natural England's Best Practice Guidance Phase III. If any MPAs, sensitive features, or sensitive areas of seabed are likely to be impacted by cable crossings, then the extent of the impact and location should be stated.	There will be one cable crossing (for all four Morgan export cables) within the boundary of the Fylde MCZ. These have been mapped and fully assessed in the Stage 1 MCZ assessment (document reference E4). No cable crossings are required in the Fylde MCZ for the Morecambe export cables. Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3) has been updated to show where the refinements made and the locations of cable crossings and these are cross referenced in Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) and Volume 2, Chapter 1 Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1).
TA_0001_024_23112 3	S42	Email	1.23 Volume 1, Chapter 3, Section 3.7.9.4 It remains unclear if or how much cable protection will be required within Fylde MCZ. We advise that a detailed cable burial risk assessment is provided as part of the Application. This should include an outline burial cable specification and installation plan which has a pollution and contingency plan. Provide a cable burial risk assessment as part of the Application.	Cable protection within the MCZ may be up to 3% of the total cable route. An outline Cable Burial Risk Assessment and Burial Assessment Study has been developed (document reference J14) alongside an outline CSIP (document reference J15).
TA_0001_025_23112 3	S42	Email	1.24 Volume 2, Chapter 1, Section 1.5.4 We are broadly content with the quality and quantity of surveys for baseline characterisation and survey methodology. N/A	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0001_026_23112 3	S42	Email	1.25 Volume 2, Chapter 1, Figure 1.3 We welcome the inclusion of metocean data sources and locations that were used to inform the assessment. N/A	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0001_027_23112 3	S42	Email	1.26 Volume 2, Chapter 1, Table 1.12 We are in broad agreement with the key receptors to be taken forward to assessment. N/A	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0001_028_23112 3	S42	Email	1.27 Volume 1 Chapter 3/ Volume 2, Chapter 1 The information on indicative MDS for cable crossing dimensions or potential locations of cable crossings is unclear. Natural England advises that further information on cable crossings, including MDS parameters and an indicative schematic is provided in the submitted ES. This should show MDS cable crossing cross-section and plan, and also a map identifying potential cable crossing locations, if possible.	There will be one cable crossing (for all four Morgan export cables) within the boundary of the Fylde MCZ. These have been mapped and fully assessed in the Stage 1 MCZ assessment (document reference E4). No cable crossings are required in the Fylde MCZ for the Morecambe export cables. Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3) has been updated to show where the refinements made and the locations of cable crossings and these are cross referenced in Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) and Volume 2, Chapter 1 Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0001_029_231123	S42	Email	1.28 Volume 2, Chapter 1, Table 1.10 There are site-specific surveys referenced throughout the chapter which have not been provided with the PEIR reports. It would be useful to see these reports:- Guardline (2022);- XOcean (2022); and- Fugro (2022). Please provide these reports or a link to them through the ETG.	Access to site specific survey reports have been provided through the Expert Working Group.
TA_0001_032_231123	S42	Email	1.31 Volume 2, Chapter 1, Table 1.7 We do not agree that jack-up vessels have been scoped out of the assessment. One of the justifications for scoping out jack-up vessels is based off of Barrow offshore wind farm with data <15 years old. The jack-up parameters are project specific, therefore not comparable to this project. Direct disturbance to the seabed from cable and turbine maintenance activities and placement of jack-up vessels (e.g. spud legs) should be assessed in this project as set out in Natural England's Best Practice Guidance Phase III. We advise that jack-up vessels should be included in the submitted assessment, in line with best practice guidance as set out in Natural England's Best Practice Guidance Phase III.	Further evidence has been provided for the scoping out of jack-up vessels within Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), Table 1.11: Impacts scoped out of the assessment. Alternate approaches to the use of jack-up vessels is provided in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).
TA_0001_033_231123	S42	Email	1.32 Volume 2, Chapter 1, Table 1.7 We do not agree that scour of seabed should be scoped out of the assessment. We advise that scour of seabed should be included in the submitted assessment, in line with best practice guidance as set out in Natural England's Best Practice Guidance Phase III.	Secondary scour has been considered within the assessment and CEA of the ES, as seen within Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), section 1.10 Assessment of effects and Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), section 1.12 Cumulative effects assessment. The Applicants have also updated Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) to include an assessment of secondary scour which draws on the assessment presented in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1).
TA_0001_034_231123	S42	Email	1.33 Volume 2, Chapter 1, Section 1.8 We acknowledge that numerical modelling has been used to quantify the changes in physical processes due to the installation of the Morgan and Morecambe Transmission Assets. We are broadly in agreement with the modelling approach, however, advise that the model outputs for Transmission Assets are presented (see comment A1.27). The submitted ES should present the Transmission Asset model outputs.	The assessment undertaken was an evidence-based conceptual study, as agreed though the scoping process. Therefore, modelling of the Transmission Assets was not undertaken. Model outputs used to support the ES can be found within the technical annex, Volume 2, Annex 1.1: Physical Processes Associated Modelling Studies (document reference F2.1.1). Which includes both the Mona Offshore Wind Project, Environmental Statement, Volume 6, Annex 1.1: Physical processes technical report and Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets, Environmental Statement, Volume 4, Annex 1.1: Physical Processes Technical Report.
TA_0001_035_231123	S42	Email	1.34 Volume 2, Chapter 1, Section 1.8.5 The developer states that models and data from the Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets PEIR have been used to infer the Transmission Assets PEIR. However, modelling output results and schematics have not been included in this Assessment. We advise that the model outputs for the Transmission Assets should be provided within the Chapter or as a separate Annex. This will be a separate application to the Generation assets and should be able to be read as a standalone document. We advise that the developer provides the model outputs for the Morgan and Morecambe Transmission Assets in the submitted ES, either within the text or as a separate Annex.	The assessment undertaken was an evidence-based conceptual study, as agreed though the scoping process. Therefore, modelling of the Transmission Assets was not undertaken. Model outputs used to support the ES can be found within the technical annex, Volume 2, Annex 1.1: Physical Processes Associated Modelling Studies (document reference F2.1.1). Which includes both the Mona Offshore Wind Project, Environmental Statement, Volume 6, Annex 1.1: Physical processes technical report and Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets, Environmental Statement, Volume 4, Annex 1.1: Physical Processes Technical Report.
TA_0001_036_231123	S42	Email	1.35 Volume 2, Section 1.9.2.10 It is noted that plough dredging may be undertaken as part of the seabed preparation activities. However, this hasn't been included in the modelling. It	The assessment undertaken was an evidence-based conceptual study, as agreed though the scoping process. Therefore, modelling of the Transmission Assets was not undertaken. Numerical modelling used to support the ES is found within the technical annex, Volume 2, Annex 1.1:

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			would be preferable to see a model simulation of plough dredging in the submitted ES to understand potential SSCs, sedimentation footprint and plume distance from this methodology.	Physical Processes Associated Modelling Studies (document reference F2.1.1) which is comprised of Mona Offshore Wind Project, Environmental Statement, Volume 6, Annex 1.1: Physical Processes Technical Report and Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets, Environmental Statement, Volume 4, Annex 1.1: Physical Processes Technical Report. Plough dredging does not represent the maximum design scenario, dredge and dumping however does, therefore the modelling supporting the assessment does represent the MDS.
TA_0001_037_231123	S42	Email	1.36 Volume 2, Chapter 1, Section 1.9.2.26 We welcome the inclusion of a Cable Burial Risk Assessment (CBRA) to inform maintenance and reburial specification in line with the project commitment CoT45. We advise that the CBRA is provided and secured appropriately with the Application and includes information in line with Natural England's Best Practice Guidance Phase III. We advise that the developer's CBRA is provided and secured appropriately with the Application and includes information in line with Natural England's Best Practice Guidance Phase III, namely: · Method(s) to be used · Overlap with MPA(s) · Habitats impacted · Presence of sensitive species and habitats · Total number of events (for the lifetime of the cable) · Frequency (worst case scenario) · Duration of each event (worst case scenario) · Total area of impact per event (worst case scenario) · Impacts from sediment plumes, if applicable	An outline Cable Burial Risk Assessment and outline Burial Assessment Study has been developed (document reference J14), as well as an outline CSIP (document reference J15). Commitments relating to the usage and scale of cable protection are included in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), Table 1.12: Measures (commitments) adopted as part of the Transmission Assets, with the full list of commitments included in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments Register (document reference F1.5.3). The assessment methodology in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), section 1.9 Assessment methodology includes assessment of activities where likely significant effects may occur. With further project definition the potential impacts relating to activities such as seabed preparation have been refined as presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).
TA_0001_038_231123	S42	Email	1.37 Volume 2, Chapter 1, Section 1.9.2 Results from the assessment of different construction activities within the Transmission Assets study area have been summarised broadly in terms of changes to SSC dispersion and sediment deposition thickness. However, the model outputs for each construction activity within the Transmission study area and schematics should also be provided. The submitted ES should provide model output of elevated SSCs and associated levels of sediment deposition for: · Drilling of monopile foundations/pin piles for jacket foundations · Seabed preparation by dredging prior to foundation and cable installation · Cable burial (i.e., the MDS for sediment release for each activity).	It should be noted that this report uses an evidence based conceptual report supported by modelling undertaken for other projects. The numerical modelling used to support the ES is found within the technical annex, Volume 2, Annex 1.1: Physical Processes Associated Modelling Studies (document reference F2.1.1) which is comprised of: Mona Offshore Wind Project, Environmental Statement, Volume 6, Annex 1.1: Physical processes technical report; and Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets, Environmental Statement, Volume 4, Annex 1.1: Physical Processes Technical Report. This technical annex provides model outputs for elevated SSCs, deposition and changes to physical processes within the Transmission Assets, that can be used to inform the impacts owing to the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the Transmission Assets.
TA_0001_039_231123	S42	Email	1.38 Volume 2, Chapter 1, Section 1.9.2 We recommend the developer includes figures to illustrate sediment deposition footprints associated with installation activities overlaid with designated conservation sites within the study area. Please provide such figures in the submitted ES.	The assessment undertaken was an evidence-based conceptual study, as agreed through the scoping process. Therefore, modelling of the Transmission Assets was not undertaken. Model outputs used to support the ES can be found within the technical annex, Volume 2, Annex 2.1: Physical Processes Associated Modelling Studies (document reference F2.1.1). Which includes both the Mona Offshore Wind Project, Environmental Statement, Volume 6, Annex 1.1: Physical processes technical report and Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets, Environmental Statement, Volume 4, Annex 1.1: Physical Processes Technical Report.
TA_0001_040_231123	S42	Email	1.39 Volume 2, Chapter 1, Section 1.9.3 We welcome the Project's commitment CoT47 and note that this will include measures to limit the extent of cable protection within the Fylde MCZ, whilst the preferred option for cable protection is cable burial. However, it is not currently stated or assessed whether cable protection is anticipated to affect any MPAs (namely Fylde MCZ and Ribble MCZ) or sensitive features. We	The impacts of cable protection on sensitive benthic habitats and features of MPAs (including the Fylde MCZ) are fully assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) and also in the Stage 1 MCZ Assessment (document reference E4). Cable protection within the MCZ may be up to 3% of the cable route. It will however be designed to be readily removable, and mitigated in line with the

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			advise that the impacts of cable protection on MPAs or sensitive features are a key consenting risk for the project, and this should be reflected in the level of assessment in the submitted ES. If any MPAs or sensitive features are likely to be impacted by cable protection, then the extent of the impact and location should be stated.	commitments described in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), Table 1.12: Measures (commitments) adopted as part of the Transmission Assets. This comment therefore falls in line with the commitments and approach proposed within the ES. Further information regarding the commitments for the Transmission Assets can be found in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments Register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0001_041_231123	S42	Email	1.4 Impacts to sediment transport pathways due to the presence of physical structures.CoT47 states that no material will be placed on the bed's surface in the inter- tidal region and low profile/tapered armouring would be employed in shallowwater should this be required.CoT47 should be defined and extended to the depth of closure based on average significant wave heights.	Where practicable the requirements for cable protection will be compliant with the Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA) navigation guidance which includes that there will be no more than a 5% reduction in water depth (referenced to Chart Datum) at any point along the cable route (MCA, 2021) without prior consultation with the MCA and licencing authorities. In line with best practice, no material will be placed on the bed's surface in the inter-tidal region and low profile/tapered armouring would be employed in shallow water. This comment aligns with the commitments and approach proposed within the ES, as described in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments Register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3), and presented within Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1) and Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2).
TA_0001_042_231123	S42	Email	1.41 Volume 2,Chapter 1 Section 1.9 The assessment states that for several impacts, the precise magnitude of impacts will be dependent on location and detailed design prior to ES submission. However, it is noted that the magnitude of impact and significance of effect has been concluded as 'low adverse' or 'negligible adverse'.We can't agree with the conclusions of the assessment until the full suite of impacts and parameters have been assessed. This is particularly pertinent for uncertainties relating to permanent infrastructure (i.e.cable protection) and its impacts onWe advise that the full suite of parameters and precise magnitude of impacts are assessed in the ES to improve the robustness of the assessment.	The project design has been refined and further detail presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). In line with refinement, the MDS presented in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), Table 1.13: Maximum design scenario considered for the assessment of impacts provides the parameters and justification for assessment for physical processes. The evidence based conceptual report has included numerical modelling outputs to support the assessment. Model outputs used to support the ES can be found within the technical annex, Volume 2, Annex 2.1: Physical Processes Associated Modelling Studies of the ES (document reference F2.1.1). Which includes both the Mona Offshore Wind Project, Environmental Statement, Volume 6, Annex 1.1: Physical processes technical report and Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets, Environmental Statement, Volume 4, Annex 1.1: Physical Processes Technical Report.
TA_0001_043_231123	S42	Email	1.42 Volume 2,Chapter 11.9.4.10;1.9.4.14;1.11.5.10; Modelling undertaken for OSP structures for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets PEIR and Morecambe Offshore windfarm project showed that given their position and distance offshore there would be no pathway to impact upon adjacent shorelines. Natural England agrees with this conclusion.N/A	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications.
TA_0001_044_231123	S42	Email	1.43 Volume 2,Chapter 11.9.4.14 For the Transmission Assets the magnitude and areas affected by cable protection will be specific to the location,i.e. water depth, orientation to tidal flow and length of continuous protection. From the modelling undertaken for the Mona and Morecambe Offshore Wind Project PEIR it may be concluded that Fylde MCZ and designated areas associated with the Ribble Estuary may be affected if cable protection is placed within these areas. Additionally, the effects of cable protection within the nearshore will be mitigated with the use of low profile tapered mattressing to be detailed in the CSIP.The area which should be exempt to cable protection to prevent impacts on sediment	A number of PDE refinements have been made between the PEIR and to final application. These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for cable protection (and associated long term habitat loss) within the Fylde MCZ. Cable protection parameters in the Fylde MCZ have reduced from 20% to 3% contingency for the Morgan export cables and from 15% to 3% contingency for the Morecambe export cables. Cable protection will be designed to be readily removable, and mitigated in line with the commitments list which can be found in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments Register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Effects are fully assessed Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			transport should be further defined and extended to the depth of closure based on average significant wave heights, and secured appropriately in the application. The depth of cable burial should be defined in the CSIP and agreed in order to prevent the need for cable protection. There should be a commitment made in the DCO to remove cable protection from the 'nearshore' as part of the decommissioning plan. Any cable protection used should be designed to be removable to prevent permanent impacts.	(document reference F2.2), in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), section 1.10 (Assessment of effects) and in the Stage 1 MCZ Assessment (document reference E4). Where practicable the requirements will be compliant with the Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA) navigation guidance which includes that there will be no more than a 5% reduction in water depth (referenced to Chart Datum) at any point along the cable route (MCA, 2021). The project has also committed to ensuring that all external cable protection used within the MCZ will be designed to be removable on decommissioning with the requirement for removal agreed with stakeholders and regulators at the time of decommissioning.
TA_0001_045_231123	S42	Email	1.44 Volume 1, Chapter 5/Volume 2, Chapter 1 Section 1.9 (general) Natural England broadly agree with the EIA methodology for the assessment of Physical Processes. However, as discussed previously we advise that the full suite of model outputs for the Transmission Assets are presented in the ES. We advise that the full suite of model outputs for the Transmission Assets are presented in the ES.	Model outputs used to support the ES can be found within the technical annex, Volume 2, Annex 1.1: Physical Processes Associated Modelling Studies (document reference F2.1.1). This includes both the Mona Offshore Wind Project, Environmental Statement, Volume 6, Annex 1.1: Physical processes technical report; and Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets, Environmental Statement, Volume 4, Annex 1.1: Physical Processes Technical Report.
TA_0001_046_231123	S42	Email	1.45 Volume 2, Chapter 1, Section 1.10 We note that the tiered system used within the cumulative impact assessment is based on a three-tier approach. Natural England and JNCC (2022) has developed a tiered approach for scoping projects into cumulative/in-combination assessments. Please see Natural England's Best Practice Guidance Phase III.	The list of projects considered within the CEA has been updated in line with developments three months prior to application submission. The revised CEA list is presented in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), section 1.11 Cumulative effect assessment methodology, and Table 1.18: List of other projects, plans and activities considered with the CEA.
TA_0001_051_231123	S42	Email	Assessment 1.5 Volume 2, Chapter 1, 1.8.2.10 1.8.2.10 of the Physical Processes Chapter states in areas with relatively low levels of sediment transport and areas with higher fine sediment content (e.g. muddy sands and sandy muds) trenches were observed, although these were relatively shallow features. Further option to mitigate impacts - Micro-siting the cable route into areas which are most likely to recover i.e. avoiding areas with higher fine sediment content within Fylde MCZ.	The project design has been refined and further detail presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES. Given the east-west split of sediment classification within the Fylde MCZ, with fine sand and mud regions lying parallel to the coast, the potential for micro-siting to avoid finer seabed material within the cable corridor is limited (Gardline, 2022). Further information regarding sediment classification within the MCZ is presented in Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) and a full assessment of the potential impacts to each feature is presented in the Stage 1 MCZ Assessment (document reference E4).
TA_0001_052_231123	S42	Email	Assessment 1.51 N/A Please see overarching comments (1.2) in Table 1 for concerns relating to Fylde MCZ Refer to comment 1.2	The project design has been refined and further detail presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The assessment methodology includes assessment of activities where significant effects may occur, outlined in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), section 1.9 Assessment methodology.
TA_0001_053_231123	S42	Email	Screening 1.52 Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the PEIR, outlines that the offshore export cable will be installed by Horizontal Directional Drilling, or equivalent trenchless technique. Concerns about impacts on potential key receptors/Appropriate of analysis - From experience on other windfarms HDD can fail on occasion, the applicant should ensure that the worst case scenario at landfall takes this into consideration. This should consider impacts on Lytham St. Annes Dunes SSSI with a sufficient baseline collected to assess impact post-construction and identify the need for remedial measures if needed.	Cable installation at landfall does not rely on HDD techniques, at this stage both open-cut trenching and trenchless techniques are being considered. Further information regarding landfall is included within Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0001_103_231123	S42	Email	Natural England's Position on Worst Case Scenario or Scenarios 1.7 Vol 1, Ch 3 / Vol 2 Ch 3 The modelling for an increase in suspended sediments has not been provided, and the physical processes chapter only references to the work done by the Generation Assets. The submitted ES should present the model outputs for changes to SSC from each aspect of the proposed development.	The assessment undertaken was an evidence-based conceptual study, as agreed through the scoping process. Therefore, modelling of the Transmission Assets was not undertaken. Model outputs used to support the ES can be found within the technical annex, Volume 2, Annex 1.1: Physical Processes Associated Modelling Studies of the ES (document reference F2.1.1). This includes both the Mona Offshore Wind Project, Environmental Statement, Volume 6, Annex 1.1: Physical processes technical report and Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets, Environmental Statement, Volume 4, Annex 1.1: Physical Processes Technical Report.
TA_0001_280_231123	S42	Email	Physical Processes Natural England have concerns relating to the use of cable protection within Fylde MCZ and impacts to Physical Processes. If the project cannot avoid Fylde MCZ, we strongly advise that the developer takes all feasible steps to reduce the level of cable protection and embeds the need to mitigate for processes impacts in the project design. Relevant documentation should be provided in the application to demonstrate that the amount of cable protection sought has been minimised e.g. through the Cable Burial Risk Assessment (CBRA).	The project design has been refined and further detail presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Currently, it is not anticipated that exhaustive seabed levelling or sandwave clearance would be required within the MCZ, estimated to be approximately 5% of the export cables within the MCZ may require sandwave clearance.
TA_0001_281_231123	S42	Email	We also advise that the submitted ES should include a commitment to remove all cable protection from the MCZ as part of the decommissioning plan. At present there are existing methodologies in the market, which with refinements in the future should allow the recovery of external cable protection.	The project design has been refined and further detail presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The project has committed to ensuring that all external cable protection used within the MCZ will be designed to be removable on decommissioning with the requirement for removal agreed with stakeholders and regulators at the time of decommissioning.
TA_0001_282_231123	S42	Email	The area impacted by sandwave clearance within Fylde MCZ is large. We recommend careful application of the mitigation hierarchy by the use of best practice methods to reduce the area impacted by disposal through, as set out in our detailed comments.	The project design has been refined since the PEIR and further detail presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for sandwave clearance (and associated temporary habitat disturbance) within the Fylde MCZ. The parameters for sandwave clearance in the Fylde MCZ have reduced from 60% to 5% for the Morgan export cables and from 30% to 5% for the Morecambe export cables. It should also be noted that sandwave clearance is an important tool to facilitate the successful burial of cables and to minimise the requirements for external cable protection. The techniques used for sandwave clearance will be undertaken with the aim of depositing material in the direct vicinity of its original location, with no sediment being removed from the sediment cell.
TA_0001_283_231123	S42	Email	All efforts to avoid areas of boulders or minimise the need for boulder clearance by micro-siting should be explored through a boulder clearance methodology and stated within the Application, and the potential impacts of boulder placement on sediment movement carefully assessed.	The description of potential impacts relating to seabed preparation including boulder clearance has been refined with respect to further project definition as presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Micrositing of cables around boulders would be onerous and impractical. Boulders pose a risk of damage and exposure to cables as well as an obstruction risk to the cable installation equipment. Therefore, any boulders identified as likely to impact installation will need to be moved to the side (side cast), away from the immediate location of the cable infrastructure. There are two key methods of clearing boulders, boulder plough and boulder grab. Where a high density of boulders is seen, the expectation is that a plough will be required to clear the cable installation corridor. Where medium and low densities of boulders are present, a subsea grab is expected to be employed. Boulder clearance will occur within the footprint of other site preparation activities. All boulders will remain in the

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				vicinity (i.e. sidecast only) of the area they were cleared from. The impact is fully assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2).
TA_0001_284_23112 3	S42	Email	From experience on other windfarms, HDD can fail on occasion. Therefore, the applicant should ensure that the worst case scenario at landfall takes this into consideration. This should consider impacts on Lytham St. Annes Dunes SSSI with a sufficient baseline collected to assess impact post construction.	Impacts to the ecological features of the Lytham St. Annes Dunes SSSI are assessed in Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). Direct pipe trenchless installation is proposed from the transition joint bays to an exit pit at or above MHWS. This will avoid the loss of vegetation and habitats across the sand dunes at Lytham St. Annes SSSI. This method has been selected to address this issue as it's the most appropriate for use in sensitive geological settings, in part because it reduces the risk of collapse that is associated with cable installation using HDD. Further information regarding the landfall is included within Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).
TA_0001_310_23112 3	S42	Email	Appendix 1The following Framework has been used in Natural England's advice to attribute risk to the project:Structure / Framework RiskPurpleNote for the developer. RedNatural England considers that unless these issues are resolved it will have to advise that (in relation to any one of them, and as appropriate) it is not possible to ascertain beyond reasonable scientific doubt that the project will not affect the integrity of an SAC/SPA/Ramsar and/or significantly hinder the conservation objectives of an MCZ and/or damage or destroy the interest features of a SSSI and/or comply fully with the Environmental Impact Assessment requirements.Addressing these concerns may require the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• new baseline or survey data; and/or• significant revisions to baseline characterisation and/or impact modelling and/or• significant design changes; and/or• significant mitigation Natural England feels that issues given Red status are so complex, or require the provision of so much outstanding information, that they are unlikely to be resolved during the Examination, and respectfully suggests that they be addressed beforehand. AmberNatural England does not agree with the developer's position or approach and consider that this could make a material difference to the outcome of the decision-making process for this project.Natural England considers that these matters may be resolved through: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• provision of additional evidence or justification to support conclusions; and/or• revisions to impact assessment methodology and/or assessment conclusions; and/or• minor to moderate revisions to impact modelling; and/or• well-designed mitigation measures that are adequately secured through the draft DCO/dML and/or• amendments to draft plans If these issues remain at the time of the application and are not addressed or resolved by the end of the Examination, then they may become a Red risk as set out above. YellowNatural England doesn't agree with the developer's position or approach. We would ideally like this to be addressed but are satisfied that for this particular project it is unlikely to make a material difference to our advice or the outcome of the decision-making process. However, we reserve the right to revise our opinion should further evidence be presented.It should be noted by interested parties that just because these issues/comments are not raised as significant concerns in this instance, it should not be understood or inferred that Natural England would be of the same view in other cases or circumstances. GreenNatural England is in broad agreement with the developer's approach and has no significant outstanding concerns. As above, we reserve the right to revise our opinion should new evidence be presented.	Natural England's advice has been noted, specifically in the assessment of effects on ecological receptors (see Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3)).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0014_031_23112 3	S42	Email	Data Sources The TSC would draw the applicant's attention to the Manx Marine Environmental Assessment2 (MMEA) which provides a useful overview of the Island's marine environment and should be taken into account as part of both the transboundary and possibly also the cumulative impacts assessment as part of this application. More detail will be provided below in respect of specific areas of the MMEA that should be reviewed. In addition to this broad statement, the TSC has provided specific comments, over subsequent pages, in relation to the individual chapters of the PEIR, and collated on behalf of various contributors within the responsible Departments of the Isle of Man Government	The Manx Marine Environmental Assessment has been considered within the ES as a relevant data source and is has been utilised and referenced within the desktop study. As Isle of Man is a Crown Dependency of the UK and not a European Economic Area (EEA) State, Regulation 32 of the EIA Regulations does not apply to the Isle of Man. As such, potential impacts upon environmental receptors within the Isle of Man are not considered to be transboundary
TA_0023_001_22112 3	S42	Email	NRW (A) have no concerns regarding impacts to the following Welsh receptors: Marine Physical Processes, Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology and Designated Landscapes.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0023_005_22112 3	S42	Email	NRW (A) have no comments to make with regards to physical processes impacts caused by the transmission assets (sandwave clearance, cable burial, cable protection, foundation installation) of Morgan and Morecambe on Welsh Water designated sites or morphodynamic features. The potential impacts to suspended sediment concentration (SSC), waves, tides and sediment transport caused by the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Morgan and Morecombe transmission assets are localised and do not affect Mona offshore wind farm (OWF) cumulatively as there is no spatial overlap other than the potential for SSC plumes to advect towards Mona OWF (5km E/W orientation). However, SSC deposition will be negligible 3-5m across region. We have no concerns with regards to any alterations to sediment transport caused by Morgan and Morecombe transmission assets as any alteration (10% modelled) will -not extend beyond 2km from the site and not extend into Welsh waters.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0023_016_22112 3	S42	Email	2. NRW (A) note that on the listed projects included for assessment of cumulative effects, the Offshore elements of EniHynet should be included and that Isle of Man offshore wind farm Moor Vannin is also due to be constructed by 2030 so should also be included.	The list of projects considered within the CEA has been updated in line with updates from PEIR to ES, and the application progress of other developments. The revised CEA list for each offshore topic is presented in the list of other projects, plans and activities considered within the CEA in each chapter of the ES. The screening matrix used within the CEA can be found in Volume 1, Annex 5.5: Cumulative screening matrix and location plan of the ES (document reference: F1.5.5). The Eni Hynet is included as a Tier 2 project in the CEA. Moor Vannin Offshore Windfarm is included as a Tier 2 project in the CEA. Moor Vannin UK Transmission Asset is included as a Tier 3 project in the CEA.
TA_0035_021_22112 3	S42/S44	Email	Shoreline Management Plan Issue No consideration of Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) Impact Potential that permanent works may conflict with long-term shoreline management strategies in this location Solution Consider current development proposals in the light of the strategy in the SMP.	Details of the impact of the Transmission Assets on physical processes, including physical features and shorelines are provided in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1).
TA_0035_082_22112 3	S42/S44	Email	CoT47 Cable Specification and Installation Plan(s) will include measures to limit the extent of cable protection and sandwave clearance within the Fylde MCZ and will be informed through the undertaking of survey works pre-construction Issue Measures to limit the impact of proposed works within the Fylde MCZ have yet to be fully developed.	An Outline Offshore Cable Specification and Installation Plan is provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J15).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			Impact Risk to the marine environment. Solution Outline Cable Specification and Installation Plan to be to be secured in the DCO submission.	
TA_0035_083_221123	S42/S44	Email	CoT65 Outline Offshore Construction Environmental Management Plan(s) will be developed and will include details of:- a marine pollution contingency plan to address the risks, methods and procedures to deal with any spills and collision incidents in relation to all activities carried out below MHWS;- a chemical risk review to include information regarding how and when chemicals are to be used, stored and transported in accordance with recognised best practice guidance;- a marine biosecurity plan detailing how the risk of introduction and spread of invasive non-native species will be minimised;- dropped object protocol will be developed for the reporting and recovery of dropped objects where they pose a potential hazard to other marine users. Issue Measures to manage environmental risk below MHWS have yet to be fully developed. Impact Risk to the marine environment Solution Outline Offshore Construction Environmental Management Plan to be to be secured in the DCO submission which is enforceable with the Marine Management Organisation.	An Offshore Environmental Management Plan will be provided post-consent and will be secured through CoT65.
TA_0010_010_221123	S42	Email	Volume 2 Chapter 1: Physical Processes 4.1. MMO notes that all coastal processes matters have been scoped in and are fully addressed. MMO considers the impacts presented within the PEIR to be comprehensive.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0010_011_221123	S42	Email	4.2. Plastic fronds have been included within the PEIR, these can introduce plastics into the marine environment as they degrade over time. If there is scope to minimise the use of plastic fronds and geotextile bags, this would be a welcomed and should be set out within any Outline Scour Protection and Cable Protection Plan.	Concerns regarding plastics in the marine environment is understood and that the design principles will seek to minimise the use of plastics where possible.
TA_0010_012_221123	S42	Email	4.3. Whilst the cable corridor has been investigated, MMO requests a wider contextual view from existing data sources. For instance, references to the "one Benthic Tool" https://rconnect.cefas.co.uk/onebenthic_portal/ for Particle size information and also the MEDIN bathymetry archive (part of UK Centre of Seabed Mapping (UKCSM)) for sediment transport/bedforms - https://www.admiralty.co.uk/uk-centre-for-seabed-mapping . An assessment of contaminants from the cable routes should be provided. As this part of the Irish Sea, there is a legacy of elevated levels of radioactivity from Sellafield. Cabling operations will involve a considerable degree of sediment disturbance this should be assessed. This is more of an issue in the fine sediment zones. E.g. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/197289/SEA6_Contaminant_CEFAS.pdf .	The dynamic nature of sediment transport and sandwave movement within the study area has been described and supported by relevant desk studies in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), Table 1.5: Summary of desk study sources used. The sources included both Cefas and MEDIN. One such supporting document is the project specific 'Assessment of Seabed Level Vertical Variability for Morgan Offshore Wind Farm, Morphodynamic Characterisation, Morphological Analysis and Prediction of Future Seabed Levels.' (ABPmer (2023)).
TA_0010_013_221123	S42	Email	4.4. Figure 4.8 (non-Technical summary) shows potential areas for Net Gain and mitigation. However, impacts of Physical processes for any mitigations do not appear in Chapter 1 e.g., the pocket near Fairhaven or the upper reaches of the Ribble estuary. This should be clear within the Environmental Statement or if no mitigation is to take place then justification should be provided.	No physical processes mitigation is considered necessary because the likely effect (beyond the designed in measures outlined in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), Table 1.12: Measures (commitments) adopted as part of the Transmission Assets) is not significant in EIA terms.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0010_014_22112 3	S42	Email	4.5. MMO welcomes the commitment to an Offshore Cable Specification and Installation Plan(s) and Construction Method Statement(s) within Section 7.2.4.1 (non-technical summary). Additionally, MMO notes the commitment to not using cable protection in the inter-tidal zone within Section 7.2.5.4 (non-technical summary).	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0010_015_22112 3	S42	Email	4.6. Only a sample of the geophysical survey has been presented in Table 1.10 and thus the geographic scope, quality and interpretation has not been assessed. This should be assessed and included within the ES. This must be clarified.	Site specific surveys have informed the baseline environment. The survey reports provide information regarding scope and interpretation with access being provided through the EWG process.
TA_0010_016_22112 3	S42	Email	4.7. MMO requests the inclusion of the seabed mobility discussed in the Coughlan et al. (2021) paper.	The baseline description presented in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), section 1.5.4 Baseline environment has been updated to reflect this more recent publication.
TA_0010_017_22112 3	S42	Email	4.8. With regards to Table 1.13, MMO queries where the boulders be laid and whether they be used in a Net Gain or mitigation mode?	The description of seabed preparation including boulder clearance has been refined and further detail presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). As boulder clearance is anticipated to take the form of sidecasting, the activity will not result in significant increases in SSC or changes to the seabed characteristics or physical processes, further information can be found in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1).
TA_0010_018_22112 3	S42	Email	4.9. With regards to Section 1.9.2.13, MMO queries the Particles size distribution at depth, especially as the pile could reach 60 metres (m)? MMO notes that any suspended sediment plume from drill cuttings is heavily dependent on the Particle size. This should be clarified within the ES.	Piling/drilling activities are no longer within the project description for the Transmission Assets Application.
TA_0010_019_22112 3	S42	Email	4.10. With regards to Section 1.9.2.17, MMO queries how many simultaneous dredging/disposal operations are expected at any one time and whether any suspended sediment plumes coalesce?	Information regarding the construction programme and potential cumulative effects within the project scope due to the simultaneous undertaking of activities has been assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), section 1.10 Assessment of effects.
TA_0010_020_22112 3	S42	Email	4.11. Within Section 1.9.5.13, the planned cable routes, the sediment transport direction and bedform in the Cable assessment document (when this is produced), should be shown as a series of maps within the ES.	Detailed bathymetry and bedforms along the cable route are presented in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), Chapter Figures Figure 1.4, the CSIP (document reference J15) and the CBRA (document reference J14).
TA_0010_021_22112 3	S42	Email	4.12. MMO advises that further details of the offshore punchout location and any released fluids is required within Section 1.9.6.1.	Cable installation considers both trenchless and open-cut trenching techniques as outlined within Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Trenchless techniques are associated with cable installation beneath the dune formations and punchout may therefore occur within the inter-tidal region, rather than offshore. This is assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1).

E1.16.8 Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology table of responses

E1.16.8.1 Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology table of responses (via feedback form)

Table E1.16.8.1: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology consultation responses (feedback form)

As set out in section 4.7.4 of the Consultation report (document reference E1). Responses have been allocated to the most appropriate topic(s). If a consultee did not provide a response for a question/sub-question this is not recorded. If a consultee included 'N/A', 'none', 'no comment', 'Nil', 'No', in response to a question, this has also not been recorded. Where a consultee provided a response associated with this sub-question (1.2; Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology) but was not related to this topic, this has been included below, as well as against any other appropriate topic(s). Where a consultee provided a response which stated 'see response above' or similar, the response has been replicated in brackets and italics.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0050_001_231123	S42	Online feedback form	1		Document states that transport of sedimentation based on desktop study and existing information, what if any, modelling of net affects of the installation is proposed to be undertaken. In addition what, if any, monitoring is proposed to determine the net effect on the sea bed, sediment transportation, and fisheries habitat and ecology.	An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken for the offshore topics of the Transmission Assets Application and is presented in Volume 2 of the ES (document reference F2). Specific examples relevant to marine life are listed below. - Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2). - Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3). - Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4). - Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5). Benthic monitoring has been considered in the outline In Principle Monitoring Plan (IPMP) (document reference J20) and will consider whether existing asset integrity surveys can have scope added to cover benthic monitoring (e.g. of recovery of seabed topography after trenching/sand wave clearance). Monitoring will focus on the Fylde MCZ. Physical processes modelling as applied to the Transmission Assets is details in Volume 2, Annex 1.1: Physical processes modelling studies of the ES (document reference F2.1.1).
TA_0056_003_141123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.2	ASAP previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0060_006_151123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.3	Sea life must be considered and proof of its protection must be provided before any work is be commenced	An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken for the offshore topics of the Transmission Assets Application and is presented in Volume 2 of the ES (document reference F2). Specific examples relevant to marine life are listed below. - Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						<p>the ES (document reference F2.2).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3). - Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4). - Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5).
TA_0060_010_151123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.8	Drilling and other work noise will not only affect residents but also the wildlife birds and sea life.	<p>An assessment of noise and vibration impacts during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Transmission Assets is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.2: Construction Noise and Vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.2). This includes an assessment of all construction activities required, as well as noise impacts due to construction traffic on the local highway network.</p> <p>An assessment of the impact and effects on affected receptors has been carried out. Mitigation measures committed to by the Transmission Assets are outlined within the ES and the project Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference: J11), Marine Enhancement Statement (document reference: J12) submitted with the application for development consent. The views and feedback of statutory and non-statutory consultees has been sought throughout the environmental impact assessment process.</p>
TA_0067_001_221123	S44	Online feedback form	1		<p>I have read all the documents and attended one of the meetings. I am totally in favour of renewable energy but totally opposed to this project. How can I comment all the various aspects when there is little detail available and the the stock answer from advisors is 'We don't know yet'. The documentation is probably the worst I have ever seen and my perception is that it is deliberately designed to confuse residents and hide all the unsavoury bits deep in the detail which consists of techno jargon and, at worst, gobbledegook. The choice of location where the cables are shown as coming ashore is probable the worst it could possibly be (though again I was told 'no-one really knows yet) as it would damage the fragile dune ecology, the nature reserve containing rare species part of a breeding program to try and save them, the environmental corridor behind my house (which no advisors knew existed) and wildlife area which is part of the runway approach to Blackpool airport. None of your advisors even knew the area, had never visited the site or had any knowledge of the environmental issues involved. It's difficult to comment on the level of detail you seen to require when you are not able to answer questions. A total disaster from start to finish!</p>	<p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Maximum parameters for the substation have been refined following statutory consultation.</p> <p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Specifically, the landscape and visual assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES) (document reference F3.10)) and onshore ecology assessment (Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES) (document reference F3.3)) set out the respective maximum design scenarios, and identify the likely significant effects during construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning, temporally and seasonally (where relevant), with and without mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p> <p>The Applicants are committed to robust and transparent public consultation as part of the development process. The Transmission Assets has undertaken three rounds of consultation with the local community, including two non-statutory periods of consultation (2 November to 13 December 2022 and 19 April to 4 June 2023) and a statutory consultation (12 October to 23 November 2023). Statutory targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).</p> <p>In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used,</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events. The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. Consultation materials, including the brochure, SoCC, PEIR NTS and feedback forms were also made available on the Applicants' consultation website and as hard copies at reference deposit locations for the duration of the consultation. Information about impacts on all areas was also included in consultation documents.
TA_0076_003_091123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.2	Do not want this to harm the St Annes pier of the views	This response appears to relate to the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and/or the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (the generation assets), which are subject to separate applications for development consent.
TA_0083_003_221123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.2	I do not want this project to go ahead in my local community	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0086_001_211123	S44	Online feedback form	1		<p>Strongly object to the proposed off shore wind farm route cabling on shore here on the Fylde coast and the destruction and disruption to our roads, farmlands natural green spaces for many years to come.</p> <p>The meetings I attended could not give a definite plan for the 120m wide cable route crossing Queensway (B5261) and could not determine where along Queensway this would be to the rear of our properties on REDACTED, this could result in property subsidence ,</p> <p>Noise, pollution etc for years to come and devaluation of our properties. We have lived here for over 50 years, we actively ran a market garden business until the Dutch ruined that, so we feel we know the local land problems round here and what the size of this proposal would impact on this area</p> <p>We have lots of wildlife around here both on land and in the various watercourses surrounding the farmlands, we can't keep pushing this wild life away from here for this proposal, it has already been pushed away from the development at Richmond Point, and the new EZ sports village.</p> <p>Not happy about the disruption to the sand dunes and traffic congestion along Clifton Drive if the cables cross here, the nature reserve Will be affected also.</p> <p>We have recently had a lot of traffic congestion along Queensway/Common Edge Road and surrounding roads caused by the new EZ development, this being the main route of 2 from Blackpool to St Annes, this congestion was horrendous and could not be avoided, we do not want to go through that again</p> <p>We know the importance of green energy and understand that, but feel this is not the on shore place for it, spoiling green belt and natural habitats, bridleways, traffic congestion, flooding, noise and property devaluation because of it, REDACTED is considered as one of the most expensive Lanes on the Fylde Coast, many residents have horses and chose to live here for that reason.</p> <p>We don't want any interruption to farmlands either, we need them.</p> <p>So I strongly object to these proposals</p>	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0092__008_151123	S44	Online feedback form	1		It would be good to understand the impact on marine life. Will there be opportunities for local businesses to get involved in the project in terms of labour/construction/administration etc and would there be a requirement for skilling those employees - potential to work with the College around training and provision of any apprentices.	An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken for the offshore topics of the Transmission Assets Application and is presented in Volume 2 of the ES (document reference F2). Specific examples relevant to marine life are listed below. - Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3). - Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4). - Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5). <p>An Outline Employment and Skills Plan has been prepared and submitted as part of the application for development consent (document reference J31). This will be developed further post-consent to detail how the Applicants will engage with local workers and training providers for anticipated employment opportunities associated with the Transmission Assets.</p>
TA_0092__010_151123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.2	Impact on marine life. Report states will aim to conserve habitats for marine life - how and what are the assurances?	<p>An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken for the offshore topics of the Transmission Assets Application and is presented in Volume 2 of the ES (document reference F2). Specific examples relevant to marine life are listed below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2). - Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3). - Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4). - Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5).
TA_0092__016_151123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.9	Need to ensure that the project continues to be sympathetic to all sea users and the environment	<p>An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken for the offshore topics of the Transmission Assets Application and is presented in Volume 2 of the ES (document reference F2). Specific examples relevant to marine life are listed below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2). - Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3). - Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4). - Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5). <p>The impacts of the Transmission Assets (alone and in-combination with other projects), including those on recreational shipping, are assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 9: Other sea users of the ES (document reference: 2.9). More information and details of the proposed mitigation measures are described in the updated Volume 2, Annex 7.1: NRA of the ES and Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and navigation chapter of the ES (document reference: F2.7.1 and F2.7, respectively) submitted as part of the Application.</p>
TA_0097_002_171123	S44	Online feedback form	2		I'm not sure of the full facts of what impact this has on the sea life this must be disruptive to their environment but I would prefer off shore power then building wind farms on shore close to peoples home and considering the list of ill effects this can cause on adults children and animals and the building, noise and eye sore on our country side. I do not want a on shore wind farm where I live in Newton.	<p>An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken for the offshore topics of the Transmission Assets Application and is presented in Volume 2 of the ES (document reference F2). Specific examples relevant to marine life are listed below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2). - Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						(document reference F2.3). - Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4). - Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5). Detailed assessments are provided within all onshore chapters within Volumes 3 and 4 of the ES (document reference F3 and F4). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets and will continue to work closely with all stakeholders.
TA_0106_003_281023	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.2	In summary, the project cannot be expected to be neutral to this aspect and will have only negative consequences. This applies to the following sections.	An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken for the offshore topics of the Transmission Assets Application and is presented in Volume 2 of the ES (document reference F2). Specific examples relevant to marine life are listed below. - Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2). - Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3). - Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4). - Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5).
TA_0108_003_231123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.2	Loss of high quality farmland. Known flood areas. Devastating consequences for Newton, Kirkham and Freckleton	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES. A flood risk assessment assessing all sources of flooding, including sewers is presented within Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3). The proposed permanent infrastructure associated with the Morgan and Morecambe substations are located within Flood Zone 1 and has a low risk of flooding from all other assessed sources.

E1.16.8.2 Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology table of responses (via all other methods)

Table E1.16.8.2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology table of responses (via all other methods)

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0001_001_231123	S42	Email	<p>1.1 Fylde MCZ – concerns relating to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cable installation • Sandwave clearance • Cable protection • O&M activities <p>Further recommendation to mitigate impacts for permanent habitat loss We advise that where possible, the avoid, reduce, mitigate hierarchy should be employed to reduce environmental impacts (please see: Environmental considerations for offshore wind and cable projects - 52965454Nature conservation considerations and environmental best practice for subsea cables for English Inshore and UK offshore waters, Sept 22.pdf - All Documents (sharepoint.com)). We advise that if the level of interaction with Fylde MCZ cannot be avoided, the next stage of the mitigation hierarchy would be for the project to minimise the amount of cable protection within the designated site. We highlight that other projects such as the original Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon OWF did not require cable protection, therefore further exploration of cable protection requirements is needed within Fylde MCZ, as well as development of design and installation measures that will increase the likelihood of successful burial. A Cable Burial Risk Assessment (CBRA) should be developed and submitted at the time of Application to understand the level of risk and inform those design and installation measures. If the project cannot avoid or reduce the level of interaction with Fylde MCZ, we strongly advise that the developer takes all feasible steps to reduce the level of cable protection and embeds the need to mitigate for processes impacts in the project design. We also advise that the submitted Environmental Statement (ES) should include a commitment to remove cable protection from the MCZ as part of the decommissioning plan. At present there are existing methodologies in the market, which with refinements in the future should allow the recovery of external cable protection. These were explored for the Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon Offshore Windfarm Extension Projects, further details can be found here - EN010109-000218-9.7.3 Cable Protection Decommissioning Feasibility.pdf (planninginspectorate.gov.uk) Further recommendation to mitigate impacts for sandwave clearance The area impacted by sandwave clearance within Fylde MCZ is large. We recommend the use of best practice methods to reduce the area impacted by disposal including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All efforts to avoid areas of sandwaves or minimise the need for sandwave clearance by micrositing should be explored. • Disposal of sediment should be within an area of similar sediment type and remain in the same sediment system. • The use of a fall pipe (also referred to as a downpipe) to dispose of material as close to the sea bed as possible to increase accuracy of disposal compared to surface release. • Dispose of material up drift of the cable route to allow infill to occur as quickly as possible following cable route installation. 	<p>The Applicants note Natural England's concerns relating to impacts to the Fylde MCZ and would highlight that the mitigation hierarchy has been considered at every stage in the design and development of the project. The Stage 1 MCZ Assessment for the final application has been updated to make this clearer (document reference E4). In summary;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid - There are a number offshore constraints (detailed in the Site Selection chapter) including designated sites and existing infrastructure that makes an overlap with the Fylde MCZ unavoidable. • Minimise: - as part of the initial site selection process, the route was chosen to cross the MCZ at its the narrowest point and to reduce the number of cable crossings within the site. • Minimise - in acknowledgment of the mitigation hierarchy, and to incorporate feedback from Natural England a number of PDE refinements have been made between the PEIR and to final application. These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for cable protection (and associated long term habitat loss) within the Fylde MCZ. Project engineers have refined the cable protection parameters in the Fylde MCZ from 20% to 3% contingency for the Morgan export cables and from 15% to 3% contingency for the Morecambe export cables. It should be noted that the aim is to bury all cables in the first instance and only where this is unsuccessful would cable protection be required. Cable protection within the MCZ will very much be a contingency measure. • Minimise - on the point of decommissioning, the project has committed to ensuring that all external cable protection used within the MCZ will be designed to be removable on decommissioning with the requirement for removal agreed with stakeholders and regulators at the time of decommissioning. <p>An outline Cable Burial Risk Assessment and Burial Assessment Study has been developed, which forms part of the outline CSIP (document reference J15). Commitments relating to the usage and scale of cable protection are included in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments Register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). With further project definition, the potential impacts relating to activities such as seabed preparation have been refined as presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The assessment methodology in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1) and Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) includes assessment of activities where likely significant effects may occur. With respect to comments relating to sandwave clearance, a number of PDE refinements have been made between the PEIR and final application. These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for sandwave clearance (and associated temporary habitat disturbance) within the Fylde MCZ. Project engineers have refined the parameters for sandwave clearance in the Fylde MCZ from 60% to 5% for the Morgan export cables and from 30% to 5% for the Morecambe export cables. It should also be noted that sandwave clearance is an important tool to facilitate the successful burial of cables and to minimise the requirements for external cable protection.</p>
TA_0001_002_231123	S42	Email	<p>1.2 The Maximum Design Scenario's (MDS) for sandwave clearance and other seabed preparation activities (within and outside of protected areas) is large. While we support the use of sandwave levelling as a form of mitigation measure to reduce the likelihood of using cable protection; there is a considerable amount of sandwave clearance and seabed preparation footprint proposed. We advise that all efforts should be made to avoid areas of sandwaves or minimise the need for clearance by micro- routing cables. Therefore, we encourage refinement of the MDS as much as possible using project specific acoustic</p>	<p>A number of PDE refinements have been made between the PEIR and final application with further detail presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for sandwave clearance (and associated temporary habitat disturbance) within the Fylde MCZ. Project engineers have refined the parameters for sandwave clearance in the Fylde MCZ from 60% to 5% for the Morgan export cables and from 30% to 5% for the Morecambe export cables. It should also be noted that sandwave</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			data. Full consideration should also be given to relocation of any disposal material and impacts that may have. We advise where possible disposal is within area of similar sediment type and within the same sediment system.	clearance is an important tool to facilitate the successful burial of cables and to minimise the requirements for external cable protection. The techniques used for sandwave clearance will be undertaken with the aim of depositing material in the direct vicinity of its original location, with no sediment being removed from the sediment cell.
TA_0001_003_231123	S42	Email	1.3 Where the cable corridor crosses an area of high-density boulders and coarse material, we recommend the developer considers micro-siting if there is capacity within the planned cable corridor. We note that the developer has stated boulder clearance would occur within the footprint of installation activities. All efforts to avoid areas of boulders or minimise the need for boulder clearance by micro-siting should be explored through a boulder clearance methodology and stated within the Application. Placement of boulders should be carefully considered to minimise impact on sediment movement.	Micrositing of cables around boulders would be onerous and impractical. Boulders pose a risk of damage and exposure to cables as well as an obstruction risk to the cable installation equipment. Therefore, any boulders identified as likely to impact installation will need to be moved to the side (side cast), away from the immediate location of the cable infrastructure. There are two key methods of clearing boulders, boulder plough and boulder grab. Where a high density of boulders is seen, the expectation is that a plough will be required to clear the cable installation corridor. Where medium and low densities of boulders are present, a subsea grab is expected to be employed. Boulder clearance will occur within the footprint of other site preparation activities. All boulders will remain in the vicinity (i.e. sidecast only) of the area they were cleared from. As boulder clearance is anticipated to take the form of sidecasting, the activity will not result in significant increases in SSC or changes to the seabed characteristics or physical processes.
TA_0001_004_231123	S42	Email	1.3 MCZ Assessment 1.5.4.15 - "It should be noted that boulder clearance will occur over the same location as the sandwave clearance." We advise that the removal of large boulders along the cable corridor could represent a significant alteration to the composition of the seabed. We also note that the developer will include a dredging and disposal site characterisation report (MCZ Assessment 1.5.4.16). We recommend that the dredging and disposal site characterisation includes an analysis of geophysical data to establish with a better degree of certainty the areas where boulder and sandwave clearance would be necessary.	Any boulders identified as likely to impact installation will need to be moved to the side (i.e. side cast), away from the immediate location of the cable infrastructure. There are two key methods of clearing boulders, boulder plough and boulder grab. Where a high density of boulders is seen, the expectation is that a plough will be required to clear the cable installation corridor. Where medium and low densities of boulders are present, a subsea grab is expected to be employed. Boulder clearance will occur within the footprint of other site preparation activities. All boulders will remain in the vicinity (i.e. sidecast only) of the area they were cleared from and therefore there will be no significant alteration to the composition of the seabed in the MCZ. As boulder clearance is anticipated to take the form of sidecasting it will not result in significant increases in SSC or changes to the seabed characteristics for physical processes.
TA_0001_012_231123	S42	Email	1.11 Volume 1, Chapter 3, 3.7.3 Natural England acknowledges that the developer will submit a UXO clearance method statement once UXO surveys are complete. Applications should provide sufficient information to assess the size and depths of craters within the ES and commit to avoiding sensitive benthic receptors. This is especially important where UXO clearance may affect designated sites or features. A more detailed assessment of potential crater impacts should be included within the final application.	Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) has been updated to include an assessment of temporary habitat disturbance associated with potential UXO detonation. An assessment of the clearance of the largest anticipated UXO is provided within Volume 1, Annex 5.2: Underwater Sound Technical Report of the ES (document reference F1.5.2).
TA_0001_014_231123	S42	Email	1.13 Volume 1, Chapter 3, 3.7.3.9 Where the cable corridor crosses an area of high-density boulders and coarse material, we recommend the developer considers micro-siting if there is capacity within the planned cable corridor. We note that the developer has stated boulder clearance would occur within the footprint of installation activities. However, specific boulder clearance methodology and the location for boulder deposition should clearly be stated within the Application. Boulder clearance methodology and location of boulder deposition should be clearly stated within the ES along with further details for micro-siting of cables if applicable.	The description of seabed preparation including boulder clearance has been refined and is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Micrositing of cables around boulders would be onerous and impractical. Boulders pose a risk of damage and exposure to cables as well as an obstruction risk to the cable installation equipment. Therefore, any boulders identified as likely to impact installation will need to be moved to the side (side cast), away from the immediate location of the cable infrastructure. There are two key methods of clearing boulders, boulder plough and boulder grab. Where a high density of boulders is seen, the expectation is that a plough will be required to clear the cable installation corridor. Where medium and low densities of boulders are present, a subsea grab is expected to be employed. Boulder clearance will occur within the footprint of other site preparation activities. All boulders will remain in the vicinity (i.e. sidecast only) of the area they were cleared from. Sidecasting will not result in significant increases in SSC or changes to the seabed characteristics or physical processes.
TA_0001_015_231123	S42	Email	1.14 Volume 1, Chapter 3, 3.7.3.10 It is noted that if offshore infrastructure crosses existing out of service cables, the developer intends on removing these. We advise that the specific methodology for the proposed cable removal along with any associated impacts should be stated in the Application. We agree that this should also be undertaken in consultation with the asset owner and in accordance with the International Cable Protection Committee guidelines (2011). The proposed cable removal methodology for existing out of service	The methodology for cable removal is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			cables should be clearly stated within the submitted ES and undertaken in consultation with the asset owner and the International Cable Protection Committee guidelines (2011)	
TA_0001_016_231123	S42	Email	1.15 Volume 1,Chapter 3,3.7.3.12 We note that the MDS for sandwave clearance is based on the assumption that up to 60% of the cable route and 60% of foundation locations may require sandwave clearance. These are exceptionally large areas when compared to other offshore windfarm projects.We strongly recommend effort is taken to refine down this substantial MDS for sandwave clearance in the final application. We advise that site-specific geophysical survey data should be used to refine the MDS. The extent and location of sediment disturbance (area, volume) should be provided for affected MPAs/features (e.g. Fylde MCZ). Natural England also queries how will the sediment be retained within designated sites to ensure that the subtidal mud and sand will fully recover i.e., have the same structure and function.	PDE refinements have been made between the PEIR and final application using the available geophysical survey data. These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for sandwave clearance (and associated temporary habitat disturbance) within the Fylde MCZ. Project engineers have refined the parameters for sandwave clearance in the Fylde MCZ from 60% to 5% for the Morgan export cables and from 30% to 5% for the Morecambe export cables. It should also be noted that sandwave clearance is an important tool to facilitate the successful burial of cables and to minimise the requirements for external cable protection.The techniques used for sandwave clearance will be undertaken with the aim of depositing material in the direct vicinity of its original location, with no sediment being removed from the sediment cell. Further information has been provided within Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), section 1.10: Assessment of effects, to characterise the recoverability of sandwave features within the physical processes study area.
TA_0001_017_231123	S42	Email	1.16 Volume 1,Chapter 3, Table 3.5 It seems that some parameters associated with sandwave clearance have not been included, without these it is not clear how the figures for sandwave clearance and seabed preparation were derived. The developer mentions 60% of the cable route and 60% of the foundations may need sandwave clearance. We suggest all parameters (i.e. length/width/area/depth) should be included in the MDS tables.We advise the developer to consider additional parameters for inclusion in Table 3.5 to provide clarity around the sandwave volume MDS figures, namely:- Length of cable route requiring sandwave clearance (km)- Width of sandwave clearance disturbance corridor (m)- Indicative depth of sandwave clearance dredging (m)- Area of seabed disturbed by sandwave clearance (m2)- Seabed preparation areas for foundations (m2).36	PDE refinements have been made between the PEIR and final application. These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for sandwave clearance (and associated temporary habitat disturbance) within the Fylde MCZ. Project engineers have refined the parameters for sandwave clearance, using the available geophysical survey data, in the Fylde MCZ from 60% to 5% for the Morgan export cables and from 30% to 5% for the Morecambe export cables. Further information has been provided within Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), section 1.10, Assessment of effects, to characterise the recoverability of sandwave features within the physical processes study area. Parameters such as length, width, depth and volume of sandwave clearance have been included within Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), Table 1.13: Maximum design scenario considered for the assessment of impacts. Full details of the refined MDS applicable to fish and shellfish ecology are outlined within section 3.9.1 of Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3).
TA_0001_018_231123	S42	Email	1.17 Volume 1,Chapter 3,Table 3.6 The MDS for OSPs is high when compared to other projects of a similar scale (i.e. 6 x OSPs, 1 booster station).We advise that this is refined. We note that for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project, the developer has included two different MDS options for OSPs. Natural England advise that the preferred option would be to have 1 large OSP rather than 4 small OSP as this will have a smaller footprint and therefore least impact on the seabed.Clarify and refine OSP parameters for the ES submission. Include seabed preparation parameters for the areas for foundations (as mentioned above).	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications.
TA_0001_019_231123	S42	Email	1.18 Volume 1,Chapter 3, Tables3.9 –3.14The MDS for boulder clearance has not been defined, it has been assumed this falls within the seabed preparation footprint. However, MDS for boulder clearance should also include consideration for the fate of removed boulders. For example, location ofdeposits, boulder size.We advise that acoustic data should allow for specific locations requiring boulder clearance and refinement of the MDS. The total area of impact presented in the submitted ES should consider where the boulders are placed, as well as where they are removed from.	The description of seabed preparation including boulder clearance has been refined and is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Any boulders identified as likely to impact installation will need to be moved to the side (i.e. side cast), away from the immediate location of the cable infrastructure. There are two key methods of clearing boulders, boulder plough and boulder grab. Where a high density of boulders is seen, the expectation is that a plough will be required to clear the cable installation corridor. Where medium and low densities of boulders are present, a subsea grab is expected to be employed. Boulder clearance will occur within the footprint of other site preparation activities. As boulder clearance is anticipated to take the form of sidcasting, the activity will not result in significant increases in SSC, significant alteration to the composition of the seabed or physical processes.
TA_0001_020_231123	S42	Email	1.19 Volume 1, Chapter 3, Table 3.10 It is not clear how the MDS for Scour Protection Area has been calculated for the Array Foundations. Please provide a rationale for the MDS Scour Protection Area for Array Foundations in the submitted ES.	The Applicants note your response and the OSPs and Array Foundations are to be classed as part of the Generation Assets DCO Applications only. They have been removed from the Transmission Assets DCO Application.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0001_021_231123	S42	Email	1.2 Volume 1, Chapter 3, Tables 3.9 – 3.14 It is not clear whether secondary scour has been included in the project description and MDS parameters. The project description only refers to scour protection. We advise that secondary scour protection impacts are scoped in and included in the MDS parameters. If they are included within the project description, this should be clearly stated and defined in the submitted ES.	Secondary scour has been considered within the assessment and CEA of the ES, as seen within Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), section 1.10 Assessment of effects and section 1.12 Cumulative effects assessment. Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) has been updated to include an assessment of secondary scour which draws on the assessment presented in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1).
TA_0001_022_231123	S42	Email	1.21 Volume 1, Chapter 3, Table 3.18 The MDS for width of export cable protection is 10m, is this per cable or in total (i.e. 6 cables)? Please clarify.	Clarification that export cable widths are per cable now added. The MDS for width of export cable, as found in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES, Table 1.13: Maximum design scenario considered for assessment of impacts, now states a value of 10 m and 10 m per cable for the Morgan export cables and Morecambe export cables, respectively.
TA_0001_023_231123	S42	Email	1.22 Volume 1, Chapter 3, Section 3.7.9.3 The parameters for cable crossings have not been defined in this Chapter, NE acknowledges the developer needs to confirm crossings with the asset owner. However, when this information is known, please provide further information on MDS parameters for cable crossing (i.e. indicative number of crossings, specific locations, overlap with MPAs etc) and methodology in line with best practise guidance. The potential interruption of sediment transport and resulting morphological change due to the presence of cable crossings near sensitive receptors and pathways should also be considered in the ES. Please provide further information on cable crossings in the submitted ES, in line with best practice guidance as set out in Natural England's Best Practice Guidance Phase III. If any MPAs, sensitive features, or sensitive areas of seabed are likely to be impacted by cable crossings, then the extent of the impact and location should be stated.	There will be one cable crossing (for all four Morgan export cables) within the boundary of the Fylde MCZ. These have been mapped and fully assessed in the Stage 1 MCZ assessment (document reference E4). No cable crossings are required in the Fylde MCZ for the Morecambe export cables. Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3) has been updated to show where the refinements made and the locations of cable crossings and these are cross referenced in Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) and Volume 2, Chapter 1 Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1).
TA_0001_024_231123	S42	Email	1.23 Volume 1, Chapter 3, Section 3.7.9.4 It remains unclear if or how much cable protection will be required within Fylde MCZ. We advise that a detailed cable burial risk assessment is provided as part of the Application. This should include an outline burial cable specification and installation plan which has a pollution and contingency plan. Provide a cable burial risk assessment as part of the Application.	Cable protection within the MCZ may be up to 3% of the total cable route. An outline Cable Burial Risk Assessment and Burial Assessment Study has been developed (document reference J14) alongside an outline CSIP (document reference J15).
TA_0001_028_231123	S42	Email	1.27 Volume 1 Chapter 3/Volume 2, Chapter 1 The information on indicative MDS for cable crossing dimensions or potential locations of cable crossings is unclear. Natural England advises that further information on cable crossings, including MDS parameters and an indicative schematic is provided in the submitted ES. This should show MDS cable crossing cross-section and plan, and also a map identifying potential cable crossing locations, if possible.	There will be one cable crossing (for all four Morgan export cables) within the boundary of the Fylde MCZ. These have been mapped and fully assessed in the Stage 1 MCZ assessment (document reference E4). No cable crossings are required in the Fylde MCZ for the Morecambe export cables. Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3) has been updated to show where the refinements made and the locations of cable crossings and these are cross referenced in Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) and Volume 2, Chapter 1 Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1).
TA_0001_033_231123	S42	Email	1.32 Volume 2, Chapter 1, Table 1.7 We do not agree that scour of seabed should be scoped out of the assessment. We advise that scour of seabed should be included in the submitted assessment, in line with best practice guidance as set out in Natural England's Best Practice Guidance Phase III.	Secondary scour has been considered within the assessment and CEA of the ES, as seen within Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), section 1.10 Assessment of effects and Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), section 1.12 Cumulative effects assessment. The Applicants have also updated Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) to include an assessment of secondary scour which draws on the assessment presented in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1).
TA_0001_037_231123	S42	Email	1.36 Volume 2, Chapter 1, Section 1.9.2.26 We welcome the inclusion of a Cable Burial Risk Assessment (CBRA) to inform maintenance and reburial specification in line with the project commitment CoT45. We advise that the CBRA is provided and secured appropriately with the Application and includes information in line with Natural England's Best Practice Guidance Phase III. We advise that the developer's CBRA is provided and secured appropriately with the Application and includes information in line with Natural England's Best Practice Guidance Phase III, namely: - Method(s) to be used - Overlap with MPA(s) - Habitats impacted - Presence of sensitive species and habitats - Total number of events (for the lifetime of the cable) - Frequency (worst case scenario)	An outline Cable Burial Risk Assessment and outline Burial Assessment Study has been developed (document reference J14), as well as an outline CSIP (document reference J15). Commitments relating to the usage and scale of cable protection are included in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), Table 1.12: Measures (commitments) adopted as part of the Transmission Assets, with the full list of commitments included in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments Register (document reference F1.5.3). The assessment methodology in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), section 1.9 Assessment methodology includes assessment of activities where likely significant effects may occur. With further

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			Duration of each event (worst case scenario)- Total area of impact per event (worst case scenario)- Impacts from sediment plumes, if applicable	project definition the potential impacts relating to activities such as seabed preparation have been refined as presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).
TA_0001_040_231123	S42	Email	1.39 Volume 2, Chapter 1, Section 1.9.3 We welcome the Project's commitment CoT47 and note that this will include measures to limit the extent of cable protection within the Fylde MCZ, whilst the preferred option for cable protection is cable burial. However, it is not currently stated or assessed whether cable protection is anticipated to affect anyMPAs (namely Fylde MCZ and Ribble MCZ) or sensitive features.We advise that the impacts of cable protection on MPAs or sensitive features are a key consenting risk for the project, and this should be reflected in the level of assessment in the submitted ES. If any MPAs or sensitive features are likely to be impacted by cable protection, then the extent of the impact and location should be stated.	The impacts of cable protection on sensitive benthic habitats and features of MPAs (including the Fylde MCZ) are fully assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) and also in the Stage 1 MCZ Assessment (document reference E4). Cable protection within the MCZ may be up to 3% of the cable route. It will however be designed to be readily removable, and mitigated in line with the commitments described in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), Table 1.12: Measures (commitments) adopted as part of the Transmission Assets. This comment therefore falls in line with the commitments and approach proposed within the ES. Further information regarding the commitments for the Transmission Assets can be found in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments Register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).
TA_0001_041_231123	S42	Email	1.4 Impacts to sediment transport pathways due to the presence of physical structures.CoT47 states that no material will be placed on the bed's surface in the inter-tidal region and low profile/tapered armouring would be employed in shallowwater should this be required.CoT47 should be defined and extended to the depth of closure based on average significant wave heights.	Where practicable the requirements for cable protection will be compliant with the Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA) navigation guidance which includes that there will be no more than a 5% reduction in water depth (referenced to Chart Datum) at any point along the cable route (MCA, 2021) without prior consultation with the MCA and licencing authorities. In line with best practice, no material will be placed on the bed's surface in the inter-tidal region and low profile/tapered armouring would be employed in shallow water. This comment aligns with the commitments and approach proposed within the ES, as described in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments Register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3), and presented within Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1) and Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2).
TA_0001_043_231123	S42	Email	1.42 Volume 2, Chapter 1 1.9.4.10; 1.9.4.14; 1.11.5.10; Modelling undertaken for OSP structures for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets PEIR and Morecambe Offshore windfarm project showed that given their position and distance offshore there would be no pathway to impact upon adjacent shorelines. Natural England agrees with this conclusion. N/A	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications.
TA_0001_044_231123	S42	Email	1.43 Volume 2, Chapter 11.9.4.14 For the Transmission Assets the magnitude and areas affected by cable protection will be specific to the location,i.e. water depth, orientation to tidal flow and length of continuous protection. From the modelling undertaken for the Mona and Morecambe Offshore Wind Project PEIR it may be concluded that Fylde MCZ and designated areas associated with the Ribble Estuary may be affected if cable protection is placed within these areas. Additionally, the effects of cable protection within the nearshore will be mitigated with the use of low profile tapered mattressing to be detailed in the CSIP.The area which should be exempt to cable protection to prevent impacts on sediment transport should be further defined and extended to the depth of closure based on average significant wave heights, and secured appropriately in the application.The depth of cable burial should be defined in the CSIP and agreed in order to prevent the need for cable protection.There should be a commitment made in the DCO to remove cable protection from the 'nearshore' as part of the decommissioning plan. Any cable protection used should be designed to be removeable to prevent permanentimpacts.	A number of PDE refinements have been made between the PEIR and to final application. These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for cable protection (and associated long term habitat loss) within the Fylde MCZ. Cable protection parameters in the Fylde MCZ have reduced from 20% to 3% contingency for the Morgan export cables and from 15% to 3% contingency for the Morecambe export cables. Cable protection will be designed to be readily removable, and mitigated in line with the commitments list which can be found in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments Register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). Effects are fully assessed Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2), in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), section 1.10 (Assessment of effects) and in the Stage 1 MCZ Assessment (document reference E4). Where practicable the requirements will be compliant with the Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA) navigation guidance which includes that there will be no more than a 5% reduction in water depth (referenced to Chart Datum) at any point along the cable route (MCA, 2021). The project has also committed to ensuring that all external cable protection used within the MCZ will be designed to be removable on decommissioning with the requirement for removal agreed with stakeholders and regulators at the time of decommissioning.
TA_0001_054_231123	S42	Email	2.1 Long term habitat loss within Fylde MCZThe assessment states that the Maximum Design Scenario (MDS) for long term habitat loss within Fylde MCZ equates to 159,580 m2 of total long term habitat loss within the Fylde MCZ. Natural England advise that this is a significant level of long-term habitat loss within Fylde MCZ. The direct habitat loss of features of the MCZ due to cable/scour protection within the site constitutes a lasting impact over the lifetime of the project which is potentially irreversible.It is our opinion that	The Applicants note Natural England's concerns relating to impacts to the Fylde MCZ and would highlight that the mitigation hierarchy has been considered at every stage in the design and development of the project. The Stage 1 MCZ Assessment (document reference E4) for the final application has been updated to make this clearer. In summary;Avoid - There are a number offshore constraints (detailed in the Site Selection chapter) including designated sites and existing infrastructure that makes an overlap

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>the proposal has a significant risk of hindering the objectives of the MCZ. 2.2 Proposed hard infrastructure to be left in situ following decommissioning phase: The MDS assumes the complete removal of all foundations and cables but that all cable and scour protection may be left in situ. This would equate to permanent changes in the benthic habitats within the site. We highlight that most of the study area comprises of sand/coarse mix material; it is a very sedimentary, dynamic part of the Irish Sea. Having permanent hard infrastructure present may impact the natural sedimentary process in the area. Additionally, it will increase the risk of phase shifts in benthic community composition (including invasive non-native species) due to the addition of hard substrate. We are particularly concerned with cable and scour protection (i.e. hard infrastructure) being left in situ within Natural England strongly advise that the developer considers a commitment to remove cable protection from Fylde MCZ as part of the decommissioning plan. We advise that the avoid, reduce, mitigate hierarchy should be employed to reduce impacts to the MCZ, drawing on best practice guidance for cable installation produced by NE and JNCC. We advise that if the level of interaction with Fylde MCZ cannot be avoided, the next stage of the mitigation hierarchy would be for the project to minimise the amount of cable protection within the designated site. However, we do acknowledge there is a likelihood of needing cable protection within Fylde MCZ and we therefore advise that the developer should explore options for an in-principle Measures of Equivalent Environmental Benefit (MEEB) Plan. Further advice on habitat loss within MCZs is provided within Appendix A of this response letter.</p>	<p>with the Fylde MCZ unavoidable. Minimise - as part of the initial site selection process, the route was chosen to cross the MCZ at its the narrowest point and to reduce the number of cable crossings within the site. Minimise - in acknowledgment of the mitigation hierarchy, and to incorporate feedback from Natural England a number of PDE refinements have been made between the PEIR and to final application. These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for cable protection (and associated long term habitat loss) within the Fylde MCZ. Project engineers have refined the cable protection parameters in the Fylde MCZ from 20% to 3% contingency for the Morgan export cables and from 15% to 3% contingency for the Morecambe export cables. It should be noted that the aim is to bury all cables in the first instance and only where this is unsuccessful would cable protection be required. Cable protection within the MCZ will very much be a contingency measure. Minimise - on the point of decommissioning, the project has also committed to ensuring that all external cable protection used within the MCZ will be designed to be removable on decommissioning with the requirement for removal agreed with stakeholders and regulators at the time of decommissioning. The Applicant's position remains that there will be no significant risks to the achievement of the Fylde MCZ conservation objectives and a Stage 2 assessment is not required.</p>
TA_0001_055_231123	S42	Email	<p>2.2 Proposed hard infrastructure to be left in situ following decommissioning phase: The MDS assumes the complete removal of all foundations and cables but that all cable and scour protection may be left in situ. This would equate to permanent changes in the benthic habitats within the site. We highlight that most of the study area comprises of sand/coarse mix material; it is a very sedimentary, dynamic part of the Irish Sea. Having permanent hard infrastructure present may impact the natural sedimentary process in the area. Additionally, it will increase the risk of phase shifts in benthic community composition (including invasive non-native species) due to the addition of hard substrate. We are particularly concerned with cable and scour protection (i.e. hard infrastructure) being left in situ within Natural England strongly advise that the developer considers a commitment to remove cable protection from Fylde MCZ as part of the decommissioning plan.</p>	<p>The project has committed to ensuring that all external cable protection used within the Fylde MCZ will be designed to be removable on decommissioning with the requirement for removal agreed with stakeholders and regulators at the time of decommissioning.</p>
TA_0001_056_231123	S42	Email	<p>2.3 In some instances where sensitivity of a habitat is measured as medium to one pressure that is likely to be exerted, Natural England would argue that sensitivity to a second pressure being low does not average out to low sensitivity over the two pressures. More generally Natural England notes that the approach to the EIA assessment is proposed to align with other OWF NSIPs. Natural England notes numerous instances where significance has been presented as a range (i.e., slight, or moderate, or large) and it is nearly always the lower value that has been taken forward. In the absence of evidence to support the use of the lower value in a range, Natural England's view is that the higher value should always be assessed in order to ensure that impacts on features are not incorrectly screened out of further assessment. Natural England recommends that the most precautionary sensitivity is used when combining pressures.</p>	<p>The assessments presented in Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) have been checked and updated to ensure the most precautionary sensitivity is applied when combining pressures. In accordance with the EIA methodology for the project, where a range of significance levels is presented, the final assessment for each effect is based upon expert judgement and explanations are provided in the text.</p>
TA_0001_057_231123	S42	Email	<p>2.4 Natural England is concerned that no proposed future monitoring is being proposed to test predictions being made within the impact assessment. We advise that the project should have adequate scope to include long term impact/recovery monitoring especially for receptors of medium and high sensitivity. An appropriate Benthic Monitoring Plan should be established at key impact locations that spatially and temporally represent all impacted biotopes, habitats, and species. The designated habitats of the Fylde MCZ should be a particular focus of the monitoring plan. Appropriate survey design and power analysis should be conducted to ensure that adequate data is collected for long term comparisons of the effect of change compared to baseline data. Recommendation</p>	<p>Benthic monitoring has been considered in the outline In Principle Monitoring Plan (IPMP) (document reference J20) and will consider whether existing asset integrity surveys can have scope added to cover benthic monitoring (e.g. of recovery of seabed topography after trenching/sandwave clearance). Monitoring will focus on the Fylde MCZ.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0001_058_231123	S42	Email	2.5 3.7.5.2 We advise that that more detail on the anticipated locations of turbines and their type of foundation is required in order to more accurately assess the impacts on benthic ecology. We advise that more detail on the type of foundation, orientation, and distribution pattern of the turbines relative to mean currents and tidal patterns is required as part of the ES submission.	This response appears to relate to the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and/or the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (the generation assets), which are subject to separate applications for development consent.
TA_0001_059_231123	S42	Email	2.6 Volume 1, Chapter 3, 3.7.3 Natural England acknowledges that the developer will submit a UXO clearance method statement once UXO surveys are complete. Applications should provide sufficient information to assess the size and depths of craters within the ES and commit to avoiding sensitive benthic receptors. This is especially important where UXO clearance may affect designated sites or features. A more detailed assessment of potential crater impacts should be included within the final application.	Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) has been updated to include an assessment of temporary habitat disturbance associated with potential UXO detonation.
TA_0001_060_231123	S42	Email	2.7 Volume 1, Chapter 3, 3.7.3 We welcome the developers consideration of low order UXO clearance methods such as deflagration and welcome further stakeholder consultation around these techniques should they be suitable. Follow up UXO clearance methodology through the EPP process and with stakeholders in statutory and non-statutory consultations.	The Applicants have proposed that any identified UXO needing clearing will be preferentially cleared using low order techniques. The Detailed MMMP(s) will include for the use of low order techniques, where possible, as the primary mitigation measure alongside other measures (as set out in CoT64). As such underwater noise modelling has been conducted for UXO clearance using both low order and high order methods.
TA_0001_061_231123	S42	Email	2.8 Volume 1, Chapter 3, 3.7.3.9 Where the cable corridor crosses an area of high-density boulders and coarse material, we recommend the developer considers micro-siting wherever there is capacity within the planned cable corridor. We note that the developer has stated boulder clearance would occur within the footprint of installation activities. However, specific boulder clearance methodology and the location for boulder deposition should clearly be stated within the Application. Boulder clearance methodology and location of boulder deposition should be clearly stated within the submitted ES, along with further details for micro-siting of cables if applicable.	Micrositing of cables around boulders would be onerous and impractical. Boulders pose a risk of damage and exposure to cables as well as an obstruction risk to the cable installation equipment. Therefore, any boulders identified as likely to impact installation will need to be moved to the side (side cast), away from the immediate location of the cable infrastructure. There are two key methods of clearing boulders, boulder plough and boulder grab. Where a high density of boulders is seen, the expectation is that a plough will be required to clear the cable installation corridor. Where medium and low densities of boulders are present, a subsea grab is expected to be employed. Boulder clearance will occur within the footprint of other site preparation activities. All boulders will remain in the vicinity (i.e. sidecast only) of the area they were cleared from.
TA_0001_062_231123	S42	Email	2.9 3.7.3.10 It is noted that if offshore infrastructure crosses existing out of service cables, the developer intends on removing these. We advise that the specific methodology for the proposed cable removal along with any associated impacts should be stated in the Application. We agree that this should also be undertaken in consultation with the asset owner and in accordance with the International Cable Protection Committee guidelines (2011). Proposed cable removal methodology for existing out of service cables should be clearly stated within the ES and undertaken in consultation with the asset owner and the International Cable Protection Committee guidelines (2011)	The methodology for cable removal is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES.
TA_0001_063_231123	S42	Email	2.1 3.7.3.12 We note that the MDS for sandwave clearance is based on the assumption that up to 60% of the cable route and 60% of foundation locations may require sandwave clearance. These are exceptionally large areas when compared to other offshore windfarm projects. We strongly recommend effort is taken to refine down this substantial MDS for sandwave clearance in the final application. We advise that site-specific geophysical survey data should be used to refine the MDS. The extent and location of sediment disturbance (area, volume) should be provided for affected MPAs/features (eg Fylde MCZ). Natural England also queries how will the sediment be retained within designated sites to ensure that the subtidal mud and	A number of PDE refinements have been made between the PEIR and final application. These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for sandwave clearance (and associated temporary habitat disturbance) within the Fylde MCZ. Project engineers have refined the parameters for sandwave clearance in the Fylde MCZ from 60% to 5% for the Morgan export cables and from 30% to 5% for the Morecambe export cables. It should also be noted that sandwave clearance is an important tool to facilitate the successful burial of cables and to minimise the requirements for external cable protection. The techniques used for sandwave clearance will be undertaken with the aim of depositing material in the direct vicinity of its original location, with no sediment being removed from the sediment cell.
TA_0001_064_231123	S42	Email	2.11 Table 3.5 It seems that some parameters associated with sandwave clearance have not been included, without these it is not clear how the figures for sandwave clearance and seabed preparation were derived. The developer mentions 60% of the cable route and 60% of the foundations may need sandwave clearance. We suggest all parameters (i.e. length/width/area/depth) should be included in the MDS tables. We advise the developer to consider additional parameters for inclusion in Table 3.5 to provide clarity around the sandwave volume MDS figures, namely: Length of cable route requiring sandwave clearance (km). Width of sandwave clearance disturbance corridor (m). Indicative	A number of PDE refinements have been made between the PEIR and final application. These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for sandwave clearance (and associated temporary habitat disturbance) within the Fylde MCZ. Project engineers have refined the parameters for sandwave clearance in the Fylde MCZ from 60% to 5% for the Morgan export cables and from 30% to 5% for the Morecambe export cables.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			depth of sandwave clearance dredging (m)- Area of seabed disturbed by sandwave clearance (m2)- Seabed preparation areas for foundations (m2).	
TA_0001_065_231123	S42	Email	2.12 Table 3.6 The MDS for OSPs is high when compared to other projects of a similar scale (i.e. 6 x OSPs, 1 booster station). We advise that this is refined. We note that for the Morgan Offshore Wind Project, the developer has included two different MDS options for OSPs. Natural England advise that the preferred option would be to have 1 large OSP rather than 4 small OSP as this will have a smaller footprint and therefore least impact on theseabed. Clarify and refine OSP parameters for the ES submission. Include seabed preparation parameters for the areas for foundations (as mentioned above).	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications.
TA_0001_066_231123	S42	Email	2.13 Tables 3.9 – 3.14 MDS for boulder clearance has not been defined, it has been assumed this falls within the seabed preparation footprint. However, MDS for boulder clearance should also include consideration for the fate of removed boulders. For example, location of deposits, boulder size. We advise that acoustic data should allow for specific locations requiring boulder clearance and refinement of the MDS. The total area of impact should consider where the boulders are placed, as well as where they are removed from.	Any boulders identified as likely to impact installation will need to be moved to the side (i.e. side cast), away from the immediate location of the cable infrastructure. There are two key methods of clearing boulders, boulder plough and boulder grab. Where a high density of boulders is seen, the expectation is that a plough will be required to clear the cable installation corridor. Where medium and low densities of boulders are present, a subsea grab is expected to be employed. Boulder clearance will occur within the footprint of other site preparation activities. All boulders will remain in the vicinity (i.e. sidecast only) of the area they were cleared from and therefore there will be no significant alteration to the composition of the seabed.
TA_0001_067_231123	S42	Email	2.14 Table 3.10 It is not clear how the MDS for Scour Protection Area has been calculated for the Array Foundations. The submitted ES should provide a rationale for the MDS Scour Protection Area for Array Foundations.	The Applicants note your response. The application does not include any structures with foundations and no scour protection is required for this application.
TA_0001_068_231123	S42	Email	2.15 Tables 3.9 – 3.14 It is not clear whether secondary scour has been included in the project description and MDS parameters. The project description only refers to scour protection. We advise that secondary scour protection impacts are scoped in and included in the MDS parameters. If they are included within the project description, this should be clearly stated and defined.	Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) has been updated to include an assessment of secondary scour which draws on the assessment presented in Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1).
TA_0001_069_231123	S42	Email	2.16 Table 3.18 The MDS for width of export cable protection is 10m, is this per cable or in total (i.e. 6 cables)? Please clarify.	The Applicants can confirm that the 10 m width of cable protection is per cable.
TA_0001_070_231123	S42	Email	2.17 Section 3.7.9.3 The parameters for cable crossings haven't been defined in this Chapter, NE acknowledges the developer needs to confirm crossings with the asset owner. However, when this information is known, please provide further information on MDS parameters for cable crossing (i.e. indicative number of crossings, specific locations, overlap with MPAs etc) and methodology in line with best practise guidance. The potential interruption of sediment transport and resulting morphological change due to the presence of cable crossings near sensitive receptors and pathways should also be considered in the ES. Please provide further information on cable crossings in line with best practice guidance as set out in Natural England's Best Practice Guidance Phase III. If any MPAs, sensitive features, or sensitive areas of seabed are likely to be impacted by cable crossings, then the extent of the impact and location should be stated.	Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3) has been updated to show where the locations of cable crossings and these are cross referenced in Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2). There will be one cable crossing (for all four Morgan export cables) within the boundary of the Fylde MCZ. These have been mapped and fully assessed in the Stage 1 MCZ assessment (document reference E4). No cable crossings are required in the Fylde MCZ for the Morecambe export cables.
TA_0001_071_231123	S42	Email	2.18 Section 3.7.9.4 It remains unclear if or how much cable protection will be required within Fylde MCZ. We advise that a detailed cable burial risk assessment is provided as part of the Application. This should include an outline burial cable specification and installation plan which has a pollution and contingency plan. Provide a cable burial risk assessment as part of the Application.	An outline Cable Burial Risk Assessment has been developed (document reference J14) along with an outline CSIP (document reference J15).
TA_0001_072_231123	S42	Email	2.19 2.4.4.2 Table 2.7 It is encouraging to see a wide range of reports utilised in the desktop study. However, most of the reports utilised are over 10 years old with some being 27 years old.	The Applicants note your response but the desktop review captures all relevant studies and data from other projects within the study area. No other data sources have been flagged through consultation or through our desktop searches. The baseline has been

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			We advise that systematic literature review should be utilised where applicable to ensure that literature used was of a high standard that accurately represent current environment.	updated with site-specific survey data and is therefore considered to be robust for the purposes of undertaking the assessment.
TA_0001_073_231123	S42	Email	2.2 We are broadly content with the quality and quantity of surveys for baseline characterisation and the survey methodology.N/a	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0001_074_231123	S42	Email	2.21 Volume 1, Chapter 3/Volume 2,Chapter r 1 The information on indicative MDS for cable crossing dimensions or potential locations of cable crossings is unclear. Natural England advises that further information on cable crossings, including MDS parameters and an indicative schematic is provided in the submitted ES. This should show MDS cable crossing cross-section and plan, and also a map identifying potential cable crossing locations, if possible.	Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3) has been updated to show where the locations of cable crossings and these are cross referenced in Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2).
TA_0001_075_231123	S42	Email	2.22 Volume 2,Chapter 1, Table 1.10There are site-specific surveys referenced throughout the chapter which have not been provided with the PEIR reports. It would be useful to see these reports:- Guardline (2022);- XOcean (2022); and- Fugro (2022).Please provide these reports or a link to them through the ETG.	Access to site specific survey reports have been provided through the Expert Working Group.
TA_0001_076_231123	S42	Email	2.23 General Please note that the Fylde MCZ condition assessment has recently been published on Natural England's Designated Sites Viewer – Fylde MCZ Marine Condition AssessmentThe condition assessment determined that both features of the site; subtidal mud and subtidal sand are in a favourable condition. We advise the condition assessment and condition of the features of Fylde MCZ are taken into consideration when assessing the proposal against theconservation objectives for the site.We advise the condition assessment and condition of the features of Fylde MCZ are taken into consideration when assessing the proposal against the conservation objectives for the site.	The Applicants note your response and this has been used in the Stage 1 MCZ Assessment (document reference E4).
TA_0001_077_231123	S42	Email	2.24 2.9.12;2.11. 9Natural England is concerned that no proposed future monitoring is being proposed to test predictions being made within the impact assessment.We advise that the project should have adequate scope to include long term impact monitoring especially for receptors of medium and high sensitivity. Anappropriate Benthic Monitoring Plan should be established at key impact locations that spatially and temporally represent all impacted biotopes, habitats, and species. The designated habitats of the Fylde MCZ should be a particular focus of the monitoring plan.Appropriate survey design and power analysis should be conducted to ensure that adequate data is collected for long term comparisons of the effect of changecompared to baseline data.	Benthic monitoring has been considered in the outline In Principle Monitoring Plan (IPMP) (document reference J20) and will consider whether existing asset integrity surveys can have scope added to cover benthic monitoring (e.g. of recovery of seabed topography after trenching/sandwave clearance). Monitoring will focus on the Fylde MCZ.
TA_0001_078_231123	S42	Email	2.25 Table 2.12 We welcome the inclusion of a Cable Burial Risk Assessment (CBRA) to inform maintenance and reburial specification in line with the project commitment CoT45. We advise that the CBRA is provided and secured appropriately with the Application and includes information in line with Natural England's Best Practice Guidance Phase III.We advise that the developer's CBRA is provided and secured appropriately with the Application and includes information in line with Natural England's Best Practice Guidance Phase III, namely:- Method(s) to be used- Overlap with MPA(s)- Habitats impacted- Presence of sensitive species and habitats- Total number of events (for the lifetime of the cable)- Frequency (worst case scenario)- Duration of each event (worst case scenario)- Total area of impact per event (worst case scenario)- Impacts from sediment plumes, if applicable	An outline Cable Burial Risk Assessment has been developed (document reference J14) along with an outline CSIP (document reference J15).
TA_0001_079_231123	S42	Email	2.26 Table 2.12 We welcome the Project's commitment CoT47 and note that this will include measures to limit the extent of cable protection within the Fylde MCZ, whilst the preferred option for cable protection is cable burial. However, it is not currently stated or assessed whether cable protection is anticipated to affect any MPAs (namely Fylde MCZ and RibbleMCZ) or sensitive features.We advise that the impacts of cable protection on MPAs or sensitive features are a key consenting risk for the project, and this should be reflected in the level of assessment in the submitted ES. If any MPAs or sensitive features are likely to be impacted by cable protection, then the extent of the impact and location should be stated.	The impacts of cable protection on sensitive benthic habitats and features of MPAs (including the Fylde MCZ) are fully assessed in the Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) and also in the Stage 1 MCZ Assessment (document reference E4).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0001_080_231123	S42	Email	2.27 2.6.1.1; Table 2.11; 2.9.5.1 Proposed hard infrastructure to be left in situ following decommissioning phase: The MDS assumes the complete removal of all foundations and cables but that all cable and scour protection may be left in situ. We advise that if cable and scour protection is left in situ, this would equate to permanent changes in the benthic complexity of the site. We highlight that most of the study area comprises of sand/coarse mix material; it is a very sedimentary, dynamic part of the Irish Sea. Having permanent hard infrastructure present may impact the natural sedimentary process in the area. Additionally, it will increase the risk of phase shifts in benthic community composition (including invasive non-native species) due to the addition of hard substrate. We are particularly concerned with cable and scour protection (i.e. hard infrastructure) being left in situ within the Fylde MCZ during the decommissioning phase. Permanent hard infrastructure has the potential to undermine the conservation objectives of the site. Natural England strongly advise that the developer considers a commitment to remove cable protection from Fylde MCZ as part of the decommissioning plan and use of appropriate cable protection if needed in the interim. At present there are existing methodologies in the market, which with refinements in the future should allow the recovery of external cable protection. These were explored for the Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon Offshore Windfarm Extension Projects, further details can be found here - EN010109-000218-9.7.3 Cable Protection Decommissioning	The project has committed to ensuring that all external cable protection used within the Fylde MCZ will be designed to be removable on decommissioning with the requirement for removal agreed with stakeholders and regulators at the time of decommissioning.
TA_0001_081_231123	S42	Email	2.28 2.9.5 (Fylde MCZ) Long term habitat loss within Fylde MCZ The assessment states that MDS for long term habitat loss within Fylde MCZ equates to 159,580 m ² of total long term habitat loss within the Fylde MCZ, which equates to 0.06% of the total area of the MCZ. This is broken down as:- Subtidal sand: 0.10 km ² (0.05% of the area of this feature)- Subtidal mud: 0.06 km ² (0.13% of the area of this feature) Natural England advise that this is a significant permanent habitat loss within Fylde MCZ. The direct habitat loss of features of the MCZ due to cable/scour protection within the site constitutes a lasting impact over the lifetime of the project which is potentially irreversible. Unless it can be demonstrated otherwise, the scale of impacts is likely to hinder the 'maintain' conservation objectives of Fylde MCZ whilst the protection is in situ, and potentially beyond due to removal implications. Natural England therefore disagree with the conclusions of the assessment which currently state that the magnitude of impacts will be low. It is our opinion that the proposal has a significant risk of hindering the objectives of the MCZ. We advise that the avoid, reduce, mitigate hierarchy should be employed to reduce impacts to the MCZ, drawing on best practice guidance for cable installation produced by NE and JNCC. We advise that if the level of interaction with Fylde MCZ cannot be avoided, the next stage of the mitigation hierarchy would be for the project to minimise the amount of cable protection within the designated site. We highlight that other projects such as the original Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon OWF did not require cable protection, therefore further exploration of cable protection requirements is needed within Fylde MCZ e.g. through the Cable Burial Risk Assessment, as well as development of design and installation measures that will increase the likelihood of successful burial, thereby reducing the rock protection needed.	The Applicants note Natural England's concerns relating to impacts to the Fylde MCZ and would highlight that the mitigation hierarchy has been considered at every stage in the design and development of the project. In acknowledgment of the mitigation hierarchy, and to incorporate the feedback from Natural England, a number of PDE refinements have been made between the PEIR and to final application. These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for cable protection (and associated long term habitat loss) within the Fylde MCZ. Project engineers have refined the cable protection parameters in the Fylde MCZ from 20% to 3% contingency for the Morgan export cables and from 15% to 3% contingency for the Morecambe export cables. It should be noted that the aim is to bury all cables in the first instance and only where this is unsuccessful would cable protection be required. Cable protection within the MCZ will very much be a contingency measure. The project has also committed to ensuring that all external cable protection used within the MCZ will be designed to be removable on decommissioning with the requirement for removal agreed with stakeholders and regulators at the time of decommissioning. The Applicants' position remains that there will be no significant risks to the achievement of the conservation objectives of the Fylde MCZ.
TA_0001_082_231123	S42	Email	2.29 2.9.6.3 The developer uses justification that by placing hard standing infrastructure on the seabed it will create habitat, increase species diversity and potentially produce beneficial effects for the wider ecosystem. Natural England advises that this justification is wholly inappropriate. Fylde MCZ and the wider Irish Sea study area is comprised of sedimentary habitats, not reef. Therefore, introducing hard infrastructure has the potential to change the existing benthic composition but not necessarily benefit the wider ecosystem as the assessment currently suggests. Natural England advises that the current wording is not appropriate and the wording around placing hard structures on the seabed needs to be revisited in the assessment.	The Applicants note your response; however the assessment considers both the potential and the adverse effects on the surrounding soft sediment environment as well as the potential for positive effects on the wider ecosystem. The wording has been reviewed to ensure we are covering both elements adequately with regard to the conservation objectives of the MCZ, but we don't agree that it would be correct to overlook wider potential benefits and neither are these framed as compensation for the long term loss of soft sediment habitats.
TA_0001_083_231123	S42	Email	2.32.9.9.49 The assessment states that the Fylde MCZ sediment transport regime may be affected to a small degree if the Morgan offshore booster substation is located at the most easterly location within the Morgan Offshore Booster Station Indicative Search Areas. Given that Fylde MCZ is already under pressure from the proposed cable corridor, we advise that the booster station should be located in the area which will have the least	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			impact on Fylde MCZ. We advise that the Morgan Offshore Booster Station should be located in the area which will have the least impact on Fylde MCZ. where feasible, and the rationale for the chosen location presented in the submitted ES.	
TA_0001_084_231123	S42	Email	2.312.9.9.59 The assessment states that "Overall for the subtidal sand IEF and subtidal mud IEF of the Fylde MCZ, the magnitude of the impact is low and the sensitivity of the receptor is negligible. The effect will, therefore, be of minor significance, which is not significant." Natural England disagrees with the conclusion of the assessment and advises the magnitude will be greater due to impacts to both the surrounding environment and Fylde MCZ. Natural England advises that the magnitude of impact is reassessed in the ES Submission.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications.
TA_0001_085_231123	S42	Email	2.32 2.11.2.78 Cumulative impacts to Fylde MCZ The assessment has concluded that a cumulative effect of around 2.07% of the MCZ is expected to be impacted. When considering cumulative impacts within Fylde MCZ, it would be useful to include information regarding cable crossings within the MCZ. Natural England also has concerns with habitat disturbance as a result of tier 2 projects. The submitted ES should provide a map showing potential cable crossing locations, including designated areas, Annex I sandbanks etc. For example, outline the anticipated spatial extent and dimensions of the Isle of Man Interconnector cable crossing. These cable crossings should be included in the Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA).	The paragraph referred to in this response was on cumulative temporary habitat disturbance. Cable crossings are considered in the cumulative assessment of long term habitat loss and the requirement for the cable crossing in the Fylde MCZ has been incorporated into the assessment. The Stage 1 MCZ Assessment (document reference E4) has also been updated to include a drawing showing the location of the cable crossing in the Fylde MCZ.
TA_0001_086_231123	S42	Email	2.33 Vol 1 Ch 5 / Vol 2 Ch 3 General In some instances where sensitivity of a habitat is measured as medium to one pressure that is likely to be exerted, Natural England would argue that sensitivity to a second pressure being low does not average out to low sensitivity over the two pressures. More generally Natural England notes that the approach to the EIA assessment is proposed to align with other OWF NSIPs. This matrix approach has been used throughout ESs to date to support the assessment of the magnitude and significance of impacts. Natural England notes numerous instances where significance has been presented as a range (i.e., slight, or moderate, or large) and it is nearly always the lower value that has been taken forward. Indeed, to date no offshore windfarm has identified ecological impacts that are assessed as significant in EIA terms, either cumulatively or in-combination which is surprising. In the absence of evidence to support the use of the lower value in a range, Natural England's view is that the higher value should always be assessed in order to ensure that impacts on features are not incorrectly screened out of further assessment. This is in line with the principles of the Rochdale envelope approach. Natural England recommends that the most precautionary sensitivity is used when combining pressures in the submitted ES.	The assessments presented in Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) have been checked and updated to ensure the most precautionary sensitivity is applied when combining pressures. In accordance with the EIA methodology for the project, where a range of significance levels is presented, the final assessment for each effect is based upon expert judgement and explanations are provided in the text.
TA_0001_088_231123	S42	Email	2.34 Table 2.20 This table highlights the issue with utilising the matrix methodology of impact sensitivity. There is a High impact value given for SS.SMu.CFiMu.SpnMeg biotope yet the overall sensitivity is considered negligible. Natural England recommends that the most precautionary sensitivity is used when combining pressures in the submitted ES.	The assessments presented in Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) have been checked and updated to ensure the most precautionary sensitivity is applied when combining pressures.
TA_0001_089_231123	S42	Email	2.35 Vol 2 Ch 3 General Definition of temporary needs to be clearly defined as this might vary depending on the scale of reference used. Physical disturbance and cumulative impacts will be apparent during construction and decommissioning phases of this project. An evaluation on how key species and biotopes will respond to predicted worst case disturbance should be modelled using baseline data, underlying knowledge of life history traits and ecological processes. This predicted rate of recovery should then be modelled and tested regarding the expected worst case time scenario of the various project stages.	A definition of temporary is presented in Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2). The methodology for undertaking the EIA was consulted on in the Scoping Report which outlined that the benthic assessment would draw upon the evidence in the Marine Evidence based Sensitivity Assessment (MarESA). The MarESA is peer reviewed and represents the largest review undertaken to date on the effects of human activities and natural events on marine species and habitats. It is considered to be one of the best available sources of evidence relating to recovery of benthic species and habitats. The evidence presented in Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) on recoverability is therefore deemed to be sufficient and robust to inform the assessment.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0001_090_231123	S42	Email	2.36 HRA Screening Report Correct designated sites have been identified and scoped into the report N/a	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0001_091_231123	S42	Email	2.37 HRA Screening report Natural England broadly agrees that the relevant sites have been screened in, correct features and pathways identified. N/a	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0001_092_231123	S42	Email	2.38 Section 1.7 We note that the screening assessment concluded that a risk of LSE on the Shell Flat and Lune Deep SAC could not be ruled out due to impacts to the Annex I habitat: sandbanks which are slightly covered by sea water all the time. Natural England have concerns about the volume of sand wave clearance required and the subsequent effects on Shell Flat and Lune Deep SAC. Please refer to upfront comments in Table 1 for further advice on mitigating sandwave clearance. The submitted ES should carefully assess the impacts of sandwave clearance on the SAC and identify any mitigation measures needed to rule out adverse effects.	As part of the PDE refinements between PEIR and final application, the parameters for sandwave clearance have reduced considerably from 60% of the cables to 9% of all cables potentially requiring sandwave clearance. The associated volumes of material to be cleared has therefore also reduced which will reduce the potential for interaction between SSCs and the Shell Flat and Lune Deep SAC. The physical processes assessment concludes that the sediment plume arising from sandwave clearance may extend circa 5 km in a principally east/west orientation, so with minimal potential for overlap with the SAC. Whilst remobilised and redistributed material may reach the south edge of the Shell Flat SAC, levels would be in depths indistinguishable from background levels.
TA_0001_093_231123	S42	Email	2.39 1.6.3; 1.6.4; Table 1.7 With the exception of Ribble Estuary MCZ (see our fish and shellfish comments), we broadly agree with the sites which have been identified and are screened in/out of the assessment	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0001_094_231123	S42	Email	2.4 Long term habitat loss within Fylde MCZ The assessment states that MDS for long term habitat loss within Fylde MCZ equates to 159,580 m2 of total long term habitat loss within the Fylde MCZ, which equates to 0.06% of the total area of the MCZ. This is broken down as:- Subtidal sand: 0.10 km2 (0.05% of the area of this feature)- Subtidal mud: 0.06 km2 (0.13% of the area of this feature) Natural England advise that this is a significant permanent habitat loss within We advise that Fylde MCZ is fully assessed under a Stage 2 MCZ assessment. We advise that the avoid, reduce, mitigate hierarchy should be employed to reduce impacts to the MCZ, drawing on best practice guidance for cable installation produced by NE and JNCC. We advise that if the level of interaction with Fylde MCZ cannot be avoided, the next stage of the mitigation hierarchy would be for the project to minimise the amount of cable protection within the designated site. We highlight that other projects such as the original Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon	The Applicants note Natural England's concerns relating to impacts to the Fylde MCZ and would highlight that the mitigation hierarchy has been considered at every stage in the design and development of the project. In acknowledgment of the mitigation hierarchy, and to incorporate the feedback from Natural England, a number of PDE refinements have been made between the PEIR and to final application. These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for cable protection (and associated long term habitat loss) within the Fylde MCZ. Project engineers have refined the cable protection parameters in the Fylde MCZ from 20% to 3% contingency for the Morgan export cables and from 15% to 3% contingency for the Morecambe export cables. It should be noted that the aim is to bury all cables in the first instance and only where this is unsuccessful would cable protection be required. Cable protection within the MCZ will very much be a contingency measure. The project has also committed to ensuring that all external cable protection used within the MCZ will be designed to be removable on decommissioning with the requirement for removal agreed with stakeholders and regulators at the time of decommissioning. The Applicant's position remains that there will be no significant risks to the achievement of the conservation objectives of the Fylde MCZ.
TA_0001_095_231123	S42	Email	Fylde MCZ. The direct habitat loss of features of the MCZ due to cable/scour protection within the site constitutes a lasting impact over the lifetime of the project which is potentially irreversible. Unless it can be demonstrated otherwise, the scale of impacts is likely to hinder the 'maintain' conservation objectives of Fylde MCZ whilst the protection is in situ, and potentially beyond due to removal implications. Natural England therefore disagree with the conclusions of the assessment which currently state that the magnitude of impacts will be low. It is our opinion that the proposal has a significant risk of hindering the objectives of the MCZ. OWF did not require cable protection, therefore further exploration of cable protection requirements is needed within Fylde MCZ e.g. through the Cable Burial Risk Assessment, as well as development of design and installation measures that will increase the likelihood of successful burial, thereby reducing the rock protection needed. Measures of Equivalent Environmental Benefit (MEEB) However, we do acknowledge there is a likelihood of needing cable protection within Fylde MCZ and we therefore advise that the developer should explore options for an in-principle Measures of Equivalent Environmental Benefit (MEEB) Plan. At the time of writing this response, we highlight Defra's Best practice guidance for developing compensatory measures in relation to Marine Protected Areas guidance,	The Applicants' position remains that there will be no significant risks to the achievement of the Fylde MCZ conservation objectives and a Stage 2 assessment is not required.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			which gives some guidance on developing an in-principle MEEB. However, we highlight that Defra are presently drafting updated guidance and therefore this guidance may be superseded. As a matter of some urgency, we advise that an in-principle MEEB should be discussed through the Evidence Plan Process, in order to ensure any MEEB proposals for Morgan and Morecambe Transmission Assets take account of stakeholder advice.	
TA_0001_096_231123	S42	Email	"Appendix A - In relation to consideration of habitat loss within Marine Conservation Zones (MCZs) in relation to cable protection Natural England provides the following advice: 1.1. Natural England will usually consider permanent, long-lasting, and irreversible loss to be an adverse effect unless it can be clearly demonstrated otherwise. 1.2. The following points should be considered (but not exclusively) when providing evidence to underpin an assessment of whether an impact is likely to have a significant risk of hindering the conservation objectives of the site: - Location of the predicted loss in terms of whether it sits on a designated feature of the site; - Duration of the loss – for loss to be considered temporary it must be clearly time-limited to the point where the impact is predicted to return to the same pre-impact condition and must include a detailed remediation plan using proven techniques as part of the licence; - Scale of the loss in relation to the feature of the site including consideration of the quality and rarity of the affected area; - Impact on structure, functioning or supporting processes of the habitat; - Feature condition; and - Existing habitat loss within the same site/ feature. 1.3. Whilst there are no hard and fast rules or thresholds, in order for Natural England to advise that there is no likelihood of a significant risk of hindering the conservation objectives of the site: 1) That the loss is not on the priority habitat/feature 2) That the loss is temporarily and reversible (within guidelines above) and/or 3) That the scale of loss is so small as to be de minimus alone and/or 4) That the scale of loss is inconsequential including other impacts on the site/ feature."	The Applicants' position remains that the information requested by Natural England in this response has been provided in the Stage 1 MCZ Assessment (document reference E4) and that there will be no significant risks to the achievement of the conservation objectives of the Fylde MCZ. In acknowledgment of the mitigation hierarchy, and to incorporate feedback from Natural England a number of PDE refinements have been made between the PEIR and to final application. These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for cable protection (and associated long term habitat loss) within the Fylde MCZ. Project engineers have refined the cable protection parameters in the Fylde MCZ from 20% to 3% contingency for the Morgan export cables and from 15% to 3% contingency for the Morecambe export cables. It should be noted that the aim is to bury all cables in the first instance and only where this is unsuccessful would cable protection be required. Cable protection within the MCZ will very much be a contingency measure. The project has also committed to ensuring that all external cable protection used within the MCZ will be designed to be removable on decommissioning with the requirement for removal agreed with stakeholders and regulators at the time of decommissioning. This is in line with the approach on the SEP and DEP projects. The one cable crossing that is required for the 4 Morgan cables in the MCZ has been located as far west as possible and as close to the edge of the boundary of the MCZ as is feasible. All other measures outlined by Natural England have been reviewed by the project engineers and the Stage 1 MZC Assessment (document reference E4) contains a narrative of the applicability/suitability of these measures to this project.
TA_0001_283_231123	S42	Email	All efforts to avoid areas of boulders or minimise the need for boulder clearance by micro-siting should be explored through a boulder clearance methodology and stated within the Application, and the potential impacts of boulder placement on sediment movement carefully assessed.	The description of potential impacts relating to seabed preparation including boulder clearance has been refined with respect to further project definition as presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Micro-siting of cables around boulders would be onerous and impractical. Boulders pose a risk of damage and exposure to cables as well as an obstruction risk to the cable installation equipment. Therefore, any boulders identified as likely to impact installation will need to be moved to the side (side cast), away from the immediate location of the cable infrastructure. There are two key methods of clearing boulders, boulder plough and boulder grab. Where a high density of boulders is seen, the expectation is that a plough will be required to clear the cable installation corridor. Where medium and low densities of boulders are present, a subsea grab is expected to be employed. Boulder clearance will occur within the footprint of other site preparation activities. All boulders will remain in the vicinity (i.e. sidecast only) of the area they were cleared from. The impact is fully assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2).
TA_0001_284_231123	S42	Email	From experience on other windfarms, HDD can fail on occasion. Therefore, the applicant should ensure that the worst case scenario at landfall takes this into consideration. This should consider impacts on Lytham St. Annes Dunes SSSI with a sufficient baseline collected to assess impact post construction.	Impacts to the ecological features of the Lytham St. Annes Dunes SSSI are assessed in Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). Direct pipe trenchless installation is proposed from the transition joint bays to an exit pit at or above MHWS. This will avoid the loss of vegetation and habitats across the sand dunes at Lytham St. Annes SSSI. This method has been selected to address this issue as it's the most appropriate for use in sensitive geological settings, in part because it reduces the risk of collapse that is associated with cable installation using HDD. Further information regarding the landfall is included within Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).
TA_0001_285_231123	S42	Email	Benthic Subtidal Ecology Natural England have significant concerns relating to impacts to Fylde MCZ. We advise that activities associated with the installation, protection, maintenance and decommissioning of the Morgan and Morecambe ECC have the potential to hinder the conservation objectives of the site.	A number of PDE refinements have been made between the PEIR and final application. These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for sandwave clearance (and associated temporary habitat disturbance) and cable protection (and associated long term habitat loss) within the Fylde MCZ. The Applicants' position remains that there

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				will be no significant risks to the achievement of the conservation objectives for the Fylde MCZ .
TA_0001_286_231123	S42	Email	The Maximum Design Scenario (MDS) for long term habitat loss and habitat alteration from cable protection within Fylde MCZ equates to 0.16km ² of the total MCZ area i.e. 16 hectares. This is a considerable loss of habitat within the MCZ, we therefore disagree with the conclusions of the MCZ Assessment. We also disagree with conclusions in the Benthic Subtidal Ecology Chapter which have concluded the magnitude of impact as low.	A number of PDE refinements have been made between the PEIR and to final application. These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for cable protection (and associated long term habitat loss) within the Fylde MCZ. Cable protection parameters in the Fylde MCZ have reduced from 20% to 3% contingency for the Morgan export cables and from 15% to 3% contingency for the Morecambe export cables. Effects are fully assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) and in the Stage 1 MCZ Assessment (document reference E4). The project has also committed to ensuring that all external cable protection used within the MCZ will be designed to be removable on decommissioning with the requirement for removal agreed with stakeholders and regulators at the time of decommissioning.
TA_0001_287_231123	S42	Email	drawing on best practice guidance for cable installation produced by NE and JNCC. We advise that if the level of interaction with Fylde MCZ cannot be avoided, the next stage of the mitigation hierarchy would be for the project to minimise the amount of cable protection within the designated site. We highlight that other projects such as the original Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon OWF did not require cable protection, therefore further exploration of cable protection requirements is needed within Fylde MCZ e.g. through the Cable Burial Risk Assessment, as well as development of design and installation measures that will increase the likelihood of successful burial, thereby reducing the rock protection needed.	A number of PDE refinements have been made between the PEIR and to final application. These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for cable protection (and associated long term habitat loss) within the Fylde MCZ. Cable protection parameters in the Fylde MCZ have reduced from 20% to 3% contingency for the Morgan export cables and from 15% to 3% contingency for the Morecambe export cables. Effects are fully assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) and in the Stage 1 MCZ Assessment (document reference E4).The project has also committed to ensuring that all external cable protection used within the MCZ will be designed to be removable on decommissioning with the requirement for removal agreed with stakeholders and regulators at the time of decommissioning. An outline Cable Burial Risk Assessment and Burial Assessment Study has also been developed, which forms part of the outline CSIP (J15).
TA_0001_288_231123	S42	Email	However, we do acknowledge there is a likelihood of needing cable protection within Fylde MCZ and we therefore advise that the developer should explore options for an in-principle Measures of Equivalent Environmental Benefit (MEEB) Plan. At the time of writing this response, we highlight Defra's Best practice guidance for developing compensatory measures in relation to Marine Protected Areas guidance, which gives some guidance on developing an in-principle MEEB. However, we highlight that Defra are presently drafting updated guidance and therefore this guidance may be superseded. As a matter of some urgency, we advise that an in-principle MEEB should be discussed through the Evidence Plan Process, in order to ensure any MEEB proposals for Morgan and Morecambe Transmission Assets take account of stakeholder advice.	The Applicants' position remains that there will be no significant risks to the achievement of the Fylde MCZ conservation objectives and a Stage 2 assessment is not required.
TA_0001_289_231123	S42	Email	Please see Annex 1 and 2 of this response in relation to our advice on benthic mitigation measures.	The Applicants note your response to individual items raised and have provided responses accordingly, see unique reference TA_0001.
TA_0001_310_231123	S42	Email	Appendix 1 The following Framework has been used in Natural England's advice to attribute risk to the project:Structure / Framework RiskPurpleNote for the developer. RedNatural England considers that unless these issues are resolved it will have to advise that (in relation to any one of them, and as appropriate) it is not possible to ascertain beyond reasonable scientific doubt that the project will not affect the integrity of an SAC/SPA/Ramsar and/or significantly hinder the conservation objectives of an MCZ and/or damage or destroy the interest features of a SSSI and/or comply fully with the Environmental Impact Assessment requirements.Addressing these concerns may require the following: • new baseline or survey data; and/or • significant revisions to baseline characterisation and/or impact modelling and/or • significant design changes; and/or • significant mitigationNatural England feels that issues given Red status are so complex, or require the provision of so much outstanding information, that they are unlikely to be resolved during the Examination, and respectfully suggests that they be addressed beforehand. AmberNatural England does not agree with the developer's position or approach and consider that this could make a material difference to the outcome of the decision-making process for this project.Natural England considers that these matters may be resolved through: • provision of additional evidence or justification to support	Natural England's advice has been noted, specifically in the assessment of effects on ecological receptors (see Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3)).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			conclusions; and/or• revisions to impact assessment methodology and/or assessment conclusions; and/or• minor to moderate revisions to impact modelling; and/or• well-designed mitigation measures that are adequately secured through the draft DCO/dML and/or• amendments to draft plansIf these issues remain at the time of the application and are not addressed or resolved by the end of the Examination, then they may become a Red risk as set out above. YellowNatural England doesn't agree with the developer's position or approach. We would ideally like this to be addressed but are satisfied that for this particular project it is unlikely to make a material difference to our advice or the outcome of the decision-making process. However, we reserve the right to revise our opinion should further evidence be presented.It should be noted by interested parties that just because these issues/comments are not raised as significant concerns in this instance, it should not be understood or inferred that Natural England would be of the same view in other cases or circumstances. GreenNatural England is in broad agreement with the developer's approach and has no significant outstanding concerns. As above, we reserve the right to revise our opinion should new evidence be presented.	
TA_0017_005_231123	S42/S44	Email	The Marine Management Organisation and Natural England should be consulted regarding potential ecological impacts offshore substation platforms and booster stations.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. The assessments offshore topic chapters of the Transmission Assets Application have been updated to reflect this amendment. With the removal of the Morgan Offshore Substation Platform (OSP), the Morecambe OSP and the Morgan Offshore Booster Station from the Project Description, and the associated removal for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0023_001_221123	S42	Email	NRW (A) have no concerns regarding impacts to the following Welsh receptors: Marine Physical Processes, Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology and Designated Landscapes.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0023_006_221123	S42	Email	NRW (A) have reviewed the Morgan and Morecambe transmission PEIR and have no comments to make from a benthic perspective. The zone of influence for Morecambe is not within Welsh Waters. The zone of influence for Morgan does span into the Mona OWF array area but JNCC colleagues are advising on this as it is beyond 12nm.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0023_007_221123	S42	Email	In terms of the screening for cumulative projects, we advise the offshore elements of Hynet North West CCS project should be screened in.	The Applicants note your response. and the Hynet CCS project has been included as a project in the CEA, in Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2).
TA_0035_082_221123	S42/S44	Email	CoT47 Cable Specification and Installation Plan(s) will include measures to limit the extent of cable protection and sandwave clearance within the Fylde MCZ and will be informed through the undertaking of survey works pre-constructionIssueMeasures to limit the impact of proposed works within the Fylde MCZ have yet to be fully developed.ImpactRisk to the marine environment.SolutionOutline Cable Specification and Installation Plan to be to be secured in the DCO submission.	An Outline Offshore Cable Specification and Installation Plan is provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J15).
TA_0035_083_221123	S42/S44	Email	CoT65 Outline Offshore Construction Environmental Management Plan(s) will be developed and will include details of:- a marine pollution contingency plan to address the risks, methods and procedures to deal with any spills and collision incidents in relation to all activities carried out below MHWS;- a chemical risk review to include information regarding how and when chemicals are to be used, stored and transported in accordance with recognised best practice guidance;- a marine biosecurity plan detailing how the risk of introduction and spread of invasive non-native species will be minimised;- dropped object protocol will be developed for the reporting and recovery of dropped objects where they pose a potential hazard to other marine users.IssueMeasures to manage environmental riskbelow MHWS have yet to be fully developed.ImpactRisk to the marine environmentSolutionOutline Offshore Construction Environmental Management Plan to be to be secured in the DCO submission which is enforceable with the Marine Management Organisation.	An Offshore Environmental Management Plan will be provided post-consent and will be secured through CoT65.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0010_022_221123	S42	Email	Volume 2 Chapter 2: Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology 5.1. Table 2.6 of Section 2.4 includes a single impact that has been scoped out of further assessment, namely, the effects of accidental pollution during construction, operations and maintenance and decommissioning. MMO agrees with the justifications and mitigations presented and the decision to scope out the effects of accidental pollution. The MMO advise that the risk of chemical breakout during horizontal directional drilling (HDD), or similar, is assessed.	The Applicants note your response on scoping out accidental pollution. The assessment presented in Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2) has been updated to include an assessment of bentonite breakout.
TA_0010_023_221123	S42	Email	5.2. MMO notes that a comprehensive search of relevant data sources has been undertaken during a desk study and site-specific benthic surveys have been carried out in support of the application. The results of which have facilitated the identification and assessment of the potential impacts to benthic ecology receptors.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0010_024_221123	S42	Email	5.3. MMO agrees with the proposed mitigation measure to install, if required, low profile tapered mattresses designed to allow continued migration of sediment closer to shore. Noting that no further mitigation measures are detailed in the summary Table 2.27. However, primary (inherent) mitigation measures have been included throughout the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process and include mitigation through e.g., engineering solution or by modification to the overall design.	The Applicants note your response and the full list of measures adopted as part of the project which are relevant to benthic ecology are outlined in Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2).
TA_0010_025_221123	S42	Email	5.4. MMO notes that Section 2.1 includes a description of the potential cumulative and inter-related impacts and effects on the physical and biological environment. Table 2.23 includes a comprehensive list of other projects, plans or activities considered within the cumulative effects assessment for the shared Transmission Assets of the Morecambe and Morgan Offshore Wind Farms and this is welcomed.	The Applicants note your response and the list of cumulative projects has been updated in view of the updated CEA long list for the final application.
TA_0010_026_221123	S42	Email	5.5. Schedule 14 of the Draft Deemed Marine Licence (dML) includes reference to the requirement for pre- and post-construction monitoring surveys "to determine the location, extent and composition of any benthic habitats of conservation, and/or ecological importance constituting Annex 1 reef habitats in the parts of the Order limits in which it is proposed to carry out construction works". MMO welcomes this.	Benthic monitoring has been considered in the outline In Principle Monitoring Plan (IPMP) (document reference J20) and will consider whether existing asset integrity surveys can have scope added to cover benthic monitoring (e.g. of recovery of seabed topography after trenching/sandwave clearance). Monitoring will focus on the Fylde MCZ.
TA_0010_027_221123	S42	Email	5.6. Section 2.5.1.5 states that:"Levels of contamination were low across the Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets and no samples were found to exceed the Cefas Action Level 1 (AL1) and Action Level 2 (AL2) for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs)."MMO has major concerns regarding the quality of the data and the concentrations observed. For example, whilst it is technically true that no sample exceeded the AL2 for PCBs, samples were only tested for the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) 7 list of PCBs, rather than the Σ25 PCBs congener group. As no AL2 exists for the ICES7 congener group, levels observed cannot be "above AL2" by definition. However, sample ENV05 had a concentration of 1.95 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) for the ICES7 congener group, which is marginally below the AL2 of the Σ25 PCBs congener group. As such, there is clear likelihood that there may be concerning or unacceptable levels of PCBs in the sediment to be disturbed/mobilised. Additional contaminant sampling is required to meet an acceptable minimum standard in the evidence supporting the application for the Generation Assets. (NB: The MMO is aware that this application is for Transmission Assets, however, the data for the Generation Assets are used in this section of the report and are hence relevant).	This comments relates to inconsistencies in the information presented in the desktop review section on the sediment chemistry results for the Morgan Generation Assets (not the Transmission Assets). These inconsistencies have been corrected for the final application. Overall, for the Morgan Generation Assets, levels of contamination are low and below the Cefas Action Level 1 (AL1) for relevant determinants. Levels of one PCB where above Cefas AL1 at a single station (but were below Cefas AL2).
TA_0010_028_221123	S42	Email	5.7. This is even more concerning when considering that only nine samples were tested for PCBs out of a total of thirty-five. It is fairly typical that contaminant sampling for offshore work only test a subset of samples for contaminants given that offshore sediments are usually lower risk than estuarine sediments, for example, however, there appears to be no justification as to why only nine samples were tested for PCBs, when a somewhat similar contaminant group – PAHs – were tested for in twenty-three samples. Determining which samples to test for contaminants usually requires assessing the particle size analysis (PSA) data to identify sites with a not-insignificant proportion of fine material. However this is difficult to do with any confidence as the laboratory conducting the PSA analysis for these data is not validated by the MMO to perform the analysis for marine licence applications (Thomson Environmental Consultants). As such, the argument can be made that the area is not sufficiently characterised by the data collected. Please see Marine	This comment relates to information presented in the desktop review section on the sediment chemistry results for the Morgan Generation Assets (not the Transmission Assets). The desktop information relating to the Morgan Generation Assets has been updated and confirms that sediment samples were collected from 11 stations in the Morgan Array Area and 13 stations within the Morgan Array Area Zone of Influence (see Volume 2, Chapter 2 Benthic, subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES, document reference F2.2). The benthic subtidal survey specification was agreed with the SNCBs prior to mobilising the surveys.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			Licensing: sediment analysis and sample plans - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) for further information on laboratory validation.	
TA_0010_029_221123	S42	Email	5.8. With respect to site-specific surveys in the Transmission Assets area (as the above comments relate to the Generation Assets data), information is captured in the Benthic Subtidal Survey technical annex. This states that thirty-nine of the total seventy-seven grab samples taken for PSA and infaunal analysis were tested for contaminants. It states that this amounts to approximately every other sample site. It would have been preferable to first conduct PSA, and then use those results to determine which samples should be tested for contaminants e.g., any sites with >30% fine material, or test all samples for contaminants.	The benthic subtidal survey specification was agreed with the SNCBs prior to mobilising the surveys, but sample locations were adjusted in the field to ensure adequate spread of samples across all sediment types.
TA_0010_030_221123	S42	Email	5.9. The trace metals and PAH results for each sample are presented in Appendix C of the report. The report states that the PCB results are present in Appendix C too, however these appear to be absent. Given the concerns with the interpretation of the PCB data outlined in comment 5.6 above, the MMO requests that these data are added to the Appendix for full review as, and to provide additionally comments concerning PCB results.	The appendices for the final application have been updated to include the full PCB analysis - see Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology technical report of the ES (document reference F2.2.1).
TA_0010_031_221123	S42	Email	5.10. The report concludes that the levels of most trace metals and PAHs are low throughout the dataset as only select few samples and/or analytes exceed the Canadian Threshold Effect Level – i.e., a comparatively more protective threshold than Cefas AL1. Organotins were all found to be below AL1. The MMO agrees with this conclusion given the results presented, and the data for these contaminants are high confidence as SOCOTEC were the contracting laboratory (who are validated for both analyses by the MMO).	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0010_032_221123	S42	Email	5.11. While not technically a mitigation measure, commitment number 65 (CoT65) states that: “a chemical risk review to include information regarding how and when chemicals are to be used, stored and transported in accordance with recognised best practice guidance” will be included. It should be noted that, where relevant, this should not be in lieu of a chemical risk assessment, which may be required for any chemicals to be used in open systems. MMO recommends that there is engagement at the earliest opportunity with the MMO to ensure that the proposals are in line with OSPAR 2008-3 Guidance on Environmental Considerations for Offshore Windfarm Development (paragraphs 57,71 and 81). Further mitigation may be required in relation to disturbance to sediments depending on the additional information provided for contaminant data.	The Applicants note your response and relevant measures will be included in the Offshore Construction Environmental Management Plan(s) which will be secured as a requirement of the deemed marine licence and developed in consultation with the MMO (document reference C1).
TA_0010_034_221123	S42	Email	5.12. Given that there will be approximately more than 1 cubic megametres (Mm ³) of material to be cleared in terms of sandwaves, a designation of a disposal site for the transmission asset works will be necessary, and adequate characterisation for the site should be provided ensuring the chemical analysis is appropriate.	The Applicants note your response and a 'Dredging and disposal – site characterisation plan' has been produced to accompany the final application (document reference J22).

E1.16.9 Fish and shellfish ecology tables of responses

E1.16.9.1 Fish and shellfish ecology table of responses (via feedback form)

Table E1.16.9.1: Fish and shellfish ecology consultation responses (feedback form)

As set out in section 4.7.4 of the Consultation report (document reference E1). Responses have been allocated to the most appropriate topic(s). If a consultee did not provide a response for a question/sub-question this is not recorded. If a consultee included 'N/A', 'none', 'no comment', 'Nil', 'No', in response to a question, this has also not been recorded. Where a consultee provided a response associated with this sub-question (1.3; Fish and shellfish ecology) but was not related to this topic, this has been included below, as well as against any other appropriate topic(s). Where a consultee provided a response which stated 'see response above' or similar, the response has been replicated in brackets and italics.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0050_001_231123	S42	Online feedback form	1		Document states that transport of sedimentation based on desktop study and existing information, what if any, modelling of net effects of the installation is proposed to be undertaken. In addition what, if any, monitoring is proposed to determine the net effect on the sea bed, sediment transportation, and fisheries habitat and ecology.	An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken for the offshore topics of the Transmission Assets Application and is presented in Volume 2 of the ES (document reference F2). Specific examples relevant to marine life are listed below. - Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2). - Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3). - Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4). - Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5). Benthic monitoring has been considered in the outline In Principle Monitoring Plan (IPMP) (document reference J20) and will consider whether existing asset integrity surveys can have scope added to cover benthic monitoring (e.g. of recovery of seabed topography after trenching/sand wave clearance). Monitoring will focus on the Fylde MCZ. Physical processes modelling as applied to the Transmission Assets is details in Volume 2, Annex 1.1: Physical processes modelling studies of the ES (document reference F2.1.1).
TA_0056_004_141123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.3	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0060_010_151123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.8	Drilling and other work noise will not only affect residents but also the wildlife birds and sea life.	An assessment of noise and vibration impacts during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Transmission Assets is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.2: Construction Noise and Vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.2). This includes an assessment of all construction activities required, as well as noise impacts due to construction traffic on the local

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						highway network. An assessment of the impact and effects on affected receptors has been carried out. Mitigation measures committed to by the Transmission Assets are outlined within the ES and the project Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference: J11), Marine Enhancement Statement (document reference: J12) submitted with the application for development consent. The views and feedback of statutory and non-statutory consultees has been sought throughout the environmental impact assessment process.
TA_0086_001_211123	S44	Online feedback form	1		<p>Strongly object to the proposed off shore wind farm route cabling on shore here on the Fylde coast and the destruction and disruption to our roads, farmlands natural green spaces for many years to come.</p> <p>The meetings I attended could not give a definite plan for the 120m wide cable route crossing Queensway (B5261) and could not determine where along Queensway this would be to the rear of our properties on REDACTED, this could result in property subsidence ,</p> <p>Noise, pollution etc for years to come and devaluation of our properties. We have lived here for over 50 years, we actively ran a market garden business until the Dutch ruined that, so we feel we know the local land problems round here and what the size of this proposal would impact on this area</p> <p>We have lots of wildlife around here both on land and in the various watercourses surrounding the farmlands, we can't keep pushing this wild life away from here for this proposal, it has already been pushed away from the development at Richmond Point, and the new EZ sports village.</p> <p>Not happy about the disruption to the sand dunes and traffic congestion along Clifton Drive if the cables cross here, the nature reserve Will be affected also.</p> <p>We have recently had a lot of traffic congestion along Queensway/Common Edge Road and surrounding roads caused by the new EZ development, this being the main route of 2 from Blackpool to St Annes, this congestion was horrendous and could not be avoided, we do not want to go through that again</p> <p>We know the importance of green energy and understand that, but feel this is not the on shore place for it, spoiling green belt and natural habitats, bridleways, traffic congestion, flooding, noise and property devaluation because of it, REDACTED is considered as one of the most expensive Lanes on the Fylde Coast, many residents have horses and chose to live here for that reason.</p> <p>We don't want any interruption to farmlands either, we need them.</p> <p>So I strongly object to these proposals</p>	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0091_002_111123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.3	How do we know the impact of the cable corridor on the sea bed will have on fish and shell fish? Are there any other wind farms in the Irish Sea that could be looked at to demonstrate before and after?	<p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects.</p> <p>All impacts on fish and shellfish are detailed in the ES Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology (document reference F2.3).</p>
TA_0092_008_151123	S44	Online feedback form	1		It would be good to understand the impact on marine life. Will there be opportunities for local businesses to get involved in the project in terms of labour/construction/administration etc and would there be a requirement for skilling those employees - potential to work with the College around training and provision of any apprentices.	<p>An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken for the offshore topics of the Transmission Assets Application and is presented in Volume 2 of the ES (document reference F2). Specific examples relevant to marine life are listed below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2). - Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3). - Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						reference F2.4). - Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5). An Outline Employment and Skills Plan has been prepared and submitted as part of the application for development consent (document reference J31). This will be developed further post-consent to detail how the Applicants will engage with local workers and training providers for anticipated employment opportunities associated with the Transmission Assets.
TA_0092__011_151123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.3	Impact on marine life. Report states will aim to conserve habitats for marine life - how and what are the assurances?	An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken for the offshore topics of the Transmission Assets Application and is presented in Volume 2 of the ES (document reference F2). Specific examples relevant to marine life are listed below. - Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2). - Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3). - Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4). - Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5).
TA_0092__016_151123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.9	Need to ensure that the project continues to be sympathetic to all sea users and the environment	An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken for the offshore topics of the Transmission Assets Application and is presented in Volume 2 of the ES (document reference F2). Specific examples relevant to marine life are listed below. - Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2). - Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3). - Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4). - Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5). The impacts of the Transmission Assets (alone and in-combination with other projects), including those on recreational shipping, are assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 9: Other sea users of the ES (document reference: 2.9). More information and details of the proposed mitigation measures are described in the updated Volume 2, Annex 7.1: NRA of the ES and Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and navigation chapter of the ES (document reference: F2.7.1 and F2.7, respectively) submitted as part of the Application.
TA_0097_002_171123	S44	Online feedback form	2		I'm not sure of the full facts of what impact this has on the sea life this must be disruptive to their environment but I would prefer off shore power then building wind farms on shore close to peoples home and considering the list of ill effects this can cause on adults children and animals and the building, noise and eye sore on our country side. I do not want a on shore wind farm where I live in Newton.	An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken for the offshore topics of the Transmission Assets Application and is presented in Volume 2 of the ES (document reference F2). Specific examples relevant to marine life are listed below. - Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2). - Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3). - Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						reference F2.4). - Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5). Detailed assessments are provided within all onshore chapters within Volumes 3 and 4 of the ES (document reference F3 and F4). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets and will continue to work closely with all stakeholders.
TA_0106_017_281023	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.3	The project cannot be expected to be neutral to this aspect and will have only negative consequences. This applies to the following sections.	Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Comprehensive environmental impact assessments, with the engagement of Expert Working Groups where appropriate, have been undertaken of the potential impacts of the project on Marine mammals as presented in Volume 2, Chapter 4 of the ES (document reference: F2.4)
TA_0108_004_231123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.3	Loss of high quality farmland. Known flood areas. Devastating consequences for Newton Kirkham and Freckleton	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES. A flood risk assessment assessing all sources of flooding, including sewers is presented within Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3). The proposed permanent infrastructure associated with the Morgan and Morecambe substations are located within Flood Zone 1 and has a low risk of flooding from all other assessed sources.

E1.16.9.2 Fish and shellfish ecology table of responses (via all other methods)

Table E1.16.9.2: Fish and shellfish ecology table of responses (via all other methods)

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0001_017_231123	S42	Email	<p>1.16 Volume 1, Chapter 3, Table 3.5</p> <p>It seems that some parameters associated with sandwave clearance have not been included, without these it is not clear how the figures for sandwave clearance and seabed preparation were derived. The developer mentions 60% of the cable route and 60% of the foundations may need sandwave clearance. We suggest all parameters (i.e. length/width/area/depth) should be included in the MDS tables.</p> <p>We advise the developer to consider additional parameters for inclusion in Table 3.5 to provide clarity around the sandwave volume MDS figures, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Length of cable route requiring sandwave clearance (km) - Width of sandwave clearance disturbance corridor (m) - Indicative depth of sandwave clearance dredging (m) - Area of seabed disturbed by sandwave clearance (m2) - Seabed preparation areas for foundations (m2).36 	<p>PDE refinements have been made between the PEIR and final application. These refinements have significantly reduced the requirements for sandwave clearance (and associated temporary habitat disturbance) within the Fylde MCZ. Project engineers have refined the parameters for sandwave clearance, using the available geophysical survey data, in the Fylde MCZ from 60% to 5% for the Morgan export cables and from 30% to 5% for the Morecambe export cables. Further information has been provided within Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), section 1.10, Assessment of effects, to characterise the recoverability of sandwave features within the physical processes study area. Parameters such as length, width, depth and volume of sandwave clearance have been included within Volume 2, Chapter 1: Physical processes of the ES (document reference F2.1), Table 1.13: Maximum design scenario considered for the assessment of impacts. Full details of the refined MDS applicable to fish and shellfish ecology are outlined within section 3.9.1 of Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3).</p>
TA_0001_097_231123	S42	Email	<p>1.1 Natural England notes that while diadromous fish are highly mobile, consideration should be made regarding the potential impacts during construction, operation and maintenance phases of the works. Particularly within coastal waters in sensitive seasons, which may disrupt diadromous fish movements between protected sites. The submitted ES should include due consideration of seasonal timing or restrictions of works to mitigate for potential impacts on diadromous fish species with the aim of avoiding (as best as possible) key migratory periods.</p>	<p>Impacts to diadromous fish are fully considered for all project phases and all relevant impacts within Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), for both the project alone assessment in section 3.11, and the Cumulative Effects Assessment in section 3.12. The baseline characterisation presented in Volume 2, Annex 3.1: Fish and shellfish ecology technical report of the ES (document reference F2.3.1) fully outlines knowledge regarding key migratory periods for diadromous fish species, and the precautionary basis that has been applied, thereby assuming that diadromous fish species may be moving through the Transmission Assets at any point year-round rather than just during specific migratory periods, due to widely acknowledged uncertainties in movements for this species group.</p>
TA_0001_098_231123	S42	Email	<p>1.2 Natural England advise that there is very little evidence to support any assertion that fish flee consistently and coherently away from noise sources and therefore we do not agree with soft start piling as mitigation for fish. Natural England advises that soft start piling is not considered as viable mitigation given the lack of evidence to support this.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that soft starts will not benefit all fish species given that fish are such a broad group of organisms, however it is realistic to expect that some fish will be reactive to such processes and may derive benefit. Further, regardless of the benefit to fish species, a soft start process will be required to be implemented to mitigate for marine mammals, therefore it is not considered a realistic scenario to model underwater sound without a soft start. It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey.</p>
TA_0001_099_231123	S42	Email	<p>1.3 Natural England notes that a risk of significant impacts has been identified on spawning herring from piling, but as yet no mitigation measures have been brought forward to address this impact.</p> <p>We advise that mitigation measures are considered and presented in the submitted ES to address the risk of impacts during the herring spawning season.</p>	<p>It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey, and potentially significant effects to spawning herring from underwater sound effects are not predicted.</p>
TA_0001_100_231123	S42	Email	<p>1.4 Natural England seeks confirmation that the proposed HDD works beneath the Ribble Estuary will take place 'bank to bank' (i.e., no works will take place in the water, and entry and exit points for drilling will be terrestrially), thereby mitigating the potential impacts on MCZ Smelt. We also note that the assessment presents no contingency/alternative measures should HDD not be used or fails. The submitted ES should confirm how HDD works will operate to confirm whether there will indeed be potential impacts on Smelt, a feature of the Ribble Estuary MCZ. We also advise the developer should consider impacts of alternate methods should HDD not be feasible or fail.</p>	<p>The Ribble Estuary crossing will be via trenchless techniques and the works will be bank to bank (i.e. no works will take place in the water). There will be no potential for impacts to the smelt feature of the Ribble Estuary MCZ which could undermine the conservation objectives. Smelt is therefore screened out.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0001_101_231123	S42	Email	Project Description 1.5 Vol 1, Ch 3 / Vol 2 Ch 3 The project parameters are clear. NA	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0001_102_231123	S42	Email	Natural England's Position on Worst Case Scenario or Scenarios 1.6 Vol 1, Ch 3 / Vol 2 Ch 3 The Maximum Design Scenario (MDS) is broadly suitable. NA	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0001_103_231123	S42	Email	Natural England's Position on Worst Case Scenario or Scenarios 1.7 Vol 1, Ch 3 / Vol 2 Ch 3 The modelling for an increase in suspended sediments has not been provided, and the physical processes chapter only references to the work done by the Generation Assets. The submitted ES should present the model outputs for changes to SSC from each aspect of the proposed development.	The assessment undertaken was an evidence-based conceptual study, as agreed through the scoping process. Therefore, modelling of the Transmission Assets was not undertaken. Model outputs used to support the ES can be found within the technical annex, Volume 2, Annex 1.1: Physical Processes Associated Modelling Studies of the ES (document reference F2.1.1). This includes both the Mona Offshore Wind Project, Environmental Statement, Volume 6, Annex 1.1: Physical processes technical report and Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets, Environmental Statement, Volume 4, Annex 1.1: Physical Processes Technical Report.
TA_0001_104_231123	S42	Email	Survey Data Acquisition 1.8 Vol 2, Ch3, Table 3.12 All relevant protected sites have been screened in. Commentary only.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0001_105_231123	S42	Email	1.9 Vol 2, Ch3, Table 3.9 Suitable data sources used, albeit somewhat coarse. Commentary only.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0001_106_231123	S42	Email	Survey Data Acquisition 1.1 Vol 2, Ch3, 3.9.2.31 & 3.9.2.48 The developer notes that the short-term nature and limited spatial extent of works means they will be of negligible significance on diadromous fish species to and from key rivers. Natural England notes that while diadromous fish are highly mobile, consideration should be made regarding construction, operation and maintenance phases of the works, particularly within coastal waters in sensitive seasons, which may disrupt diadromous fish movements between protected sites. For example, Atlantic Salmon and smelt move beyond and between important sites, so pressures such as sediment plumes may hinder movements. The submitted ES should include due consideration of seasonal timing or restrictions of works to mitigate for potential impacts on diadromous fish species with the aim of avoiding (as best as possible) key migratory periods, particularly for diadromous fish from designated sites.	Impacts to diadromous fish are fully considered for all project phases and all relevant impacts within Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), for both the project alone assessment in section 3.11, and the Cumulative Effects Assessment in section 3.12. The baseline characterisation presented in Volume 2, Annex 3.1: Fish and shellfish ecology technical report of the ES (document reference F2.3.1) fully outlines knowledge regarding key migratory periods for diadromous fish species, and the precautionary basis that has been applied, thereby assuming that diadromous fish species may be moving through the Transmission Assets at any point year-round rather than just during specific migratory periods, due to widely acknowledged uncertainties in movements for this species group.
TA_0001_107_231123	S42	Email	1.11 Vol 2, Ch3, 3.9.2.70 Similarly with decommissioning, see above comment. As above, the submitted ES should include due consideration of seasonal timing or restrictions of works in relation to diadromous fish species with the aim of avoiding (as best as possible) key migratory periods.	Impacts to diadromous fish are fully considered for all project phases and all relevant impacts within Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), for both the project alone assessment in section 3.11, and the Cumulative Effects Assessment in section 3.12. The baseline characterisation presented in Volume 2, Annex 3.1: Fish and shellfish ecology technical report of the ES (document reference F2.3.1) fully outlines knowledge regarding key migratory periods for diadromous fish species, and the precautionary basis that has been applied, thereby assuming that diadromous fish species may be moving through the Transmission Assets at any point year-round rather than just during specific migratory periods, due to widely acknowledged uncertainties in movements for this species group.
TA_0001_108_231123	S42	Email	1.12 Vol 2, Ch3, 3.11.3.15 3.11.3.38 3.9.3.47 3.11.3.63 Natural England advise that there is very little evidence to support any assertion that fish flee consistently and coherently away from noise sources and therefore we do not agree with soft start piling as mitigation for fish. Natural England advises that soft start piling is not considered as viable mitigation for fish given the lack of evidence to support this.	It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey.
TA_0001_109_231123	S42	Email	Identified Impacts 1.13 Vol 2 Ch 3 3.11.3.22 3.11.3.45 3.11.3.68 3.11.3.88 The cumulative effect significance for herring has been concluded as minor adverse. However, the developer also	It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			states that there could be a residual risk of significant effects on herring spawning for the Transmission Assets if piling occurs during the herring spawning period. It is also noted that further mitigation measures are currently being investigated to minimise this risk but this information hasn't been provided in the Chapter. Therefore, we disagree with the conclusions of minor adverse significance in the absence of mitigation measures. Natural England does not agree with the conclusions of the cumulative effect on herring. We advise that mitigation measures are considered and presented in the submitted ES to address the risk of impacts during the herring spawning season. These measures will need to be presented with adequate justification on how they will minimise the risk.	include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey, and potentially significant effects to spawning herring from underwater sound effects are not predicted.
TA_0001_110_231123	S42	Email	Methodology 1.14 Vol 2, Ch3 Please note that Natural England defer to CEFAS on the suitability of the underwater noise modelling parameters and methods. To note.	The Applicants note your response. Comments from CEFAS have been addressed and responded to separately.
TA_0001_111_231123	S42	Email	Methodology 1.15 Vol 2, Ch3, Table 3.14 Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets – Method statements and installation plans. Natural England should be consulted on for the Construction Method Statements, Mitigation Protocols, EMPs and Installation plans in advance of construction to ensure that all the correct measures are secured. This should be secured within the DCO/dML.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0001_012_231123	S42	Email	Screening 1.16 Table 1.13 (HRA screening) Both species of shad are screened out despite their presence in the region. Include shad within all assessments of impacts on diadromous fish, particularly underwater noise, or provide a justification for excluding them. The species is regionally present. https://sac.jncc.gov.uk/species/S1103/	Both allis and twaite shad are included as important ecological features (IEFs) for the Environmental Statement (see section 3.6.5 of Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3)), and are specifically assessed for relevant impacts within section 3.11 and 3.12 of Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3). For HRA, no sites are screened in for assessment for Annex II diadromous fish include shad species as designated features, therefore shad are fully assessed within Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3).
TA_0001_113_231123	S42	Email	In- combination 1.17 Table 3.33 Issues highlighted in other thematic areas: Some of the cumulative tier 1 plans, projects and activities in the cumulative Zone of Influence (Zol) do not have figures for the predicted temporary habitat disturbance or loss. Therefore, the total figure presented at the bottom of the table is an underestimate. For projects that have been classified as "low level and intermittent throughout the licence period", further information should be provided in the submitted ES to clarify their cumulative impact.	It is not always possible to include values for all projects within the Cumulative Effects Assessment, where those projects do not publicly publish values for these parameters. The projects screened in for Cumulative Effects Assessment for fish and shellfish ecology have been reviewed for inclusion in Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and where values are available representing habitat loss, these have been incorporated.
TA_0001_114_231123	S42	Email	Screening 1.18 Transmission assets MCZ assessment All relevant MCZ and features have been screened in. Commentary only	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0001_115_231123	S42	Email	1.19 Transmission assets MCZ assessment, Table 1.7 Natural England note that the developer proposes to use Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) for transmission works beneath the Ribble estuary. Can the developer confirm that works will take place bank to bank (i.e., no works will take place in the water, and entry and exit points for drilling will be terrestrially)? Additionally, full consideration of impacts should HDD not be undertaken or should HDD fail (i.e. consideration of alternate methods and their potential impacts). The submitted ES should confirm how drilling works intend to operate (i.e., terrestrially, bank to bank) to confirm whether there will indeed be impacts on Smelt, a feature of the Ribble Estuary MCZ. We also advise the developer should consider impacts of alternate methods should HDD not be feasible or fail.	The Ribble Estuary crossing will be via trenchless techniques and the works will be bank to bank (i.e. no works will take place in the water). There will be no potential for impacts to the smelt feature of the Ribble Estuary MCZ which could undermine the conservation objectives. Smelt is therefore screened out.
TA_0001_290_231123	S42	Email	Fish and Shellfish Ecology There is a lack of evidence suggesting that fish flee away from noise sources in a consistent and directional way. Therefore, soft-start mitigation is not thought to be effective mitigation for fish receptors and Natural England advises the developer to remove soft start piling from the list of viable mitigation for protected fish species.	It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0001_291_231123	S42	Email	The report states that there could be a residual risk of significant effects on herring spawning for the Transmission Assets if piling occurs during the herring spawning period. Natural England advises that robust mitigation measures are identified and presented in the ES.	It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey, and potentially significant effects to spawning herring from underwater sound effects are not predicted.
TA_0001_292_231123	S42	Email	Further detail is required confirming how the HDD works intend to operate in order to assess the impacts on Smelt from the Ribble Estuary MCZ. Natural England also advises that the developer should consider the impacts of alternative methods should HDD fail.	The Ribble Estuary crossing will be via trenchless techniques and so there will be no impacts to the smelt feature of the Ribble Estuary MCZ which could undermine the conservation objectives. Smelt is screened out.
TA_0001_310_231123	S42	Email	<p>Appendix 1</p> <p>The following Framework has been used in Natural England's advice to attribute risk to the project:</p> <p>Structure / Framework Risk</p> <p>Purple</p> <p>Note for the developer.</p> <p>Red</p> <p>Natural England considers that unless these issues are resolved it will have to advise that (in relation to any one of them, and as appropriate) it is not possible to ascertain beyond reasonable scientific doubt that the project will not affect the integrity of an SAC/SPA/Ramsar and/or significantly hinder the conservation objectives of an MCZ and/or damage or destroy the interest features of a SSSI and/or comply fully with the Environmental Impact Assessment requirements. Addressing these concerns may require the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new baseline or survey data; and/or • significant revisions to baseline characterisation and/or impact modelling and/or • significant design changes; and/or • significant mitigation <p>Natural England feels that issues given Red status are so complex, or require the provision of so much outstanding information, that they are unlikely to be resolved during the Examination, and respectfully suggests that they be addressed beforehand.</p> <p>Amber</p> <p>Natural England does not agree with the developer's position or approach and consider that this could make a material difference to the outcome of the decision-making process for this project. Natural England considers that these matters may be resolved through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provision of additional evidence or justification to support conclusions; and/or • revisions to impact assessment methodology and/or assessment conclusions; and/or • minor to moderate revisions to impact modelling; and/or • well-designed mitigation measures that are adequately secured through the draft DCO/dML and/or • amendments to draft plans <p>If these issues remain at the time of the application and are not addressed or resolved by the end of the Examination, then they may become a Red risk as set out above.</p> <p>Yellow</p> <p>Natural England doesn't agree with the developer's position or approach. We would ideally like this to be addressed but are satisfied that for this particular project it is unlikely to make a material difference to our advice or the outcome of the decision-making process. However, we reserve the right to revise our opinion should further evidence be presented.</p> <p>It should be noted by interested parties that just because these issues/comments are not raised as significant concerns in this instance, it should not be understood or inferred that Natural England would be of the same view in other cases or circumstances.</p> <p>Green</p> <p>Natural England is in broad agreement with the developer's approach and has no significant outstanding concerns. As above, we reserve the right to revise our opinion should new evidence be presented.</p>	Natural England's advice has been noted, specifically in the assessment of effects on ecological receptors (see Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3)).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0014_001_231123	S42	Email	Table 3.4: Summary of scoping responses Noting responses received on the Scoping Report, the Territorial Sea Committee (TSC) should, for clarity, indicate that it is a committee made up of a number of Departments from the Isle of Man Government.	This has been amended within Table 3.5 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3).
TA_0014_002_231123	S42	Email	3.5.2.2 (Pg 35): 'spiny scallop Chlamys hastata' this is a North American (Pacific) species and not present in the eastern Atlantic. Perhaps Mimachlamys varia is the intended species?	This has been amended within section 3.6.2 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3).
TA_0014_003_231123	S42	Email	Table 3.11: Suggest consideration of herring as a Regional (sensitivity/value), rather than a National. Herring quota is allocated regionally, fished by several jurisdictions (including the Isle of Man from 2023) and life cycle stages are transboundary around the transmission assets, and with multi-jurisdictional legislation and management applicable	Herring are considered of National value due to their listing as Species of Principal Importance in England and Wales under the NERC Act 2006, and the importance of the Manx herring spawning ground to the east Irish Sea herring stocks. It is proposed that herring remain considered of National value based on the criteria presented within Table 3.11 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3).
TA_0014_004_231123	S42	Email	European eel similarly a regional species (potentially international), but not national. Significant transboundary relevance, including migration.	The Applicants note your response. European eel defined value is based upon it's protection under national legislation , OSPAR status and status as a Species of Principal Importance under the NERC Act 2006. It is proposed that European eel remain considered of National value based on the criteria presented within Table 3.11 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3).
TA_0014_005_231123	S42	Email	Consider also Sea trout as regional, as above.	The Applicants note your response. Sea trout defined value is based upon it's protection under national legislation in some areas, and it's status as a Species of Principal Importance under the NERC Act 2006. It is proposed that sea trout remain considered of National value based on the criteria presented within Table 3.11 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3).
TA_0014_006_231123	S42	Email	Table 3.14: CoT64: There is a reference to Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocols in the Fish and Shellfish Chapter, and similarly in the Non-Technical Summary; "An Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocols will be developed and implemented during construction to reduce the risk of injury to marine mammals and fish species."It seems odd to include fish in a Marine Mammal document. If the potential impacts are similar, the response or specific /appropriate mitigation may not be. As such, there should be separate MarineMammal and Fish Mitigation Protocols - or renamed to megafauna as appropriate.	The Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (document reference J18) is specifically designed to mitigate for marine mammals, however has overall benefits to fish. A separate Protocol for fish is not considered required.
TA_0014_007_231123	S42	Email	3.9.3.36 (pg.105- herring and piling noise) – noted. - Is there a time period mitigation in relation to piling (e.g. Sep-Oct?) given that; 'This study suggests that herring's biological driver to use these grounds to spawn may have overridden the potential effects of percussive piling sound on herring (Brown and May Marine Ltd, 2009d).- Noted: 3.9.3.46 Herring are deemed to be of high vulnerability, high recoverability and national importance. The sensitivity of the receptor is high. - Pg.117....however this increased level of impact would only potentially occur, with disturbance to spawning herring, if piling takes place during the spawning period (September to October). - Pg 117 noted: 'It is noted above that there is a residual risk of significant effects on herring spawning if piling occurs during the herring spawning season. Measures to minimise the risk of significant effects on herring spawning are currently being investigated and will be discussed with relevant stakeholders via the EWG and included in the ES if required. 'The TSC therefore requests inclusion in these discussions due to its interest in the management and fishing of regional herring population.	It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey, and potentially significant effects to spawning herring from underwater sound effects are not predicted.
TA_0014_008_231123	S42	Email	3.9.5.6: The TSC has previously submitted comments on this section (see Morgan Generation Scoping Response, Section 8.8.4.13), and since the section remains the same in this PEIR, then the earlier response remains valid. The text requires review and amendment as appropriate;- This section raises a number of concerns about how data is presented, assessed and concluded. For example; - 'Many shellfish species, such as edible crab and king and queen scallop, have a high tolerance to SSC and are reported to be insensitive to increases in turbidity (Wilber and Clarke, 2001); '- This reference relates to a temperate/subtropical North American species (Argopecten irradians) in estuarine conditions, and CANNOT be extrapolated to king and queen scallops. 'In the case of possible burial during settlement of SSC, both king and queen scallop have the potential to be impacted negatively. However, it has been found that any potential burial of queen scallop does not negatively impact emergence from sediment and	The relevant sections described have been reviewed and updated for the Environmental Statement, with amendments consistently applied between Morgan Generation Assets and the Transmission Assets. Updated text is presented within Section 3.11 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>survival rates in the short term of up to two days, with the caveat that they do have the potential to be negatively impacted when buried under several centimetres of sediment over longer time periods, up to seven days (Hendrick et al., 2016). 'The actual conclusion of this laboratory study was that 'the queen scallop (<i>Aequipecten opercularis</i>)' was 'highly intolerant to burial'. Why not also present this simple conclusion? 'The MDS modelling of sediment plume movement and deposition depths have shown this is unlikely to occur in this case. King and queen scallop both have high intensity spawning grounds mostly overlapping the Morgan Array Area and are both more mobile than many other shellfish species and are expected to avoid active events causing increases in SSC. This potential avoidance behaviour is less prevalent in juvenile king scallop, where burial from up to 5cm of SSC deposition can reduce growth rates, potentially having impacts on future spawning times (Szostek et al., 2013). However, the relatively low level of SSC and deposition, and the large area available alternatively for spawning, is unlikely to significantly impact king scallop populations in the short or long term.' -While these species are relatively more mobile than other shellfish, Szostek et al., 2013, also noted that 'A. opercularis frequently swim short distances (by repeated 'clapping' of the shells) to escape predators, while P. maximus exhibit this behaviour much less frequently and require a longer aerobic recovery time (Brand 2006).' - The research also involved juvenile scallops (30mm) which are more active than adults – so the extrapolated effect to include adult (commercial size) animals cannot be reasonably concluded.- As such, this appears to represent rather selective data and over-generalised conclusions, and is of concern in the context of such assessments if this practice is common, given the scope and scale of the material presented.</p>	
TA_0014_009_231123	S42	Email	<p>Future Monitoring -Noting 3.9.11 and 3.11.9: If there is no monitoring to test predictions, how will the validity of the assumptions and conclusions in relation to impacts be validated? -Without monitoring evidence how can the ES be defended in the longer term, or stakeholders interests be properly safeguarded? The TSC considers that it should be a fundamental requirement of such a project to include a basic monitoring programme across all receptors to confirm assumptions, conclusions and predictions, or otherwise.</p>	<p>No monitoring is considered necessary to test the predicted effects of the Transmission Assets outlined within Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3).</p>
TA_0014_010_231123	S42	Email	<p>3.12 Transboundary Effects Noted: '3.12.1.1 A screening of transboundary impacts has been carried out and has identified that there was no potential for significant transboundary effects with regard to fish and shellfish ecology from the Transmission Assets upon the interests of other states. ' Monitoring · However, noting Tables 3.35 and 3.36, and see also comment on Future Monitoring (above), how can confirmation of no transboundary effects be achieved if no monitoring is undertaken? · Non Technical Summary: 'An Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocols will be developed and implemented during construction to reduce the risk of injury to marine mammals and fish species.' Why is this referred to in the fish and shellfish section, when it relates to marine mammals? As noted above: It seems odd to include fish in a Marine Mammal document. If the potential impacts are similar, the response or specific /appropriate mitigation may not be. As such, there should be separate Marine Mammal and Fish Mitigation Protocols - or renamed to megafauna as appropriate.</p>	<p>The Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (document reference J18) is specifically designed to mitigate for marine mammals, however has overall benefits to fish. A separate Protocol for fish is not considered required.</p>
TA_0017_005_231123	S42/S44	Email	<p>The Marine Management Organisation and Natural England should be consulted regarding potential ecological impacts offshore substation platforms and booster stations.</p>	<p>The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. The assessments offshore topic chapters of the Transmission Assets Application have been updated to reflect this amendment. With the removal of the Morgan Offshore Substation Platform (OSP), the Morecambe OSP and the Morgan Offshore Booster Station from the Project Description, and the associated removal for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.</p>
TA_0023_002_221123	S42	Email	<p>Fish and Shellfish Ecology: NRW (A) agree the overall conclusions, but provide some advice on how to improve the shadow HRA. We do not agree with some of the (in - combination) conclusions of the Environmental Statement.</p>	<p>The Applicants note your response.</p>
TA_0023_008_221123	S42	Email	<p>Overall, NRW (A) agree with the shadow HRA conclusion of no significant impact to site integrity for diadromous fish features of the following sites: Dee Estuary/ Aber Dyfrwy SAC, River Dee</p>	<p>The Applicants note your response.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			and Bala lake/ Afon Dyfrwy a Llyn Tegid SAC and Afon Gwyrfai a Llyn Cwellyn SAC. We do, however, provide some advice below that would improve the robustness of the shadow HRA.	
TA_0023_009_221123	S42	Email	NRW (A) do not at agree that the impacts from underwater noise on fish receptors can be assessed as 'minor adverse' in-combination with other planned projects in Liverpool Bay	It should be noted that the project design has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey.
TA_0023_010_221123	S42	Email	1. NRW (A) note that, amongst other consultees, NRW advised during the consultation stage that ; "...due to the extensive migration periods of various life stages of migratory fish and inshore foraging of sea trout and eel, determining key migration windows robustly is difficult". NRW (A) therefore advise that diadromous fish are assumed to be present in the study area throughout the year'.	The baseline characterisation presented in Volume 2, Annex 3.1: Fish and shellfish ecology technical report of the ES (document reference F2.3) fully outlines knowledge regarding key migratory periods for diadromous fish species, and the precautionary basis that has been applied, thereby assuming that diadromous fish species may be moving through the Transmission Assets at any point year-round rather than just during specific migratory periods, due to widely acknowledged uncertainties in movements for this species group.
TA_0023_011_221123	S42	Email	2. While NRW (A) recognises the response made in Table 3.4, Vol 2, Chapter 3, page 23 we note that throughout the PEIR repeated reference is made to diadromous fish "passing through the area during migrations to and from rivers located on the west coast of England and Wales, such as to rivers with designated sites with diadromous fish species listed as qualifying features". Consequently, it appears that our advice has not been followed and we reiterate the advice that diadromous fish should be assumed to be present throughout the year.	The baseline characterisation presented in Volume 2, Annex 3.1: Fish and shellfish ecology technical report of the ES (document reference F2.3) fully outlines knowledge regarding key migratory periods for diadromous fish species, and the precautionary basis that has been applied, thereby assuming that diadromous fish species may be moving through the Transmission Assets at any point year-round rather than just during specific migratory periods, due to widely acknowledged uncertainties in movements for this species group. Whilst migratory movements are referred to within Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), the assumption still stands that these movements may occur year-round.
TA_0023_012_221123	S42	Email	3. Furthermore, we note that in the Habitats Regulations Assessment Stage 2 Information to Support an Appropriate Assessment p. 143, sections 1.8.1.14 - 1.8.1.16, it states that no site specific information is available for the feature. Please note that NRW publish an annual catchments specific report for migratory salmonids on the river Dee, available online (Know your river - Dee), as for river and sea lamprey this would be the same information as set out above for the Dee Estuary.	Baseline information on diadromous fish populations have been considered in Volume 2, Chapter 3.1: Fish and shellfish ecology technical report of the ES (document reference: F2.3.1), as relevant, including relevant information on diadromous fish in north west England and north Wales. The baseline has been updated with the NRW publication for migratory salmonids within Part 2 of the ISAA (Assessment of potential adverse effect on integrity: Annex II diadromous fish species; ISAA Part 2 - document reference E2.2)
TA_0023_013_221123	S42	Email	1. We note that Atlantic cod have high intensity spawning and nursery grounds overlapping with the array site and are a group 3 hearing fish, so sensitive to noise. Furthermore, Atlantic cod are listed as Vulnerable (vu) on the IUCN Red List and ICES advice for 2023 for the Eastern Irish Sea stock (division VIIa) is that there should be zero catch (Working Group for the Celtic Seas Ecoregion (WGCSE) (figshare.com)). On this basis we consider that Atlantic cod should be given a sensitivity rating of 'High'.	Sensitivity of cod to underwater sound impacts is considered high (Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3)). It should be noted that the design of the transmission Assets has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the design (see Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES, document reference F1.3). The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey.
TA_0023_014_221123	S42	Email	2. NRW (A) agree with the conclusion of the PEIR of no significant effects on fish and shellfish receptors from the project alone, based on the limited spatial and temporal nature of the piling noise. We note that Page 104 section 3.9.3.85 recognises that a residual risk exists of significant effects on herring spawning if piling occurs during the herring spawning season and that measures to minimise the risk of significant effects on herring spawning are currently being investigated and will be discussed with relevant stakeholders via the Expert Working Group (EWG) and included in the Environmental Statement (ES) if required. NRW (A) welcomes this and with reference to our position on Atlantic cod above, advise that measures for cod spawning are also considered.	It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey. No potentially significant effects to herring or cod spawning are predicted to occur as a result of underwater sound associated with UXO clearance or geophysical surveys.
TA_0023_015_221123	S42	Email	1. In relation to the cumulative assessment for noise impacts, NRW (A) are however, unable to agree with the conclusion of 'minor adverse' for fish receptors. In our consultation responses for Mona PEIR, Morgan PEIR and Morecambe PEIR we have consistently advised	It should be noted that the design of the transmission Assets has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the design. The updated

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			that we are unable to agree with a conclusion of 'Minor adverse' for Atlantic cod and Herring. NRW (A) would therefore advise that, in the final ES, consideration is given to further mitigation in terms of timing piling activities to avoid spawning seasons for cod and herring.	MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey. No potentially significant effects to herring or cod spawning are predicted to occur as a result of underwater sound associated with UXO clearance or geophysical surveys.
TA_0023_017_221123	S42	Email	1. NRW (A) welcomes the stated intention to use of the Popper et al (2014) guidelines and welcome the inclusion of a behavioural disturbance threshold of 160dB contour. We note that this is given as based on SPLpeak. However in line with the discussions in the Popper et al 2014 guidelines NRW would recommend that SELcum is used when assessing the total noise energy level from pile driving impacting fish.	It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey. No underwater sound modelling outputs are presented for piling in section 3.11 of Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3). Volume 1, Annex 5.2: Underwater sound technical report of the ES (document reference F1.5.2) - Piling has been removed from the design for the DCO application of the Transmission Assets.
TA_0023_018_221123	S42	Email	1. NRW (A) advise that for clarity in the final ES, a clear worst case scenario assessment for each species of particular interest (sandeel, cod and herring) is presented which shows each individual effect of noise (injury/death, temporary threshold shift [TTS]), behavioural effects and effects to eggs/larvae). Furthermore, for key information, such as thresholds for death/injury, TTS and behavioural impacts, NRW (A) would advise that the area which is ensonified should be presented in tables and as percentage of available spawning/nursery habitat in Liverpool bay. Finally, maps showing the SELcum noise contours at the thresholds should be included to aid interpretation. 15. This is particularly relevant to the subsequent assessments of inter-related and cumulative impacts on these IEG species.	It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey. No underwater sound modelling outputs are presented for piling in section 3.11 of Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3). The maximum scenario for underwater sound is presented in Volume 1, Annex 5.2: Underwater sound technical report of the ES (document reference F1.5.2), further interpretation of which is undertaken as part of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3).
TA_0023_019_221123	S42	Email	16. NRW (A) note CoT64 specifies implementing soft-start and ramp-up measure to reduce the potential for impacts to fish and shellfish receptors. Soft-start and ramp up is also mentioned as a mitigation measure throughout the remainder of the chapter.17. While NRW (A) recognise that soft-start and ramp up are standard practise in piling operations, we are unaware of any evidence to supports that soft-start and ramp up is effective to mitigate impulsive noise impact for fish or illicit a fleeing behaviour. Furthermore, due to the lack of evidence to support fleeing behaviour we advise that spawning fish are assessed as static receptors. Consequently, we would advise that the final ES assessment a realistic worst-case scenario discounting soft-start and ramp up a measure is presented.	It is acknowledged that soft starts will not benefit all fish species given that fish are such a broad group of organisms, however it is realistic to expect that some fish will be reactive to such processes and may derive benefit. Further, regardless of the benefit to fish species, a soft start process will be required to be implemented to mitigate for marine mammals, therefore it is not considered a realistic scenario to model underwater sound without a soft start. It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES, and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey. No underwater sound modelling outputs are presented for piling in section 3.11 of Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3).
TA_0023_020_221123	S42	Email	18. Section 1.8.2.3 p. 57, of Volume 1, Annex 5.2 Underwater noise Technical report when describing the impact piling scenarios states that "there is the potential for piling to occur concurrently at the OSP within the Morecambe Array Area and the Morgan booster substation. Injury ranges are not presented for this case as there is no overlap of the injury ranges due to the separation of the activities. This is therefore assessed in terms of disturbance only in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the PEIR."19. In the final ES NRW (A) strongly advise that concurrent monopile scenarios are fully described and modelled as a potential worst-case scenario for fish and shellfish and that the impact in terms of TTS and behavioural effects are presented, in addition to those for injury.	It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey. No underwater sound modelling outputs are presented for piling in section 3.11 of Volume 2, chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3).
TA_0035_082_221123	S42/S44	Email	CoT47 Cable Specification and Installation Plan(s) will include measures to limit the extent of cable protection and sandwave clearance within the Fylde MCZ and will be informed through the undertaking of survey works pre-constructionIssueMeasures to limit the impact of proposed	An Outline Offshore Cable Specification and Installation Plan is provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J15).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			works within the Fylde MCZ have yet to be fully developed. Impact Risk to the marine environment. Solution Outline Cable Specification and Installation Plan to be to be secured in the DCO submission.	
TA_0035_083_221123	S42/S44	Email	CoT65 Outline Offshore Construction Environmental Management Plan(s) will be developed and will include details of:- a marine pollution contingency plan to address the risks, methods and procedures to deal with any spills and collision incidents in relation to all activities carried out below MHWS;- a chemical risk review to include information regarding how and when chemicals are to be used, stored and transported in accordance with recognised best practice guidance;- a marine biosecurity plan detailing how the risk of introduction and spread of invasive non-native species will be minimised;- dropped object protocol will be developed for the reporting and recovery of dropped objects where they pose a potential hazard to other marine users. Issue Measures to manage environmental risk below MHWS have yet to be fully developed. Impact Risk to the marine environment Solution Outline Offshore Construction Environmental Management Plan to be to be secured in the DCO submission which is enforceable with the Marine Management Organisation.	An Offshore Environmental Management Plan will be provided post-consent and will be secured through CoT65.
TA_0010_035_221123	S42	Email	Volume 2 Chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology – Shellfish 6.1. MMO considers that concerns raised prior to the submission of the PEIR in pre-application engagement and EIA scoping have been included for shellfish and shellfisheries. 6.2. MMO agrees with the decision to scope out the effects of accidental pollution during construction, operations and maintenance and decommissioning. 6.3. The PEIR uses relevant data sources to characterise the baseline for shellfish and shellfisheries. The assessment is proportionate to fully identify and assess the potential impacts relating to shellfish and shellfisheries. 6.4. All impacts relating to shellfish and shellfisheries have been considered and that there are no information gaps that require attention currently for shellfish and shellfisheries. There is also an adequate description of the potential cumulative and inter-related impacts and effects on the physical and biological environment.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0010_036_221123	S42	Email	Volume 2 Chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology – Fish 7.1. MMO notes that the Applicant has defined a broad study area for the characterisation of fish and shellfish ecology and the key demersal, pelagic and migratory species, as well as several important elasmobranch species, all have generally been well characterised. A table of the key fish receptors taken forward to the assessment is presented in Table 3.12.7.2. A desk-based assessment using existing data sources has been carried out to identify the fish receptors in the region. Data sources include international fisheries survey data, pre- and post-construction surveys from other nearby Offshore Wind Farms (OWFs), MMO landings data, and existing peer-reviewed papers and relevant publications. The data and publications used are appropriate to inform the assessment, and whilst some of the data are somewhat dated now (>10 years old), the limitation of the data vintage has been acknowledged within the report. 7.3. MMO notes a detailed discussion on the spawning and nursery grounds within the transmission assets boundary (TAB) in Section 1.3.3 of the Fish and Shellfish Ecology Technical Report using data from Coull et al., (1998) and Ellis et al., (2012). Fish species with spawning and/or nursery grounds that overlap the TAB have been presented in Table 1.4 and the spawning seasons for these species have been presented in Table 1.5.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0010_037_221123	S42	Email	7.4. The spawning period for herring in Table 1.4 is indicated as being that for the Mourne stock. Whilst this is not incorrect, historically, the Isle of Man has been acknowledged as an important spawning ground for Manx herring in the Irish Sea region (Dickey-Collas et al., 2001), and the presence of spawning grounds, particularly around Douglas Bank to east of the Isle of Man, has been well-documented (Coull et al., 1998; Dickey-Collas et al., 2001; Ellis et al., 2012). The Isle of Man grounds comprise one of the three main spawning grounds in the Irish Sea region, alongside the Mourne spawning component, located off the coast of Kilkeel, Northern Ireland, and the Clyde spawning component, located in the Clyde Estuary (Brophy and Danilowicz, 2002). However, both the Mourne and Clyde spawning stocks are depleted and their contributions to the Irish Sea herring stock are considered somewhat minor (ICES, 1994; 2001). 7.5. The sampling grid for the Northern Irish Herring Larvae (NINEL) survey covers the northern Irish sea with sample stations across both the east and west extents, and in 2021 found that, as in previous years, the majority of larvae were captured in the eastern Irish Sea, in the vicinity of the Douglas bank spawning ground near the Isle of Man (ICES, 2023). Whilst the NINEL survey does sample in the vicinity of the Mourne spawning grounds, given that the Manx	The spawning period has been updated in Volume 2, Annex 3.1: Fish and shellfish ecology technical report of the ES to specifically reference the Douglas Bank Manx herring as outlined in Dickey-Collas et al., (2001) (document reference F2.3.1).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>spawning grounds represent a more productive spawning ground and are closer to the Morgan array, the Applicant should narrow their assessment to this stock only. For Isle of Man herring, spawning is considered to take place over a period of 3-4 weeks from late September (Dickey-Collas et al. , 2001) and so the period of spawning indicated in Table 1.4 should be updated to include the month of September.</p>	
TA_0010_038_221123	S42	Email	<p>7.6. Potential impacts to fisheries and fish ecology within the TAB which could occur during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases are detailed in Table 3.6 and summarised in Table 1 below. The impacts identified are appropriate for a development of this nature and scale. Table 1: Potential impacts to fisheries and fish ecology arising from the project. This table is available in the PDF from the MMO. 7.7. The potential effects of accidental pollution during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning phases have been scoped out of further assessment on the basis that such effects will be managed by the implementation of measures set out in standard post-consent plans (e.g., Outline Offshore Construction Environmental Management Plan (EMP)). MMO agrees with this.</p>	<p>The Applicants note your response.</p>
TA_0010_039_221123	S42	Email	<p>7.8. Section 3.9.3.16 is somewhat misleading. The report states that "when consecutive pin piling is considered and modelled, the TTS ranges for fish... modelled as stationary receptors have a maximum range of 19.8 km. These ranges are considerably lower than the impacts of the single piling and are thus unlikely to significantly increase the level of impact". The installation of a single monopile is predicted to give the largest effect ranges. However, consecutive pin piles have a larger effect range than a single pin pile. The MMO requests that the wording is clarified here. 7.9. MMO requests the rationale for adopting a threshold of 160 decibels (dB) peak sound pressure level (SPL_{peak}) for assessing behavioural effects in fish. The report states that "a threshold of 160 dB re 1 µPa SPL_{pk} is considered more appropriate for detecting real impacts on a proportionate basis, in line with the evidence set out above". Evidence and justification must be provided prior to the application submission. 7.10. The footnote on page 83 states: "Different SNCBs show a preference for different metrics for the assessment of impacts of underwater sound. Bellman et al. (2020) demonstrates that zero to peak SPL and broadband SEL metrics show a relatively consistent differentiation of approximately 22 dB, i.e., an SEL of 140 dB is equivalent to a peak SPL of approximately 162 dB. This suggests that an SEL value of 135 dB is almost the equivalent of a peak SPL value of 160 dB". Presumably, the reference to Bellman et al. (2020) is specifically referring to Figure 12 which shows measured peak sound pressure levels and sound exposure levels (SEL) at 750 m from the source. Please note that the difference in dB will vary with the shape of the pulse, which is dependent on many factors, not least the distance from the source and water depth etc. Lippert et al. (2015) provide an empirical estimation of the peak sound pressure level from the sound exposure level for impact pile driving noise (see equation 1): $SPL_{peak} = A SEL + B$ (equation 1) where sound pressure level (SPL)_{peak} is the peak SPL, SEL is the sound exposure level, and A and B are empirical constants, estimated from measurements. Using this conversion, for a single strike Sound Exposure Level (SELs) of 140 dB, there will be a difference of 16 dB (deriving a SPL_{peak} value of 156 dB). For a SELs of 150 dB, there will be a difference of 20 dB, and so on. Thus, a SELs of 135 dB is equivalent to a SPL_{peak} value of approximately 149 dB. The assessment should be revised accordingly. 7.11. Section 3.9.4.7, which addresses noise from continuous sources, states that "SELs have been estimated for each vessel type based on 24 hours continuous operation, although it is important to note that it is highly unlikely that any fish would stay at a stationary location or within a fixed radius of a vessel for 24 hours. Therefore, the acoustic modelling has been undertaken based on an animal swimming away from the source (or the source moving away from an animal)". Please see comment (points 9.1 and 9.25) regarding the root-mean-square sound pressure level (SPL_{rms}) metric for fish species.</p>	<p>It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey. No underwater sound modelling outputs are presented for piling in section 3.11 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey. No underwater sound modelling for piling is presented within Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3).</p>
TA_0010_040_221123	S42	Email	<p>Habitat suitability assessments for herring and sandeel. 7.12. MMO notes the presentation habitat suitability maps in Figures 1.24-1.25 (for herring) and 1.31-1.32 (for sandeel) which depict the broadscale distribution of 'preferred', 'marginal' and 'unsuitable' habitat sediments. Broadscale seabed sediment data taken from European Marine Observation and Data Network (EMODnet), have been overlain with site-specific particle size analysis (PSA) data, which is appropriate. However, there are large areas of the maps which present no broadscale seabed sediment data. MMO has assumed that the data layer has been clipped to present only the 'relevant' sediments, i.e., suitable and marginal ones, however this has not been outlined in the</p>	<p>Sediments presented within habitat suitability maps in Volume 2, Annex 3.1: Fish and shellfish ecology technical report of the ES (document register F2.3.1) are those which are consistent with the Folk classifications aligning with "preferred" or "marginal" sediment composition. A separate figure is provided showing the full BGS classification, however we suggest that presenting the "relevant" substrate types provides more clarity in the distribution of where preferred and marginal sediments are reported to occur.</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			accompanying text and initially it appears as though no data are available, which is not the case. It would be more appropriate to present the full distribution of all seabed sediment types across the study area, to help contextualise the wider environment and the site-specific PSA data. For this purpose, MMO requests the Applicant presents the British Geological Survey (BGS) Seabed Sediment data which is classified according to the Folk Sediment classification units (Folk, 1954). Although this is an older dataset, the distribution of seabed sediments for the wider study area are available. PSA data should also be presented as Folk Sediment classification units (Folk, 1954), and coloured to be consistent with the underlying BGS data. Doing so will ensure that the PSA data are easily comparable and will prevent misinterpretation. MMO expects the data to be presented as requested in the ES.	
TA_0010_041_221123	S42	Email	Sandeel 7.13. In Figure 1.32, the EMODnet data characterises sediments within the TAB as a matrix of sand, and slightly gravelly sand, denoted as 'preferred' sandeel habitat (as per Latto et al. , 2013), and presumed unsuitable sediments (see point 7.11). It is concluded that "the distribution of habitat suitability shows that the Morgan Array Area is largely classified as unsuitable (48%; >10% mud) and marginal (37%; between 4%-10% mud and between 50%-70% sand) habitat, with intermittent areas of preferred (16%) habitat". The 23 PSA samples presented in this figure have been classified as either 'preferred', or 'marginal' habitat, compared to 38 samples classified as 'unsuitable', however, it is also important to note the TAB falls in its entirety within the high intensity spawning ground as indicated by Ellis et al. , (2012).	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0010_042_221123	S42	Email	7.14. For this reason, MMO disagrees with the assertion that sediments within the array area are largely unsuitable as sandeel habitat as the evidence presented indicates very mixed potential. Classifying sediments as 'marginal' or 'suitable' does not preclude that sandeel will inhabit these areas as, though the sediment may not be the most preferred type, these sediments will still have sufficient integrity to provide habitat for sandeel. At present, the sandeel suitability assessment is based solely on the distribution and composition of sediments and presence/absence data for sandeel (which has been acknowledged as anecdotal evidence of presence only). Additional data layers (including sandeel fishing fleet Automatic Identification System (AIS) / Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) data, as well as the Coull et al. (1998) data layer) are incorporated into the MarineSpace (2013b) 'heat' mapping methodology which allows for a more confident assessment of sandeel potential habitat. Therefore, MMO requests that the sandeel habitat suitability assessment is revised following the MarineSpace (2013b) method and provide a 'heat' map of sandeel potential habitat for the fish ecology study area.	The Applicants note your response. Heat mapping using AIS/VMS data has been investigated and is not considered likely to provide further clarity than the information presented regarding site-specific PSA data alongside mapped spawning grounds. Data from the Cefas OneBenthic tool has been integrated into substrate suitability mapping within Volume 2, Annex 3.1: Fish and shellfish ecology technical report of the ES (document reference F2.3.1) to provide more regional context for the project from a more robust perspective than heavy reliance on broadscale, interpolated data.
TA_0010_043_221123	S42	Email	Herring 7.15. Figure 1.25 indicates that only two out of the 103 PSA samples taken from within the TAB, contained sediments with potential to support herring spawning (one preferred and one marginal). This is supported by the NINEL data which are presented in Figures 1.26 - 1.30 (Vol.2, Annex 3.1: Fish and Shellfish Ecology Technical Report), and indicate that for the years of data presented (2012-2021) there is little overlap between the presence of herring larvae with the TAB. MMO notes that it is acknowledged that there is some underestimation of larval abundance in the NINEL data compared to acoustic surveys. In addition, it is outlined that the spawning grounds identified by Coull et al. , (1998) do not overlap with the TAB. MMO is in broad agreement with this initial assessment and agrees with the conclusion that impacts to herring arising from seabed disturbance from cable laying activities are unlikely to occur. However, MMO does have concerns regarding the potential impacts to Manx herring at their spawning grounds from underwater noise (UWN) caused by piling activity (see comment 7.29 and comment 7.31).	The Applicants note your response. It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey.
TA_0010_044_221123	S42	Email	7.16. MMO notes that it is indicated that, for the final ES, additional mapping will be undertaken which will present a ten-year aggregated dataset of the herring larvae data presented in Figures 1.26 -1.30, to determine whether this gives rise to identification of any potential spawning "hot spots" within the NINEL survey area. MMO assumes that this map may resemble the kernel density map that was produced by RPS Group following Fisheries Advice on the Mona and Morgan OWF generation PEIRs. MMO supports this approach and recommends that the mapped 10-year data set is presented with the relevant modelled UWN contours for piling and UXO clearance overlaid. Please see comment 7.29 below regarding UWN modelling for herring.	The Applicants note your response. A kernel density plot of aggregated herring larval density data is provided within Volume 2, Annex 3.1: Fish and shellfish ecology technical report of the ES (document reference F2.3.1). As piling has been removed from the Project Design Envelope for the Environmental Statement, no underwater sound contours associated with piling will be presented within Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3).
TA_0010_045_221123	S42	Email	Cod 7.17. The Applicant has identified that the TAB overlaps areas of high intensity cod spawning grounds throughout the west portion of the Transmission Assets, with low intensity	The Applicants note your response. It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			spawning grounds throughout the offshore export cable corridor. The commercial importance of this species has been recognised, as has the vulnerability of the stock due to the collapse of the cod fishery in the Irish Sea. Cod have been included in the UWN impact assessment because they have spawning grounds overlapping the TAB and are a species with a swim bladder involved in hearing which makes them highly sensitive to UWN. Modelled noise contours for monopiling and pin-piling are presented in Figures 3.8 and 3.9 respectively. Please see comments below regarding the UWN modelling for cod.	project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey.
TA_0010_046_221123	S42	Email	Underwater Noise Modelling 7.18. MMO notes the acknowledgement that the installation of foundations for the Morgan and Morecambe OSPs and the Morgan Booster Station, may lead to injury and/or disturbance to fish species due to underwater noise during pile driving. The maximum design scenario (MDS) for piling, UXO and geophysical surveys during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases have been presented in Table 3.13.	It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey.
TA_0010_047_221123	S42	Email	7.19. Noise impacts from piling are estimated to last for up to either six days (monopiles) or 20 days (pin piles), over a 2-year piling phase (see Annex 3). Maximum hammer energies of 5,500 kilojoules (kJ) for Morgan, and 5,000kJ for Morecambe are proposed based on the use of monopiles. A project commitment has been made that no concurrent piling will take place between the Morgan OSP and Morgan offshore booster station, or at the two Morecambe OSPs. However, concurrent piling at the Morgan OSP and Morecambe OSPs, and the Morgan offshore booster station and Morecambe OSPs is proposed within the MDS.	It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey.
TA_0010_048_221123	S42	Email	7.20. UWN modelling has been carried out to assess the potential impacts to sandeel, herring and cod which all have spawning grounds/habitat overlapping, or close to the TAB and have been identified as either being highly sensitive to UWN and/or are reliant on a specific habitat for part or all of their life stages.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0010_049_221123	S42	Email	7.21. Regarding the UWN modelling presented in Figures 3.6 - 3.11, it is not clear whether the modelling is based on a fleeing or stationary receptor. MMO recommends that fish should be modelled as a stationary receptor as there is a lack of evidence to support the use of a fleeing animal model. MMO therefore requests that all modelled figures presented in the ES are based on a stationary receptor model, and that this is explicitly stated in the drawing titles.	It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (documents register F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey.
TA_0010_050_221123	S42	Email	7.22. The UWN contour maps in Figures 3.8 and 3.9 for cod are very 'busy' with multiple layers of data overlaid, making them difficult to interpret. For the ES, MMO requests that the maps are simplified and presented as more than two figures if possible. For example:• Maps depicting spawning grounds should be presented separately from those for nursery grounds. • Rather than using hash lines to depict spawning and nursery grounds, a light colour could be used to map the areas. • Rather than use colour block for each UWN contour area, use different coloured lines to indicate each dB increment presented. For the ES, rather than presenting SPL _{peak} noise contours in 10dB increments, the Applicant could consider presenting noise contours which follow the Popper et al. (2014) guidelines for hearing thresholds for pile driving as follows, e.g., 213 dB peak, 207 dB peak, and 186 dB cumulative Sound Exposure Level (SEL _{cum}) for temporary threshold shift (TTS).	It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey.
TA_0010_051_221123	S42	Email	7.23. The UWN contour maps in Figures 3.6 and 3.7 for sandeel are also very 'busy' for the same reasons as those outlined above for cod. For the ES, MMO requests that these maps are also simplified as above. As sandeel spawn in the same locations that they inhabit, a suitable habitat map (see comment 7.12) could be used instead of two separate maps of spawning and nursery grounds.	It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey.
TA_0010_052_221123	S42	Email	7.24. Figure 4.2 presents noise contours for concurrent piling at the Morgan OSP and Morecambe OSP. However, the map title does not state whether this concurrent piling scenario	It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			is for pin piles or monopiles. This should be corrected for the ES, as a standalone map this provides limited information to determine the range of effect in respect of fish spawning grounds.	impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey.
TA_0010_053_221123	S42	Email	7.25. The maps in Figures 3.6 – 3.13 are not for concurrent piling, therefore they do not represent the worst-case / MDS scenarios. For the ES, MMO requests appropriate UWN modelling figures should be presented which show the worst-case scenarios, in particular, the maximum spatial extent from concurrent piling, and the maximum noise level generated by concurrent piling. The modelling should be based on the maximum hammer energy (5,500 kJ for Morgan, and 5,000kJ for Morecambe) for concurrent piling and maximum pile diameters. The parameters used in each model should be included in the figure's title/description.	It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey.
TA_0010_054_221123	S42	Email	UWN – Behavioural Responses7.26. It is noted that a 160 dB threshold is used to support discussions on the behavioural impacts to herring from UWN, for reasons that this a more realistic threshold. From MMO's understanding, there is an attempt to justify this threshold by way of the following:1)It is stated that "Different SNCBs show a preference for different metrics for the assessment of impacts of underwater sound. Bellman et al. (2020) demonstrates that zero to peak SPL and broadband SEL metrics show a relatively consistent differentiation of approximately 22 dB, i.e., an SEL of 140 dB is equivalent to a peak SPL of approximately 162 dB. This suggests that an SEL value of 135 dB is almost the equivalent of a peak SPL value of 160 dB."A 135 dB SELs does not equate to a 160 dB SPLpeak, and the MMO requests using a conversion based on a study by Lippert et al. (2015) which, when using this conversion, would mean that a SELs of 140 dB is equivalent to approximately 156 dB SPLpeak, and a SELs of 135 dB is equivalent to approximately 149 dB SPLpeak. The assessment should be updated including any modelling where appropriate.2)A study is also cited by Doksaeter et al. (2012) which presented reactions in caged herring to sonar signals and other stimuli (e.g., boat engine noise) during three seasons of a year (summer, winter, and autumn), excluding the spring spawning season for this stock. In this study, significant reactions in herring to sonar signals from a passing ship were observed ship at a received root-mean-square sound-pressure level (SPL) up to 168 dB referenced to a pressure of 1 microPascal (re 1µPa). Because the 160 dB threshold adapted for use is below the 168 dB re 1µPa in which reactions were observed by Doksaeter et al. (2012), the Applicant considers the use of the 160 dB as an appropriate precautionary threshold.Based on a brief review of the Doksaeter et al. (2012) paper, MMO does not feel that this study adequately supports the use of a 160 dB threshold to determine behavioural responses in herring. The study involved the use of captive herring, rather than wild schools. In fact, it is noted in Section 3.9.3.33 that"Application of the abovementioned studies to wild fish should be interpreted with caution due to inherent differences expected between caged versus free-roaming fish."Furthermore, it should be noted that the herring in the Doksaeter et al. (2012) study did exhibit a significant diving reaction when exposed to other sounds with a much lower SPL, e.g., from a two-stroke engine.For the reasons outlined above, MMO is unable to support the use of a 160 dB threshold for determining the range of behavioural effects in herring and maintain the recommendation that a 135dB threshold is more appropriate. Whilst MMO acknowledges that 135 dB is precautionary, the Hawkins et al. (2014) study (from which the 135 dB threshold is taken) monitored reactions in free-living clupeids (sprat), rather than caged fish, so would not have been exposed and habituated to noise in the same way and were able to exhibit natural behavioural responses to noise. All modelling and assessments should be updated to use the 135dB threshold.	It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey.
TA_0010_055_221123	S42	Email	UWN Modelling – Discussion on modelling presented in Figures 3.6 – 3.137.27. Figures 3.6 - 3.7 Sandeel: For the discussion on sandeel, MMO notes that it is acknowledged that noise from mono- and pin piling overlaps the mapped sandeel habitat. Whilst this overlap has been quantified as a percentage of habitat affected by noise, the limitation that habitats and spawning grounds do not have fixed boundaries has been acknowledged, which MMO supports. It is noted that the maximum spatial extent of impact for noise will come from monopiling, which MMO would expect. The extent of impact/range of effect is based on the 160 dB threshold discussed in comment 7.26 above. For the ES, the MMO requests that the Applicant refers to the thresholds described by Popper et al. (2014) for 'Group 1' fish - no swim bladder (particle motion detection), see comment 7.30 below.	It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0010_056_221123	S42	Email	7.28. Figures 3.8 – 3.9 Cod: MMO notes that it is acknowledged that noise from mono- and pin piling overlaps the mapped cod spawning grounds. This overlap has been quantified as a percentage of habitat affected by noise, but the limitation of the approach has been recognised. As per sandeel, the report should refer to the thresholds described by Popper et al. (2014) – see comment 7.30 below for interpreting the extent of impacts mortality and potential mortal injury, recoverable injury, and temporary threshold shift (TTS) in cod as a 'Group 3' fish where the swim bladder is involved in hearing (primarily pressure detection).	It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey.
TA_0010_057_221123	S42	Email	7.29. Figures 3.10 – 3.13 Herring: For mono- and pin piles, noise contours ranging from 140 dB – 150 dB overlap the mapped spawning ground for Manx herring for Morgan OSP and Morgan offshore booster station. Additional mapping will be undertaken to present a ten-year aggregated dataset of the herring larvae from the NINEL survey, so the extent of overlap with the spawning ground may change from that shown in Figures 3.10 – 3.13. Nonetheless, based on the modelling presented in these figures, herring at the Manx spawning ground would be expected to exhibit behavioural responses in the context of the 135 dB threshold (Hawkins et al. 2014) recommended in comment 7.26	It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey.
TA_0010_058_221123	S42	Email	7.30. Choosing to use a 160 dB threshold aligns with the use of noise contours in 10 dB increments as shown in the UWN figures, thus aiding the discussions and interpretations of UWN modelling. However, as per comment 7.26 above regarding the 160 dB threshold, MMO requests that for the ES, the assessment is based on the Popper et al. (2014) hearing threshold 'guidelines' for fish for pile driving and explosions for Unexploded Ordinance (UXO). Thresholds described by Popper et al. (2014) are given for the onset of mortality and potential mortal injury, recoverable injury, and TTS. The paper is based on multiple studies of the effects of sound on fish, was written by reputable, experienced co-authors in the specialist field of acoustics, and is regularly referred within EIAs to inform noise exposure guidelines in fish.	It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey.
TA_0010_059_221123	S42	Email	7.31. Given the sensitivity of herring and cod to UWN and given the vulnerable state of these stocks in the Irish Sea, these species are of primary concern when considering the overlap of noise from piling. Notwithstanding previous comments regarding the use of suitable metrics and revised modelling based on concurrent piling, the report has already demonstrated overlaps of piling noise with the spawning grounds of cod and herring. MMO advises consideration of a temporal piling restriction on the dML during the Manx herring spawning season (September – October inclusive) and cod spawning season (January to April, peaking in February and March). However, recommendations must be made based on appropriate modelling for the worst-case / MDS scenarios. MMO requests that this is provided prior to the Application submission to ensure all comments have been captured for the development of the ES. MMO recognises that the periods of piling are relatively short-term in nature and may be intermittent (i.e., approximately six days for monopiles and 20 days for pin piles over a two-year piling phase), therefore any potential effects on herring and cod would only occur if piling was undertaken during their spawning seasons. However, a construction schedule has not yet been provided, so these comments are precautionary at this stage. MMO would expect to see the piling schedules for Morgan, Morecambe and Mona generation assets presented alongside the piling schedules for the Morgan and Morecambe transmission assets for further consideration of the potential for cumulative impacts from UWN to affect the entire fish ecology study area. No fisheries-specific mitigation measures are proposed in the draft dML document. As discussed above, there is potential for temporal piling restrictions to be recommended during the Manx herring and cod spawning seasons, but this will be determined on the outcomes of the modelling to be provided. Until this modelling is provided the precautionary approach should be adopted and therefore seasonal restrictions should be included in the dML.	It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey.
TA_0010_060_221123	S42	Email	7.32. At this stage only impacts from accidental pollution during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning phases have been scoped out. The report states that accidental pollution, from sources such as vessels, vehicles, equipment, and machinery, will be managed through the implementation of Environmental Management Plans. Included in these plans will be industry good practice and OSPAR (Oslo-Paris), International Maritime Organisation and MARPOL (International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships) guidelines for preventing pollution at sea. This is consistent with measures implemented for applications of a similar size and scale and MMO agrees this is appropriate. MMO would	The Applicants note your response.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			recommend an outline Environmental Management Plan being shared prior to submission to PINS.	
TA_0010_061_221123	S42	Email	7.33. 'Best practise' mitigation measures for the project outlined in the PEIR include;• Burial of the export cables to a minimum depth of 0.5m, up to a maximum depth of 3m. • Mitigation for the effects of EMF on electro-sensitive fish receptors should be employed through a recommended minimum cable burial depth of 1.5m (Dept. of Energy & Climate Change, 2011), though we recognise that in some locations this depth may not be achievable due to local geology or cable/pipeline crossing points. • Soft-start procedures for 20 minutes on commencement of piling. The MMO supports the implantation of soft-start procedures in accordance with JNCC (2017) guidelines as the gradual ramping up of hammer energy will allow all fish receptors to move away from the source of disturbance and avoid auditory injury.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0010_062_221123	S42	Email	7.34. It is clear that the years 2026 – 2029 will be a period of significant development in the Irish sea with no less than four offshore wind projects being installed during this time, alongside the piling of substations to support transmission infrastructure. Based on the information presented, MMO has concerns as to the impacts on fish receptors from cumulative UWN arising from the various OWF projects. Mitigation measures and/or careful scheduling of piling activity may be necessary to reduce the impacts to fish, particularly with regard to fish considered to have a higher hearing sensitivity (including herring and cod). Whilst the Morgan and Morecambe Transmission Assets PEIR attempts to present the worst-case scenario for the works covered by the TAB Development Consent Order (DCO), the report doesn't present the clearest picture. Given that the Irish sea OWF projects are inherently linked and have development schedules taking place in the same window of years, for a more complete and robust assessment of cumulative impacts to fish from UWN it will be necessary to see modelled cumulative UWN contours presented for any projects with overlapping construction schedules. This will require collaboration between the OWF developers in the sharing of modelled UWN data. MMO requests further worst-case scenario modelling for the cumulative impact assessment and for this to be reviewed and discussed as part of the evidence plan process.	It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in section 3.91 of Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey.
TA_0010_066_221123	S42	Email	8.4. Table 4.13 outlines the measures (commitments) adopted as part of the Transmission Assets. MMO welcomes that Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocols (MMMP) will be developed and implemented during construction to reduce the risk of injury to marine mammals and fish species during piling and UXO clearance (Commitments CoT64 and CoT68). The MMMPs will need to be agreed with the regulator and relevant agencies. A Vessel Management Plan (VMP) will also be developed pre-construction (CoT69).	The Applicants note your response. MMMPs will be developed post-consent, in line with latest guidance, further to any project updates at this stage and an Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (Outline MMMP) (document reference J18) will be included with the application. The MMMPs will be updated post-application, discussed and agreed with stakeholders.
TA_0010_073_221123	S42	Email	Volume 2 Appendix 5.2 Underwater Sound Technical Report 9.1. MMO notes that disturbance thresholds are considered for marine mammals and fish in Annex 5.2. Section 1.4.5.25 refers to criteria presented in the Washington State Department of Transport Biological Assessment Preparation for Transport Projects Advanced Training Manual (WSDOT, 2011), which are used in this assessment for predicting the distances at which behavioural effects may occur due to sound from impulsive piling. The manual suggests an un-weighted sound pressure level (SPL) of 150 dB re 1 µPa root mean square (rms) as the criterion for onset of behavioural effects, based on work by (Hastings, 2002). However, it could be argued that a threshold based on the SPLrms may not be the most appropriate or relevant for impulsive sources such as impact pile driving. Thresholds based on the peak sound pressure level, or the single strike sound exposure level would be more appropriate for impulsive sounds. However, the MMO notes that Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology, does consider the 135 dB SELss threshold for herring and further comments have been provided within section 7	The Applicants note your response. It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3), and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey. The updated MDS for the impacts of UXO and geophysical survey on marine mammal receptors is presented in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4).

E1.16.10 Marine mammals table of responses

E1.16.10.1 Marine mammals table of responses (via feedback form)

Table E1.16.10.1: Marine mammals consultation responses (feedback form)

As set out in section 4.7.4 of the Consultation report (document reference E1). Responses have been allocated to the most appropriate topic(s). If a consultee did not provide a response for a question/sub-question this is not recorded. If a consultee included 'N/A', 'none', 'no comment', 'Nil', 'No', in response to a question, this has also not been recorded. Where a consultee provided a response associated with this sub-question (1.4; Marine mammals) but was not related to this topic, this has been included below, as well as against any other appropriate topic(s). Where a consultee provided a response which stated 'see response above' or similar, the response has been replicated in brackets and italics.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0056_005_141123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.4	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0060_010_151123	S44	Online feedback form	3	3.8	Drilling and other work noise will not only affect residents but also the wildlife birds and sea life.	An assessment of noise and vibration impacts during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Transmission Assets is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.2: Construction Noise and Vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.2). This includes an assessment of all construction activities required, as well as noise impacts due to construction traffic on the local highway network. An assessment of the impact and effects on affected receptors has been carried out. Mitigation measures committed to by the Transmission Assets are outlined within the ES and the project Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference: J11), Marine Enhancement Statement (document reference: J12) submitted with the application for development consent. The views and feedback of statutory and non-statutory consultees has been sought throughout the environmental impact assessment process.
TA_0086_001_211123	S44	Online feedback form	1		Strongly object to the proposed off shore wind farm route cabling on shore here on the Fylde coast and the destruction and disruption to our roads, farmlands natural green spaces for many years to come. The meetings I attended could not give a definite plan for the 120m wide cable route crossing Queensway (B5261) and could not determine where along Queensway this would be to the rear of our properties on REDACTED, this could result in property subsidence , Noise, pollution etc for years to come and devaluation of our properties. We have lived here for over 50 years, we actively ran a market garden business until the Dutch ruined that, so we feel we know the local land problems round here and what the size of this proposal would impact on this area We have lots of wildlife around here both on land and in the various watercourses surrounding the farmlands, we can't keep pushing this wild life	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
					<p>away from here for this proposal, it has already been pushed away from the development at Richmond Point, and the new EZ sports village.</p> <p>Not happy about the disruption to the sand dunes and traffic congestion along Clifton Drive if the cables cross here, the nature reserve Will be affected also.</p> <p>We have recently had a lot of traffic congestion along Queensway/Common Edge Road and surrounding roads caused by the new EZ development, this being the main route of 2 from Blackpool to St Annes, this congestion was horrendous and could not be avoided, we do not want to go through that again We know the importance of green energy and understand that, but feel this is not the on shore place for it, spoiling green belt and natural habitats, bridleways, traffic congestion, flooding, noise and property devaluation because of it, REDACTED is considered as one of the most expensive Lanes on the Fylde Coast, many residents have horses and chose to live here for that reason.</p> <p>We don't want any interruption to farmlands either, we need them. So I strongly object to these proposals</p>	<p>prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</p>
TA_0091_003_111123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.4	How do we know what the impact will be of the cable corridor on the sea bed on marine mammals?	<p>As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects.</p> <p>All impacts on marine mammals are detailed in the ES Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals (document reference F2.4).</p>
TA_0092_008_151123	S44	Online feedback form	1		It would be good to understand the impact on marine life. Will there be opportunities for local businesses to get involved in the project in terms of labour/construction/administration etc and would there be a requirement for skilling those employees - potential to work with the College around training and provision of any apprentices.	<p>An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken for the offshore topics of the Transmission Assets Application and is presented in Volume 2 of the ES (document reference F2). Specific examples relevant to marine life are listed below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2). - Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3). - Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4). - Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5). <p>An Outline Employment and Skills Plan has been prepared and submitted as part of the application for development consent (document reference J31). This will be developed further post-consent to detail how the Applicants will engage with local workers and training providers for anticipated employment opportunities associated with the Transmission Assets.</p>
TA_0092_012_151123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.4	Impact on marine life. Report states will aim to conserve habitats for marine life - how and what are the assurances?	<p>An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken for the offshore topics of the Transmission Assets Application and is presented in Volume 2 of the ES (document reference F2). Specific examples relevant to marine life are listed below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2). - Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3). - Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4). - Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0092__016_151123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.9	Need to ensure that the project continues to be sympathetic to all sea users and the environment	<p>An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken for the offshore topics of the Transmission Assets Application and is presented in Volume 2 of the ES (document reference F2). Specific examples relevant to marine life are listed below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2). - Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3). - Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4). - Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5). <p>The impacts of the Transmission Assets (alone and in-combination with other projects), including those on recreational shipping, are assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 9: Other sea users of the ES (document reference: 2.9). More information and details of the proposed mitigation measures are described in the updated Volume 2, Annex 7.1: NRA of the ES and Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and navigation chapter of the ES (document reference: F2.7.1 and F2.7, respectively) submitted as part of the Application.</p>
TA_0097_002_171123	S44	Online feedback form	2		I'm not sure of the full facts of what impact this has on the sea life this must be disruptive to their environment but I would prefer off shore power then building wind farms on shore close to peoples home and considering the list of ill effects this can cause on adults children and animals and the building, noise and eye sore on our country side. I do not want a on shore wind farm where I live in Newton.	<p>An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken for the offshore topics of the Transmission Assets Application and is presented in Volume 2 of the ES (document reference F2). Specific examples relevant to marine life are listed below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2). - Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3). - Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4). - Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5). <p>Detailed assessments are provided within all onshore chapters within Volumes 3 and 4 of the ES (document reference F3 and F4). The Applicants are committed to working with local communities that may be impacted by the Transmission Assets and will continue to work closely with all stakeholders.</p>
TA_0106_018_281023	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.4	The project cannot be expected to be neutral to this aspect and will have only negative consequences. This applies to the following sections.	<p>Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects.</p> <p>Comprehensive environmental impact assessments, with the engagement of Expert Working Groups where appropriate, have been undertaken of the potential impacts of the project on fish and shellfish ecology as presented in Volume 2, Chapter 3 of the ES (document reference: F2.3).</p>
TA_0108_005_231123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.4	Loss of high quality farmland. Known flood areas. Devastating consequences for Newton Kirkham and Freckleton	<p>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						<p>the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES. A flood risk assessment assessing all sources of flooding, including sewers is presented within Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3). The proposed permanent infrastructure associated with the Morgan and Morecambe substations are located within Flood Zone 1 and has a low risk of flooding from all other assessed sources.</p>

E1.16.10.2 Marine mammals table of responses (via all other methods)

Table E1.16.10.2: Marine mammals table of responses (via all other methods)

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0001_116_231123	S42	Email	4.1 The marine mammals document is not well presented, is hard to follow and often confusing. There are sections that refer to the results of other assessments (Morgan OWF GA and Morecambe OW GA) but these are not clearly presented in a way that allows comparison and context. We recommend the structure of the chapter is revised in the submitted ES to make it more reader friendly, with tables for comparison and context used more frequently.	The structure of the marine mammals chapter has been revised and updated. The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. This has removed the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling and has further simplified Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4).
TA_0001_117_231123	S42	Email	4.2 Natural England have concerns on the assessment methodology thus we are not able to agree to the outcomes of the assessments at this stage. There seems to be a lack of clarity and consistency while precautionary approach is not always applied. the main issues are: Dual effect categories in the assessment matrix where in certain cases non-significant and significant effects can result from the same combination of magnitude and sensitivity, without further justification when lower effect categories are chosen. Terminology used to base the conclusions of the assessment is not defined thus there is uncertainty as to what terms such 'short term', 'medium term', long term', "temporary", "small scale", "regional", 'highly localised' mean. Inconsistency in assigning magnitude and sensitivity scores. Methodology of the assessment is not always clear (e.g. how the number of animals disturbed have been derived using dose response curves). In some cases, conclusions on the assessment are made without a robust evidence and justification. The submitted ES should revise and clearly outline the assessment methodology, apply consistent approach and use evidence to support the assessment conclusions.	The Applicants note your response. Thank you for your detailed comments. Please see detailed responses where these comments have been addressed individually.
TA_0001_118_231123	S42	Email	4.3 Natural England has not yet had sight of the draft Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (MMMP). Therefore, we cannot agree at this stage that the measures in the MMMP will be sufficient to avoid residual significant effect in EIA terms. We advise that all available mitigation measures to minimise the impact of underwater noise are considered. Provide the draft MMMP at the DCO application stage, as already stated by the Applicant. Additionally, Natural England would welcome sight of the draft MMMP through future Marine Mammal ETGs.	Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocols (MMMPs) will be developed post-consent, in line with latest guidance, further to any project updates at this stage and a draft Outline MMP ((document reference J18) will be included with the application.
TA_0001_119_231123	S42	Email	4.4 It appears that 30min Acoustic Deterrent Device (ADD) duration was included in the assessment for Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS) from piling and Unexploded Ordnance (UXOs). We advise that the assessment conclusions should be based on the scenario without use of ADD. This is because the 30min ADD duration has not been agreed with SNCBs, and its inclusion obscures the worst-case scenario that the impact assessment should be based on. The submitted ES should base its assessment on the underwater noise modelling without ADDs, and revise any assessments that are based on the predicted ranges with 30min ADDs.	The assessment in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4) presents the ranges both without ADD and with ADD, the latter providing evidence to demonstrate the potential efficacy of using ADD as a tool in the mitigation strategy. Most assessments model both with and without ADD to show the benefits of ADDs where this has been proposed as an integral part of the project designed-in mitigation measures to reduce the risk of injury to marine mammals. Therefore, the assessment considers the implementation of an indicative 30 minute ADD deployment duration as well as the predicted ranges without the use of an ADD. ADDs are included as part of standard industry tertiary measures (as with passive acoustic monitoring/marine mammal observers) and therefore are accepted as part of best practice within marine mammal mitigation protocols (MMMPs). The detailed MMMP will be developed post-consent further to any project updates at this stage and a draft Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (document reference J18) will be included with the application. The results of the assessment of UXO clearance within Volume 1, Annex 5.2: Underwater sound technical report of the ES (document reference F1.5.2) is provided without the influence of ADDs.
TA_0001_120_231123	S42	Email	Project Description 4.5 Table 4.6 We notice that the removal of the piles during the decommissioning has not been mentioned here. We assume this will be assessed in the future as the details of the activities are currently unknown. However, it is worth acknowledging the additional potential effects due to the activity itself besides the impacts of vessel traffic only. Please see our advice in the Best Practice Phase III document. The submitted ES should consider the additional effects arising from decommissioning activity. Consult Natural England's Best Practice Advice.	This comment relates to the assessment of injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling. With the removal of the Morgan Offshore Substation Platform (OSP), the Morecambe OSP and the Morgan Offshore Booster Station from the Project Description, and the associated removal for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the Environmental Statement, and therefore no technical response has been provided.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0001_121_231123	S42	Email	Natural England's Position on Worst Case Scenario or Scenarios 4.6 Table 4.12 Natural England understands that concurrent piling is not being considered in certain circumstances. It is an imperative that the WCS as presented here is reflected later in underwater noise modelling and assessment. Note.	This comment relates to the assessment of injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling. The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the Environmental Statement, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0001_122_231123	S42	Email	Survey Data Acquisition 4.7 Natural England agree that all relevant marine mammal receptors have been identified.N/A	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0001_123_231123	S42	Email	Survey Data Acquisition 4.8 Table 4.8 The list of data sources should be updated to include SCANS IV (2023), Marine Mammal Welsh Atlas (2023), IAMMWG (2022) and SCOS 2022. Update the reference to inform the baseline characterisation in the submitted ES.	The list of data sources has been updated to include SCANS IV (Gilles et al., 2023), Welsh Marine Mammal Atlas (Evans and Waggitt, 2023), IAMMWG (2022, 2023) and SCOS, 2022. These data sources have been included in Volume 2, Annex 4.1: Marine Mammal Technical Report (document reference F2.4.1) and Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals, of the ES (document reference F2.4).
TA_0001_124_231123	S42	Email	Survey Data Acquisition 4.9 4.4.4.2 Natural England understand that no site- specific surveys have been conducted, but the two sets of site-specific aerial digital surveys that overlap with the Transmission Assets (Morgan OWF GA and Morecambe OWF GA) have been used to inform the baseline characterisation. Note	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0001_125_231123	S42	Email	Survey Data Acquisition 4.11.2.5.2 This section needs to be updated when the two years of survey data for the Morgan Generation Assets becomes available. Also, the final species densities derived from the completed survey should supersede the current densities based on one year of data.The submitted ES should include the data of the full two-year survey for the Morgan Generation Assets.	Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4) has been updated to include two years of site-specific survey data from Morgan Offshore Windfarm: Generation Assets and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Generation Assets.
TA_0001_126_231123	S42	Email	Survey Data Acquisition 4.11 Table 1.2 If survey data for Mona OWF becomes publicly available, it should be included in the list of the references. The following references should be added here too: SCANS IV (2023), Marine Mammal Welsh Atlas (2023), IAMMWG (2022) and SCOS 2022. Update the list of references in the submitted ES to reflect the most up to date evidence.	The list of data sources has been updated to include SCANS IV (Gilles et al., 2023), Welsh Marine Mammal Atlas (Evans and Waggitt, 2023), IAMMWG (2022, 2023) and SCOS 2022. Data from the Mona Offshore Wind Project has also been included. These data sources have been included in Volume 2, Annex 4.1: Marine Mammal Technical Report (document reference F2.4.1) and Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals, of the ES (document reference F2.4).
TA_0001_127_231123	S42	Email	Survey Data Acquisition 4.12 Table 1.15 Sites presented in Figure 1.15 do not correspond to those listed in Table 1.3. i.e.Bristol Chanel Approaches SAC and Lundy SAC are missing in Table 1.3.Make sure that both Figures and Tables list the correct protected areas.	Thank you for highlighting this error. In Volume 2, Annex 4.1: Marine Mammal Technical Report of the ES (document reference F2.4.1), the table of designated sites and figure of designated sites have now been aligned, to both include the Bristol Channel Approaches SAC and Lundy SAC .
TA_0001_128_231123	S42	Email	Survey Data Acquisition 4.13 Para 1.3.3.33; 1.3.4.22; 1.3.5.14; 1.3.6.19; Since the ETG in April 2023, Natural England have continued to consider the most robust approach to generating species densities.We highlight Waggitt et al. (2020) state within their paper: "Because of these caveats, outputs should not be used as a representation of absolute densities and fine-scale distributions at the present time. Instead, it is recommended that outputs be used as a general illustration of relative densities and broad-scale distribution over several decades". As such, we have reviewed our previous advice and unfortunately, we are no longer able to advise that Waggitt et al. (2020) is the most appropriate density to take forward in the absence of site-specific survey data. We apologise for any additional work that this change in advice may cause. We typically advise that the highest density estimate is used, unless justified otherwise. Thus, we advise that the densities are revised upon inclusion of SCANS IV (2023) and two years survey data at Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Generation Assets. Revise the densities upon inclusion of new data sources and chose the most appropriate	The list of data sources included to establish an up to date marine mammals baseline has been updated to include SCANS IV (Gilles et al., 2023), Welsh Marine Mammal Atlas (Evans and Waggitt, 2023), IAMMWG (2022, 2023), SCOS 2022 and two years of survey data at the Morgan Offshore Windfarm: Generation Assets and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Generation Assets (presented in Volume 2, Annex 4.1: Marine Mammal Technical Report (document reference F2.4.1) and Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals, of the ES (document reference F2.4)). The most appropriate density taken forward to assessment has been established on a species-specific basis, and we have noted the advice on not applying Waggitt et al. (2020) for these densities.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			density (i.e. most precautionary unless justified otherwise) to take forward to assessment in the submitted ES.	
TA_0001_129_231123	S42	Email	Survey Data Acquisition 4.14 Table 1.15 We note that harbour porpoise densities vary considerably (0.56, 0.247 and 1.394) over a project area. Thus, we request that reasons for such variability are explored (aided by figures where appropriate) in order to help select the best density for the assessment. The submitted ES should provide further detail behind the variability of harbour porpoise density.	A single density estimate has been included in the assessment (Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4)) for harbour porpoise (this approach has been applied to all other marine mammal species considered).
TA_0001_130_231123	S42	Email	Data Gaps 4.15 1.3.3.34; 1.3.4.24; 1.3.6.21; 1.3.7.16 Include abundance derived from SCAN IV (2023) surveys and the two years of survey data at Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Generation Assets. Include newer references on species abundance in the submitted ES.	The list of data sources has been updated to include SCANS IV (Gilles et al., 2023). These data sources have been included in Volume 2, Annex 4.1: Marine Mammal Technical Report (document reference F2.4.1), and Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals, of the ES (document reference F2.4). Additionally, two years of survey data at the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Generation Assets have been included (presented in Volume 2, Annex 4.1: Marine Mammal Technical Report (document reference F2.4.1), and Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals, of the ES) (document reference F2.4).
TA_0001_131_231123	S42	Email	Data Gaps 4.16 1.3.8.12; 1.3.9.21 SCOS (2022) is the latest report on seal counts, thus it is most up to date reference for the population estimate of grey and harbour seals. Include data from SCOS (2022) report in the submitted ES.	The list of data sources included to establish an up to date marine mammal baseline has been updated to include the latest SCOS (2022) report, and two years of survey data at the Morgan Offshore Windfarm: Generation Assets and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Generation Assets (presented in Volume 2, Annex 4.1: Marine Mammal Technical Report (document reference F2.4.1), and Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals, of the ES) (document reference F2.4).
TA_0001_132_231123	S42	Email	Analysis, Modelling and Reporting 4.17 Table 4.13 The Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocols (MMMP) should consider all available mitigation measures to minimise the impact of underwater noise such as noise abatement, timing of piling and piling methods. Give a full consideration of all mitigation measures available in order to design the most appropriate mitigation plan and present this alongside the Application.	Detailed MMMPs will be developed post-consent, in line with latest guidance, further to any project updates at this stage and a draft will be included with the application. The Applicant will continue to explore options for mitigating sound post consent, at a time when more detailed information is available on UXO. If needed, a commitment to Noise Abatement Systems (NAS) will be considered as part of a stepped strategy post consent and following the mitigation hierarchy - avoid, reduce, mitigate. Consequently, if NAS is required a detailed exploration of available technologies will be undertaken and information presented to demonstrate how such technology would contribute to the reduction in underwater sound from UXO clearance. Additional details and potential mitigation options (if required) will be considered within the detailed MMMPs, an outline of which has been submitted with the application for consent (document reference J18). The detailed MMMPs will be updated post-application, discussed and agreed with stakeholders.
TA_0001_133_231123	S42	Email	Identified impacts 4.18 Table 4.16 Natural England have concerns regarding the assessment matrix and double outcome categories of significance. Such approach needs further justification with explanation on how the conclusions of the assessment are reached especially in scenarios where non-significant and significant effects can result from the same combination of magnitude and sensitivity (e.g. high sensitivity and low magnitude result in minor and moderate effects). It is generally accepted that the assessment should follow the precautionary principle in which case moderate effects should be concluded unless a robust evidence and strong justification is provided to argue on contrary. Revise the assessment matrix in the submitted ES to reflect the precautionary principle unless there is strong evidence to indicate otherwise.	The EIA methodology is set out within Volume 1, Chapter 5: Environmental assessment methodology of the ES. The chapter describes how significance of effects has been assessed. Professional judgement is used to define the magnitude of impact and receptor sensitivity. The matrix is then used, together with professional judgement, to evaluate the significance of effect. The significance may be one, or a range of, no change, negligible, minor, moderate or major. In general, a significance of effect of moderate or greater is considered 'significant' in EIA terms. For each topic chapter, what is considered 'significant' has been clearly defined. Where further mitigation is not possible a residual significant effect may remain. Within the assessment chapters the justification for determining the significance of effect is described. Where a range is given, the assessment chapter details the reason for the significance that has been concluded.
TA_0001_134_231123	S42	Email	4.19 Table 4.13 Natural England cannot provide a view on the assessment where conclusion of no significant effect for the pathway of physical and permanent auditory injury references the mitigation detailed in the piling MMMP until the draft MMMP has been provided. Provide the draft piling MMMP with the DCO Application and potentially present a draft MMMP for comment before submission.	MMMPs will be developed post-consent, in line with latest guidance, further to any project updates at this stage and an Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (document reference J18) will be included with the application.
TA_0001_135_231123	S42	Email	4.2 Table 4.17 Natural England advise that the consistent swimming speeds are used across the assessment to ensure consistency. Please refer to our Best Practice Phase III document.	The establishment of consistent swim speeds has been undertaken in line with Natural England's Best Practice Phase III document.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			Refer to Natural England's Best Practice Advice, Phase III for swimming speeds when finalising the ES.	Where this comment applies to the assessment of injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided for this.
TA_0001_136_231123	S42	Email	4.21 4.9.2.17 A reference should be provided to support the statement that 30 min ADD activations the maximum standard industry ADD duration. Provide the reference in the submitted ES or otherwise delete this statement.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0001_137_231123	S42	Email	4.22 4.9.2.77 The results of the modelling to understand the effectiveness of the ADD in relation to cumulative sound exposure leading to PTS (i.e., SELcum) should be presented here in a table for the context and comparison with the results of Table 4.22. However, a consistent approach of basing the assessment on the most precautionary impact ranges is required throughout. Apply a consistent approach in the submitted assessment, basing it on the most precautionary impact ranges.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0001_138_231123	S42	Email	4.23 4.9.2.86 Considering that the most precautionary harbour porpoise density was not used to calculate the number of animals potentially impacted, it cannot presently be concluded that the assessment is precautionary. The submitted ES should reflect our advice for calculating the number of animals impacted in the Best practice document Phase III ("...the area of impact should be multiplied by the most appropriate density estimate for the species (typically the highest density estimate, unless justified otherwise) in order to calculate the number of individuals impacted by an activity.)	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0001_139_231123	S42	Email	4.24 4.9.2.88 and 4.9.2.95 Paragraph 4.9.2.88 states: "The potential for piling to coincide with key breeding periods for harbour porpoise is extremely low, given that piling will occur on a maximum of six days for monopiles or 20 days for pin piles (maximum temporal scenario) over the two-year piling phase." While paragraph 4.9.2.95 makes the different conclusion: "The impact could, however, result in a small but measurable alteration to the distribution of marine mammals intermittently during piling only (e.g. four days for concurrent piling or six days for single piling of monopiles) and could affect fecundity of some individuals (up to 1.5% of the IS MU population) over the short term." Thus, based on the logic of the second paragraph, an overlap between breeding period and piling could have a potential effect on harbour porpoise too. The submitted ES should apply a consistent approach and logic to justify the outcome of the assessment.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0001_140_231123	S42	Email	4.25 4.9.2.88 and elsewhere relevant Natural England advise that the results of IPCoD modelling are presented for shorter periods alongside 25 years and that those periods are also considered in the assessment (e.g. the first 6 years, based on the former Favourable Conservation Status (FCS) reporting period). The submitted ES should present iPCoD modelling results for shorter periods of time.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0001_141_231123	S42	Email	4.26 4.9.2.49 Natural England disagree with the statement that harbour porpoises are expected to have "some adaptability to piling". There is no evidence to support this statement. Revise any conclusions that were based on such assumptions in the submitted ES.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0001_142_231123	S42	Email	4.27 4.9.2.50 A sensitivity score of 'medium' does not accurately reflect the sensitivity of harbour porpoise to underwater sound disturbance thus we suggest amending it to 'high'. Revise sensitive score for harbour porpoises in the submitted ES.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0001_143_231123	S42	Email	4.28 Table 4.22 We note that the swim distances greatly exceed the predicted PTS impact ranges, suggesting that the animals are excluded from a far wider range than needed to prevent the injury, resulting in the impact pathway shift from injury to displacement. We advise that the assessment is done on the scenario without ADD activation. Impacts arising from the use of ADDs leading to disturbance and displacement should be included in the assessment. The assessment in the submitted ES should address the displacement effects arising from ADDs. If ADDs are used as a mitigation measure, then the duration of their activity should be carefully chosen so it prevents the PTS but do not cause unnecessary displacement and disturbance of animals.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0001_144_231123	S42	Email	4.29 4.9.3.30 Natural England do not support use of scare charges for UXO clearance. Note	Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocols (MMMPs) will be developed post-consent, in line with latest guidance, further to any project updates at this stage and a draft Outline MMP (document reference J18) will be included with the application. The Applicant has proposed that any identified UXO needing clearing will be preferentially using low order techniques. The use of mitigation measures (e.g. ADDs or soft start/scare charges), should a high order clearance be necessary, will be discussed and agreed as part of the final MMMPs with all relevant stakeholders, once project parameters have been refined.
TA_0001_145_231123	S42	Email	4.3 4.9.3.30 The latest study on the effects of ADDs on harbour porpoise states that "We conclude that AHD exposure at many km can evoke both startle, flight and cardiac responses which may impact blood-gas management, breath-hold capability, energy balance, stress level and risk of by-catch. We posit that current AHDs are too powerful for mitigation use to prevent hearing damage of porpoises from offshore construction." (https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-023-43453-8) Therefore, the effect of ADDs on harbour porpoise should be fully assessed, and relying on the ADDs as the primary mitigation tool should be reevaluated. Include the suggested reference, assess the impact of ADDs and revise the mitigation strategy in the submitted ES. Additionally, disturbance caused by ADDs should be included in the cumulative assessment.	A qualitative review of the effects of ADDs on harbour porpoise has been presented in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F4.2). This includes Elmegaard et al., 2023. The assessment in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F4.2) presents the ranges both without ADD and with ADD, the latter providing evidence to demonstrate the potential efficacy of using ADD as a tool in the mitigation strategy. Most assessments model both with and without ADD to show the benefits of ADDs where this has been proposed as an integral part of the project designed-in mitigation measures to reduce the risk of injury to marine mammals. Therefore the assessment considers the implementation of an indicative 30 minute ADD deployment duration as well as the predicted ranges without the use of an ADD. ADDs are included as part of standard industry tertiary measures (as with passive acoustic monitoring/marine mammal observers) and therefore are accepted as part of best practice within marine mammal mitigation protocols (MMMPs). The detailed MMMP will be developed post-consent further to any project updates at this stage and an Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (document reference J18) will be included with the application.
TA_0001_146_231123	S42	Email	4.31 4.9.3.37 Natural England disagree with the statement that the application of tertiary measures to reduce the risk of PTS will also to some extent reduce the risk of TTS/moving away. Revise the statement and update the assessment accordingly in the submitted ES.	The statement has been reviewed and revised and conclusions of the assessment are aligned accordingly (see Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F4.2))
TA_0001_147_231123	S42	Email	4.32 4.9.4.15 In order to assess the increase in vessel traffic and support the statement that the increase in the vessel activity will not differ greatly from the baseline, the current baseline needs to be quantified and presented for context and comparison. The submitted ES should present the current vessel traffic baseline in the area.	Further information on baseline levels of vessel activity has been provided from Volume 2, Annex 7.1: Navigational Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F2.7.1).
TA_0001_148_231123	S42	Email	4.33 4.9.1.23 Natural England (as well as Cefas who are underwater noise experts) provided comments on the underwater sound modelling for Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Generation Assets and the Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets. Any changes to these reports should be reflected in this assessment where relevant.	The assessment presented in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F4.2) is based on the final Transmission Assets Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description of the ES (document reference F1.3), and Volume 1,

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				Annex 5.2: Underwater Sound Technical Report of the ES (document reference F1.5.2).
TA_0001_149_231123	S42	Email	4.34 4.9.1.30 Natural England seek further justification as to why “mild” and “strong” fixed disturbance thresholds were used alongside dose response curves to assess disturbance from piling when using dose response alone is the recommended method to assess behavioural responses. It is our concern that addition of “mild” and “strong” fixed disturbance thresholds is leading to downwards interpretation of numbers of animals disturbed, thereby lessening the potential impact. The assessment in the submitted ES should be made using dose response only, unless a strong justification for the current approach can be provided.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0001_150_231123	S42	Email	4.35 4.9.2.82 – 83 Natural England seek further clarification on the methods used to calculate the number of animals disturbed. We note that contour maps for each species and tables with dose response calculations are not provided. We are unsure as to which values are taken forward to IPCoD modelling. We are therefore not able to comment on the outcome of the assessment based on this method unless further details and clarity is provided. The submitted ES should provide further detail on the method used to calculate number of animals disturbed by piling.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0001_151_231123	S42	Email	4.36 4.9.4.16 If basing the assessment on the statement that “all marine mammals are deemed to have some tolerance to disturbance”, robust evidence needs to be provided to support it. Given the difference in hearing threshold of different marine mammal species as well as other variables that may impact their response to disturbance, such generalised statement is unhelpful. Provide evidence to support this statement or omit it from the submitted ES.	The final paragraph on conclusion of sensitivity is underpinned by the 'Definition of terms relating to the sensitivity of the receptor' and the evidence set out in the paragraphs preceding this statement.
TA_0001_152_231123	S42	Email	4.37 4.9.4.25 This paragraph is hard to follow as various values from different sources have been presented. We suggest using tables to summarise the results and for easier comparison. Here and elsewhere, the submitted Chapter should present results in a table.	Results have been presented in a table here, and wherever else this is relevant.
TA_0001_153_231123	S42	Email	4.38 4.9.6.9 There is inconsistency in the approach when assigning the sensitivity score for effects on marine mammals due to changes in prey availability. Minke whale has been assigned medium due to being particularly vulnerable to potential effects on herring. Paragraph 4.9.6.6 states that harbour porpoise and harbour seal may be particularly vulnerable to changes in prey availability, but both are assigned a sensitivity score of low. Due to the vulnerability of harbour porpoise and harbour seal to changes in prey availability, their sensitivity score should be assigned as medium in the submitted ES.	The assignment of sensitivity scores for the impact of changes in prey availability has been reviewed and further justification for the assigned sensitivities has been presented.
TA_0001_154_231123	S42	Email	4.39 4.10.1.2 Natural England recommend application of the tiered approach for cumulative assessment as outlined in the Best Practice Guidelines Phase III. Refer to Natural England Best Practice Guidelines Phase III when drafting the submitted ES.	All relevant projects which fall inside the cumulative screening area for marine mammals, and have the potential to result in an impact-receptor pathway have been screened into the Cumulative Effects Assessment (Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4)) based on the tiered approach for cumulative assessment as outlined in the Best Practice Guidelines Phase III.
TA_0001_155_231123	S42	Email	4.4 4.10.1.5 Natural England were already consulted on the cumulative assessment for Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Generation Assets and Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets. We suggest that any updates on those cumulative assessments are considered here too. Any changes to cumulative assessments for Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Generation Assets and Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets based on our previous comments should be considered in the future iterations.	Where relevant, comments received from Natural England on the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Generation Assets and Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets have been considered.
TA_0001_156_231123	S42	Email	4.41 Table 4.36 The disturbance ranges for cable trenching and survey/support vessels are quite large (18km and 20km respectively) thus these impacts need to be appropriately considered and addressed in the assessment. Address the large impact ranges for survey/support and cable trenching vessels in the submitted ES.	As a result of changes to Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description of the ES (document reference F1.3) and a review of noise modelling approaches, ranges for cable trenching and survey/support vessels have now been concluded to be between 3,430 and 4,000 m. An assessment of injury and disturbance to marine mammals from vessel use and other (non-piling) sound-producing activities has been presented accordingly in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F4.2).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0001_157_231123	S42	Email	4.42 4.11.2.8 Considering the wide scale disturbance and thus potential for lower level of tolerance, we advise that the sensitivity score for behavioural disturbance from elevated underwater sound due to piling is revised from medium to high. Additionally, the statement on high recoverability should be revised given the evidence in the previous paragraph stating "...exposures may be loud enough to trigger stress responses, which in turn can lead to a depressed immune function and reduced reproductive success."Revise the sensitivity score in the submitted ES.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0001_158_231123	S42	Email	4.43 4.11.2.11 As per our previous comment, the results of IPCoD modelling should be presented for shorter time scale (i.e. 6 years) as well. The conclusion on the potential for long term cumulative effect should be revised accordingly if required. The cumulative assessment in the submitted ES should take into account shorter time scales.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0001_159_231123	S42	Email	4.44 4.11.2.13 (as an example)Terms short, medium and long term are used throughout document without much clarity what periods of time they refer to,and how this period of time relates to the assigned magnitude if low.. Given that the duration of the impact is often used as a basis for the assessment conclusions, these terms need to be clearly defined and context provided in terms of the life span of the species being impacted.Clearly define terms short, medium and long term in the submitted ES.	The terms short, medium and long term have been defined within the ES chapters, as part of the Environmental assessment methodology section within each chapter.
TA_0001_160_231123	S42	Email	4.45 4.11.2.46 The number of harbour porpoises disturbed (3,835 harbour porpoise, 6.13% of the CIS MU) warrants more in-depth consideration in the assessment. We recommend that in order to establish what% of reference population (MU) is classed as significant, appropriate thresholds should be defined.The submitted ES should define appropriate thresholds for % of reference population predicted to be impacted by an activity to aid assessment of the appropriate level of magnitude.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0001_161_231123	S42	Email	4.46 4.11.2.50 and 4.11.2.59 We understand that the reasons behind 'double counting' of bottlenose dolphins. However, we do not agree that the number of animals (i.e. 21 and 22) potentially impacted is an overestimate, considering that bottlenose dolphins are social species often in groups of 20. Thus, there is likelihood that any such group occurring in the area during the activity could be impacted.It is recommended to revise the submitted ES to omit the statement on the highly precautionary number of bottlenose dolphins impacted.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0001_162_231123	S42	Email	4.47 4.11.2.59 We note that in case of simultaneous piling at all three projects up to 5,114 harbour porpoise (8.18% of the CIS MU)could be potentially disturbed, which is 1279 more than for simulations piling scenarios at the Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets and Transmission Assets. Thus, we question why the same magnitude low has been assigned.Revise the magnitude for harbour porpoise during simultaneous piling at all three projects in the submitted ES.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0001_163_231123	S42	Email	4.484 .11.4.8 (as an example) We disagree with the terminology used describing the impacts due to presence of construction vessels as 'highly localised', considering the number of vessels expected and their potential disturbance ranges of up to 20km.Revise the terminology used throughout the assessment in the submitted ES.	The terminology has been reviewed and revised in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4).
TA_0001_164_231123	S42	Email	4.49 4.11.4.12 Evidence needed to support the conclusion that "marine mammals are anticipated to demonstrate some degree of habituation to sound from vessels." This a generalised statement which cannot be apply to all species (especially harbour porpoises) and different types of vessels and activity. The submitted ES should include evidence to support statements used a basis for the assessment outcomes.	Thank you for the detailed response on this point. We note the information provided and have amended the language regarding use of the terminology 'habituation to disturbance'. Additional discussion in relation to Wisniewska (2018) and other relevant studies from the published literature have been provided in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0001_165_231123	S42	Email	4.5 4.14.1.5 We note that the options for reducing project alone effects will be discussed with the Expert Working Group through the Evidence Plan Process and we welcome further discussions	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0001_166_231123	S42	Email	Methodology 4.51 Section 4.11 Our previous comments on project alone should be taken forward to cumulative assessment and where relevant, the assessment should be revised accordingly. See previous comments on the project alone and revise the cumulative assessment where relevant.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0001_167_231123	S42	Email	4.52 Section 4.13 The outcomes of the inter-related effects assessment should be presented here. We note the 'light touch' approach of the assessment (Volume 4, Chapter 5, Table 5.9) especially when it comes to assessment of disturbance. We disagree with the outcome of the assessment for receptor led effects. Include the outcomes of the inter-related effects assessment in this report. In particular, the inter-related effects from various disturbance sources should be assessed adequately in the submitted Es.	The assessment in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4) has been revisited for all impacts and amendments made on the basis of project refinements and the best available evidence. Further justification has been provided throughout to support the conclusions of the assessment. The full inter-related effects assessment is presented in Volume 4, Chapter 3: Inter-related Effects of the ES (document reference F4.3).
TA_0001_168_231123	S42	Email	4.53 Annex 5.2 1.6.4.11 Comment 4.31 is also relevant here. See comment above and update assessment accordingly.	Volume 1, Annex 5.2: Underwater sound technical report of the ES (document reference F1.5.2) does not include discussion of tertiary mitigation strategies.
TA_0001_169_231123	S42	Email	4.54 Annex 5.2 Natural England defer to Cefas, as underwater noise experts, to provide detailed comments on the Underwater Sound Technical report. Note.	Please note, comments from Cefas have been addressed and responded to separately.
TA_0001_170_231123	S42	Email	Screening 4.55 General We defer to the relevant SNCBs on the appropriate approach for assessing SACs outside English waters. Note	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0001_171_231123	S42	Email	4.56 Table 1.5 All relevant marine mammal SACs in English waters have been screened in. Agreement.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0001_172_231123	S42	Email	4.57 1.5.2.7/9 The maximum foraging ranges for grey seals and harbour seals from Carter et al., 2022 should be used as a screening range instead of the average foraging distances of 100km and 40-50km respectively. Use Carter et al., 2022 maximum foraging distances for screening in the submitted report.	The HRA Stage 1 Screening report (document reference E3) considers European sites within OSPAR Region III Interim MU designated for grey seal, however telemetry data from Wright and Sinclair (2022) has then been used to capture any SACs with potential connectivity to the Transmission Assets. As agreed with Natural England via the Marine Mammals Expert Working Group (EWG) (EWG03) SACs screened in for grey seal include: • Pen Llŷn a'r Sarnau/Llŷn Peninsula and the Sarnau SAC • Lambay Island SAC • Cardigan Bay/Bae Ceredigion SAC • Pembrokeshire Marine/Sir Benfro Forol SAC • Saltee Islands SACs agreed with Natural England via the Marine Mammals Expert Working Group (EWG) (EWG03) all SACs for harbour seal were screened out.
TA_0001_173_231123	S42	Email	4.58 Table 1.17 Appropriate potential impact pathways are identified for marine mammal sites. Agreement	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0001_174_231123	S42	Email	4.59 1.10.10.6 Natural England agree with the conclusions in the LSE matrices. Agreement	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0001_175_231123	S42	Email	In- combination 4.6 Table 1.173 The Applicant has identified that up to 15.64% of the Celtic and Irish Sea Management Unit population of harbour porpoise may be disturbed at any one time from all projects in-combination. Whilst we acknowledge there is no spatial overlap between the Project and the Bristol Channel Approaches SAC, our concern is whether this level of in-combination disturbance could impact the ability of harbour porpoise to remain a viable component of the site (Conservation Objective 1). This is due to harbour porpoise from this SAC being part of the CIS MU population. We welcome further engagement on potential further assessment/mitigation to demonstrate/ensure that no adverse effect on site integrity could occur. Continue engagement on potential further assessment/mitigation of in-combination disturbance effects to demonstrate no AEol to harbour porpoise SACs.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0001_293_231123	S42	Email	Marine Mammals Natural England have concerns on the assessment methodology thus we are not able to agree to the outcomes of the assessments at this stage. There seems to be a lack of clarity and consistency while precautionary approach is not always applied. We have concerns relating to: dual effect categories in the assessment matrix where in certain cases	The Applicants note your response. Please see detailed responses where these comments have been addressed individually.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			non-significant and significant effects can result from the same combination of magnitude and sensitivity; unclear terminology regarding scale and duration of effects used without description or justification; inconsistency in assigning magnitude and sensitivity scores; unclear methodologies at times (e.g. how the number of animals disturbed have been derived using dose response curves) and conclusions being drawn without robust evidence and justification.	
TA_0001_294_231123	S42	Email	The assessment for PTS from piling and UXOs should be based on the underwater noise modelling without rather than with ADDs. Therefore, these assessments should be revised.	It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The assessment in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4) presents the ranges both without ADD and with ADD, the latter providing evidence to demonstrate the potential efficacy of using ADD as a tool in the mitigation strategy. Most assessments model both with and without ADD to show the benefits of ADDs where this has been proposed as an integral part of the project designed-in mitigation measures to reduce the risk of injury to marine mammals. Therefore, the assessment considers the implementation of an indicative 30 minute ADD deployment duration as well as the predicted ranges without the use of an ADD. ADDs are included as part of standard industry tertiary measures (as with passive acoustic monitoring/marine mammal observers) and therefore are accepted as part of best practice within marine mammal mitigation protocols (MMMPs). The detailed MMMP will be developed post-consent further to any project updates at this stage and an Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (document reference J18) will be included with the application. In terms of underwater sound, piling has been removed from the design for the DCO application of the Transmission Assets.
TA_0001_295_231123	S42	Email	Natural England would welcome the sight of a draft MMMP through future Marine Mammal EWGs before it gets to the DCO application stage.	MMMPs will be developed post-consent, in line with latest guidance, further to any project updates at this stage and an Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (document reference J18) will be included with the application.
TA_0001_310_231123	S42	Email	Appendix 1 The following Framework has been used in Natural England's advice to attribute risk to the project: Structure / Framework Risk Purple Note for the developer. Red Natural England considers that unless these issues are resolved it will have to advise that (in relation to any one of them, and as appropriate) it is not possible to ascertain beyond reasonable scientific doubt that the project will not affect the integrity of an SAC/SPA/Ramsar and/or significantly hinder the conservation objectives of an MCZ and/or damage or destroy the interest features of a SSSI and/or comply fully with the Environmental Impact Assessment requirements. Addressing these concerns may require the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new baseline or survey data; and/or • significant revisions to baseline characterisation and/or impact modelling and/or • significant design changes; and/or • significant mitigation Natural England feels that issues given Red status are so complex, or require the provision of so much outstanding information, that they are unlikely to be resolved during the Examination, and respectfully suggests that they be addressed beforehand. Amber Natural England does not agree with the developer's position or approach and consider that this could make a material difference to the outcome of the decision-making process for this project. Natural England considers that these matters may be resolved through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provision of additional evidence or justification to support conclusions; and/or • revisions to impact assessment methodology and/or assessment conclusions; and/or • minor to moderate revisions to impact modelling; and/or • well-designed mitigation measures that are adequately secured through the draft DCO/dML and/or • amendments to draft plans If these issues remain at the time of the application and are not addressed or resolved by the end of the Examination, then they may become a Red risk as set out above. Yellow Natural England doesn't agree with the developer's position or approach. We would ideally like this to be addressed but are satisfied that for this particular project it is unlikely to make a material difference to our advice or the outcome of the decision-making process. However, we reserve the right to revise our opinion should further evidence be presented. It should be noted by interested parties that just because these issues/comments are not raised as significant concerns in this instance, it should not be understood or inferred that Natural England would be of the same view in other cases or circumstances. Green Natural England is in broad agreement with the developer's approach	Natural England's advice has been noted, specifically in the assessment of effects on ecological receptors (see Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3)).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			and has no significant outstanding concerns. As above, we reserve the right to revise our opinion should new evidence be presented.	
TA_0014_011_231123	S42	Email	General Point: Please ensure that relevant marine mammal considerations, as raised by the Isle of Man Government during discussions with Manx Whale and Dolphin Watch, Manx Wildlife Trust and RPS representatives for the Morgan and Mona Offshore wind farm projects in recent months, are also incorporated within this Morgan and Morecambe Transmission Assets assessment process. This will ensure consistent approaches for related projects, and that Manx data and interests are appropriately included and considered.	All relevant marine mammal considerations, as raised by the Isle of Man Government during discussions with Manx Whale and Dolphin Watch, Manx Wildlife Trust through the Morgan Offshore Windfarm: Generation Assets and the Mona Offshore Wind Project Expert Working Group (EWG) have been considered within Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4) and Volume 2, Annex 4.1: Marine Mammal Technical Report of the ES (document reference F2.4.1).
TA_0014_012_231123	S42	Email	4.9.8 Future monitoring'4.9.8.1 Marine mammal monitoring to test the predictions made within the impact assessment is not considered necessary, at this stage.'and4.11.8 Future monitoring'4.11.8.1 As per section 4.9.8 above, marine mammal monitoring to test the predictions made within the impact assessment is not considered necessary, at this stage.'- As such, if there is no monitoring to test predictions, how will the validity of the assumptions and conclusions in relation to impacts be validated? -Without monitoring evidence how can the Environmental Statement be defended in the longer term, or stakeholders interests be properly safeguarded? - It would appear to be a fundamental requirement of such a project to include a basic monitoring programme across all receptors to confirm assumptions, conclusions and predictions, or otherwise. -Noting inclusion of the reference: Deaville R. and Jepson P.D. (2011) UK Cetacean Strandings Investigation Programme: Final report for the period 1st Jan 2005 – 31st December 2010. Institute of Zoology, Zoological Society of London; at the very least, monitoring of CSIP data over the relevant construction and operational phases of the project may indicate changes in cetacean strandings and mortalities. As part of an industry-wide monitoring programme for the numerous Irish sea windfarm developments, this would seem to be a potential starting point. - Noting Table 4.9: Designated sites and relevant qualifying interests, and that Manx Marine Nature Reserves are the closest, statutorily-designated conservation sites with marine mammal interests.The relevant Departments of the Isle of Man Government, via the Territorial Sea Committee, seeks specific clarification as to how the assumptions and impact predictions will be verified in the absence of monitoring?	An Offshore In-principle Monitoring Plan (document reference J20) has been included in the Transmission Assets DCO application, which will be discussed and agreed with stakeholders once there is a final detailed design agreed.
TA_0014_013_231123	S42	Email	Table 4.42: Temporal time scale for potential cumulative projects with direct impacts on marine mammalsIn relation to Tier 3: Isle of Man Offshore Wind Farm, which is only 2.59 km from the Morgan Array Area, The Isle of Man Government strongly recommends that contact is made with Ørsted to improve the largely 'unknown' classification of this project, and to ensure appropriate inclusion in the cumulative impact assessments.	All relevant projects which fall inside the cumulative screening area for marine mammals, and have the potential to result in an impact-receptor pathway have been screened into the Cumulative Effects Assessment (Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4)) and in-combination assessment in the ISAA (document reference E2.1, 2.2, 2.3).
TA_0017_005_231123	S42/S44	Email	The Marine Management Organisation and Natural England should be consulted regarding potential ecological impacts offshore substation platforms and booster stations.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. The assessments offshore topic chapters of the Transmission Assets Application have been updated to reflect this amendment. With the removal of the Morgan Offshore Substation Platform (OSP), the Morecambe OSP and the Morgan Offshore Booster Station from the Project Description, and the associated removal for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0023_003_221123	S42	Email	Marine Mammals: NRW (A) are not able to agree the conclusions of the PEIR without significant revisions with respect to the methodology. This position is particularly with regard to densities for harbour porpoise, use of acoustic deterrent devices (ADDs), cumulative assessment of vessel noise, and technical aspects of behavioural noise thresholds.	The Applicants thank you for your detailed comments. Please see detailed responses where these comments have been addressed individually. Further detail regarding marine mammals is presented in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4) and Volume 2, Annex 4.1: Marine mammals technical report of the ES (document reference F2.4.1). With respect to Volume 1, Annex 5.2: Underwater sound technical report of the ES (document reference F1.5.2), no use of ADDs have been included for the DCO. The application of the behavioural noise thresholds falls outside of the scope of the report, as does the cumulative assessment.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0023_021_221123	S42	Email	1. Overall, regarding marine mammals, NRW(A) are not satisfied with the marine mammal assessment for Morgan within these reports and advise that some major revisions are required in order to address these concerns	The Applicants note your response. Please see detailed responses where these comments have been addressed individually.
TA_0023_022_221123	S42	Email	1. NRW (A) defer Morecambe comments to Natural England.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0023_023_221123	S42	Email	2. NRW (A) cannot agree with several conclusions, or the methodology used in the assessment (including cumulative assessment) of behavioural disturbance (Key issue 1).	The Applicants note your response. Please see detailed responses where these comments have been addressed individually.
TA_0023_024_221123	S42	Email	3. The assessment appears to rely heavily on the use acoustic deterrent devices (ADDs) to reduce the magnitude of permanent threshold shift (PTS) from piling and unexploded ordnance (UXO). Thus, impacts are being shifted from PTS injury to displacement of animals. NRW (A) do not agree that 30 minutes of ADD should be included in the underwater noise modelling to predict injury impact ranges for the assessment. The 30 minute ADD duration has not been agreed with statutory nature conservation bodies (SNCBs), is not industry standard, and its inclusion obscures the true worst-case scenario (i.e. without ADDs) that the assessment must be based on. Final ADD duration will be determined post-consent and the applicant should base assessment on the underwater noise modelling without ADDs and revise any assessments, including cumulative and HRA, that are currently based on the predicted ranges with 30min ADDs (Key issue 2).	The assessment in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4) presents the ranges both without ADD and with ADD, the latter providing evidence to demonstrate the potential efficacy of using ADD as a tool in the mitigation strategy. Most assessments model both with and without ADD to show the benefits of ADDs where this has been proposed as an integral part of the project designed-in mitigation measures to reduce the risk of injury to marine mammals. Therefore, the assessment considers the implementation of an indicative 30 minute ADD deployment duration as well as the predicted ranges without the use of an ADD. ADDs are included as part of standard industry tertiary measures (as with passive acoustic monitoring/marine mammal observers) and therefore are accepted as part of best practice within marine mammal mitigation protocols (MMMPs). The detailed MMMP will be developed post-consent further to any project updates at this stage and an Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (document reference J18) will be included with the application. An assessment of the clearance of the largest anticipated UXO is provided within Volume 1, Annex 5.2: Underwater sound technical report of the ES (document reference F1.5.2). Piling has been removed for the design for the DCO application.
TA_0023_025_221123	S42	Email	1. NRW (A) recommend presenting results from IPCoD modelling to provide the ratio of the impacted vs unimpacted population over a set period of time (e.g. the first 6 years) (Key issue 3).	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0023_026_221123	S42	Email	2. NRW (A) note the vessel noise assessment is poor. Given the weight of evidence showing the impacts of vessel noise on species such as harbour porpoise the applicant needs to assess this impact pathway adequately particularly given that there will be an estimated 700 vessels in the area from the development alone (Key issue 4).	Further information on baseline levels of vessel activity has been provided from Volume 2, Annex 7.1: Navigational Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F2.7.1).
TA_0023_027_221123	S42	Email	3. NRW (A) notes the densities for harbour porpoise are inconsistent, and different throughout the documentation. We advise that the applicant should choose one or provide a strong and ecologically relevant justification for the use of multiple densities (Key issue 5).	A single density estimate has been included in the assessment (Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4)) for harbour porpoise (this approach has been applied to all other marine mammal species considered)
TA_0023_028_221123	S42	Email	4. NRW (A) requires the inclusion of the latest Marine Mammal Atlas, Evans, P.G.H. and Waggitt, J.J. [2023], and inclusion of SCANS IV (Key issue 6).	The list of data sources has been updated to include SCANS IV (Gilles et al., 2023), Welsh Marine Mammal Atlas (Evans and Waggitt, 2023), IAMMWG (2022, 2023) and SCOS, 2022. These data sources have been included in Volume 2, Annex 4.1: Marine Mammal Technical Report (document reference F2.4.1), and Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals, of the ES (document reference F2.4).
TA_0023_029_221123	S42	Email	1. NRW (A) disagrees with the assessment matrix as proposed (Key issue 7).	The EIA methodology is set out within Volume 1, Chapter 5: Environmental assessment methodology of the ES. The chapter describes how significance of effects has been assessed. Professional judgement is used to define the magnitude of impact and receptor sensitivity. The matrix is then used, together with professional judgement, to evaluate the significance of effect. The significance may be one, or a range of, no change, negligible, minor, moderate or major. In general, a significance of effect of moderate or greater is considered 'significant' in EIA terms. For each topic chapter, what is considered 'significant' has been clearly defined. Where further mitigation is not possible a residual significant effect may remain. Within the

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				assessment chapters the justification for determining the significance of effect is described. Where a range is given, the assessment chapter details the reason for the significance that has been concluded.
TA_0023_030_221123	S42	Email	1. Clear definitions need to be provided for keywords used to make assessment conclusions such as: "short term", "temporary", "small scale", "regional". These are currently undefined (Key issue 8).	Definitions have been included within the ES chapters, where relevant, as part of the Environmental assessment methodology section within each chapter.
TA_0023_031_221123	S42	Email	1. We cannot currently agree with several conclusions, or the methodology used in the assessment (including the cumulative assessment) of behavioural disturbance. We recommend that substantial changes to the methodology and text are required to address our concerns regarding the adequacy of the assessment:	The Applicants note your response. Please see specific responses to detailed comments following.
TA_0023_032_221123	S42	Email	2. Although dose / response (D/R) curves were employed to assess disturbance from piling, additional interpretation was carried out through the qualitative use of "mild" and "strong" fixed disturbance thresholds. Dose response curves alone are sufficient to accurately quantify and draw conclusions on disturbance from pile driving since they are based on detailed and species and source-specific behavioural observations in the field. These give realistic predictions of how an animal response varies with dose or distance from a source. Given this, we strongly question the purpose of providing additional qualitative context to these results through fixed thresholds, which were originally based on observations of mysticete behaviour in response to airgun noise (thus may be inaccurate for other species and other noise sources). At present, the application of "mild" and "strong" thresholds have been used to qualitatively interpret downwards the numbers of disturbed animals calculated through the use of a dose response curve. Piling noise disturbance assessments and conclusions will need to be revised using the correct methodology: i.e. the use of dose-response curves alone without additional interpretation at either stage of the assessment.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0023_033_221123	S42	Email	3. Effective deterrence ranges (EDRs) have been incorrectly applied in the PEIR. They are area-based thresholds defined as reflecting the overall loss of habitat that would occur if all animals vacated an area within the EDR, being equivalent to the mean loss of habitat per animal for use in HRA / Information to Support an Appropriate Assessment rather than estimating the number of animals disturbed.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0023_034_221123	S42	Email	4. It is unclear how the number of animals disturbed has been derived. We recommend that the applicant needs to provide contour maps for each species and tables showing D/R calculations (i.e. rows with each 5 dB contour, showing area covered by that contour, and numbers of animals disturbed for each contour, and whether these are "per day" or totals over the entire MDS). Clarification needs to be provided as to which value for numbers of animals disturbed was used for the IPCoD modelling. We cannot agree with the results and conclusions unless these calculations are clear.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0023_035_221123	S42	Email	5. For harbour porpoise, it is unclear (in the main chapter) which total number of animals disturbed was used for the IPCoD modelling and in the overall conclusions. Is it: (a) the number of animals disturbed from the maximum spatial scenario, or (b) the total number from the single scenarios, or (c) something else? Clarification and justification needs to be provided as to which value for numbers of animals disturbed for all species (it is assumed that similar approaches were taken for all species). Note: The appendix shows that it's the maximum spatial scenario, but this is unclear in the main chapter.	This comment relates to the assessment of injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling. With the removal of the Morgan Offshore Substation Platform (OSP), the Morecambe OSP and the Morgan Offshore Booster Station from the Project Description, and the associated removal for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0023_036_221123	S42	Email	6. No evidence has been provided to justify the conclusion that marine mammals are deemed to have some tolerance to behavioural disturbance, or "it is anticipated that there would be some adaptability to piling". This conclusion of tolerance appears to have been made by interpreting the decreased probability of displacement at increasing distance from the piling source (as seen in data collected from piling studies) as evidence of lack of behavioural disturbance. Here a lack of measurable overt reaction has been taken to either imply that there has been no impact, or that the impact is mild, or that the animals tolerate the impact pathway. Behavioural reactions may be more subtle than a displacement reaction to	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			be quantified with the parameters chosen for a given study, or may have occurred out of view as is often the case with e.g. diving animals or physiological stress reactions and are thus overlooked even if they may still affect individual fitness / survivability. The applicant should either provide evidence of such tolerance and adaptability or revise any conclusions that were based on such assumptions.	
TA_0023_037_221123	S42	Email	7. The use of TTS as a disturbance threshold is not justifiable (other than as an interim method for assessing disturbance from UXO detonations until more accurate predictions of noise levels can be made). In the text it is frequently stated that for marine mammals a fleeing response "is assumed to occur at the same noise levels as TTS". However fleeing responses and other disturbance responses (which would fall under significant disturbance but may not necessarily involve flight) can and do take place at lower levels as can be observed in data collected from existing dose / response curve data for various species (e.g. Graham et al 2019, 2017; Neart na Gaoithe, 2018; Thompson et al. 2013; Whyte et al 2020) other studies on pile driving impacts (e.g. Brandt et al, 2018), and various studies showing reactions to boat noise (Wisniewska et al., 2018; Pirota et al 2013, 2015; Dyndo et al 2015; Oakley et al 2017; Marley et al 2017a, 2017b, Rojano-Doñate et al 2023) and ADDs (Elmegaard et al 2023). We draw particular attention to the fact that TTS thresholds are inherently under precautionary given that they mark the boundary between the most severe disturbance responses and the start of physical impacts on the auditory system. This means that the threshold may not capture less severe disturbance responses that would still fall under the definition of significant disturbance. We therefore recommend that any disturbance estimates and conclusions derived from the use of a TTS threshold (other than for UXO) are revised / re-assessed using appropriate behavioural disturbance thresholds.	The discussion of the magnitude of impact does not form part of Volume 1, Annex 5.2: Underwater sound technical report of the ES (document reference F1.5.2). The Applicants confirm that the use of TTS as a disturbance threshold has only been applied to the assessment of injury and disturbance from elevated underwater sound during UXO clearance (as an interim method for assessing disturbance from UXO detonations until more accurate predictions of noise levels can be made, as identified by NRW).
TA_0023_038_221123	S42	Email	8. No explanation or justification has been given for the use of differing disturbance thresholds for different projects	The structure of Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4) has been revised and updated. The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this has further simplified Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4).
TA_0023_039_221123	S42	Email	9. Paras 4.9.2.82 & 4.9.3.34 – The change of impulsive noise into continuous does not have any impact on disturbance conclusions especially if using D/R curves which are based on observation (see comments for UW noise chapter below). Noting also that Southall et al [2021] do not discuss this topic. The issue of changes in impulsive noise characteristics with range is discussed in a different paper, Southall [2021] which focuses on noise exposure criteria and thresholds for injury but not behaviour. Any conclusions derived from this reasoning should thus be re-assessed and revised.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0023_040_221123	S42	Email	10. We recommend that when presenting results from IPCoD modelling to provide the ratio of the impacted vs unimpacted population over a set period of time (e.g. the first 6 years, based on the former Favourable Conservation Status (FCS) reporting period), and the full 25 year modelled period. To help interpret results from modelling we would suggest that one way of doing this could be that if as a result of PTS / disturbance, a population shows a continued decline of >1% per year (versus a modelled unimpacted reference population over e.g. the first 6 years since the start of piling) then there is a high likelihood that a significant effect / AEOSI cannot be ruled out [as per NRW, 2023].	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0023_041_221123	S42	Email	11. 4.9.1.30 It is unclear how SPLrms thresholds for mild and strong disturbance were accurately converted into SELs unless the duration, T, over which the rms averaging was performed was known. It is assumed that for this PEIR a nominal value was chosen for the duration T (e.g. T= 0.1s or T=0.125s etc) although this should be clarified in the text. While these informal calculations can be extremely useful as a quick guide, we would not recommend basing assessment conclusions on such conversions. We advise consulting Madsen [2005], and Tougaard et al [2015] for a more in-depth discussion of the challenges of applying rms thresholds to transient sounds noting that in various studies where the SPLrms,	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			SEL, and duration were measured, differences between SPLrms and SEL ranged from 5–15 dB, with considerable variation depending on distance from source, water depth and geo-acoustic environment. Generally speaking, these differences tend to be larger at close distances where the pulse duration is still short (i.e. <<1 s), and diminish at longer distances, where pulse duration tends to increase because of propagation effects.	
TA_0023_042_221123	S42	Email	12. As per our advice on the results of the assessment for the project alone, we cannot agree to the results and conclusions of the cumulative assessment unless the above changes are made.	The Applicants note your response. Thank you for your detailed comments. Please see detailed responses where these comments have been addressed individually.
TA_0023_043_221123	S42	Email	13. Par 4.9.4.15 - Vella [2002] (i.e. the reference provided in the reference list) mentions habituation to offshore wind farms, but no specific reference to boat noise is made in that reference.	Vella (2002) has been reviewed and reference to this paper has been updated.
TA_0023_044_221123	S42	Email	14. Pars 4.9.4.32 & 4.9.4.33 – no appreciable quantified assessment has been carried out on vessel noise. We disagree with the proposed magnitude of medium for disturbance for harbour porpoise, and advise that this should be set to high. We may be able to agree with the overall assessment of minor adverse as per 4.9.4.35 but would need to have sight of the final EMP.	Further information on baseline levels of vessel activity has been provided from Volume 2, Annex 7.1: Navigational Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F2.7.1). The assessment of the potential impact of injury and disturbance to marine mammals from vessel use and other (non-piling) sound-producing activities has been reviewed and further quantification provided. An Offshore Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) will be developed post-consent further to any project updates at this stage and a draft will be included with the application.
TA_0023_045_221123	S42	Email	15. Par 4.9.7.26 – no appreciable quantified assessment has been carried out on geophysical and geotechnical surveys. Furthermore with reference to pars 4.9.7.23 and 4.9.7.25 we note that 120 dB SPLrms is the threshold for onset of level B harassment, which refers to “acts that have the potential to disturb (to a biologically significant degree - but not injure) a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild by disrupting behavioural patterns, including, but not limited to, migration, breathing, nursing, breeding, feeding, or sheltering.” Thus the statement that “and there is no distinction between mild and strong disturbance, it can be assumed that not all animals found within those ranges (Table 4.39) would be disturbed.” is incorrect, should be removed, and any related conclusions in the PEIR documents based on this statement amended.	A quantitative assessment has been conducted, based on noise modelling for typical geophysical/geotechnical survey equipment. As such it is unclear what changes are being requested. It is also noted the request to remove the statement that “and there is no distinction between mild and strong disturbance, it can be assumed that not all animals found within those ranges (Table 4.39) would be disturbed”. The Applicants have amended this statement within the context of the assessment.
TA_0023_046_221123	S42	Email	16. Par. 4.11.4.12 – States: “Introduction of vessels during construction and operation and maintenance phases of the projects will not be a novel impact for marine mammals present in the area and therefore marine mammals are anticipated to demonstrate some degree of habituation to sound from vessels.” 17. Current evidence suggests otherwise, given the various studies showing reactions to boat noise with no evidence of habituation occurring [Wisniewska et al., 2018; Pirota et al 2013, 2015; Dyndo et al 2015; Oakley et al 2017; Marley et al 2017a, 2017b, Rojano-Doñate et al 2023].	Thank you for the detailed response on this point. We note the information provided and have amended the language regarding use of the terminology 'habituation to disturbance'. Additional discussion in relation to Wisniewska (2018) and other relevant studies from the published literature have been provided in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4).
TA_0023_047_221123	S42	Email	18. NRW (A) contends that the term “habituation” is being used incorrectly in this PEIR when describing wildlife responses to underwater stimuli. Here evidence that a particular disturbance has little or no effect (specific to the metric being measured) is being referred to as habituation to support conclusions that the animals are not adversely affected by human activities. It is more likely that impact studies referred to as evidence of “habituation” documented differences in levels of tolerance to a stressor. Proof that habituation had occurred would require long-term sequential measurements of responses by individuals to controlled stimuli. Furthermore, conclusions based on behavioural responses do not tend to consider physiological responses that typically have no visible, external indicator and are thus not readily detectable in free-ranging animals. It should not be assumed that tolerance to a stressor is evidence of absence of detrimental consequences for targeted animals. We recommend that any related conclusions in the PEIR documents based on such assumptions are amended.	Thank you for the detailed response on this point. The Applicants note your response and have amended the language regarding use of the terminology 'habituation to disturbance'. Additional discussion in relation to Wisniewska (2018) and other relevant studies from the published literature have been provided in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4).
TA_0023_048_221123	S42	Email	19. It is unclear as to how modelling population parameters for IPCoD provided by NRW are conservative and that therefore IPCoD results should be interpreted with caution. These parameters were developed and tested to be specific to Welsh populations.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0023_049_221123	S42	Email	20. It is unclear whether for cumulative assessments the OSPAR III border was used as a screening distance where the OSPAR III grey seal population was used in IPCoD modelling. If not, we note that modelling the impacts of projects screened in from the SMU screening distance would essentially be diluting the effect by using the same number of projects (screened in from a smaller area) on a much larger population. Thus substantially reducing the value of such results.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0023_050_221123	S42	Email	1. The assessment appears to rely heavily on the use ADDs to reduce the magnitude of PTS from piling and UXO. Thus, it appears that impacts are being shifted from PTS injury to displacement of animals (see: Elmegaard et al 2023).	The assessment in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4) presents the ranges both without ADD and with ADD, the latter providing evidence to demonstrate the potential efficacy of using ADD as a tool in the mitigation strategy. Most assessments model both with and without ADD to show the benefits of ADDs where this has been proposed as an integral part of the project designed-in mitigation measures to reduce the risk of injury to marine mammals. Therefore the assessment considers the implementation of an indicative 30 minute ADD deployment duration as well as the predicted ranges without the use of an ADD. ADDs are included as part of standard industry tertiary measures (as with passive acoustic monitoring/marine mammal observers) and therefore are accepted as part of best practice within marine mammal mitigation protocols (MMMPs). The detailed MMMP will be developed post-consent further to any project updates at this stage and an Outline Marine Mammals Mitigation Protocol (document reference J18) will be included with the application.
TA_0023_051_221123	S42	Email	1. NRW(A) do not agree that 30 minutes of ADD should be included in the underwater noise modelling to predict injury impact ranges for the assessment. The 30 minute ADD duration has not been agreed with SNCBs, and its inclusion obscures the true worst-case scenario (i.e. without ADDs) that our assessment must be based on. Final ADD duration will be determined post-consent and the applicant should base assessment on the underwater noise modelling without ADDs and revise any assessments, including cumulative and HRA, that is based on the predicted ranges with 30min ADDs.	The assessment in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4) presents the ranges both without ADD and with ADD, the latter providing evidence to demonstrate the potential efficacy of using ADD as a tool in the mitigation strategy. Most assessments model both with and without ADD to show the benefits of ADDs where this has been proposed as an integral part of the project designed-in mitigation measures to reduce the risk of injury to marine mammals. Therefore the assessment considers the implementation of an indicative 30 minute ADD deployment duration as well as the predicted ranges without the use of an ADD. ADDs are included as part of standard industry tertiary measures (as with passive acoustic monitoring/marine mammal observers) and therefore are accepted as part of best practice within marine mammal mitigation protocols (MMMPs). The detailed MMMP will be developed post-consent further to any project updates at this stage and an Outline Marine Mammals Mitigation Protocol (document reference J18) will be included with the application.
TA_0023_052_221123	S42	Email	1. We cannot currently agree with the lack of cumulative assessment for injury especially given the reliance on ADDs to reduce the magnitude of PTS. Swim distances by far exceed the PTS impact range, strongly suggesting that the impact pathway is instead being shifted to displacement of animals.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the Environmental Statement, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0023_053_221123	S42	Email	1. We cannot currently agree with densities used for harbour porpoise (1.394 from surveys for Morecambe OSP, and 0.560 for Morgan offshore booster station). Densities are substantially different over a relatively small area, and an ecological justification should be proposed for this, or a single density selected.	A single density estimate has been included in the assessment (Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4)) for harbour porpoise (this approach has been applied to all other marine mammal species considered).
TA_0023_054_221123	S42	Email	2. We note that Waggitt et al [2019] stated that their paper should not be used for absolute densities in this way, and recommend use of Evans and Waggitt [2023]. We further note that if the intent is to keep the Waggitt et al [2019] densities and the survey densities,	The most appropriate density taken forward to assessment has been established on a species-specific basis, and we have noted the advice on not applying Waggitt et al. (2020) for these densities.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			then it should not also be argued that results are over-precautionary given the densities were selected by the applicant when other robust densities were also available.	
TA_0023_055_221123	S42	Email	1. The assessment matrix in Table 4.16 appears biased towards a “minor” magnitude of impact. We also note the use of dual magnitudes, for which detailed clarification and justification should be provided.	The EIA methodology is set out within Volume 1, Chapter 5: Environmental assessment methodology of the ES. The chapter describes how significance of effects has been assessed. Professional judgement is used to define the magnitude of impact and receptor sensitivity. The matrix is then used, together with professional judgement, to evaluate the significance of effect. The significance may be one, or a range of, no change, negligible, minor, moderate or major. In general, a significance of effect of moderate or greater is considered 'significant' in EIA terms. For each topic chapter, what is considered 'significant' has been clearly defined. Where further mitigation is not possible a residual significant effect may remain. Within the assessment chapters the justification for determining the significance of effect is described. Where a range is given, the assessment chapter details the reason for the significance that has been concluded.
TA_0023_056_221123	S42	Email	1. NRW(A) cannot currently agree with several densities proposed or sources used in the baseline chapter:	A single density estimate has been included in the assessment (Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4)) for harbour porpoise (this approach has been applied to all other marine mammal species considered).
TA_0023_057_221123	S42	Email	2. In line with previous rounds of comments on the Morecambe generation assets, we note the references to Waggitt et al. [2019] for absolute densities of cetaceans in the project area, although Waggitt et al [2019] stated that their paper should not be used for absolute densities in this way.	The most appropriate density taken forward to assessment has been established on a species-specific basis, and we have noted the advice on not applying Waggitt et al. (2020) for these densities.
TA_0023_058_221123	S42	Email	1. The New Seabird and Marine Mammal Atlas has now been published and we would recommend its use over Waggitt et al [2019]. The Atlas is now available on the NRW website at 646: Modelled Distributions and Abundance of Cetaceans and Seabirds of Wales and Surrounding Waters. Evans, P.G.H. and Waggitt, J.J. 2023. Modelled Distribution and Abundance of Cetaceans and Seabirds in Wales and Surrounding Waters. NRW Evidence Report, Report No: 646, 354 pp. Natural Resources Wales, Bangor.	The list of data sources has been updated to include SCANS IV (Gilles et al., 2023), Welsh Marine Mammal Atlas (Evans and Waggitt, 2023), IAMMWG (2022, 2023) and SCOS, 2022. These data sources have been included in Volume 2, Annex 4.1: Marine Mammal Technical Report (document reference F2.4.1), and Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals, of the ES (document reference F2.4). The most appropriate density taken forward to assessment has been established on a species-specific basis, and we have noted the advice on not applying Waggitt et al. (2020) for these densities.
TA_0023_059_221123	S42	Email	3. The SCANS IV report has now also been published, and we recommend its inclusion in the baseline.	The list of data sources has been updated to include SCANS IV (Gilles et al., 2023), which is included in Volume 2, Annex 4.1: Marine Mammal Technical Report (document reference F2.4.1), and Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals, of the ES (document reference F2.4).
TA_0023_060_221123	S42	Email	4. Multiple and substantially different densities have been used for the different projects. Strong, ecological justification should be provided for this approach or a single density used instead.	A single density estimate has been included in the assessment (Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4)) for harbour porpoise (this approach has been applied to all other marine mammal species considered).
TA_0023_061_221123	S42	Email	5. Proposed harbour porpoise densities (0.560) from Waggitt et al [2019] and from surveys (1.394) are significantly higher than Evans and Waggitt [2023], despite in paragraph 1.2.5.52 it is stated that estimates from the latest Welsh marine mammal atlas are “highly precautionary”. Overall, we would still recommend the use of Welsh atlas density data due to its greater robustness. Although data from Waggitt et al [2019] was not originally intended for use as baseline densities we may be able to accept their use for Harbour porpoise for precautionary reasons, i.e. solely because these are higher than the values from the Welsh MM Atlas. If the intent is to retain the proposed density of 0.560, then any conclusions of the assessment will need to be based on that density and therefore qualitative arguments that conclusions are over- precautionary should be avoided since other densities were available for use.	A single density estimate has been included in the assessment (Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4)) for harbour porpoise (this approach has been applied to all other marine mammal species considered).
TA_0023_062_221123	S42	Email	6. With regard to the densities proposed for other species, we defer to Natural England. While we note that Waggitt et al [2019] stated that their paper should not be used for absolute densities in this way, and recommend use of Evans and Waggitt [2023] instead, the densities proposed would be acceptable given similarities to densities from other sources.	The Applicants note your response. The most appropriate density taken forward to assessment has been established on a species-specific basis, and we have noted the advice on not applying Waggitt et al. (2020) for these densities.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0023_063_221123	S42	Email	1. Definitions need to be provided for keywords used to make assessment conclusions such as: "short term", "temporary", "small scale", "regional". These are currently undefined.	Definitions have been included within the ES chapters, where relevant, as part of the Environmental assessment methodology section within each chapter.
TA_0023_064_221123	S42	Email	1. Bristol Channel Approaches SAC was not included in table 1.3, although it has been mentioned elsewhere in the document and has been screened in.	The Applicants note your response. This table has now been updated to include Bristol Channel Approaches SAC (Volume 2, Chapter: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4)).
TA_0023_065_221123	S42	Email	1. We disagree with the conclusion in Par 1.2.5.52 that estimates from the Welsh Marine Mammals Atlas are "highly precautionary". The values of the composite map show the highest mean density for each cell at any point over the 30 years of data. The highest mean densities tend to occur in the summer months and there are close similarities between the data for the overall composite and the maps for the summer quarter. Given that marine construction tends to occur in the summer months and coincides with the higher mean density months, we would argue that the composite map shows a realistic worst case and is therefore an appropriate source to use for density estimates for consenting purposes.	Language around precautionarily has been reviewed and updated in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4) .
TA_0023_066_221123	S42	Email	1. Telemetry data presented in figs 1.47 and 1.48 strongly suggests that grey seal do not follow jurisdictional boundaries, therefore justification should ideally be provided with regard to the decision to use SMUs which stop at jurisdictional boundaries and do not include the East coast of Ireland. NRW defers to Natural England with regard to the decision on which Management Unit to use.	The Applicants note your response that NRW defer to Natural England on which Management Units to use. Identified MUs applied to the assessment in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4) are defined by telemetry data provided by SMRU, which identifies connectivity between the Transmission Assets, SACs and Management Units.
TA_0023_067_221123	S42	Email	1.4.2.3 Volume 1, Annex 5.2: Underwater Sound Par 1.4.5.14- States: "It should be borne in mind that there is a considerable degree of uncertainty and variability in the onset of disturbance and therefore any disturbance ranges should be treated as potentially over precautionary. Exceedance of a threshold does not mean that there is a 100% chance of disturbance occurring or indeed that any such disturbance would be significant."	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0023_068_221123	S42	Email	1.4.2.3 Volume 1, Annex 5.2: Underwater Sound Uncertainty and variability in the onset of disturbance does not preclude the need to draw conclusions on which to base an assessment even if these may be precautionary. The rationale for taking a precautionary approach is to ensure confidence that no adverse or significant effect will occur under the worst case scenario, thus covering all situations.	Discussion of the onset of disturbance for specific sources does not form part of Volume 1, Annex 5.2: Underwater sound technical report of the ES (document reference F1.5.2), this section is seeking to give a background to the difficulties surrounding setting thresholds. Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4), draws from the information set out in Volume 1, Annex 5.2: Underwater sound technical report of the ES (document reference F1.5.2) and presents an assessment of effects, highlighting known uncertainties and associated precautionarily.
TA_0023_069_221123	S42	Email	1.4.2.3 Volume 1, Annex 5.2: Underwater Sound The statement that " Exceedance of a threshold does not mean that there is a 100% chance of disturbance occurring or indeed any such disturbance would be significant" is incorrect for fixed noise thresholds and EDRs. Fixed noise thresholds assume as standard that all animals that receive sound at and above a certain level are disturbed, while none of the receptors outside this area will react. While there is no evidence to support this assumption, there may be a balance between the animals that do not react within the calculated impact area and those that are affected outside the range.	The statement is not referring to EDRs and remains true for the thresholds, which are designed to average out the balance mentioned in the comment. The thresholds are carried forward to the assessment, and the statement is intended to give context to the difficulty surrounding setting fixed thresholds for individual response. These thresholds are carried forward to the assessment of effects in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES, and the statement is intended to give context to the difficulty surrounding setting fixed thresholds for individual response.
TA_0023_070_221123	S42	Email	1.4.2.3 Volume 1, Annex 5.2: Underwater Sound Although the probability of a response at greater distances is very low, there are many more animals at longer ranges due to the larger total area covered. Thus when carrying out an assessment a 100% rate of disturbance should be assumed when applying a fixed noise threshold. EDR's similarly assume a 100% rate of disturbance within the radius, although these should only be applied for area assessment	In Volume 1, Annex 5.2: Underwater sound technical report of the ES (document reference F1.5.2), no assumptions are made on the response of individuals: the report only covers applying the thresholds to the results of the noise propagation model. As highlighted in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4), whilst it can be assumed that not all animals found within those threshold ranges would be disturbed to the same level, and there is likely to be a proportional response (i.e. not all animals will be disturbed to the same extent) there are no accepted dose-response curves available to apply for the assessments of noise as a result of geophysical/geotechnical survey sources, or vessels and other non-piling sound sources. As such, where numbers of animals with the potential to be disturbed have been calculated, 100% of animals within ranges have been assumed to be disturbed.
TA_0023_071_221123	S42	Email	1.4.2.3 Volume 1, Annex 5.2: Underwater Sound As discussed in detail in Southall et al [2021] and particularly in Tyack and Thomas [2019], responses to disturbance in nature tend to be	Volume 1, Annex 5.2: Underwater sound technical report of the ES (document reference F1.5.2) makes no recommendations on revising numbers downwards, and

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>probabilistic. Differences between species, among individuals, across situational contexts, and with the temporal and spatial scales over which exposures occur lead to variability in the probability and severity of behavioural responses. This means that in the wild, individuals do not always react to sound levels at or greater than the fixed noise thresholds, but also can and do react to sound levels that are lower than the threshold. Indeed, fixed noise thresholds may sometimes underestimate the number of disturbed animals vs a dose-response function. Tyack & Thomas [2019] for example demonstrate that using a fixed threshold based on the received level of continuous sound avoided by 50% of animals (e.g. level B harassment thresholds), underestimated effects by a factor of 280 vs the dose-response function. Thus, it is incorrect and potentially misleading to argue the above unless within the context of a full review of the pros and cons of different methods to assess behavioural disturbance, and variability of behavioural reactions in the wild. The language used here appears to suggest that the conclusions made on the number of animals impacted should in reality be revised downwards. We therefore recommend that any conclusions derived from the reasoning in Par 1.4.5.14 are re-assessed and revised in line with the accepted use of disturbance thresholds.</p>	<p>is giving context to the difficulty of setting hard thresholds to individual response. The application of any disturbance thresholds falls outside of the Report. As highlighted in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4), whilst it can be assumed that not all animals found within those threshold ranges would be disturbed to the same level, and there is likely to be a proportional response (i.e. not all animals will be disturbed to the same extent) there are no accepted dose-response curves available to apply for the assessments of noise as a result of geophysical/geotechnical survey sources, or vessels and other non-piling sound sources. As such, where numbers of animals with the potential to be disturbed have been calculated, 100% of animals within ranges have been assumed to be disturbed.</p>
TA_0023_072_221123	S42	Email	<p>The PEIR is correct in noting that as an impulsive sound propagates, over long ranges the impulsive characteristics are gradually lost, and that these transitions have implications with respect to thresholds for PTS and TTS which were set assuming that impulsive noise retains its characteristics at range. However, in par 1.4.5.29, this argument is also applied to disturbance, where it is posited that at longer ranges the dose-response relationship "could be misleading" due to the loss of impulsive characteristics and that "great caution should be used when interpreting potential disturbance ranges in the order of tens of kilometres". We disagree with this conclusion because:</p>	<p>The Applicants note your response.</p>
TA_0023_073_221123	S42	Email	<p>Dose response curves are based on observations of behavioural reactions in the field (often at ranges of 10's of km), and therefore show that disturbance will still occur at range regardless of changes in impulsive noise characteristics. While there is scientific consensus that these transitions at range impact the rate of TTS / PTS growth, to our knowledge no such issues or discussions have been raised about disturbance. Thus, these conclusions on disturbance appear to have been drawn independently and clear published evidence underpinning them should be provided. Any conclusions derived from the reasoning in Par 1.4.5.29 should thus be re-assessed and revised in line with the accepted use of dose-response relationships.</p>	<p>As set out for Volume 1, Annex 5.2: Underwater sound technical report of the ES (document reference F1.5.2), although piling has been removed from the DCO and therefore this comment is no longer as relevant, it is useful to discuss. As stated, dose response curves are derived based on a response up to 10's of km, however the results for the PEIR calculations covered ranges in the order of 100's km. Measurements have shown loss of impulsive character over a range of distances but none would agree that impulsive sound at 100 km could still be impulsive. As it stands this comment refers to piling noise which has since been removed from the design.</p>
TA_0023_074_221123	S42	Email	<p>79. Par 1.3.1.1.: We agree that direct comparisons / conversions between sound in air and sound in water is complex and not straightforward. However, it is not sufficient to subtract ~26 dB from an underwater level to make a viable comparison to an airborne sound since the acoustic impedance of the two media also needs to be considered. The specific acoustic impedance of water (given by the product of density of water and sound speed in water) is ~3600 times greater than that of air. This means that a further correction factor of 36 dB is required (obtained by calculating the 10log10 of the acoustic impedance in water divided by the acoustic impedance in air giving a total subtraction of 61.5 dB. See Finfer et al [2008] for a detailed discussion of the issues involved: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apacoust.2007.05.008</p>	<p>As set out for Volume 1, Annex 5.2: Underwater sound technical report of the ES (document reference F1.5.2), this comparison has been removed from the updated Volume 1, Annex 5.2: Underwater sound technical report of the ES (document reference F1.5.2).</p>
TA_0023_075_221123	S42	Email	<p>1.4.2.4 Volume 1, Annexe 5.5: Cumulative Screening Matrix and Location Plan Injury has been scoped out from the cumulative assessment. We cannot currently agree with the lack of cumulative assessment for injury especially given the reliance on ADDs to reduce the magnitude of PTS. Swim distances by far exceed the PTS impact range, strongly suggesting that the impact pathway is instead being shifted to displacement of animals.</p>	<p>The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the Environmental Statement, and therefore no technical response has been provided.</p>
TA_0023_076_221123	S42	Email	<p>NRW (A) does not agree with the use of SCOS [2018] for screening. We advise the use of Carter et al [2020].</p>	<p>The HRA Stage 1 Screening Report (document reference E3) considers European sites within OSPAR Region III Interim MU designated for grey seal, however telemetry data from Wright and Sinclair (2022) has then been used to capture any SACs with potential connectivity to the Transmission Assets. As agreed with Natural England via the Marine Mammals Expert Working Group (EWG) (EWG03) SACs screened in for grey seal include:</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pen Llŷn a'r Sarnau/Llŷn Peninsula and the Sarnau SAC • Lambay Island SAC • Cardigan Bay/Bae Ceredigion SAC • Pembrokeshire Marine/Sir Benfro Forol SAC • Saltee Islands SAC <p>As agreed with Natural England via the Marine Mammals Expert Working Group (EWG) (EWG03) all SACs for harbour seal were screened out.</p>
TA_0010_063_221123	S42	Email	Volume 2 Chapter 4: Marine Mammals 8.1. MMO notes that for underwater noise, all marine mammal functional hearing groups have been considered in the underwater sound technical report, as per Southall et al. (2019) and NMFS (2018) which is appropriate. Furthermore, it is appropriate that all relevant fish groups/categories have been considered as per Popper et al. (2014).	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0010_064_221123	S42	Email	8.2. MMO also notes that the key marine mammal species which have been scoped in for assessment are harbour porpoise, bottlenose dolphin, short-beaked common dolphin, Risso's dolphin, minke whale, grey seal and harbour seal.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0010_065_221123	S42	Email	8.3. In general, the key impacts in relation to underwater noise have been considered and assessed. MMO would highlight however that this PEIR assessment is very difficult to follow and absorb in places, given the extensive amount of detailed material to review. This also makes the concurrent piling scenarios difficult to assess across the projects (especially as there are separate noise assessments for (i) the Morgan Generation Assets (which covers the installation of the OSP, (ii) the Morecambe Generation Assets (which covers the installation of the OSP, and (iii) the Morgan and Morecambe Transmission Assets).	The Applicants note your response. Furthermore, the structure of Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4) has been revised and updated. The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this has further simplified within the marine mammals chapter.
TA_0010_066_221123	S42	Email	8.4. Table 4.13 outlines the measures (commitments) adopted as part of the Transmission Assets. MMO welcomes that Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocols (MMMP) will be developed and implemented during construction to reduce the risk of injury to marine mammals and fish species during piling and UXO clearance (Commitments CoT64 and CoT68). The MMMPs will need to be agreed with the regulator and relevant agencies. A Vessel Management Plan (VMP) will also be developed pre-construction (CoT69).	The Applicants note your response. MMMPs will be developed post-consent, in line with latest guidance, further to any project updates at this stage and an Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (Outline MMMP) (document reference J18) will be included with the application. The MMMPs will be updated post-application, discussed and agreed with stakeholders.
TA_0010_067_221123	S42	Email	8.5. The most direct and comprehensive way to mitigate the risk of acoustic impact on marine species is to reduce the amount of noise pollution emitted at source (noise abatement). For pile driving, there are now noise reduction technologies available, such as big bubble curtains and acoustic barriers that are integrated into the piling rig (e.g. IHC Noise Mitigation System), which are being routinely deployed in German waters (see Merchant, 2019). The MMO recommends you review potential noise abatement measures and this is included within the ES. Although at this noise abatement is not mandatory at this stage, the MMO recommends noise is reduced at source and policy is moving forward. Early engagement, planning implementation as part of work schedules and development of noise abatement as mitigation should be assessed and included in the Application.	The Applicants note your response, thank you. Furthermore, the structure of Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4) has been revised and updated. The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this has further simplified the marine mammals chapter. MMMPs will be developed post-consent, in line with latest guidance, further to any project updates at this stage and an OMMMP (document reference J18) will be included with the application. The Applicants will continue to explore options for mitigating piling sound post consent, at a time when more detailed information is available (i.e. geotechnical data) and where further refinements to the Transmission Assets project design have been made on this basis. A commitment to Noise Abatement Systems (NAS) will be considered as part of a stepped strategy post consent and following the mitigation hierarchy - avoid, reduce, mitigate. Consequently, if NAS is required a detailed exploration of available technologies will be undertaken and information presented to demonstrate how such technology would contribute to the reduction in underwater sound from piling. Project refinements and potential mitigation options will be considered within the MMMPs, an OMMMP (document reference J18) has been submitted with the application for consent. The Transmission Assets OMMMP (document reference J18) will be updated post-application, discussed and agreed with stakeholders.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0010_068_221123	S42	Email	8.6. MMO recommends that noise modelling is undertaken to assess the reduction in Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS) / TTS zones that applying noise abatement measures will bring. Further steps on this are provided in Faulkner et al. (2018), and, on noise abatement, in Merchant (2019) and the report of the workshop at the Royal Society (Merchant and Robinson, 2020). Once these zones have been determined, this would then allow a better assessment of whether Acoustic Deterrent Devices (ADDs) are indeed required, and if so, the required duration. As highlighted in Faulkner et al. (2018), if animals are displaced from ADDs, the extent of marine mammal displacement may exceed the range of displacement from the activity itself if noise abatement measures are applied (Dähne et al., 2017).	The Applicants will continue to explore options for mitigating piling sound post consent, at a time when more detailed information is available (i.e. geotechnical data) and where further refinements to the Transmission Assets project design have been made on this basis. A commitment to Noise Abatement Systems (NAS) will be considered as part of a stepped strategy post consent and following the mitigation hierarchy - avoid, reduce, mitigate. Consequently, if NAS is required a detailed exploration of available technologies will be undertaken and information presented to demonstrate how such technology would contribute to the reduction in underwater sound from piling. Project refinements and potential mitigation options will be considered within the MMMP. An Outline MMMP (document reference J18) has been submitted with the application for consent. The Transmission Assets Outline MMMP (document reference J18) will be updated post-application, discussed and agreed with stakeholders.
TA_0010_069_221123	S42	Email	8.7. Chapter 3: Project description states that there will be up to four OSPs for Morgan, yet the maximum design scenario in Table 4.12 of Chapter 4 Marine mammals considers the installation of only one OSP. For Morecambe, Table 4.12 identifies that there will be two OSPs (which is in line with Chapter 3). This should be clarified within the assessment of Chapter 4 as this should be the worst-case scenario.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0010_070_221123	S42	Email	8.8. With reference to section 4.9.1.27, as requested for previous developments, MMO does not consider it appropriate to use TTS-onset thresholds as a proxy for disturbance. TTS occurs at much higher sound exposures, and so will underestimate the risk of disturbance. MMO does however, support the dose response approach for piling.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0010_071_221123	S42	Email	8.9. As per section 4.9.3.24: "Hastie et al. (2019) suggests that some measures of impulsiveness (for seismic airguns and pile-driving) change markedly within approximately 10 km of the source. Therefore, great caution should be used when interpreting any results with predicted injury ranges in the order of tens of kilometres as the PTS ranges are likely to be significantly lower than predicted". MMO believes it is reasonable, based on the Hastie et al. paper, to add caveats to large ranges predicted for PTS/TTS from pile driving, that it is likely that pile driving pulses will have lost a lot of their impulsive characteristics by, for example, ~60km). It is noted that a TTS range of 54,860m was predicted for Low Frequency cetaceans and piling at the Morgan Booster Station (although the pulse may still contain significant acoustic energy). This is likely to reduce the incidence of TTS at such distances, but it is not certain to what degree. Thus, there is no agreed cut-off of 10km for auditory effects. Nor, as far as the MMO is aware, does the Hastie et al. paper recommend that auditory effects should be discounted beyond 10km. Furthermore, Hastie et al. considered seismic and pile driving, but not UXO clearance. Therefore, the conclusions from this paper should not be applied to UXO (especially as there are reasons to believe that explosions may propagate differently because of the blast wave).	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, much of this comment does not apply to the ES. With respect to Hastie et al., 2019 and UXO, an overview of sound and marine mammals has been set out in section 4.11.1 of Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4) and discussed in specifically in relation to UXO in section 4.11.3 of Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4).
TA_0010_072_221123	S42	Email	8.10. Some of the statements made throughout this chapter are incorrect. For instance, section 4.9.2.94 states that "Received sound levels at the coastal region are predicted to reach maximum SELs levels of 140 dB. This is equivalent to 150 dB re 1 µPa (rms) SPL and therefore below the NMFS (2005) threshold for strong disturbance (=160 dB re 1 µPa (rms) SPL) and is likely to elicit less severe disturbance reactions". MMO requires an explanation as to why a SELs level of 140 dB is equivalent to a SPL(rms) of 150 dB re 1µPa.	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.
TA_0010_073_221123	S42	Email	Volume 2 Appendix 5.2 Underwater Sound Technical Report 9.1. MMO notes that disturbance thresholds are considered for marine mammals and fish in Annex 5.2. Section 1.4.5.25 refers to criteria presented in the Washington State Department of Transport Biological Assessment Preparation for Transport Projects Advanced Training Manual (WSDOT, 2011), which are	The Applicants note your response. It should be noted that the Project Design Envelope has undergone revision from PEIR to Environmental Statement, and all elements of the project which were originally planned to include pile-driving have now been removed from the Design. The updated MDS for the impact of "Underwater

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>used in this assessment for predicting the distances at which behavioural effects may occur due to sound from impulsive piling. The manual suggests an un-weighted sound pressure level (SPL) of 150 dB re 1 µPa root mean square (rms) as the criterion for onset of behavioural effects, based on work by (Hastings, 2002). However, it could be argued that a threshold based on the SPLrms may not be the most appropriate or relevant for impulsive sources such as impact pile driving. Thresholds based on the peak sound pressure level, or the single strike sound exposure level would be more appropriate for impulsive sounds. However, the MMO notes that Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology, does consider the 135 dB SELss threshold for herring and further comments have been provided within section 7</p>	<p>sound from piling, UXO clearance and geophysical surveys impacting fish and shellfish receptors" is presented in Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3)., and now reflects just UXO and geophysical survey. The updated MDS for the impacts of UXO and geophysical survey on marine mammal receptors is presented in Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4).</p>

E1.16.11 Offshore ornithology table of responses

E1.16.11.1 Offshore ornithology table of responses (via feedback form)

Table E1.16.11.1: Offshore ornithology consultation responses (feedback form)

As set out in section 4.7.4 of the Consultation report (document reference E1). Responses have been allocated to the most appropriate topic(s). If a consultee did not provide a response for a question/sub-question this is not recorded. If a consultee included 'N/A', 'none', 'no comment', 'Nil', 'No', in response to a question, this has also not been recorded. Where a consultee provided a response associated with this sub-question (1.5; Offshore ornithology) but was not related to this topic, this has been included below, as well as against any other appropriate topic(s). Where a consultee provided a response which stated 'see response above' or similar, the response has been replicated in brackets and italics.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0053_003_171123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.5	Will lose migrating birds visiting my land annually	An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken within the ES, including the following with reference to ornithology: - Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5) - Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).
TA_0056_006_141123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.5	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0083_004_221123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.5	I do not want this offshore project to go ahead	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0092_013_151123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.5	Again - need to confirm mitigations to the detrimental impact on ornithology and not impede natural habitats and feeding areas etc.	An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken within the ES, including the following with reference to ornithology: - Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5) - Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).
TA_0106_004_281023	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.5	The project cannot be expected to be neutral to this aspect and will have only negative consequences. This applies to the following sections. These types of projects are renowned for being "bird killers".	An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken for the offshore topics of the Transmission Assets Application and is presented in Volume 2 of the ES (document reference F2). Specific examples relevant to marine life are listed below. - Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2). - Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3). - Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4). - Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5).
TA_0108_006_231123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.5	Loss of high quality farmland. Known flood areas. Devastating consequences for Newton, Kirkham and Freckleton	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						<p>to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES. A flood risk assessment assessing all sources of flooding, including sewers is presented within Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3). The proposed permanent infrastructure associated with the Morgan and Morecambe substations are located within Flood Zone 1 and has a low risk of flooding from all other assessed sources.</p>

E1.16.11.2 Offshore ornithology table of responses (via all other methods)

Table E1.16.11.2: Offshore ornithology table of responses (via all other methods)

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0001_176_231123	S42	Email	5.1 The Applicant has stated that there is no spatial or temporal overlap between the Transmission Assets and Tier 1 Projects and that therefore there are no cumulative effects for red-throated diver or common scoter. NE disagree with this. A full cumulative assessment should be carried out on the basis that other projects in the region are exerting a continuous displacement effect on sensitive species such as red-throated diver and common scoter.	The approach to cumulative assessment has been discussed with stakeholders as part of the EWG. A cumulative assessment taking into account the permanent and temporary nature of associated impacts is provided in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5) and HRA Stage 2 ISAA: Part 3 SPA and Ramsar Site Assessments (document reference E2.3).
TA_0001_177_231123	S42	Email	5.2 NE disagree that the impacts on Liverpool Bay SPA red-throated diver and common scoter features are so low from the project alone that an in-combination assessment does not need to be carried out. A full in-combination assessment of impacts should be carried out for both these species.	The approach to cumulative assessment has been discussed with stakeholders as part of the EWG. A cumulative assessment taking into account the permanent and temporary nature of associated impacts is provided in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES and HRA Stage 2 ISAA: Part 3 SPA and Ramsar Site Assessments (document reference E2.3).
TA_0001_178_231123	S42	Email	5.3 Efforts should be made, as a matter of best practice, to minimise and mitigate disturbance to the receptor species of Liverpool Bay SPA. Disturbance should be minimised through the implementation of a Vessel Management Plan (VMP), a draft version of which should be presented as part of the DCO/dML application.	An Outline Vessel Traffic Management Plan (document reference J21) is included as a secondary mitigation measure to reduce the disturbance effects predicted for relevant receptors (see section 5.11 of Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5).
TA_0001_179_231123	S42	Email	Survey Data Acquisition 5.45.5.3.1 We note that no site-specific surveys have been carried out with our previous comments on the Morgan Generation Assets PEIR, Natural England highlights the risk that the additional data analysis could have the potential to change the conclusions of the Environmental Statement from those set out in the PEIR, which could raise issues not flagged by the PEIR assessments.	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5) incorporates 24 months of baseline aerial survey data from the Morgan and Morecambe Generation Assets which are used alongside other relevant data sources to identify receptors for consideration in the assessments required.
TA_0001_180_231123	S42	Email	5.55.9.2.16 5.9.2.30 5.9.2.61 5.9.2.75, etc. Only the study by Lawson et al. (2016) has been used to calculate densities of receptor species within the red line boundary. This study used visual aerial survey techniques, which are no longer considered best practice. The study carried out by HiDef (2023) used digital aerial surveys to characterise the densities of key receptor species in the Liverpool Bay SPA. Although the Lawson et al. study covered a greater area, as the data from the HiDef study are more up-to-date and were produced with more appropriate survey techniques, they should be used to produce densities where possible. Natural England recommend an approach for the submitted ES whereby the HiDef(2023) study is used to produce densities for receptor species within the Liverpool Bay SPA, as far as the survey area covered, and the Lawson et al. (2016) data is used to cover areas that the Hi Def survey did not extend to. If the Lawson et al (2016) data is used, we advise that a robust justification for doing so will need to be presented.	Natural England have provided the Applicants with the data associated with HiDef Aerial Surveying Limited (2023) and these data have been used to inform relevant assessments in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5) and HRA Stage 2 ISAA: Part 3 SPA and Ramsar Site Assessments (document reference E2.3).
TA_0001_181_231123	S42	Email	Methodology 5.6 5.9.2.41 The adult survival rate from Horswill and Robinson (2015) has been used for comparison of the predicted mortality associated with the Project of the receptor species. However, as the species considered are non-breeding features of the Liverpool Bay SPA, the population will be composed of birds of all ages and not just adults, therefore a weighted mean survival rate across all age classes should be used to calculate a mean mortality rate for the population. We note this would be consistent with the assessment for the Morecambe Generation assets PEIR, as well as others. Use a weighted mean survival rate across all age classes to calculate a reference mean mortality rate for red-throated diver and common scoter.	Baseline mortality rates used in the assessments presented in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5) represent the weighted mean survival rate across all age classes as recommended by Natural England.
TA_0001_182_231123	S42	Email	5.7 5.10.2.50 The Applicant state here that there is no temporal overlap between the Transmission Assets and any Tier 1 projects, while in Table 5.39 there are multiple projects identified as overlapping temporally. The Applicant has used the reasoning that as there is no spatial or temporal overlap, there can be no cumulative effects on key receptor species. NE disagree with this. There is a clear temporal overlap between the construction and operation of the Transmission Assets and any other project in the region that is currently operational. While these projects are operational, several of them are likely to be exerting an ongoing displacement effect on the receptors screened in due to the presence of the turbines, and therefore their effects should be included in the cumulative assessment. For a full cumulative assessment to be carried out in the submitted ES, the numbers of the receptor species screened into the cumulative assessment which are subject to displacement	The approach to cumulative assessment has been discussed with stakeholders as part of the EWG. A cumulative assessment taking into account the permanent and temporary nature of associated impacts is provided in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5) and HRA Stage 2 ISAA: Part 3 SPA and Ramsar Site Assessments (document reference E2.3).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			mortality from ongoing/existing Tier 1 projects (in particular common scoter and red-throated diver) should be presented alongside the figures for the Transmission Assets.	
TA_0001_183_231123	S42	Email	Assessment 5.8 1.10.3.27,1.10.3.37 As for EIA, only the Lawson et al. (2016) study has been used to generate receptor densities. It would be more appropriate to use the HiDef (2023) study to generate densities within the Liverpool Bay SPA for the assessment of impacts, or justification should be provided for why this study has not been used. See comment 5.5 above.	Natural England have provided the Applicants with the data associated with HiDef Aerial Surveying Limited (2023) and these data have been used to inform relevant assessments in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5) and HRA Stage 2 ISAA: Part 3 SPA and Ramsar Site Assessments (document reference E2.3).
TA_0001_184_231123	S42	Email	5.9 1.10.3.64,1.10.3.131 Although the impacts of this project on the designated features of Liverpool Bay SPA are not likely to cause AEol alone, given the pressure on SPA species across the site, efforts should still be made as a matter of best practice to minimise and mitigate disturbance to the receptor species. Disturbance should be minimised through the implementation of a Vessel Management Plan (VMP), a draft version of which should be presented as part of the DCO/dML application. As part of the VMP, the Applicant should also consider restricting activities which have the potential to disturb sensitive receptor species to months when those species are unlikely to be present, thus avoiding the potential for impacts entirely. Natural England has produced a best practice protocol for vessel movements in red-throated diver SPAs, and we recommend this is incorporated in the VMP.	An Outline Vessel Traffic Management Plan (document reference J21) is included as a secondary mitigation measure to reduce the disturbance effects predicted for relevant receptors (see section 5.11 of Volume 2 Chapter 5 Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5)).
TA_0001_185_231123	S42	Email	In- combination 5.11. 10.4.48,1.10.4.62, etc. NE do not agree that the impact on red- throated diver is so low that it is not necessary to carry out an in-combination assessment. A full in-combination assessment of the impacts of projects in the region along with the Transmission Assets on the red-throated diver feature of Liverpool Bay SPA should be carried out.	The approach to cumulative assessment has been discussed with stakeholders as part of the EWG. A cumulative assessment taking into account the permanent and temporary nature of associated impacts is provided in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5) and HRA Stage 2 ISAA: Part 3 SPA and Ramsar Site Assessments (document reference E2.3).
TA_0001_186_231123	S42	Email	5.11 1.10.4.50,1.10.4.51,1.10.4.67, etc. While the number of common scoters at risk of mortality is below the threshold advised for further investigation for project- alone impacts, this does not mean that an in-combination assessment should not be carried out. A full in-combination assessment of the impact of projects in the region along with the Transmission Assets on the common scoter feature of Liverpool Bay SPA should be carried out.	The approach to cumulative assessment has been discussed with stakeholders as part of the EWG. A cumulative assessment taking into account the permanent and temporary nature of associated impacts is provided in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5) and HRA Stage 2 ISAA: Part 3 SPA and Ramsar Site Assessments (document reference E2.3).
TA_0001_296_231123	S42	Email	Offshore Ornithology Justification should be provided for only using the Lawson et al. data, otherwise we recommend an approach whereby the HiDef (2023) study is used to produce densities for receptor species within the Liverpool Bay SPA, as far as the survey area covered, and the Lawson et al. (2016) data is used to cover areas that the HiDef survey did not extend to.	Natural England have provided the Applicants with the data associated with HiDef Aerial Surveying Limited (2023) and these data have been used to inform relevant assessments in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5) and HRA Stage 2 ISAA: Part 3 SPA and Ramsar Site Assessments (document reference E2.3).
TA_0001_297_231123	S42	Email	Natural England disagrees that there are no cumulative effects for red-throated diver or common scoter. A full cumulative assessment should be carried out on the basis that other projects in the region are exerting a continuous displacement effect on sensitive species such as red-throated diver and common scoter.	The approach to cumulative assessment has been discussed with stakeholders as part of the EWG. A cumulative assessment taking into account the permanent and temporary nature of associated impacts is provided in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5) and HRA Stage 2 ISAA: Part 3 SPA and Ramsar Site Assessments (document reference E2.3).
TA_0001_299_231123	S42	Email	Onshore Ornithology Natural England do not agree with the conclusion of No AEol for Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA based on information provided, due to potential impacts of disturbance, displacement and non-permanent habitat loss. Further information is required to support this conclusion. Based on the presented information, Natural England also does not agree with some of the conclusions for impacts to qualifying bird species of Liverpool Bay SPA, Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA, and Morecambe Bay and Duddon Estuary SPA.	Additional surveys have been completed and reported within the ES. An assessment of the potential impact on key receptors, including qualifying features of the SPA and Ramsar site, as identified in section 4.6.2, is presented within section 4.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4). Details on the impacts on European sites from the Transmission Assets are contained within the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (ISAA) report (document reference E2.1, 2.2, 2.3). No adverse effects on integrity are predicted.
TA_0001_310_231123	S42	Email	Appendix 1 The following Framework has been used in Natural England's advice to attribute risk to the project: Structure / Framework Risk Purple Note for the developer. Red Natural England considers that unless these issues are resolved it will have to advise that (in relation to any one of them, and as appropriate) it is not possible to ascertain beyond reasonable scientific doubt that the project will not affect the integrity of an SAC/SPA/Ramsar and/or significantly hinder the conservation objectives of	Natural England's advice has been noted, specifically in the assessment of effects on ecological receptors (see Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3)).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			<p>an MCZ and/or damage or destroy the interest features of a SSSI and/or comply fully with the Environmental Impact Assessment requirements. Addressing these concerns may require the following:• new baseline or survey data; and/or• significant revisions to baseline characterisation and/or impact modelling and/or• significant design changes; and/or• significant mitigation</p> <p>Natural England feels that issues given Red status are so complex, or require the provision of so much outstanding information, that they are unlikely to be resolved during the Examination, and respectfully suggests that they be addressed beforehand. Amber</p> <p>Natural England does not agree with the developer's position or approach and consider that this could make a material difference to the outcome of the decision-making process for this project. Natural England considers that these matters may be resolved through:• provision of additional evidence or justification to support conclusions; and/or• revisions to impact assessment methodology and/or assessment conclusions; and/or• minor to moderate revisions to impact modelling; and/or• well-designed mitigation measures that are adequately secured through the draft DCO/dML and/or• amendments to draft plans</p> <p>If these issues remain at the time of the application and are not addressed or resolved by the end of the Examination, then they may become a Red risk as set out above. Yellow</p> <p>Natural England doesn't agree with the developer's position or approach. We would ideally like this to be addressed but are satisfied that for this particular project it is unlikely to make a material difference to our advice or the outcome of the decision-making process. However, we reserve the right to revise our opinion should further evidence be presented. It should be noted by interested parties that just because these issues/comments are not raised as significant concerns in this instance, it should not be understood or inferred that Natural England would be of the same view in other cases or circumstances.</p> <p>Green</p> <p>Natural England is in broad agreement with the developer's approach and has no significant outstanding concerns. As above, we reserve the right to revise our opinion should new evidence be presented.</p>	
TA_0017_005_231123	S42/S44	Email	<p>The Marine Management Organisation and Natural England should be consulted regarding potential ecological impacts offshore substation platforms and booster stations.</p>	<p>The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. The assessments offshore topic chapters of the Transmission Assets Application have been updated to reflect this amendment. With the removal of the Morgan Offshore Substation Platform (OSP), the Morecambe OSP and the Morgan Offshore Booster Station from the Project Description, and the associated removal for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this comment does not apply to the ES, and therefore no technical response has been provided.</p>
TA_0023_004_221123	S42	Email	<p>Marine Ornithology: NRW (A) have some comments on changes needed to the shadow HRA methodology, though this may not change the overall conclusions.</p>	<p>The Applicants note your response, specific responses provided, see unique reference TA_0023.</p>
TA_0023_077_221123	S42	Email	<p>We agree with the potential impacts considered during the different phases and with the Welsh designated sites that have been screened in for LSE (i.e. Liverpool Bay SPA) and that have been screened out for LSE. Whilst we generally agree that there will probably be no adverse effect on integrity (AEOI) for the project alone for the red-throated diver and common scoter features of the Liverpool Bay/Bae Lerpwl SPA, we do have some queries/comments regarding the data used in the assessments, which are set out in detail below. Additionally, we are currently not in a position to provide comments/advice on the overall level of in- combination impacts or their significance for this SPA due to the lack of full information.</p>	<p>The Applicants note your response, specific responses provided, see unique reference TA_0023.</p>
TA_0023_078_221123	S42	Email	<p>84. As noted above, whilst we generally agree that no AEOI for the project alone is probable for the red-throated diver and common scoter features of the Liverpool Bay/Bae Lerpwl SPA, we note that the assessments for impacts during all phases for the project alone for these features are based solely on the data presented in Lawson et al. (2016), which used survey techniques which are no longer recommended as best practice. No consideration has been given to the more recent data on densities and distributions of these features presented in HiDef (2023). Whilst the HiDef (2023) study covered a more limited extent than the Lawson et al. (2016) surveys, the HiDef (2023) surveys used digital aerial survey techniques which are considered best practice, and being more recent, the results are likely to be a more accurate representation of current baseline numbers of these species. We recommend that assessments also consider the more recent densities and distributions</p>	<p>Natural England have provided the Applicants with the data associated with HiDef Aerial Surveying Limited (2023) and these data have been used to inform relevant assessments in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5) and HRA Stage 2 ISAA: Part 3 SPA and Ramsar Site Assessments (document reference E2.3).</p>

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			presented in HiDef (2023). Therefore, we cannot unreservedly agree to no AEOI alone for this SPA until we see assessments based on the more recent data.	
TA_0023_079_221123	S42	Email	1. We also note that the assessments for the red-throated diver and common scoter features of the Liverpool Bay/Bae Lerpwl SPA use the adult survival rates from Horswill & Robinson (2015) to calculate the mortality rates. As Liverpool Bay/Bae Lerpwl SPA is designated for non-breeding populations of these species and impacts could be on birds of all ages and not just adults, we recommend that a weighted mean survival across all age-classes is used to calculate a weighted mean mortality rate. We note that this is consistent with the approaches taken by other offshore wind farm assessments, including for the Liverpool Bay/Bae Lerpwl SPA assessments in the Morecambe Generation Assets project PEIR in the draft Report to Inform the Appropriate Assessment.	Baseline mortality rates used in the assessments presented in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5) represent the weighted mean survival rate across all age classes as recommended by Natural England.
TA_0023_080_221123	S42	Email	2. Whilst the impacts to Liverpool Bay/Bae Lerpwl SPA from the project alone are expected to be very small and it is considered probable that an AEOI can be ruled out for the project alone, we would suggest that as a matter of best practice the best practice vessel movements etc to minimise disturbance/displacement to red-throated diver and common scoter noted in paragraphs 1.10.3.151 and 1.10.3.153 of the ISAA report are secured in the DCO or dML. We note that this commitment was made in the Mona OWF project PEIR.	An Outline Vessel Traffic Management Plan (document reference J21) is included as a secondary mitigation measure to reduce the disturbance effects predicted for relevant receptors (see section 5.11 of Volume 2 Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5).
TA_0023_081_221123	S42	Email	3. We would also suggest that the Applicants give consideration to timing restrictions on construction activities, such that the potential disturbing activities in different areas (offshore, cable land fall etc) avoid key periods when sensitive features of the Liverpool Bay/Bae Lerpwl SPA are present in key numbers.	Measures adopted as part of the project are discussed in section 5.8 of Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5) with any mitigation measures required discussed in the relevant assessment sections. As discussed with the EWG, due to the magnitude of impacts associated with the project alone, the Applicants are not currently considering timing restrictions for offshore works.
TA_0023_082_221123	S42	Email	At present we are unable to make any comments on the overall level of in- combination impacts or their significance on the red-throated diver and common scoter features of the Liverpool Bay/Bae Lerpwl SPA for the following reasons: The data included in the assessments for the Morgan Generation Assets project and Morecambe Generation Assets project are from the PEIRs, which were based on only 12 months of survey data. We note that these will be updated to include data for the full 24 months of surveys for each of these projects ahead of their submissions and hence the assessments for the Morgan and Morecambe Transmission Assets will require updating and are hence subject to change.	Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5) incorporates 24 months of baseline aerial survey data from the Morgan and Morecambe Generation Assets which are used alongside other relevant data sources to identify receptors for consideration in the assessments required.
TA_0023_083_221123	S42	Email	90. Whilst Table 1.359 of the ISAA report lists a number of Tier 1 projects with the potential to affect features of Liverpool Bay/Bae Lerpwl SPA as they are located within the SPA or within the zone of influence, there appears to have been no attempt made to include impacts from these projects in the in-combination assessments. As there is a clear temporal overlap between the construction and operation of the Morgan and Morecambe Transmission Assets and any other project operating within the SPA and zone of influence, while these projects are operational, several of them are likely to be exerting a displacement effect on the receptors screened in (red-throated diver and common scoter) due to the presence of the turbines in the water, and therefore their effects should be included in the in-combination assessment. We suggest approaches to dealing with this should be explored collaboratively through the offshore ornithology EWG	The approach to cumulative assessment has been discussed with stakeholders as part of the EWG. A cumulative assessment taking into account the permanent and temporary nature of associated impacts is provided in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5) and HRA Stage 2 ISAA: Part 3 SPA and Ramsar Site Assessments (document reference E2.3).
TA_0030_002_231123	S42	Email	Having examined the consultation documents and in particular the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) it is our view, given the scale and extent of the proposal, and in particular its location in relation to West Cumbria (and former South Copeland area), that it is unlikely to have any significant detrimental impact. That said however, it is requested that the potential wider ecological impacts (for example on migratory birds and Haverigg Haws sand dunes which are of national and international nature conservation importance) of the proposal be assessed in the Environmental Statement (ES) accompanying the DCO application with reference to the sensitive ecological designations of the Duddon Estuary SSSI, SPA and RAMSAR and Morecambe Bay SAC.	The Applicants note your response. Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5) includes assessments for all impacts associated with the project on all relevant offshore ornithological receptors.
TA_0010_101_221123	S42	Email	Volume 2 Chapter 5: Offshore Ornithology 10.1. The MMO defers to Natural England regarding the potential impacts to offshore ornithology and will maintain a watching brief on anything that may fall within the MMO's remit – such as dML conditions.	The Applicants note your response.

E1.16.12 Commercial fisheries table of responses

E1.16.12.1 Commercial fisheries table of responses (via feedback form)

Table E1.16.12.1: Commercial fisheries consultation responses (feedback form)

As set out in section 4.7.4 of the Consultation report (document reference E1). Responses have been allocated to the most appropriate topic(s). If a consultee did not provide a response for a question/sub-question this is not recorded. If a consultee included 'N/A', 'none', 'no comment', 'Nil', 'No', in response to a question, this has also not been recorded. Where a consultee provided a response associated with this sub-question (1.6; Commercial fisheries) but was not related to this topic, this has been included below, as well as against any other appropriate topic(s). Where a consultee provided a response which stated 'see response above' or similar, the response has been replicated in brackets and italics.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0056_007_141123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.6	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0092_014_151123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.6	Need to understand mitigations further and that local businesses with fishing licences are not negatively impacted during the construction and post construction period.	The impacts of the Transmission Assets (alone and in-combination with other projects), including those on recreational shipping, are assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 9: Other sea users of the ES (document reference: 2.9). More information and details of the proposed mitigation measures are described in the updated Volume 2, Annex 7.1: NRA of the ES and Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and navigation chapter of the ES (document reference: F2.7.1 and F2.7, respectively) submitted as part of the Application.
TA_0106_018_281023	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.6	The project cannot be expected to be neutral to this aspect and will have only negative consequences. This applies to the following sections.	Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Comprehensive environmental impact assessments, with the engagement of Expert Working Groups where appropriate, have been undertaken of the potential impacts of the project on Commercial Fisheries as presented in Volume 2, Chapter 6 of the ES (document reference: F2.6)
TA_0108_007_231123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.6	Loss of high quality farmland. Known flood areas. Devastating consequences for Newton, Kirkham and Freckleton	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES. A flood risk assessment assessing all sources of flooding, including sewers is presented within Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3). The proposed permanent

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
						infrastructure associated with the Morgan and Morecambe substations are located within Flood Zone 1 and has a low risk of flooding from all other assessed sources.

E1.16.12.2 Commercial fisheries table of responses (via all other methods)

Table E1.16.12.2: Commercial fisheries table of responses (via all other methods)

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0014_014_231123	S42	Email	Table 6.4 indicates multiple times that; - Ten-year datasets have been obtained for landings statistics and Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) data, as outlined in section 6.4 - Additional data sources have also been used to supplement the VMS data, which does not capture smaller fishing vessels. More detail on the data sources used to inform the commercial fisheries baseline is provided in section 6.5.1.	The Applicants have obtained relevant VMS data from the Isle of Man Government, which provides comprehensive coverage of Manx vessels, of all sizes, in the region. This data has now been incorporated into Volume 2 Annex 6.1 Commercial Fisheries technical report of the ES (document reference: F2.6.1) and has been brought into the commercial fisheries assessment within Volume 2, Chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries of the ES (document reference: F2.6).
TA_0014_015_231123	S42	Email	However, noting Section 6.5.1 and Table 6.8; These still appears to be only >15m data with respect to scallop dredge sector. In the previous submissions from the TSC to the Morgan and Morecambe Transmission Asset Scoping Report, and the PEIR for Morgan OWF in relation to the same issue, it was clearly indicated that higher resolution VMS data was available that better characterised mobile gear fishing in the area.	MMO landings data by ICES Rectangle for <10m vessels has been included, however the limitation that vessels this size are not required to complete logbooks so may be under-represented within the data has been acknowledged. Although UK >12m in length have VMS, the MMO only provide datasets for >15m vessels. This is also an acknowledged limitation of the MMO and ICES VMS data, which does not include vessels <12m. The Applicants have obtained relevant VMS data from the Isle of Man Government, which provides comprehensive coverage of Manx vessels, of all sizes, in the region. This data has now been incorporated into Volume 2 Annex 6.1 Commercial Fisheries technical report of the ES (document reference: F2.6.1) and has been brought into the commercial fisheries assessment within Volume 2, Chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries of the ES (document reference: F2.6).
TA_0014_016_231123	S42	Email	Note: The TSC wishes to advise that the Department for Environment, Food and Agriculture, a Department of the Isle of Man Government has recently entered into a data sharing agreement for fisheries data with a consulting party to the Morgan and Mona Offshore Windfarms, to ensure better representation of regional fishing activity, and can do so for other equivalent parties and developments.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0014_017_231123	S42	Email	Annex 6.1 clearly indicates that the commercial fisheries baseline consists of; -Vessel Monitoring Systems (VMS) data for UK and Isle of Man vessels (≥ 15 m); -VMS data for EU mobile bottom contacting gear vessels (>12 m); - As such, it's still not clear whether/how under 15m VMS data for UK and IoM dredge vessels was obtained and incorporated, as raised multiple times by various stakeholders in the consultation responses. - Vol.2 Chapter 6 indicates/acknowledges data for <15m static gear vessels (6.5.1.15) 12m eam trawl vessels (e.g. 6.5.1.21) and otter trawl (6.5.1.26), but not for dredge vessels. The relevant Departments of Isle of Man Government, via the Territorial Sea Committee, reaffirms its earlier statement in the Scoping Report submission that the dredge fishery baseline is not valid if based on >15m vessels only, and so it should be unequivocally indicated how these data have been obtained and used. Given relative fleet-length characteristics, there is concern from the TSC that this will disproportionately under-represent Manx vessels in the baseline, with consequences for assessment in the EIA – see comments below in relation to incorrect assumptions about gear types employed and the subsequent comparison with Scottish West Coast dredge vessels.	The Applicants have obtained relevant VMS data from the Isle of Man Government, which provides comprehensive coverage of Manx vessels, of all sizes, in the region. This data has now been incorporated into Volume 2 Annex 6.1 Commercial Fisheries technical report of the ES (document reference: 2.6.1) and has been brought into the commercial fisheries assessment within Volume 2, Chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries of the ES (document reference: 2.6).
TA_0014_018_231123	S42	Email	The information noted in Table 6.10 relating to IoM scallop vessels is not accurate. - Fishery Regulations in the Isle of Man do not specifically generate differences in fishing technique – queen scallop can be fished in Manx waters via otter trawl or dredge. King scallop are only fished via dredge, both in Manx or UK waters, but never with otter trawl. Please clarify text, and reassess as appropriately. - More importantly, otter trawl vessels do not target king scallop, only queen scallop. Manx vessels target king scallop using Newhaven dredges, both inside and outside Manx waters, and so the assessment should be reconsidered, and potentially more similar to the Scottish West Coast (dredge) vessels. - For example, see Sections 6.9.2.12 – 6.9.2.14 (Sensitivity of Receptor) where the difference between these categories is medium for Scottish vessels but low for Isle of Man, and the gear type is the same. - The TSC requests that Section 6.9.2 (Loss or restricted access to fishing grounds) should therefore be re-assessed with respect to 'Scallop vessels – Isle of Man'. - Also similarly at Sections 6.9.2.35 – 6.9.2.42 Magnitude of Receptor. - Also similarly at Sections in 6.9.2.52 Significance of the Effect. - Also similarly at Sections in 6.9.2.53 Operation and maintenance phase. - Also similarly at	This response has been acknowledged and text throughout Volume 2, Annex 6.1: Commercial Fisheries technical report of the ES (document reference: F2.6.1) and Volume 2, Chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries of the ES (document reference: F2.6), has been updated to align with this feedback.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			Sections 6.9.2.76 - 6.9.2.83 Magnitude of Impact. - And Summarised in Tables 6.17, 6.18 - Also similarly at Section 6.9.3 Displacement of fishing activity into other areas; Sections 6.9.3.9 - 6.9.3.13-Also similarly at Section 6.9.4 Loss or damage to gear due to snagging.- And Summarised in Tables 6.22, 6.23 - All other sections from page 96 onwards, where Scottish West Coast Scallop Vessels and Isle of Man Scallop Vessels are assessed differently, and should potentially be comparable.	
TA_0014_019_231123	S42	Email	In summary; - The use of >15m vessel VMS data is likely to disproportionately under-represent Manx scallop dredge vessels operating in the area, as vessel size is typically smaller than nomadic UK vessels. -The incorrect statement (Table 6.10) that Isle of Man scallop vessels only use otter trawls, will also tend under-represent the Manx scallop dredge fleet in the area. -Several Manx vessels are known to fish the area for scallops using dredges – and it is not clear that they are properly represented in this assessment. - Given the different assessment outcomes for Scottish West Coast scallop dredge vessels, compared to their equivalent Manx vessels, The TSC has significant concerns as to whether the Manx scallop dredge sector has been appropriately considered.	The Applicants have obtained relevant VMS data from the Isle of Man Government, which provides comprehensive coverage of Manx vessels, of all sizes, in the region. This data has now been incorporated into Volume 2, Annex 6.1: Commercial Fisheries technical report of the ES (document reference: F2.6.1) and has been brought into the commercial fisheries assessment within Volume 2, Chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries of the ES (document reference: F2.6).Text throughout Volume 2 Annex 6.1 Commercial Fisheries technical report and Volume 2, Chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries of the ES has been updated to align with feedback provided.
TA_0014_020_231123	S42	Email	Please note that Manx-registered fishing vessels are now fishing herring with pelagic trawls (as of 2023), and should be considered in this assessment. Consultation with the Manx Fish Producers Organisation (MFPO) on this issue is recommended. -As such, reconsider Section 6.9.2.18 (Herring Vessels) and elsewhere, as appropriate.	Feedback considered within Volume 2, Chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries of the ES (document reference: F2.6).
TA_0014_021_231123	S42	Email	Table 6.28: List of other projects, plans and activities considered within the CEA Tier 3- Isle of Man Wind Farm Offshore Wind Farm Lease Area -Initial surveys have been undertaken since 2016; however, no progress has been made since as renewable energy projects outside UK waters cannot bid in the UK Government contract-for difference (CfD) auction rounds This is not accurate, see https://orsted.co.uk/insights/future-developments/isle-of-man , and/or contact Ørsted for the most up to date progress in respect of this development. Once the current status/progress of this development has been determined, adjust significance for CEA (Section 6.11 onwards) accordingly. And also section 6.11.2.80, and elsewhere.	The Scoping report for the Isle of Man Offshore Wind Farm (now called Moor Vannin Offshore Wind Farm) has been submitted to Isle of Man Government and is available on Orsted's website: https://orsted.im/mooirvannin/document-library . As a Scoping chapter has been submitted, this project has been included as a Tier 2 project within the cumulative effects assessment section of Volume 2, Chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries of the ES (document reference: F2.6). (The Moor Vannin UK Transmission Asset has been considered as a Tier 3 in assessments where relevant)
TA_0014_022_231123	S42	Email	6.11 Cumulative effects assessment As noted above in relation to Isle of Man scallop dredge vessels, there appears to be a potentially fundamental mis-classification between Scottish West coast scallop vessels and Isle of Man scallop vessels. Both deploy Newhaven dredges (not otter trawls) in this area and should potentially be considered equivalently.	These potential cumulative effects are considered within the cumulative effects assessment of Volume 2, Chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries of the ES (document reference: F2.6) and close engagement will continue with Commercial Fisheries Stakeholders in order to discuss key issues.
TA_0014_023_231123	S42	Email	11 Cumulative effects assessment 6.11.1 Introduction 6.11.1.1 A description of the significance of cumulative effects upon commercial fisheries receptors arising from each identified impact is given below. 6.11.1.2 The likelihood of any significant effects on commercial fisheries occurring would largely depend on the operational practices of each particular fleet, the location and extent of their grounds relative to other developments and the timings of the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning phases. Effects and receptor groups are only discussed where there is the potential for a cumulative effect to arise 1.2 Loss or restricted access to fishing grounds 6.11.2.1 For loss or restricted access to fishing grounds, the potential effect for the Transmission Assets alone, across all phases, is assessed as negligible for all receptor groups other than the Scottish west coast scallop vessels.'-Specifically, the TSC seeks confirmation that Manx scallop dredge vessels have been appropriately assessed relative to Scottish dredge vessels, and whether they should therefore also be considered/included in the Cumulative Effects Assessment section, including Table 6.32: 'Summary of potential cumulative environmental effects, mitigation and monitoring'.	The Applicants have obtained relevant VMS data from the Isle of Man Government, which provides comprehensive coverage of Manx vessels, of all sizes, in the region. This data has now been incorporated into Volume 2 Annex 6.1 Commercial Fisheries technical report of the ES (document reference: F2.6.1) and has been brought into the commercial fisheries assessment within Volume 2, Chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries of the ES (document reference: F2.6). Following incorporation of this data, the Isle of Man scallop vessels have been screened into the cumulative effects assessment within Volume 2, Chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries of the ES (document reference: F2.6).
TA_0014_024_231123	S42	Email	6.12 Transboundary effects Noting in the Glossary, definition of: 'Transboundary Effects: Effects from a project within one state that affect the environment of another state(s).'- This section appears to refer to Belgian and Irish vessels only. The Isle of Man is not part of the UK, being a separate jurisdiction and with a defined territorial sea, which is subject to potential impacts from this proposed development.-The TSC seeks specific	Commercial fishing vessels that are registered to the Isle of Man are required to hold both Isle of Man and UK fishing licences. Isle of Man vessels have, therefore, not been screened into the transboundary impacts section within Volume 2, Chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries of the ES (document reference: F2.6).

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			confirmation that the Isle of Man, as another state, has been appropriately considered in the context of Transboundary effects.	
TA_0014_025_231123	S42	Email	6.14 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Monitoring Monitoring Noting Table 6.31: Summary of potential environmental effects, mitigation and monitoring.-The only proposed monitoring is in relation to 'Loss or damage to fishing gear due to snagging' (CoT 71). -As such, if there is no monitoring to test predictions, how will the validity of the assumptions and conclusions in relation to impacts be validated? - Without monitoring evidence how can the ES be defended in the longer term, or stakeholders interests be properly safeguarded? - It would appear to be a fundamental requirement of such a project to include a basic monitoring programme across all receptors to confirm assumptions, conclusions and predictions, or otherwise. The relevant Departments of Isle of Man Government, via the Territorial Sea Committee, seeks specific clarification as to how the assumptions and impact predictions on regional fisheries will be verified in the absence of monitoring	An Offshore In-principle Monitoring Plan (document reference J20) has been included in the application for development consent, which will be discussed and agreed with stakeholders at the detailed design stage.
TA_0010_102_221123	S42	Email	Volume 2 Chapter 6: Commercial FisheriesSupply chain opportunities for local fishing vessels:11.1. Due to the specification requirements on guard / Offshore Fisheries Liaison Officer (OFLO) vessels, there are very few North West English fleet vessels which will be negatively impacted by the temporary exclusion zones, who would be able to take up any opportunities presented to act as guard / OFLO vessels in order to mitigate their loss of earnings from such exclusions, or benefit from the alternative employment opportunity. Therefore, any North West English vessels which can be used for these roles should be prioritised over other suitable vessels from elsewhere. This will help mitigate the impact of closures on the local fleet and reduce the need for vessels to travel longer distances to carry out necessary duties.	All efforts will be made to ensure that consideration is given to the use of regional fishing industry vessels for any guard duties, as set out within the Outline Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan (document reference J13).
TA_0010_103_221123	S42	Email	11.2. In regards to dredging, due to the damage potential to both cable and vessel upon a snagging event, it is highly likely scallop dredges would leave a wide safe margin around cable burial sites, regardless of projected burial depths and would avoid towing gear across laid cables. Therefore, the assessment that some scallop vessels would have limited vulnerability and high recoverability is questioned. The result of this reasonably cautious approach by scallop dredgers means in reality, scallop dredgers will be subjected to wider exclusion zones in the operational and maintenance phase of the project than have been accounted for in determining the impacts on commercial vessels in the report. This will also be compounded by the cumulative impacts of the generation assets for Morgan, Morecambe and Mona further limiting scallop effort in the Eastern Irish Sea. Therefore, MMO recommends that measures are put in place to ensure suitable mitigation / remuneration is available to impacted fishing businesses.	During construction of the Transmission Assets, rather than complete closure of the Transmission Assets Order Limits: Offshore, it is proposed that temporary advisory exclusion zones of 500 m will be present around vessels installing interconnector cables and subtidal export cables (see Safety Zone Statement, document reference J33). Cables will be buried, where possible, to a minimum of 0.5 m to reduce the risk of snagging. If appropriate burial depth cannot be achieved, external cable protection may be required, the locations of which would be communicated to all commercial fisheries groups. Cable protection shall be designed to minimise snagging hazards as far as possible, for example by minimising height above seabed, smooth and shallower profiles, grade used for rock placement, type of rock (e.g. smoother edges). Where cable exposures exist during the operational and maintenance phase, which would result in significant risk, guard vessels will be used where appropriate until the risk has been mitigated by burial and/or other protection methods, ensuring navigational safety and minimising the potential risk of gear snagging.Potential snagging risk of project infrastructure such as subtidal export cables and potential loss or restricted access to fishing grounds as a result of the proposed advisory exclusion zones has been assessed within Volume 2, Chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries of the ES (document reference: F2.6).
TA_0010_104_221123	S42	Email	11.3. MMO recommends early engagement with National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations (NFFO), Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authorities (IFCA), local harbour authorities and any other relevant producer organisations, along with the early appointment of a Fisheries Liaison Officer.	Early engagement for the Transmission Assets specifically was established with fisheries stakeholders in November 2022 and will continue throughout the lifetime of the project. Close engagement has continued with commercial fisheries stakeholders, including those that represent the NFFO, NWIFCA and other relevant authorities and producers organisations, in order to discuss key aspects with regard to the Transmission Assets. Meetings were undertaken in September 2023 to update commercial fisheries stakeholders on the revised Transmission Assets Order Limits: Offshore. To date, the Applicants have managed fisheries co-existence via open and transparent communications, timely notices for surveys and consultation meetings with commercial fisheries stakeholders. The Applicants have and will continue to disseminate information to the fishing community via the CFLO and appointed FIR. Notices and information for fisheries stakeholders, will be distributed to all relevant fisheries interests via NtMs and through the Kingfisher Information Service of Seafish notifications as a minimum. Specific notification periods are outlined

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
				within the Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan. An Outline Fisheries Liaison Coexistence Plan (document reference J13) has been included with the Application.
TA_0010_105_221123	S42	Email	11.4. MMO would welcome engagement with the local MMO office (Preston) on impact to the fishing industry within the area. MMO Preston office Lutra House, Dodd Way, Dodd Way, Preston, PR5 8BX Email: preston@marinemanagement.org.uk Phone: 0208 026 5643	The Applicants note your response. The contact details provided have been saved and will be included in all future information dissemination and invites to consultation events.
TA_0010_106_221123	S42	Email	11.5. MMO request an Outline Fisheries Liaison Plan is submitted with the Application and it is noted that the MMO will not be involved in any compensation discussions.	The Applicants are working to facilitate co-existence with existing commercial fishing activity and minimise disruption as far as is practicably possible. A Fisheries Liaison and Coexistence Plan is being developed by the Applicants through ongoing consultation with fisheries stakeholders. An Outline Fisheries Liaison Coexistence Plan (document reference J13) has been included with the Application.
TA_0010_107_221123	S42	Email	11.6. MMO will maintain a watching brief on anything that may fall within the MMO's remit – such as dML conditions.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0010_108_221123	S42	Email	11.7. Although the Commercial Fisheries Chapter has been reviewed MMO would welcome the opportunity to further review this to provide additional comments.	The Applicants note your response.

E1.16.13 Shipping and navigation table of responses

E1.16.13.1 Shipping and navigation tables of responses (via feedback form)

Table E1.16.13.1: Shipping and navigation consultation responses (feedback form)

As set out in section 4.7.4 of the Consultation report (document reference E1). Responses have been allocated to the most appropriate topic(s). If a consultee did not provide a response for a question/sub-question this is not recorded. If a consultee included 'N/A', 'none', 'no comment', 'Nil', 'No', in response to a question, this has also not been recorded. Where a consultee provided a response associated with this sub-question (1.7; Shipping and Navigation) but was not related to this topic, this has been included below, as well as against any other appropriate topic(s). Where a consultee provided a response which stated 'see response above' or similar, the response has been replicated in brackets and italics.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0056_008_141123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.7	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0083_005_221123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.7	I d not want this project to go ahead	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0092_015_151123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.7	Need to ensure no impact on shipping routes that will have an affect on commeciality (sic)	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE) which no longer includes any surface piercing structures. This includes the removal of the Morgan Booster Station. The impacts of the Transmission Assets (alone and in-combination with other projects), including those on recreational shipping, are assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 9: Other sea users of the ES (document reference: 2.9). More information and details of the proposed mitigation measures are described in the updated Volume 2, Annex 7.1: NRA of the ES and Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and navigation chapter of the ES (document reference: F2.7.1 and F2.7, respectively) submitted as part of the Application.
TA_0108_008_231123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.7	Loss of high quality farmland. Devastating consequences for Newton, Kirkham and Freckleton	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES. A flood risk assessment assessing all sources of flooding, including sewers is presented within Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3). The proposed permanent infrastructure associated with the Morgan and Morecambe substations are located within Flood Zone 1 and has a low risk of flooding from all other assessed sources.

E1.16.13.2 Shipping and navigation tables of responses (via all other methods)

Table E1.16.13.2: Shipping and navigation table of responses (via all other methods)

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0008_001_221123	S42	Email	Thank you for your email dated 12th October 2023 inviting comments on the Preliminary Environment Information Report (PEIR) for the proposal to construct and operate the Morecambe Morgan offshore wind farms transmission assets. The MCA's remit for offshore renewable energy development is to ensure that safety of navigation is preserved, as progress is made towards government targets for renewable energy. This response is focused on the shipping and navigation elements of the PEIR and will form the basis of our response to the Environmental Impact Assessment Report in due course	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0008_002_221123	S42	Email	Navigation Risk Assessment (NRA) and MGN Checklist – General Comments We note in Chapter 1.8.1 that four 14-day traffic surveys (radar, AIS and visual) were completed and additional surveys of the booster station location and 'top up' surveys in 2023 will be completed and fed into the final NRA and ES for application. We expect the NRA and ES to be updated with the additional data incorporated and MCA will provide further comments once completed.	An additional 14-day top up survey was carried out and the results have been incorporated into the NRA (document reference: F2.7.1), as well as being considered within Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and navigation of the ES (document reference: F2.7). The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications.
TA_0008_010_221123	S42	Email	Comment left on DCO - Completion of construction 25 - "Within three months - also applies to Schedule 15 Part 2"	The Applicant considers 4 months is an appropriate timescale which has been included in Condition 27 of Schedules 14 and 15.
TA_0008_011_221123	S42	Email	Comment left on DCO - Completion of construction 25.b - "and associated transmission infrastructure e.g. offshore platforms - also applies to Schedule 15 Part 2"	The application no longer includes any offshore structures requiring foundations so this amendment is not necessary.
TA_0014_026_231123	S42	Email	The TSC (Territorial Sea Committee) would point out that in Section 7.5.3.5 in addition to ODiglas bay, during Westerly gales the east coast of the IOM is used as shelter for ships and this is where Liverpool pilots board when gales prevent boarding off Liverpool. Noting this is just outside the shipping and navigation study area however should still be noted as relevant.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0014_027_231123	S42	Email	Table 7.11 - The TSC highlights that it is expected from September 2024, there will be approximately 40 return crossings to Liverpool with the Manxman during winter (80 sailings in total). Whilst these sailings used to sail every winter between the Island and Liverpool, they have not recommenced since Covid and as such, may not form part of previous 2022 AIS surveys and accounts for the difference between 2019-2022. The TSC confirmation is sought from the Isle of Man Steam Packet Company as to these sailings	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0014_028_231123	S42	Email	Related to concerns over shipping would be the potential issue around 'temporary' and unscheduled disruptions that may affect inbound to Heysham traffic in particular - this concern relates to the Island's supermarket supplies and the 'just in time delivery' model they all heavily rely on. Currently, at least the CO-OP and Marks and Spencer operate a system of JIT deliveries, the issue is that if the inbound boat is late and there is no or insufficient notice then the truck would be turned around and sent elsewhere and the potential is that these stores would not get that delivery. Whilst in isolation this may not necessarily be an issue, but if it were a continued issue that wasn't scheduled, it could become a more serious one. This must be taken into account for both the construction of the offshore booster stations as well as for the duration of the laying of the transmission cables where they are in proximity to the well-established shipping routes for the Isle of Man Steam Packet Company, specifically the Douglas to Liverpool and the Douglas to Heysham (including this weather route).	The offshore booster station is no longer required and has been removed from the application for the Transmission Assets. The Offshore Substation Platforms no longer form part of the Transmission Assets application and are assessed in Morgan Offshore Wind Project and Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) applications. The impact to commercial shipping during the three phases of the Transmission Assets project has been assessed within the updated NRA and Shipping and Navigation chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference: F2.7, F2.7.1), which concluded that cable laying operations alone would not have a significant effect on regular shipping routes.
TA_0014_029_231123	S42	Email	The TSC wishes to point out that there is an AfL with Ørsted for an offshore windfarm within Isle of Man territorial waters. The TSC is disappointed that there appears to be no mention of this site as part of the cumulative assessment specifically in respect of shipping and navigation in Vol.2 Chapter 7. The Ørsted site during construction and maintenance has the potential to increase the number of vessel movements in and around the proposed Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farm areas, as well as part of the site boundary for the Morgan and Morecambe Transmission Assets. Whilst firm timelines	Moor Vannin Offshore Windfarm was not included within the PEIR cumulative assessments due to limited data available at the time of PEIR reporting and being classed a Tier 3 project. Following the PEIR, the Moor Vannin project has issued its scoping report for the offshore windfarm and has been considered as a Tier 2 project which has also been assessed in the Cumulative Regional Navigation Risk Assessment (CRNRA) (document reference F2.7.1). The Moor Vannin UK Transmission Asset has been included as a Tier 3 project. The Moor Vannin projects have been considered in

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			are unknown, this future scenario should be taken into account and at least an estimate made as to the increased number of vessels within the area added in.	the cumulative effects assessment (CEA) of the updated NRA (document reference F2.7.1) and the Shipping and navigation chapter of the ES (document reference F2.7).
TA_0010_109_221123	S42	Email	Volume 2 Chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation 12.1. MMO defers to and supports the Maritime and Coastguard Agency and Trinity House and relevant Harbour Authority's regarding the potential impacts on shipping and navigation that may occur because of the Projects.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0010_110_221123	S42	Email	12.2. MMO will maintain a watching brief on anything that may fall within the MMO's remit – such as dML conditions.	The Applicants note your response.

E1.16.14 Marine archaeology table of responses

E1.16.14.1 Marine archaeology table of responses (via feedback form)

Table E1.16.14.1: Marine archaeology consultation responses (feedback form)

As set out in section 4.7.4 of the Consultation report (document reference E1). Responses have been allocated to the most appropriate topic(s). If a consultee did not provide a response for a question/sub-question this is not recorded. If a consultee included 'N/A', 'none', 'no comment', 'Nil', 'No', in response to a question, this has also not been recorded. Where a consultee provided a response associated with this sub-question (1.8; Marine Archaeology) but was not related to this topic, this has been included below, as well as against any other appropriate topic(s). Where a consultee provided a response which stated 'see response above' or similar, the response has been replicated in brackets and italics.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0056_009_141123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.8	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0083_006_221123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.8	I do not want this project to go ahead	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0108_009_231123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.8	Loss of high quality farmland. Known flood areas. Devastating consequences for Newton, Kirkham and Freckleton	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES. A flood risk assessment assessing all sources of flooding, including sewers is presented within Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3). The proposed permanent infrastructure associated with the Morgan and Morecambe substations are located within Flood Zone 1 and has a low risk of flooding from all other assessed sources.

E1.16.14.2 Marine archaeology table of responses (via all other methods)

Table E1.16.14.2: Marine archaeology table of responses (via all other methods)

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0010_111_221123	S42	Email	Volume 2 Chapter 8: Marine Archaeology 13.1. MMO defers to and supports Historic England regarding the potential impacts to marine archaeology that may occur.	MMO deference to Historic England is noted.
TA_0010_112_221123	S42	Email	13.2. MMO will maintain a watching brief on anything that may fall within the MMO's remit – such as dML conditions.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0049_001_231123	S42	Email	Section 3.7.2 (Pre-construction surveys) – the text explains that “...pre-construction site investigation surveys will be undertaken to provide detailed information on seabed conditions and morphology and to identify the presence/absence of any potential obstructions or hazards and to verify the seabed geology layers.” Although the text does not explicitly include archaeology, we must add that it will be essential for this project to ensure that any pre-construction survey campaigns (such as outlined in Table 3.4) are designed to optimise archaeological analysis and interpretation. This point is made in reference to the risk of this project encountering presently unknown elements of the historic environment.	Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets include the requirement for archaeological advice and input into pre-construction survey. Further information is provided in the Outline Offshore Written Scheme of Investigation and Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (document reference J17).
TA_0049_002_231123	S42	Email	Section 3.7.3 (Site preparation activities) – describes action to clear debris from the cable route and we stress at this point the importance of archaeological advice to differentiate contemporary debris/litter or geological items (e.g. boulders) from other materials which might be of archaeological interest. It is an important matter that for both boulder and sand wave clearance that detailed survey campaigns are conducted no more than 6 months ahead of commencement of intrusive works. We therefore encourage the Applicant to plan these investigation programmes (should consent be obtained) with the timely involvement of professional, experienced and accredited archaeological consultants, so that data acquisition and processing allows for avoidance of known heritage assets and identification and avoidance of presently unknown heritage assets. In particular, noting paragraph 3.7.3.12 and any additional seabed preparation that might be required for Gravity Base Foundations (GBFs), including dredging of the soft sediments.	Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets include the requirement for archaeological advice and input into pre-construction survey. Further information regarding survey methodology is provided in the Outline Offshore Written Scheme of Investigation and Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (document reference J17).
TA_0049_003_231123	S42	Email	Section 8.1 (Overview) we note that this chapter relates to the offshore elements of the Transmission Assets seaward of Mean Low Water Springs (MLWS). It is therefore important that the Environmental Statement (ES) explains clearly how any foreshore area will be included within either the marine and/or terrestrial WSIs. We concur with the matters identified in Table 8.6 (potential effects scoped into the assessment).	Agreement of effects scoped in noted. Two Outline WSIs have been produced for application and in support of both Volume 3, Chapter 5: Historic Environment of the ES (document reference F3.5) and Volume 2, Chapter 8: Marine Archaeology of the ES (document reference F2.8). Outline Offshore Written Scheme of Investigation and Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (document reference J17) covers the Transmission Assets Order Limits seaward of MLWS whilst the Outline Onshore and Intertidal Written Scheme of Investigation (document reference J9) covers the Transmission Assets Order Limits landward of MLWS.
TA_0049_004_231123	S42	Email	Section 8.4.4 (Transmission assets survey area) – we appreciate the information provided that geophysical surveys were carried out between April 2022 and September 2022 and comprised Multi-Beam Echo Sounder (MBES), Side Scan Sonar (SSS), Magnetometer, parametric Sub-bottom Profiler (SBP) and 'Pinger' SBP. Furthermore, that geotechnical site investigations (vibrocore sampling) were conducted in 2022 within the Morgan Transmission Assets Red Line Boundary. The acquisition of geotechnical survey data is important given the ongoing chronology debate for the submergence of proposed development area (as explained in paragraph 8.5.2.8).	The results of the Stage 1 geoarchaeological assessment are presented in section 1.4.3 of Volume 2, Annex 8.1: Marine Archaeology Technical Report of the ES (document reference F2.8.1). Recommendations for further geoarchaeological assessment have been made and will form a Final Archaeology Report submitted to HE post-application. Full details of reporting and archiving are given in the accompanying Outline Offshore Written Scheme of Investigation and Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (document reference J17).
TA_0049_005_231123	S42	Email	Regarding historic maritime activity we appreciate the attention given to the potential for encountering archaeological sites from different periods (as set out in Table 8.10), which is considered “moderate” for Early Medieval and Medieval and “high” for the post medieval and modern periods. In reference to Modern Military Remains we note the identification from desk-based sources of information a First World War German submarine, U3 (Ref: NRHE 1597596) which was lost while being towed to be scraped in November 1918. We also note the records of Second World War aircraft losses attributed to the study area and that one of these losses is of a Blackburn Botha MK I (Ref: NRHE 1327855), for which there are no surviving examples of this aircraft type and therefore any identified remains will be considered important. Furthermore, the archaeological interpretation of geophysical survey data acquired for the Transmission Assets corridor has determined that: - 3 seabed anomalies have been classified as “high potential”; - 4 “medium potential”; and - 54 “low potential”. We did note that some medium potential anomalies (e.g. Table 8.12, Ref: MG23_0051) could actually be contemporary infrastructure (e.g. cabling). It is therefore important that any subsequent	Summary of baseline findings noted. UKHO Ref: 8292; NRHE Ref: 1027211; Survey Ref: MG23_0059 has been interpreted as an unknown wreck site and as such, is considered to have a high potential to be an archaeological asset of significance. However without further site investigation no further information on the origin or significance of the asset can be determined at ES. All anomalies identified as having either a high (including MG23_0059) or medium potential to be archaeological in nature have been assigned an appropriate AEZ in order to ensure that there will be no direct impacts to these potential archaeological assets. All AEZs are presented in

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			survey campaigns are designed to differentiate such features. Within the proposed Morgan Offshore Wind Project, we note that 5 are classed as "high potential" anomalies, 5 are of "medium potential" and 42 have been classed as "low potential" anomalies. It was noted again that some provisional medium potential anomalies could be geological (Table 8.13, Ref: Morgan_0030). Morecambe Offshore Windfarm (generation assets) identified anomalies e.g. "unidentified debris" that could be of archaeological interest (Table 8.14). For the Transmission Assets Survey Area, it seems that from geophysical survey data, corroborated is possible with desk-based sources for the wreck of the Ben Rein (UKHO Ref: 5462; NRHE Ref: 909472, Survey Ref: MG23_0053), a cargo ship sunk by German submarine UB57 in 1918. An unknown vessel (UKHO Ref: 8292; NRHE Ref: 1027211; Survey Ref: MG23_0059) is also identifiable and therefore the ES should determine if it should be considered as a heritage asset.	Volume 2, Chapter 8: Marine Archaeology of the ES (document reference F2.8).
TA_0049_006_231123	S42	Email	Section 8.5.4 (Historic Seascapes Character) describes available data and the perception the character of the area is that modern energy infrastructure dominates seascape character. Given that Section 8.8.5 mentions determination of historic seascape capacity to accommodate change, as could be introduced by this proposed project, we refer you to our comments made on this topic as included within Annex 8.1 (marine archaeology technical report).	Further discussion on approach to HSC was undertaken through the Offshore AHEF and advice from Historic England has been utilised in the further development of assessment effects on HSC as presented in Volume 2, Chapter 8: Marine Archaeology of the ES (document reference F2.8).
TA_0049_007_231123	S42	Email	Section 8.5.6 (Data limitations) highlights some important matters such that the survey data acquired was considered sufficient for "robust archaeological assessment", as necessary for an EIA exercise. However, it is important to acknowledge the risk that this project could encounter presently unknown elements of the historic environment, such as mentioned in paragraph 8.7.2.9.	The measures adopted as part of Transmission Assets include mitigation to minimise impacts to any archaeological material that may be encountered during the course of Transmission Assets construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning. This includes impacts to previously unknown archaeology receptors. Further details are provided in the Outline Offshore Written Scheme of Investigation and Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (document reference: J17).
TA_0049_008_231123	S42	Email	Section 8.6 (Key parameters for assessment) – regarding the MDS, identified in Table 8.17, we appreciate the attention given to each phase of the proposed project (construction, operation and decommissioning) and the following aspects: - sand wave clearance (e.g. those up to 8m);- boulder clearance;- seabed preparation for GBFs that will require both sand wave clearance and dredging activities;- export and interconnector cables requiring trench width of up to 3m and a depth of up to 3m; and- seabed impact due to jack-ups at OSPs and the Morgan offshore booster station. We did see the assumptions made about boulder and debris clearance activities that could, for example, apply to "...up to 40% of interconnector and Morgan export cables..." and "...up to 30% of Morecambe export cables will be subject to pre-lay preparation..." and that sand wave clearance could be required for "...up to 60% of Morgan interconnector cables, 60% of Morgan export cables and 30% of Morecambe export cables" during construction phase. We also note the detail provided in Section 8.9 (Assessment of effects) and the attention given to sediment disturbance and deposition at each phase. It is important that consideration is given to the risk of encountering presently unknown elements of the historic environment that could presently be buried in sand waves or in the seabed at locations where GBF dredging could be required. We note that for OSP GBF and monopile suction bucket foundations that diameters are given, but it would be helpful if the ES also includes depth of seabed preparation.	The measures adopted as part of Transmission Assets include mitigation to minimise impacts to any archaeological material that may be encountered during the course of Transmission Assets construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning. Further details are provided in the Outline Offshore Written Scheme of Investigation and Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (document reference: J17). Sandwave clearance and boulder clearance assumptions have been refined and OSPs removed from the Project Design from PEIR to ES. The updated MDS for sediment disturbance and deposition is presented in Volume 2, Chapter 8: Marine Archaeology of the ES (document reference F2.8).
TA_0049_009_231123	S42	Email	Section 8.7 (Commitments) – Table 8.18 summarises the following commitments:- production of an Outline Marine Archaeology Written Scheme of Investigations (WSI) in consultation with Historic England;- the spatial identification and application of Archaeological Exclusion Zones (AEZs) or temporary exclusion zones; and- implementation of a reporting protocol system for archaeological discoveries to facilitate prompt action and communication between key stakeholders. We concur that such measures are detailed in full within the conditions of a draft Development Consent Order and Deemed Marine Licences for which we have offered comment.	Agreement of mitigation measures detailed in the draft DCO noted.
TA_0049_010_231123	S42	Email	Section 8.7.2 (Archaeological Exclusion Zones) – It is important that all parties have a clear understanding that all seabed impacting operations should be excluded from AEZs. It is therefore a fundamental aspect of AEZs that they are spatially sufficient to prevent any direct or indirect impact(s). Furthermore, we recommend further archaeological-led investigation of the four anomalies classed as "medium potential" within the Transmission Assets Survey Area to determine whether AEZs are required and if so, what scale is necessary. We also wish to highlight that any Outline WSI produced for this proposed project should specify the methodological approach to further survey data capture and analysis as could be commissioned post-consent (subject to authorisation). A statement in paragraph 8.7.2.5 mentions "archaeological monitoring" which should be seen as a further step after detailed participation and involvement of experienced, accredited and professional archaeological consultants in any post-consent survey planning and commissioning phase.	Acceptance of the AEZ extents, as given, noted. The Outline Offshore Written Scheme of Investigation and Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (document reference: J17) specifies the methodological approach to data acquisition and the procedure for reporting previously unknown marine archaeology receptors post-consent. Adherence to the Outline Offshore Written Scheme of Investigation and Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (document reference: J17) includes the requirement for archaeological advice and assessment of survey planning and subsequent data of survey operations post-consent.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
			Paragraph 8.7.2.9 mentions micro-sitting of design to be informed by the acquisition of high-resolution geophysical survey data post-consent, as relevant to presently classed "low potential" anomalies. On the basis of the information presented in this PEIR, we are prepared to accept the AEZ extents presented in Table 8.19 and illustrated in Figure 8.8.	
TA_0049_011_231123	S42	Email	Section 8.3.3 (Receptor sensitivity/value) – we appreciate the attention given to Historic England guidance. However, it is important that for the marine area, a key first step is to determine whether heritage asset(s) (as defined within the UK Marine Policy Statement, 2011 and the North West Marine Plan Technical Annex, 2021) are present. Once sufficient certainty is available via archaeological analysis and interpretation of both desk-based sources of information and project-specific survey data, determination of receptor sensitivity is then possible. Furthermore, this will be especially relevant during any post-consent and pre-construction phase of survey planning and commissioning (for Scenario 1, 2 or 3). It is through this approach that the determination of the significance of effect (Section 8.8.4) becomes possible.	Archaeological analysis and interpretation of both desk-based sources and project-specific survey data has been completed to establish the presence of heritage assets within the marine archaeology study area and in support of Volume 2, Chapter 8: Marine Archaeology of the ES (document reference F2.8). The results are presented in the Outline Offshore Written Scheme of Investigation and Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (document reference: J17). This information has been used in the determination of receptor sensitivity for the assessment of effects within the chapter.
TA_0049_012_231123	S42	Email	Section 8.9 (Assessment of effects) – direct damage to marine archaeology receptors, direct damage to deeply buried marine archaeology and alteration of sediment transport regimes it is suggested that effect(s) will be of "minor adverse significance". We also note the conclusions draw in Section 8.11 (Cumulative effects assessment) for the same set of receptors as "minor adverse significance" and the attention given to implementation of AEZs, WSI and a reporting protocol for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Generation Assets and Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets to reduce the magnitude of the impact. It is apparent that such determination of "no significant effects" or "no significant cumulative effects" is predicated on specified mitigation measures being delivered as statutory obligations. We therefore welcome the statement made in Section 8.15 (next steps) that an Outline WSI (and reporting protocol) will be prepared in consultation with Historic England through the Archaeology and Heritage Engagement Forum (AHEF).	Agreement of the development and submission of an Outline Offshore Written Scheme of Investigation and Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (document reference: J17), which has been submitted with the DCO Application.
TA_0049_013_231123	S42	Email	Section 8.9.6 (Effects on Historic Seascape Character) – we are aware of the focus directed at trying to determine 'magnitude' and the effort to try and determine 'significant change'. However, in consideration of the detail of this proposed development, we can appreciate your perception that change can be accommodated, but we do not concur that this is "...without altering the existing characteristics of the HSC..." the physical placement of seabed infrastructure will influence other activities including (generic) 'fishing'. We therefore advise that further narrative is provided in the ES assessment to explain perceptions of change drawing on historic character.	Further discussion on approach to HSC was undertaken through the Offshore AHEF (meeting held 29th February 2024) and advice from HE has been utilised in the further development of assessment of effects on HSC as presented in Volume 2, Chapter 8: Marine Archaeology of the ES (document reference F2.8).
TA_0049_014_231123	S42	Email	<u>Volume 1, Annex 5.3 Commitments Register</u> We understand that the Commitments Register present measures (primary, secondary and tertiary) to be adopted during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the proposed project. We appreciate that they reflect the present state of design of the proposed development and they will receive more attention in the ES and at application in an accompanying draft DCO. Therefore, for the "offshore topic" marine archaeology we note the following commitment, in summary:- CoT63 – 'primary' a marine outline WSI to be developed in consultation with Historic England, the use of AEZs, application of a reporting system for archaeological discoveries and incorporation of marine archaeology specification and analysis in further geophysical and geotechnical preconstruction surveys.	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0049_015_231123	S42	Email	<u>Volume 2, Annex 8.1 Marine Archaeology Technical Report</u> We are aware that this report used a Transmission Assets marine archaeology study area as defined as the Transmission Assets Red Line Boundary with an additional 2km buffer. Section 1.3.3 (Site-specific surveys) states that geophysical surveys were carried out between April 2022 and September 2022 in three separate campaigns, acquiring data using Multi-Beam Echo Sounder (MBES), a Side Scan Sonar (SSS), a Magnetometer, a parametric Sub-bottom Profiler (SBP), and a Pinger SBP. Regarding the standard of survey data obtained we note the statement that they were considered as "good quality overall" with MBES provided 100% coverage. SBP data provided "suitable coverage and penetration for the interpretation of the palaeoenvironment". Importantly, paragraph 1.3.3.6 states that those data were "...appropriate specification, coverage and quality to undertake a robust archaeological assessment to inform the EIA process..." We also note that "additional data collection and interpretation will be required prior to construction." The attention given to "quaternary sequence" and "sea level data" and sedimentary Units C and D within the Transmission Assets Survey Area (TASA) is key to informing the relevance of further specialist geoarchaeological input into survey planning. A research objective should be specified such as seeking evidence of the marine transgression of the study area to determine the prehistoric submerged landscape (Figure 1.3). The opinion offered in Section 1.4.2 (Submerged prehistoric archaeology potential) regarding potential for survival is helpful.	Agreement on opinion offered in Volume 2, Annex 8.1: Marine Archaeology technical report of the ES (document reference F2.8.1), noted.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0049_016_231123	S42	Email	Paragraph 1.4.3.4 mentions the “deep” boreholes obtained from within Morgan Generation Assets and Mona Offshore Wind Project Red Line Boundaries. In general, it does seem that there is the potential for palaeoenvironmental evidence to be obtained which could help refine sedimentary deposit models. We therefore recommend that objectives should be set for any subsequent geoarchaeological analysis programme and we offer the following reference Deposit Modelling and Archaeology (Historic England 2020) (https://historicengland.org.uk/imagesbooks/publications/deposit-modelling-and-archaeology/). Therefore, in reference to the five boreholes recommended for “Stage 2” geoarchaeological recording, we highlight the advice given to the Morecambe Offshore Wind Generation Assets PEIR and Morgan Offshore Windfarm Generation Assets PEIR, that a deposit model, especially in relation to the timings of the various marine transgressions (due to the current conflicting models), is necessary to provide context that can support understanding about potential for human activity in the Palaeolithic and Mesolithic periods. Therefore, it will be crucial that post-application analysis for this transmission assets project builds and contributes to a geoarchaeological/geotechnical programme, which is designed and implemented to integrate the Outline WSIs for Morgan Offshore Wind and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farm generation assets.	Advice to Morecambe Generation Assets noted. The objective for seeking evidence of the marine transgression of the study area to determine the prehistoric submerged landscape has been incorporated into the geoarchaeological assessment and will continue to be an objective of further archaeological work undertaken post-consent. This is discussed in section 1.3.4 of the accompanying Outline Offshore Written Scheme of Investigation and Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (document reference: J17). An evolving Ground Model has been developed by bp/ENBW for the Morgan Generation Assets and Mona Offshore Wind Projects. This model will continue to be informed by the results of the proposed Stage 2 geoarchaeological assessments outlined in the respective Outline Offshore WSIs for Morgan Generation Assets and Mona, and any further stages that may be required as a result of these. Archaeological input into specifications for, and assessment of, new geophysical and geotechnical data acquisition post-consent is detailed within the respective WSI documents to allow for the continued building of a knowledge base of quaternary depositional history within the eastern Irish Sea.
TA_0049_017_231123	S42	Email	<u>Vol 2 Annex 8.1 Marine Archaeology Technical Report</u> We understand that a stage 1 geoarchaeological assessment has been carried out, identifying a series of sub-glacial and pro-glacial landscape features and deposits. We support a stage 2 to the geoarchaeological recording, though the details of this ‘recording’ remain unclear and should be in the form of a deposit model and geoarchaeological assessment of deposits. Please refer to the following guidance: Deposit Modelling and Archaeology (Historic England 2020) (https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/deposit-modelling-and-archaeology/)	Support for Stage 2 geoarchaeological assessment noted. The deposit modelling guidance suggested has been considered in the production of Volume 2, Annex 8.1 Marine Archaeology Technical Report (document reference F2.8.1) and the Outline Offshore Written Scheme of Investigation and Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (document reference J17).
TA_0049_018_231123	S42	Email	<u>Draft Development Consent Order incl. Draft Deemed Marine licence</u> In reference to:- Schedule 14 Marine Licence 1: Morgan Offshore Wind Farm Transmission Assets, Part 2 Conditions, under “Pre-construction plans and documentation” we see that the following are included: o 19(1)(g) vis. an offshore WSI for archaeology in relation to the Order limits, which must accord with the Outline offshore WSI; and o 19(3) vis. pre-commencement survey etc.- Schedule 15 Marine Licence 2: Morecambe Offshore Wind Farm Transmission Assets under “Pre-construction plans and documentation” we see that the following are included: o 18(1)(g) vis. an offshore WSI for archaeology in relation to the Order limits, which must accord with the Outline offshore WSI; and o 18(3) vis. pre-commencement survey etc. It is an important matter that the realisation of the above draft conditions are contingent on timetable(s) for all further site investigations that allows sufficient opportunity to establish a full understanding of the historic environment. We therefore hope that there will be further advice sought from Historic England, through the AHEF, regarding the content of any outline marine archaeological WSI as produced as part of any DCO application.	The content of the Outline Offshore Written Scheme of Investigation and Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (document reference: J17) were further discussed with HE through the AHEF at the meeting held on the 29th of February 2024 and the advice received has been incorporated into the production of the Outline Offshore Written Scheme of Investigation and Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (document reference: J17).

E1.16.15 Other sea users table of responses

E1.16.15.1 Other sea users table of responses (via feedback form)

Table E1.16.15.1: Other sea users consultation responses (feedback form)

As set out in section 4.7.4 of the Consultation report (document reference E1). Responses have been allocated to the most appropriate topic(s). If a consultee didn't provide a response for a question/sub-question this is not recorded. If a consultee included 'N/A', 'none', 'no comment', 'Nil', 'No', in response to a question, this has also not been recorded. Where a consultee provided a response associated with this sub-question (1.9; Other sea users) but was not related to this topic, this has been included below, as well as against any other appropriate topic(s). Where a consultee provided a response which stated 'see response above' or similar, the response has been replicated in brackets and italics.

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicant's response
TA_0056_010_141123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.9	As previously stated <i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means. Until its explained in plain English, I will object about it. I cannot aggressive to what I don't fully understand may or may not affect me and my property.")</i>	The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the consultation information was available to as many people as possible, many different methods were used, including but not limited to a website, newsletter, postcards, consultation brochure, deposit locations, webinar and in-person events (a full list of materials produced for the consultation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference E1). The Applicants aimed to ensure that it was clear how people could have their say, but also how to get in touch with the Transmission Assets team to find out more information. The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation, including a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) highlighting the findings of the environmental and technical assessments at that stage of the Transmission Assets. A newsletter, consultation brochure and PEIR NTS were also available with the aim of simplifying the key elements of the PEIR. These materials were produced using plain English and, where appropriate, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).
TA_0083_007_221123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.9	I do not want this project to go ahead	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0092__016_151123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.9	Need to ensure that the project continues to be sympathetic to all sea users and the environment	An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken for the offshore topics of the Transmission Assets Application and is presented in Volume 2 of the ES (document reference F2). Specific examples relevant to marine life are listed below. - Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2). - Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3). - Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4). - Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5). The impacts of the Transmission Assets (alone and in-combination with other projects), including those on recreational shipping, are assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 9: Other sea users of the ES (document reference: 2.9). More information and details of the proposed mitigation measures are described in the updated Volume 2, Annex 7.1: NRA of the ES and Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and navigation chapter of the ES (document reference: F2.7.1 and F2.7, respectively) submitted as part of the Application.
TA_0093_001_211123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.9	As an open water swimmer and a member of the local outdoor swimming group Lancashire Bluetits I am concerned about how this will impact our ability to train in the sea from Starr Gate and along St Annes beach during construction	Details of the design of the Transmission Assets, including the landfall area near Lytham St Annes, are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES. This includes a range of measures to avoid or reduce impacts, including measures to ensure that the construction period on the beach will be as short as practicable. Substantial reductions to the Order Limits have been made to the north of the PEIR boundary at landfall. The areas of beach subject to construction works, including landfall compounds will not be available for public access during this period. However, the Applicants have committed to ensure public access to the east of the works areas will be maintained during construction. This will ensure that, areas to the north and south of the works area would remain accessible for beach-based activities. The Applicants have sought to minimise the duration of beach works by committing to a direct pipe trenchless installation technique in order to limit potential disruption to users of the beach and an Outline Open Space

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Feedback form question	Feedback form sub - question	Statutory consultation response received	Applicant's response
						Management Plan has been appended to the Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (document reference J1.5), which includes measures to minimise potential impacts.
TA_0108_010_231123	S44	Online feedback form	1	1.9	Loss of high quality farmland. Known flood land. Devastating consequences for Newton, Kirkham and Freckleton	The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site selection and consideration of alternatives of the ES (document reference F1.4) and the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3). Detailed assessments are provided within all chapters within Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document reference F1 to F4). As set out in every ES chapter, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and most versatile land and disruption to farm holdings are identified in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES. A flood risk assessment assessing all sources of flooding, including sewers is presented within Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3). The proposed permanent infrastructure associated with the Morgan and Morecambe substations are located within Flood Zone 1 and has a low risk of flooding from all other assessed sources.

E1.16.15.2 Other sea users table of responses (via all other methods)

Table E1.16.15.2: Other sea users table of responses (via all other methods)

Unique Reference Identifier	S42/S44	Feedback method	Statutory consultation response received	Applicants' response
TA_0001_015_231123	S42	Email	<p>1.14 Volume 1, Chapter 3, 3.7.3.10</p> <p>It is noted that if offshore infrastructure crosses existing out of service cables, the developer intends on removing these. We advise that the specific methodology for the proposed cable removal along with any associated impacts should be stated in the Application. We agree that this should also be undertaken in consultation with the asset owner and in accordance with the International Cable Protection Committee guidelines (2011).</p> <p>The proposed cable removal methodology for existing out of service cables should be clearly stated within the submitted ES and undertaken in consultation with the asset owner and the International Cable Protection Committee guidelines (2011)</p>	The methodology for cable removal is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).
TA_0001_062_231123	S42	Email	<p>2.93.7.3.10</p> <p>It is noted that if offshore infrastructure crosses existing out of service cables, the developer intends on removing these. We advise that the specific methodology for the proposed cable removal along with any associated impacts should be stated in the Application. We agree that this should also be undertaken in consultation with the asset owner and in accordance with the International Cable Protection Committee guidelines (2011). Proposed cable removal methodology for existing out of service cables should be clearly stated within the ES and undertaken in consultation with the asset owner and the International Cable Protection Committee guidelines (2011)</p>	The methodology for cable removal is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES.
TA_0014_030_231123	S42	Email	<p>Crogga Hydrocarbon site</p> <p>The Department of Infrastructure has issued a Seaward Production Innovate Licence to Crogga Limited in respect of the hydrocarbon block 112/25. This licence commenced on 1st January 2019. Again, the TSC would draw this to your attention as it is within close proximity to the proposed Morgan and Morecambe Transmission Asset site boundaries.</p>	The Crogga licence is noted within the baseline environment section of Volume 2, Chapter 9: Other sea users of the ES (document reference F2.9).
TA_0010_113_221123	S42	Email	<p>Volume 2 Chapter 9: Other Sea Users</p> <p>14.1. MMO defers to the Maritime and Coastguard Agency and Trinity House, relevant Harbour Authorities and Royal Yachting Association regarding the potential impacts on shipping and navigation that may occur because of the Projects.</p>	The Applicants note your response.
TA_0010_114_221123	S42	Email	<p>14.2. MMO will maintain a watching brief on anything that may fall within the MMO's remit – such as DML conditions.</p>	The Applicants note your response.