



# MORGAN AND MORECAMBE OFFSHORE WIND FARMS: TRANSMISSION ASSETS

## Consultation Report Annex

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



September 2024  
Rev: Rev01

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

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

| <b>Document status</b> |                            |                    |                |                    |                |
|------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------|
| <b>Version</b>         | <b>Purpose of document</b> | <b>Approved by</b> | <b>Date</b>    | <b>Approved by</b> | <b>Date</b>    |
| 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

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| <b>(PART 2 OF 2)</b> .....  | <b>1</b> |
| E1.16.16 Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions table of responses .....                           | 2        |
| E1.16.16.1 Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions table of responses (via feedback form) .....     | 3        |
| E1.16.16.2 Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions table of responses (via all other methods) ..... | 16       |
| E1.16.17 Hydrology and flood risk table of responses .....  | 31       |
| E1.16.17.1 Hydrology and flood risk table of responses (via feedback form) .....                        | 32       |
| E1.16.17.2 Hydrology and flood risk table of responses (via all other methods) .....                    | 54       |
| E1.16.18 Onshore ecology table of responses .....   | 110      |
| E1.16.18.1 Onshore ecology table of responses (via feedback form) .....                                 | 111      |
| E1.16.18.2 Onshore ecology table of responses (via all other methods) .....                             | 141      |
| E1.16.19 Onshore and intertidal ornithology table of responses .....                                    | 200      |
| E1.16.19.1 Onshore and intertidal ornithology table of responses (via feedback form) .....              | 201      |
| E1.16.19.2 Onshore and intertidal ornithology table of responses (via all other methods) .....          | 208      |
| E1.16.20 Historic environment table of responses .....  | 238      |
| E1.16.20.1 Historic environment table of responses (via feedback form) .....                            | 239      |
| E1.16.20.2 Historic environment table of responses (via all other methods) .....                        | 244      |
| E1.16.21 Land use and recreation table of responses .....   | 251      |
| E1.16.21.1 Land use and recreation table of responses (via feedback form) .....                         | 252      |
| E1.16.21.2 Land use and recreation table of responses (via all other methods) .....                     | 298      |
| E1.16.22 Traffic and transport table of responses .....   | 368      |
| E1.16.22.1 Traffic and Transport table of responses (via feedback form) .....                           | 369      |
| E1.16.22.2 Traffic and Transport table of responses (via all other methods) .....                       | 397      |
| E1.16.23 Noise and vibration table of responses .....   | 430      |
| E1.16.23.1 Noise and vibration table of responses (via feedback form) .....                             | 431      |
| E1.16.23.2 Noise and vibration table of responses (via all other methods) .....                         | 457      |
| E1.16.24 Air quality tables of responses .....  | 482      |
| E1.16.24.1 Air quality table of responses (via feedback form) .....                                     | 483      |
| E1.16.24.2 Air quality table of responses (via all other methods) .....                                 | 491      |
| E1.16.25 Seascape, landscape and visual resources table of responses .....                              | 497      |
| E1.16.25.1 Seascape, landscape and visual resources table of responses (via feedback form) .....        | 498      |
| E1.16.25.2 Seascape, landscape and visual resources table of responses (via all other methods) .....    | 523      |
| E1.16.26 Aviation and radar table of responses .....  | 562      |
| E1.16.26.1 Aviation and radar table of responses (via feedback form) .....                              | 563      |
| E1.16.26.2 Aviation and radar table of responses (via all other methods) .....                          | 570      |
| E1.16.27 Socio-economics table of responses .....   | 574      |
| E1.16.27.1 Socio-economics table of responses (via feedback form) .....                                 | 575      |
| E1.16.27.2 Socio-economics table of responses (via all other methods) .....                             | 588      |
| E1.16.28 Human health table of responses .....  | 638      |
| E1.16.28.1 Human health tables of responses (via feedback form) .....                                   | 639      |
| E1.16.28.2 Human health tables of responses (via all other methods) .....                               | 665      |
| E1.16.29 Draft Habitats Regulations Assessment table of responses (via all methods) .....               | 694      |
| E1.16.30 Draft Development Consent Order table of responses .....                                       | 701      |
| E1.16.30.1 Draft Development Consent Order table of responses (via feedback form) .....                 | 702      |
| E1.16.30.2 Draft Development Consent Order table of responses (via all other methods) .....             | 707      |
| E1.16.31 Targeted statutory consultation table of responses .....                                       | 739      |

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



## E1.16.16 Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions table of responses

## **E1.16.16.1 Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions table of responses (via feedback form)**

**Table E1.16.16.1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions 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 (3.1; Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions) 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_002_231123          | S42     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.1                          | There are some SSSI areas for geology in the in/around the area. Superficial deposits in many locations consist have bands of peat which are of value as carbon sink - disturbance, including compression of peat will have a detrimental effect on localised groundwater which is rising in some places and affecting some properties. Compressed, dried out peat oxidises and makes the peat useless and locked in carbon would be released. What mitigation measures are proposed to alleviate this?  | Peaty soils are considered within Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). This chapter includes details of soil surveys undertaken. 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). The assessment has considered the presence of peaty soils located within the Transmission Assets Order Limits.  |
| 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_0051_002_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.2                          | The natural drainage of the land is already working to its maximum capacity, and any disruption to this natural process would severely impact our properties with an unacceptable risk of flooding. Although it is proposed that the transmission cable corridor would be re-instated, studies have suggested that it could take up to 40 years for the disturbed land to return to its natural state.   | 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).<br>Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2).<br>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.<br><br>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_0056_013_141123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.1                          | As previously stated<br><i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay</i>   | The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. In order to ensure the   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <i>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>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, made strong use of images and graphics (as noted in the Statement of Community Consultation).</p>  |
| 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_003_201123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 14                     |                              | <p>Object on the basis of unknown health risks, foundation problems to residential properties on sand based land and total disruption to road traffic and associated delays that will be created.</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_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</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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | 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>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.</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 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. 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.</p> |
| TA_0060_004_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.1                          | Sand dunes are a protected conservation area. So how do you get the right to work on them?  | 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.  |
| TA_0060_015_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 7                      |                              | Freckleton area is known for its cause of earth quakes whenever the ground is dug into.   | <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 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.</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| TA_0060_017_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 12                     |                              | Fracking on the Fylde coast caused major earth tremors.<br><br>Why do you think this project will not cause this same issue when you dig up the land?  | 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/streams). 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: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions (document reference F3.1) of the ES.  |
| TA_0061_001_161123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      |                              | I object strongly to option two being chosen on the basis that all residential properties are built on sand based foundations. Drilling horizontal tunnels or large trenches so close to residential properties on sand based foundations may create structures to subside, move or crack with various defects that could occur.<br><br>Can you give an assurance that prior to any work being undertaken, if option two is chosen you will carry out a full structural survey of all properties on Blackpool road north and that if during or post any of your works that any defects are identified then you will pay full costs and compensation to all property owners.<br><br>I further object on the basis of unknown health effects that may be caused by a permanent high voltage magnetic field so close to residential properties. Can you provide any evidence that no minor or major health effects have been identified on any similar type projects. Can you also confirm that if any subsequent health issues are observed or identified that you will pay full compensation to any and all those who have been exposed or subjected to such effects of long term high voltage magnetic fields.   | The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.<br>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).<br>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.<br>See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4). |
| TA_0062_002_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | 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.<br>Should option 2 go ahead this will totally devastate our lives.<br>I will, object and campaign to exhaustion against this development ruining our lives.<br>I am REDACTED this month, I had no intentions of moving again and have designed, together with my wife, the property to fulfil our needs for the rest our lives through retirement.<br>I am too old to start all over again and all this is giving me mental health issues making me extremely ill.<br>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.<br>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 | The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.<br>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.<br>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.<br>With regard to EMF impacts, the project will adopt the International     |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p>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 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.</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>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> |
| TA_0066_004_171023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.1                          | <p>The excavation process seems to be similar to that used for fracking and which caused such controversy and disruption locally. The project should be held to at least the same standards as were imposed then and monitored accordingly. Work should be carried out over a short period to minimise any disruption and potential tremors.</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 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.</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
| 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_003_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.1                          | Unstable shifting sand  | 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. 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_0067_004_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.3                          | Huge impact on the unstable dunes, wildlife areas, environmental areas  | Detailed assessments are 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).<br>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.<br>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_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.<br>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_0068_005_231123          | S44     | Hard copy feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | Will this have an impact on the foundations of the houses? What checks will you put in place to reassure residents that their properties will be safe from damage? Dust and grit getting into people's houses. | The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.<br>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.<br>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_0073_004_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form    | 5                      |                              | Disruption of sand dunes and of Clifton Drive St Annes, and the nature reserve   | 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.<br>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).<br>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_0074_004_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form    | 3                      | 3.1                          | The whole area is sand based and I do not want drilling or heavy vehicles in the area as it is a danger to the stability of my property.   | 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.   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| TA_0074_009_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | Totally unacceptable in this area where ground is so unstable I recently had to have deep piling for a small extension   | 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.<br>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_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_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.<br>I am also concerned about the size and the location of the transition joint boxes. I would like more information please.<br>I'm also concerned about the impact on the habitats of the nature reserve bordering our estate .<br>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.<br>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).<br>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).<br>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_0082_003_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | My home is within 50 meters of Queensway. I have concerns about noise during the cable laying phase in addition to vibration and possible damage to my property.   | 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.<br>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_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_0085_002_191123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.1                          | 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   | 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).<br>Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2)<br>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_0085_003_191123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.2                          | As above flooding - dykes and land, and rising water table issues <i>(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)</i>  | 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).<br>Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2)<br>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.  |
| TA_0085_010_191123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 5                      |                              | This will cross the sand dunes and has impact to the nature of these as well as potential structure of the actual hills  | 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.<br>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_0092_018_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.1                          | Need to understand flood risk etc Need to understand are any of the works likely to cause vibration impact that could have an impact on instrumentation works within our College building and are any of the works likely to cause subsidence?   | 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).<br><br>Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2)<br><br>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.  |
| 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 REDACTED 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 REDACTED 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. | 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).<br><br>Detailed assessments are 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   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| TA_0093_007_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 12                     |                              | When the Cuadrilla fracking was in operation (before protestors successfully lobbied for work to be ceased) we felt small earth tremors in our houses even though we are a few miles away. Any activity involving major drilling under our houses will be met with huge opposition unless you can guarantee there will be no noise pollution or vibration and no damage to houses which already shake when lorries drive past. | <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/streams). 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: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions (document reference F3.1) of the ES.</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).</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_0098_002_081123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.1                          | Lots of flood areas which will only be made worse by this project  | <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 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_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.   | <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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | groundwater management plan (document reference J1.9) includes measures in relation to drainage.  |
| TA_0102_003_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 2                      |                              | <p>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.</p> <p>the noise would also impact the horses as they have much more sensitive hearing than us.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>i cant imagine losing any land to pipes etc, the land we are on is marshy 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>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).</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> |
| TA_0102_004_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      |                              | <p>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.</p> <p>the noise would also impact the horses as they have much more sensitive hearing than us.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>i cant imagine losing any land to pipes etc, the land we are on is marshy 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>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).</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> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method        | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| TA_0106_006_281023          | S44     | Online feedback form   | 3                      | 3.2                          | The proposed site is quasi marsh land and subject to flooding. Not the ideal place for sinking of cables, perhaps acknowledged by the very shallow proposed submergence. This has been exacerbated by St Annes cancelling improved defences.               | 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).<br>Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2).<br>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_0111_002_131123          | S44     | Hardcopy feedback form | 3                      | 3.1                          | The ground conditions on the Nature Reserve include many ponds - at least 7, one of which is especially lowse in the winter period.  | Ponds have been considered within Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).<br>New ponds are proposed as part of the design.  |
| TA_0112_006_231123          | S44     | Online feedback form   | 3                      | 3.8                          | See above, I am concerned about the level of noise/vibration especially with a disabled person at home. Working from home means any action also impacts on residents jobs. Houses in this area are old and may suffer disproportionately due to their age. | 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).<br>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).  |

## **E1.16.16.2 Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions table of responses (via all other methods)**



**Table E1.16.16.2: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions table of responses (via all other methods)**

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| TA_0001_187_231123          | S42     | Email           | <p>6.1 The proposed cabling route falls within an area of deep peaty soils as identified here. Further evidence required to determine presence of deep peaty soils. Natural England advises that either further information is provided to demonstrate the extent of deep peat in the area of the cable route, or that the proposed developments are amended to avoid any work within these particular areas.</p> <p>Natural England advise that it may be useful to refer to existing borehole data from the British Geological Survey (BGS) but if there is a lack of data across the proposed development site then a peat survey may be required. A peat survey should be undertaken by a soils scientist and should determine the presence of peat, it's depth and the presence of any spoil/waste materials that would impact the restoration ability. Natural England advise that peat surveys are carried out in line with the IUCN peatland programme field protocol</p> <p>6.1 3.9.3.3 and 3.9.5.8</p> <p>Both these sections include list of pre- construction surveys to be undertaken for the caballing routes. The caballing routes fall within the deep peaty soils layer – peat can be damaged from cabling works. In Cheshire to Lancashire, for onshore projects, Natural England request that evidence for any project which may impact peat needs to demonstrate that a) either peat is not present within the area, or b) it cannot be restored. As the proposed cabling route falls within an area of deep peaty soils, Natural England advises that the developer provides information detailing the presence or absence of peat along the cable route. Further information on the location of deep peaty soils can be found here. Natural England do not support the principle of developing on peat. Peat is an irreplaceable asset that once gone is lost for ever and can never be restored to sequester carbon which is difficult to justify in a climate emergency. Natural England advises that any ground works, such as cutting a trench in the peat or drift deposits under or adjacent to the peat will have impacts both on ground water and water levels within the peat.</p> <p>Peat habitat is very sensitive to modification to water levels, this means these works can impact a wide area of the peat mass.</p> <p>Natural England therefore advises that either further information is provided to demonstrate the extent of deep peat in these areas or that the proposed developments are amended to avoid any work within these particular areas.</p> <p>Natural England advises that it may be useful to refer to existing borehole data from the British Geological Survey (BGS) but if there is a lack of data across the proposed development site then aa peat survey may be required. A peat survey should be undertaken by a soils scientist and should determine the presence of peat, it's depth and the presence of any spoil/waste materials that would impact the restoration ability. Natural England advise that peat surveys are carried out in line with the IUCN peatland programme field protocol.</p> | <p>The EIA process has taken into account both existing information (including details of BGS boreholes) and site survey. Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1) sets out details of ground conditions. Peaty soils are considered within Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). This chapter includes details of soil surveys undertaken. 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). The assessment has considered the presence of peaty soils located within the Transmission Assets Order Limits.</p>       |
| TA_0001_194_231123          | S42     | Email           | <p>6.8 There is a lack of consideration of other impacts to Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI, particularly with regards to changes to the water table. Please see comment 6.27 for further detail. Consider changes to the water table at Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI.</p>   | <p>This impact is considered within section 3.11 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).</p>   |
| TA_0001_195_231123          | S42     | Email           | <p>Project Description 6.9</p> <p>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.</p>   | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> |
| TA_0001_196_231123          | S42     | Email           | <p>6.10 3.9.33 and 3.9.5.8. Both these sections include list of pre- construction surveys to be undertaken for the caballing routes. The caballing routes fall within the deep peaty soils layer – peat can be damaged from cabling works. In Cheshire to Lancashire, for onshore projects, Natural England request that evidence for any project which may impact peat needs to demonstrate that a) either peat is not present within the area, or b) it cannot be restored. As the</p>  | <p>The EIA process has taken into account both existing information (including details of BGS boreholes) and site survey. Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1) sets out details of ground conditions. Peaty soils are considered within Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). This chapter includes details of soil surveys undertaken.</p>  |

|                    |         |       |   |  |
|--------------------|---------|-------|---|--|
|                    |         |       | <p>proposed cabling route falls within an area of deep peaty soils, Natural England advises that the developer provides information detailing the presence or absence of peat along the cable route. Further information on the location of deep peaty soils can be found here. Natural England do not support the principle of developing on peat. Peat is an irreplaceable asset that once gone is lost for ever and can never be restored to sequester carbon which is difficult to justify in a climate emergency. Natural England advises that any ground works, such as cutting a trench in the peat or drift deposits, under or adjacent to the peat will have impacts both on ground water and water levels within the peat. Peat habitat is very sensitive to modification to water levels, this means these works can impact a wide area of the peat mass. Natural England therefore advises that either further information is provided to demonstrate the extent of deep peat in these areas or that the proposed developments are amended to avoid any work within these particular areas. Natural England advises that it may be useful to refer to existing borehole data from the British Geological Survey (BGS) but if there is a lack of data across the proposed development site the aa peat survey may be required. A peat survey should be undertaken by a soils scientist and should determine the presence of the peat, its depth and the presence of any spoil/waste materials that would impact the restoration ability. Natural England advise that peat surveys are carried out in line with the IUCN peatland programme field protocol.</p> | <p>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). The assessment has considered the presence of peaty soils located within the Transmission Assets Order Limits. Further detailed information regarding the methodology, scope and results of the soil surveys, which were undertaken by a soils specialist, is provided in Volume 3, Annex 6.2: Soil surveys data technical report of the ES (document reference F3.6.2).</p>  |
| TA_0001_203_231123 | S42     | Email | <p>6.17 N/A –General Comment One of main justification 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 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. The developer should link to any evidence to support the justification it will be less intrusive and limit impacts on ecological receptors.</p>  | <p>This impact is considered within Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES. 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. Direct pipe or microtunnelling is proposed beneath the River Ribble to ensure that there would be no direct impacts on the river habitats. 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.</p> |
| TA_0001_211_231123 | S42     | Email | <p>Identified impacts. 6.25 There is a lack of consideration of other impacts to Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI, particularly with regards to changes to the water table. The SSSI citation highlights “the series of exceptionally large and extensive dune slacks on either side of Clifton Drive North support a wide range of species which vary according to the depth of water and degree of moisture retention in relation to the water table”. Depending on the depth of cable installation the impacts of HDD on the dune water table (i.e., the cable resulting in the dune slacks becoming drier changing the species composition) should be considered. Other impacts such as impacts of dust on the SSSIs (identified in the Air Quality chapter as being features sensitive to dust of medium sensitivity – although ruled out due to HDD methods being used and provided the dust control measures are successfully implemented, the resultant effects of the dust exposure will normally be ‘not significant’). Note nitrogen deposition to SSSIs does not appear to be covered – sand dunes are particularly sensitive to nitrogen deposition which can lead to over stabilisation through the dominance of coarse grasses. An assessment using the Air Pollution Information System (<a href="https://www.apis.ac.uk/">https://www.apis.ac.uk/</a>) should be undertaken. The effects of surface water run-off should also be considered. Consider changes to the water table at Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI. When considering habitats, it would be good to list all the potential pressures/ impacts considered.</p>                                       | <p>Section 3.11.3 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation (document reference F3.3) provides an assessment of impacts to the SSSI, including changes in relation to the water table, changes in air quality from emissions of nitrogen, and the impact of surface runoff and pollution. Volume 3, Annex 9.1: Air quality impacts on ecological receptors of the ES (document reference F3.9.1) which states that impacts are insignificant for all pollutants at designated sites</p>  |
| TA_0004_001_161123 | S42     | Email | <p>Notice of publicising a proposed application for a Development Consent Order for the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms: Transmission Assets Thank you for your notification of 12 October 2023 seeking the views of the Coal Authority on the above. I have checked the site location plan against the information held by the Coal Authority and can confirm that the proposed development site is located outside of the defined coalfield. On this basis, the Planning team at the Coal Authority have no comments to make. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you would like to discuss this matter further.</p>   | <p>The Applicants note your response.</p>  |
| TA_0007_028_231123 | S42/S44 | Email | <p>4. Geo Environmental / Geotechnical Groundwater Environment and Water Resources The application boundary for the transmission assets extends to include sandstone rock, designated as a groundwater source protection zone (SPZ 3). These are used for the abstraction of water for</p>  | <p>Source Protection Zones are described in section 1.6.7 and impacts posed by the Transmission Assets are assessed in section 1.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1). Due to linkages between surface water and groundwater, reference to discussions involving groundwater</p>   |

|                    |         |       |   |   |
|--------------------|---------|-------|---|---|
|                    |         |       | public water supply purposes. We request that the approach to the assessment of the impact on the groundwater environment is considered and agreed with United Utilities.   | will be made within sections 2.11.4 and 2.11.2 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 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 J1). |
| TA_0007_029_231123 | S42/S44 | Email | As a nationally and regionally significant scheme, the applicant should follow 'The Environment Agency's approach to groundwater protection' 1 (hereafter referred to as 'the Environment POF PAgency's approach') in relation to protection of drinking water supply from United Utilities' groundwater abstractions. At the current time we do not have sufficient information in order to be able to assess the impact of the proposed development and associated proposals where these lie within a groundwater source protection zone, or directly overlie an abstracted aquifer, to ensure the proposals 'do not have the potential to cause pollution or harmful disturbance to groundwater flow' and to ensure 'these risks can be reduced to an acceptable level'. We wish to draw attention to Position Statements C1 and C2 of 'The Environment Agency's approach' which state: 'C1 - Nationally or regionally significant schemes The Environment Agency requires the promoters of schemes of national or regional significance to protect groundwater when choosing the location for their activity or development. In the cases where this is not possible due to national or regional interests, the Environment Agency expects to be fully involved in the scheme development to mitigate groundwater risks via EPR where applicable. Promoters are expected (via the environmental impact assessment process) to identify all the potential pollution linkages and apply best available techniques to mitigate the risks. C2 - Non-nationally significant infrastructure schemes In SPZ1 and SPZ2, the Environment Agency will only agree to proposals for infrastructure developments of non-national significance where they do not have the potential to cause pollution or harmful disturbance to groundwater flow or where these risks can be reduced to an acceptable level via EPR if applicable. | The referenced guidance has been used and is listed in paragraph 1.2.3.1 of Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F1.3). Due to linkages between surface water and groundwater, reference to discussions involving groundwater will be made within section 2.6.11.2 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES.  |
| TA_0007_030_231123 | S42/S44 | Email | Where the proposed development impacts on a sensitive location within a SPZ, relating to a drinking water abstraction resource (including those not currently in use for public water supply purposes but may need to be activated in the future), United Utilities may require a 'Hydrogeological Risk Assessment' for the specific borehole abstraction and intersection with the cable route. This risk assessment should form part of the Environmental Statement and identify the pollution and ground disturbance impacts on the SPZ and set out pollution prevention mitigation measures that will be needed, both during construction and during the operational life of the proposed development. The risk assessment should fully consider any related development activities and mitigation. The need for a risk assessment reflects the Environment Agency Position Statement N7 of the aforementioned groundwater protection document. This states: 'N7 - Hydrogeological risk assessment Developers proposing schemes that present a hazard to groundwater resources, quality or abstractions must provide an acceptable hydrogeological risk assessment (HRA) to the Environment Agency and the planning authority. Any activities that can adversely affect groundwater must be considered, including physical disturbance of the aquifer. If the HRA identifies unacceptable risks then the developer must provide appropriate mitigation. If this is not done or is not possible the Environment Agency will recommend that the planning permission is conditioned, or it will object to the proposal.'   | Source Protection Zones are described in section 1.6.7 and impacts posed by the Transmission Assets are assessed in section 1.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1).   |
| 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 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 practise 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_0017_010_231123 | S42/S44 | Email | Policy 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):<br>• National Policy Statements, including for example:<br>o Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1)<br>o National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3)<br>o National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5)<br>• The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF);<br>• Local Plan policies.<br>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:<br>• all elements of the development would be located and designed to avoid or minimise harm to biodiversity, and<br>• adequate mitigation/compensation for any unavoidable impacts, as well as net gains for biodiversity, will be provided. | 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).  |
| TA_0017_014_231123 | S42/S44 | Email | Surveys Survey data submitted with the planning application should be current/up-to-date, in line with recognised guidelines (as summarised above). The survey area should include:<br>• The intended location of the development footprint;<br>• Potential working areas, compounds, storage areas and access routes;<br>• Any land that may be used within the mitigation, compensation or biodiversity net gain proposals (on or off-site);<br>• A suitable buffer distance, taking account of the likely zone of influence and relevant survey guidelines.   | The survey area is the area used for site-specific surveys and is generally defined as a 150 m buffer around the Onshore Order Limits. The 150 m buffer was included to take account of protected species that may occur adjacent or close to the Transmission Assets and to allow for evolution of the boundary during the site selection process. A separate survey area was used for GCN surveys. The GCN survey area is defined as a 250 m buffer around the Onshore Order Limits. Volume 3, Annex 3.8: Great crested newt survey and reptile survey technical report of the ES (document reference F3.3.8) provides further details regarding the GCN survey area. Owing to the iterative design process of the Transmission Assets, some surveys were undertaken further than 150 m from the Onshore Order Limits. Nevertheless, information from these surveys have been included in technical annexes because it provides context regarding the ecological sensitivity of the wider area. |
| 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   | 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   |

|                    |         |       |  |   |
|--------------------|---------|-------|--|---|
|                    |         |       | crossings. In accordance with the Trust's Third Part\:) Works Code of Practice (CoP) Part 2 <a href="https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/business-and-trade/undertaking-works-on-our-property-and-our-code-ofpractice">https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/business-and-trade/undertaking-works-on-our-property-and-our-code-ofpractice</a> 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.  | 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_016_231123 | S42/S44 | Email | 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 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 ma\:) 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. | 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:• 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.   |
| TA_0035_011_221123 | S42/S44 | Email | Contaminated Land: Contaminated ground conditions are currently an unknown risk. Thus it is not possible to advise on mitigation until further information has been provided.  | Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1) sets out effects in relation to existing areas of contamination. The proposed mitigation is set out in section 1.8 of this chapter.  |
| TA_0035_012_221123 | S42/S44 | Email | Groundwater: The impacts of the proposals on groundwater-dependant habitats of Lytham St Annes dunes SSSI have not been assessed.  | Section 3.11.3 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation (document reference F3.3) provides an assessment of impacts to the SSSI, including changes in relation to the water table.   |
| TA_0035_053_221123 | S42/S44 | Email | 1.5.1.8 Issue<br>Lack of clarity regarding where details of permanent pollution measures (ie interceptors) at the substations will be included. The Outline Operational Onshore Substation Drainage Management Plans will consider drainage from a flood risk perspective but there is no mention as to whether these wouldalso detail permanent pollution prevention at these sites.ImpactRisk of pollution to the aquatic environment arising fromuncontained incidents (eg fire breakout) from substation sites.SolutionProvide clarity as to how details regarding permanent pollution measures will be considered and covered.  | Information regarding permanent pollution measures is provided within the Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan (document reference J10).  |
| TA_0035_055_221123 | S42/S44 | Email | 1.5.1.14 Issue<br>The section describing HDD does not include clarity regarding which document will consider the management of effluent arising from HDD (potential contamination with soilconditioners etc), or from any subsequent dewatering activity.ImpactLack of clarity may result in pollution risk to the aquatic environmentSolutionIf no such effluent is expected then this should also be clearly stated.   | Details regarding the trenchless techniques and anticipated effluent are provided within Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description of the ES (document reference F1.3).The Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) sets out measures to control construction impacts, including best practice with regard to the use and storage of oils, chemicals and other wastes. (document reference J1). The CoCP also includes the following documents as annexes - an Outline Bentonite Breakout Plan (Document reference J1.13) and an Outline Pollution Prevention Plan (document reference J1.4).The impacts and effects are assessed in Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2) with regard to surface waters and Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1) with reference to groundwater. |
| TA_0035_056_221123 | S42/S44 | Email | 1.5.1.17 Issue<br>No reference to the presence of emergency spill kits<br>Impact<br>Risk of pollution to the aquatic environment<br>Solution   | Spill kits and emergency procedures are detailed within the Outline Pollution Prevention Plan (document J1.4) which forms part of the Outline CoCP (document reference J1).   |



|                    |         |       |  |  |
|--------------------|---------|-------|--|--|
|                    |         |       | Ensure that either the Onshore Pollution Prevention Plan or the Spillage and Emergency Response Plan mentions the requirement for emergency spill kits to be provided.   |  |
| TA_0035_058_221123 | S42/S44 | Email | <p>CoT10 Issue</p> <p>Unknown geophysical conditions with the potential for unexpected boulders in the underlying Glacial Till under the River Ribble could result in the HDD process to stop or loosedirection.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Lost circulation could result in drilling muds discharged viariver bottom sediments into the River Ribble.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Complete geophysical surveys to understand the relationship of the stratigraphy to be penetrated. (NB previous surveys associated with previous pipeline activity may be available to supplement new research).</p>  | 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.  |
| TA_0035_059_221123 | S42/S44 | Email | <p>CoT30 Issue</p> <p>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 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</p> | 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. |
| TA_0035_060_221123 | S42/S44 | Email | <p>Impact</p> <p>Ground conditions are currently an unknown risk. Thus establishing appropriate mitigation is not possible at this time and the environment is at risk.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Code of construction practice will include '...details of appropriate studies (e.g., Site Investigations) proposed to be undertaken where major HDDs (or other trenchless methodologies) are proposed, during the detailed design stage to confirm ground conditions.</p>   | Existing ground conditions are set out in section 1.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1). The potential for mobilisation of any existing contamination is set out in section 1.11 of that chapter. 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. An Outline Code of Construction Practice is provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1).                             |
| TA_0035_061_221123 | S42/S44 | Email | <p>Table 1.12 Issue</p> <p>A current licensed abstraction has been omitted: 2671353003. ROYAL LYTHAM AND ST ANNES GOLF CLUB LAND HOLDINGS LIMITED (Also not listed in table 1.3 of Volume 3 annex 1.1. Spatially it is close to GWA_03 and 05)</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Not considered further in document.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Include abstraction and update document as required.</p>  | These are not located within the study area and are not therefore discussed further.   |
| TA_0035_062_221123 | S42/S44 | Email | <p>1.5.5.38 Issue</p> <p>Groundwater flow direction is stated as being orientated to the Northeast. This is almost certainly incorrect and will betowards the Ribble.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Likely inaccurate conceptualisation may have affect subsequent assessment of impact of works on abstractions /groundwater dependent features.</p> <p>Solution</p>   | The groundwater flow this relates to is within the sandstone Principal aquifer of the Sherwood Sandstone Group. This is discussed in section 1.6.5 of Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1) . The groundwater flow within the superficial aquifer will be towards the River Ribble.   |

|                    |         |       |  |   |
|--------------------|---------|-------|--|---|
|                    |         |       | Update report to include that the base / natural flow direction is to the Ribble in that part of the aquifer. Then consider any changes needed elsewhere in document.  |   |
| TA_0035_063_221123 | S42/S44 | Email | <p>1.9.9.2 Issue</p> <p>This is not considered correct. Lytham St. Anne's Dunes SSSI itself will be groundwater dependent. The citation states: "The series of exceptionally large and extensive dune slacks on either side of Clifton Drive North support a wide range of species which vary according to the depth of water and degree of moisture retention in relation to the water table."</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Potential impacts on this feature have not been considered or subsequently mitigated.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Regard this feature as being groundwater dependent and consider further. Include ref to Section 1.9.9 in Table 1.25.</p>   | 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). Effects in terms of ecology are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).  |
| TA_0035_064_221123 | S42/S44 | Email | <p>Tables 1.11 1.14/whole document.</p> <p>Issue</p> <p>Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystem (GWDTE) Test for both quantitative and chemical tests. The SSSI at Lytham St Annes is groundwater dependent and will interact with the groundwater. Table 1.11 has scoped these aspects out. Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, Hydrogeology and ground conditions had also overlooked the groundwater interaction of the SSSI.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Potential adverse WFD impacts.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Consider impacts and potential mitigation options for the SSSI at Lytham St Annes.</p>   | 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). Effects in terms of ecology are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).  |
| TA_0035_066_221123 | S42/S44 | Email | <p>CoT04 An Outline Onshore Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) will form part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice, which will be prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. Onshore PPP(s) will be developed in accordance with the Outline Onshore PPP and will include details of emergency spill procedures. Good practice guidance detailed in the Environment Agency's Pollution Prevention Guidance notes (including Pollution Prevention Guidance notes 01, 05, 08 and 21) will be followed where appropriate, or the latest relevant available guidance. Issue Pollution prevention risks have yet to be fully addressed.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>There remains a risk of detrimental impact on the aquatic environment</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Outline onshore pollution prevention plan to be secured in the DCO submission.</p> | An Outline Pollution Prevention Plan has been prepared and submitted as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1.4).  |
| TA_0035_075_221123 | S42/S44 | Email | <p>CoT30 A Contaminated Land and Groundwater Discovery Strategy will be prepared to identify any suspected areas of contamination and any remedial measures which may be required. The strategy will also identify the construction protocol for discovery of any currently unknown contamination and any remedial measures that may be required.</p> <p>Issue</p> <p>Measures required to manage contaminated land and groundwater have yet to be fully addressed</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Risk of pollution to ground and surface water</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Outline Contaminated Land and Groundwater Discovery Strategy to be secured through DCO requirement.</p>   | An Outline Contaminated Land and Groundwater Discovery Strategy has been prepared and is submitted as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1.14). A Preliminary Risk Assessment is provided in Volume 3, Annex 1.1: Phase 1 Geo-Environmental Preliminary Risk Assessment of the ES. Details of the measures proposed to manage contaminated land and groundwater are set out in section 1.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1). |
| TA_0035_077_221123 | S42/S44 | Email | <p>CoT33 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. The CoCP will include best practice measures in relation to air quality that will be applied where human receptors reside within 350 m of works, where required, or where sensitive</p>   | An Outline Dust Management Plan is provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1.2).   |

|                    |         |       |  |   |
|--------------------|---------|-------|--|---|
|                    |         |       | <p>ecological receptors are present within 50 m, as described in Institute of Air Quality guidance Management (IAQM,2014) as appropriate.</p> <p>Issue<br/>Measures required to manage dust and airquality have yet to be fully addressed.</p> <p>Impact<br/>Risk to sensitive ecological receptors from poor air quality.</p> <p>Solution<br/>Outline Dust Management Plan setting out dust and air quality control measures to be appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission.</p>  |   |
| TA_0035_078_221123 | S42/S44 | Email | <p>CoT35, 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. The CoCP will include measures to maintain and address:- 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.</p> <p>Issue<br/>Measures required to manage environmental risks have yet to be fully addressed.</p> <p>Impact<br/>Risk to the environment</p> <p>Solution<br/>Outline versions of various Plans to manage environmental risks to be appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission. See also CoT04 - Onshore pollution prevention plan CoT09 - Drainage Management Plan CoT11 - Operational Onshore Substation Drainage Management plan CoT20 - Construction Fencing Plan CoT26 - Site Waste Management Plan CoT30 - Contaminated Land and Groundwater Discovery Strategy CoT33 - Air Quality CoT73 - Biosecurity Protocol CoT76 - Outline Ecological Management Plan CoT77 - Bentonite Breakout Plan CoT78 - Biosecurity Protocol CoT81 - Soil Management Plan CoT86 - Measures to protect minor watercourses</p> | <p>See the Outline CoCP (document reference J1) and the following plans submitted as part of the application for development consent: •Outline Communications Plan (document reference J1.1) •Outline Dust Management Plan (document reference J1.2) •Outline Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (document reference J1.3) •Outline Pollution Prevention Plan (document reference J1.4) •Outline Public Rights of Way (PRoW) Management Plan (document reference J1.5) •Outline Site Waste Management Plan (document reference J1.6) •Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7) •Outline Spillage and Emergency Response Plan (document reference J1.8) •Outline Surface Water and Groundwater Management Plan (document reference J1.9) •Outline Construction Fencing Plan (document reference J1.10) •Outline Construction Artificial Light Emissions Management Plan (document reference J1.11) •Outline Biosecurity Protocol (document reference J1.12) •Outline Bentonite Breakout Plan (document reference J1.13) •Outline Contaminated Land and Groundwater Discovery Strategy (document reference J1.14)</p> |
| TA_0035_080_221123 | S42/S44 | Email | <p>CoT41 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 to inform a site-specific crossing method statement which will also be agreed with the relevant authorities prior to construction.</p> <p>Issue<br/>Measures to manage hydrogeological risk have yet to be fully developed, and relevant locations have yet to be identified.</p> <p>Impact<br/>Risk to the environment</p> <p>Solution<br/>Secure through DCO requirement</p>   | <p>This measure will be secured via CoT41 as a requirement of the DCO.</p>  |
| 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<br/>Measures to protect water quality and flow during trenched crossing of minor watercourses have yet to be fully developed.</p> <p>Impact<br/>Risk to the environment</p>  | <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.</p>   |



|                    |         |       |   |   |
|--------------------|---------|-------|---|---|
|                    |         |       | <p>Solution<br/>Measures to be included in Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission.</p>  |   |
| TA_0035_090_221123 | S42/S44 | Email | <p>CoT94<br/>The Outline Code of Construction practice (CoCP) will be submitted as part of the application for the development consent. CoCP(s) will be developed in accordance with the outline CoCP. The outline CoCP will include details of appropriate studies (e.g. Site Investigations) proposed to be undertaken where major HDDs (or other trenchless methodologies) are proposed, during the detailed design stage to confirm ground conditions.<br/>Issue<br/>Detailed understanding of localised groundconditions has yet to be completed.<br/>Impact<br/>Unknown ground conditions may impact on HDD activity resulting in detrimental impacts on the environment.<br/>Solution<br/>Secure through DCO requirement</p> | This is a standard approach to project development and for detailed site investigation work to be undertaken post-consent to inform the specific construction approach in any location.   |
| TA_0035_093_221123 | S42/S44 | Email | <p>CoT103 Where suspected contamination is present and piling is proposed, where required a detailed piling risk assessment will be developed prior to the commencement of construction. Consultation with the Environment Agency will be sought.<br/>Issue<br/>Relevant locations, and measures required to prevent pollution of controlled waters have yet to be fully developed<br/>Impact<br/>Potential for groundwaters pollution pathways to be created.<br/>Solution<br/>Secure through DCO requirement</p>  | This is a standard approach to project development and for detailed site investigation work to be undertaken post-consent to inform the specific construction approach in any location.   |
| TA_0035_094_221123 | S42/S44 | Email | <p>CoT104 Where the onshore export cable corridor and/or 400 kV grid connection corridor crosses sites of particular sensitivity, which cannot be avoided and has the potential to impact protected species populations, a mitigation strategy will be devised and agreed with relevant stakeholders.<br/>Issue<br/>Measures to protect water quality and flow during trenched crossing of minorwatercourses have yet to be fully developed.<br/>Impact<br/>Risk of impact on sensitive species orhabitats<br/>Solution<br/>An Outline Mitigation Strategy to be included in DCO submission.</p>  | Measures to protect water quality are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1). The potential impacts on habitats and species are set out in section 3.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).  |
| TA_0043_003_211123 | S44     | Email | <p>3 My farm soil is heavy, and clay based. It is easily damaged, particularly when worked in the wet. The structure of the clay soil takes thousands of years to develop and has been carefully managed by generations of custodians. The soil structure consists of microscopic fissures and larger peds. This structure is destroyed by working at depth. Genuine reinstatement is impossible. My previous experience on a smaller scale project shows a large reduction in yield of the affected area and close surrounding areas. It is inevitable that there will be some mixing of subsoil and topsoil and this also causes reduction in crop yield.</p>   | The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets on agricultural land use 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). This includes consideration of the effects of all elements of the Transmission Assets, including onshore substations on the viability existing farming businesses. 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. Following cable installation, land would be reinstated to its previous condition. An Outline Soil Management Plan is provided as part of the application for development consent. The Applicants are committed to ongoing dialogue with land owners. |
| TA_0043_019_211123 | S44     | Email | <p>19 Water pollution: Aside from the risks from contractors, staff and vehicles, our clay forms a suspension in water when damaged in the wet. This can take weeks or months to settle. This suspended clay is damaging to fish and many forms of riverine and marine life. This will inevitably end up int the River Ribble. In a large body of water suspended clay has a massively deleterious impact on photosynthetic activity – this will damage water-based food chains.</p>  | Impacts and effects on water, including the River Ribble, are set out in section 2.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Measures to control runoff during construction are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).  |

|                    |     |       |   |  |
|--------------------|-----|-------|---|--|
| TA_0044_006_211123 | S44 | Email | 6. Huge problems with drainage both in field, and ditches, as this project could last several years, damage to soil structure, compaction, localised flooding etc, etc  | 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 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). 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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction. As part of the Heads of Terms, Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants, and alongside a drainage consultant will discuss existing drainage systems with interests so that a detailed drainage plan and design can be agreed for both pre and post construction. There will be provisions relating to compensation so as to address any impacts to the farming business. |
| 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_0130_003_191123 | S44 | Email | We also know from past experience disruption to land, digging drilling etc in the area, has driven vermin into our homes! It has also caused flooding and water tables to rise. The question of noise from transmitting that amount of electricity through the corridors is also unclear. A local electrical expert that installs commercially on a large scale doubts it will be silent. | 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_0140_004_201123 | S44 | Email | Also the structural impact on our properties caused by you laying huge cables close to us, subsidence has occurred on the road next to ours and was caused by an excavation.  | 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. 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_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> |
| TA_0184_001_221123 | S44 | Email | <p>We totally object to the proposed landfall area for this scheme. We totally object to the disruption this work will cause. The ground that the coastal dunes housing is built on will be badly affected as this land is not stable. Dunes are not stable. We believe this scheme puts the fabric of our house in danger. The area of coastal dunes housing does not have suitable roads for heavy plant either in structure or capacity.</p>  | <p>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). 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: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions (document reference F3.1) of the ES. 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.</p>  |
| TA_0185_005_221123 | S44 | Email | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Running Sand has been found in the area where the Morecambe 2 site has been proposed.</li> <li>• Slurry spreading area would be decreased and create an environmental problem.</li> <li>• The farm</li> </ul>   | <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</p>  |

|                    |     |       |  |   |
|--------------------|-----|-------|--|---|
|                    |     |       | <p>employs from the local community a team of 5 people as well as employing local subcontractors which will have a direct impact on the local economy. • The farm is part of a stewardship scheme for managing hedgerows and biodiversity gain. • Bio security issues and contamination between farm units would have detrimental effects. • Management of livestock during the construction period, when contractors come on there is potential hazard of livestock escaping. (This has been experienced in the past with other schemes).</p>   | <p>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>   |
| TA_0186_002_221123 | S44 | Email | <p>We were only notified of the substation locations on the 9th October and a meeting was demanded on the Friday the 13th October 2023 leaving insufficient time to prepare and understand the magnitude of the impact of the substation location on our farm. This was declined and a meeting was held on the 26th October 2023 where we pointed out the following observations: • Running Sand has been found at the Morecambe 2 site in previous years.</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. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_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 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.</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 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_0187_003_221123 | S44 | Email | <p>We have been away on holiday but, on speaking to our neighbours, we feel we have to very strongly object to these proposals. We cannot stress our concerns strongly enough and we have the backing also of our MP Mark Menzies who has been very vocal in his opposition of this project. We may also add that locally the fracking was brought to a halt due to minor earthquakes in the area and the size of this project is not only unimaginable but totally unacceptable.</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</p>   |

|                    |     |       |   |  |
|--------------------|-----|-------|---|--|
|                    |     |       |   | 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_0189_010_221123 | S44 | Email | 7. Any land that was used as a cable corridor would be useless from an agricultural perspective for at least 30 years afterwards due to the damage to the soil, despite developers saying that it would be reinstated properly. The land and soil have taken years of improvement and careful management to create the productive land that we farm today.  | 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 (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_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 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.   | 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 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_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 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. | 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.  |



|                    |     |       |  |   |
|--------------------|-----|-------|--|---|
| TA_0202_003_221123 | S44 | Email | <p>Land Issues We once built a slurry store at our old farm (REDACTED) and we had to pile down 40ft to maintain some stability. Please tell me how you are going to stone and make access road stable on this type of Moss Land. You will sink. Look at the link road they are building on Wild Road and how many years that has been going on. They are struggling to get it stable. There is very little clay across your routes and some of it is quite tidal underneath the ground. In some places if we leave machinery on the land in places the machine can sink. At Queensway before development took place the Farm manager could put fencing posts in by hand all you had to do was push them in. Cypress point in our books was christened "sinking city". Once you take the topsoil off the land you then hit a soil structure we know as blue billy. It is a grey sort of clay structure which is like a jelly. If you bring this to the surface with a plough it sets like concrete and is unfarmable, so again how are you going to reinstate a field of that calibre. There is also running sand in many of the fields. This land used to be marshy bog land if not tidal. There was boat moorings by REDACTED on the A583. If you are putting a cable in no matter how small or big, please tell me how you are going to stop it from rising to the top. All the cables rise to the surface from a depth. We have often ploughed through the Penwortham communication cable whilst we have farmed this land. The other problem would be Moss Stocks (ancient fallen trees) which invariably rise to the surface. The cable from your literature will be laid at 1.2 – 1.5 meters this is not deep enough and will rise, so think again! Were paid to have good soil structure with SFI payments with no compaction under cross compliance legislation. If you compact the land by driving heavy machinery with roadways on it, this will be lost and maybe lose money for being out of production and not being able to grow food for the country, whatever type of agricultural business you are in.</p> | <p>Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6) includes details of soil surveys undertaken. 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).</p>   |
| TA_0225_005_231123 | S44 | Email | <p>Unsuitable Ground Conditions There are pockets of running sand to the north of the farmstead in the locality of the proposed Morecambe substation Option 2 site which will also affect any cable route proposed in this area.</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_0226_005_231123 | S44 | Email | <p>Unsuitable Ground Conditions There are pockets of running sand to the north of the farmstead in the locality of the proposed Morecambe substation Option 2 site which will also affect any cable route proposed in this area.</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_0234_005_231123 | S44 | Email | <p>Unsuitable Ground Conditions There are pockets of running sand to the north of the farmstead in the locality of the proposed Morecambe substation Option 2 site which will also affect any cable route proposed in this area.</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> |



## E1.16.17 Hydrology and flood risk table of responses

## E1.16.17.1 Hydrology and flood risk table of responses (via feedback form)

**Table E1.16.17.1: Hydrology and flood risk 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 (3.2; Hydrology and Flood Risk) 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_002_231123          | S42     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.1                          | There are some SSSI areas for geology in the in/around the area. Superficial deposits in many locations consist have bands of peat which are of value as carbon sink - disturbance, including compression of peat will have a detrimental effect on localised groundwater which is rising in some places and affecting some properties. Compressed, dried out peat oxidises and makes the peat useless and locked in carbon would be released. What mitigation measures are proposed to alleviate this?  | Peaty soils are considered within Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). This chapter includes details of soil surveys undertaken. 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). The assessment has considered the presence of peaty soils located within the Transmission Assets Order Limits.  |
| TA_0050_003_231123          | S42     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.2                          | See above<br><i>(There are some SSSI areas for geology in the in/around the area. Superficial deposits in many locations consist have bands of peat which are of value as carbon sink - disturbance, including compression of peat will have a detrimental effect on localised groundwater which is rising in some places and affecting some properties. Compressed, dried out peat oxidises and makes the peat useless and locked in carbon would be released. What mitigation measures are proposed to alleviate this?)</i>  | Peaty soils are considered within Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). This chapter includes details of soil surveys undertaken. 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). The assessment has considered the presence of peaty soils located within the Transmission Assets Order Limits.  |
| TA_0050_004_231123          | S42     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.3                          | What proposals to offset BNG, Carbon and flood mitigation measures need to be made.  | 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_0051_002_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.2                          | The natural drainage of the land is already working to its maximum capacity, and any disruption to this natural process would severely impact our properties with an unacceptable risk of flooding. Although it is proposed that the transmission cable corridor would be re-instated, studies have suggested that it could take up to 40 years for the disturbed land to return to its natural state.   | 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 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> <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.</p>   |
| TA_0056_014_141123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.2                          | <p>As previously stated<br/> <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_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.</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 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</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | (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: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions (document reference F3.1) of the ES.  |
| TA_0060_005_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.2                          | The sand dunes are a natural projective (sic) barrier from floods from rising sea levels.  | 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_0073_001_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.2                          | Because here in REDACTED we are classed as a flood plain as we are very low lying and very poor drainage in the area on to Main River, the water table is very high and will require de watering by the use of well points for the excavation for the cables. We are concerned that this could cause settlement to neighbouring properties should it be close to the rear of REDACTED, and possible flooding | 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 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. |
| TA_0074_003_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      |                              | Not enough detail given but I am concerned that the interference with dunes will pose a flood risk.  | 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_0074_005_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.2                          | Any interference in dunes is a flood risk  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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 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)   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | 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_0078_004_051123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.2                          | The whole of this area is marshy and a flood risk. We are concerned that opening channels for cables will create weaknesses and enable seawater to come inland and magnify these risks.  | Flood risk is considered in the Flood Risk Assessment (Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood risk assessment of the ES, document reference F3.2.3). This includes consideration of coastal flood risk. All land used to install cables would be reinstated following construction.  |
| TA_0080_001_201123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | <p>Concern about noise from the wind farm should the distance to the shore be too close.</p> <p>Concern about contamination of bathing water during the development of the project . This is an area of tourism with swimming, windsurfing and families enjoying the beach .</p> | <p>In regards to noise, 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.</p> <p>Increased suspended sediment concentrations and associated deposition affecting recreational diving sites and designated bathing water site is assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 9: Other sea users of the ES (document reference F2.9). This assessment concludes a negligible significance.</p> <p>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 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.</p> |
| TA_0080_003_201123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      |                              | I am concerned that the installation of the underground cable could compromise sea defences and flood our homes . I am concerned that existing drainage infrastructure could be affected by construction.  | <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.</p>   |
| TA_0080_004_201123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.2                          | Concerned about sea defences being compromised by the development and our homes being flooded.   | <p>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.</p> <p>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).</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
| TA_0080_009_201123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 5                      |                              | <p>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.</p> <p>I am also concerned about the size and the location of the transition joint boxes. I would like more information please.</p> <p>I'm also concerned about the impact on the habitats of the nature reserve bordering our estate .</p> <p>Also we have concerns about the windfarm development causing radar disruption at Blackpool airport and safety issues.</p>   | <p>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.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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).</p>  |
| TA_0080_010_201123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 6                      |                              | <p>We have concerns about the effect on drainage infrastructure .</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.</p>  |
| TA_0084_003_091123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.2                          | <p>Yes a big worry</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 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> <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. 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> |
| TA_0085_001_191123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      |                              | <p>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:</p> <p>Concerns about the following:</p> <p>1) The impact of the wide corridor immediately next to our properties, but also will it go under our land?</p> <p>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!</p> <p>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</p> | <p>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).</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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>4) Vermin - we know from other local digging, drilling that this has driven vermin into our homes!</p> <p>5) Noise from the amount of electricity being transmitted right by our homes.</p> <p>6) Impact on the local wildlife in the area</p> <p>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</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 specific 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 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 REDACTED</p> | <p>consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase.</p>   |
| TA_0085_002_191123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.1                          | <p>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</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)</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_0085_003_191123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.2                          | <p>As above flooding - dykes and land, and rising water table issues<br/>(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</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</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <i>using) - activity could cause flooding and or blockages. Also potential rise in the water table which is already a concern in the area)</i>  | reference F3.2).<br>Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2)<br>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.   |
| 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 , 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. 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. 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_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"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- It feels like someone has just looked at a map and decided these are the easiest places, with little other consideration.</li> <li>- Your website is hard to navigate and does not provide large scale detailed maps. It is difficult to determine exact proposed areas.</li> <li>- There has been little consideration of potential flood risks and lack of information to local residents about how this would be managed.</li> <li>- There is no information about why any Fylde or Blackpool Council</li> </ul>  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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.<br>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                    |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p>enterprise zones or brown field sites have not been considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- There is no information about how any access to the sites would be obtained, and no assessment about impact on local traffic and roads.</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- This is an area of quite countryside and would involve significant loss of a local amenity and change to the local environment.</li> <li>- Potential loss of value to local property.</li> <li>- Two large sub stations are proposed quite near to each other, making a significant impact on the local amenity.</li> <li>- 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</li> <li>- I have attended public consultation meetings which have been poorly presented with representatives being poorly prepared and unable to answer most questions</li> </ul> | <p>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> |
| 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"> <li>- selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets</li> <li>- refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received.</li> </ul> <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>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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase.   |
| TA_0092__017_151123         | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      |                              | Need to understand if there will be an impact on water tables - any potential to cause flood risk to the area - particularly at the landfall area - which is in relatively close proximity to the LEHQ (Energy) College campus - based at the Blackpool Enterprise Zone, alongside a number of other businesses serving the local community   | This area lies outside the Transmission Assets Order Limits and no impacts are predicted.   |
| TA_0092__019_151123         | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.2                          | Measures to be taken to mitigate flood risk   | <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 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_0093_005_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.9                          | Linked to traffic question 3.7 above - As a resident on REDACTED, REDACTED my house is on the main road opposite the beach. 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 and resulting CO2 fumes in our gardens and houses. If the Wind Farm work lasted weeks or months I would be concerned about the damage to our health as a result. | <p>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.</p> <p>The assessment indicates that there would be no significant effects arising from air quality emissions from traffic during the construction or decommissioning phases.</p> <p>Effects during the operational phases are not likely and have been scoped out in agreement with the Planning Inspectorate.</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)). 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> |
| TA_0094_004_061123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.2                          | The area is marshland and already prone to flooding. I'm concerned disturbing the land may create a bigger problem.   | <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 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> <p>The Applicants through Dalcour Maclaren and appointed drainage specialists will engage with landowners regarding pre-construction</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | 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_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 and experience as residents situated closest to the monstrous constructions being proposed | <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). 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).</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_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  | <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</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | will actually see and experience as residents situated closest to the monstrous constructions being proposed   | <p>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).</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_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 and experience as residents situated closest to the monstrous constructions being proposed | <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). 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).</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> |

| 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_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 | <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). 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).</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_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 and experience as residents situated closest to the monstrous constructions being proposed | <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). Visualisations have been presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | <p>Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 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> |
| TA_0097_005_171123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.2                          | We already having bad flooding in this area  | <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 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_0098_003_081123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.2                          | As above.<br>Horrendous flooding occurs in these areas every year when we have heavy rain  | <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 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_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. | <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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | <p>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.</p>   |
| TA_0099_003_081123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.2                          | I have grave concerns over the already sodden / waterlogged nature of the ground in area REDACTED that I cannot support your proposal.  | <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 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> <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.</p>  |
| TA_0252_002_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.2                          | <p>The project proposes to lay the electrical cabling up to 1.5m deep. This is not deep enough to go underneath the main drainage dykes which can be deeper in some instances. This will cause a bund in the dykes and prevent water drainage. The field drainage systems will be destroyed and even when they are replaced and made good the disturbed soil will settle and not drain.</p> <p>Once the cables have (sic) been dug in situ the predominately clay soils on the farm will be prone to flooding.</p>  | <p>The depths provided are indicative - cables depths can be increased where obstacles are present, if required. The Applicants are committed to reinstating all land used on a temporary basis during construction.</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</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | <p>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 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_0102_005_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.2                          | we already have bad flooding in newton and surrounding areas due to developments and water run off   | <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 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_0106_006_281023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.2                          | The proposed site is quasi marsh land and subject to flooding. Not the ideal place for sinking of cables, perhaps acknowledged by the very shallow proposed submergence. This has been exacerbated by St Annes cancelling improved defences. | <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_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  | <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:</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | 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_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. |
| 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,   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | 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_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  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_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 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   |

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



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method        | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' 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. |
| 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. |
| TA_0111_003_131123          | S44     | Hardcopy feedback form | 3                      | 3.2                          | Flood risk could increase during construction in the landfall area.   | 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | reference F3.2).<br>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.   |
| 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. 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. | 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).<br>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).<br>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).<br>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).<br>Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2).<br>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.<br><br>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_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.   | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              |  | <p>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> |

## E1.16.17.2 Hydrology and flood risk table of responses (via all other methods)



**Table E1.16.17.2: Hydrology and flood risk table of responses (via all other methods)**

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' 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. |
| TA_0001_193_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.7 As the proposed installation method for to avoid Lytham St. Anne's SSSI is HDD, it is felt that the developer has not fully considered the Maximum Design Scenario (MDS) for this designated site. Please see comment 6.12 for further detail. A full baseline assessment of Lytham St. Anne's Dunes SSSI should be undertaken, and presented within the submitted ES, so that should the worst-case scenario occur (i.e. HDD is not possible) sufficient ecological data is available to inform/ develop suitable mitigation measures. In addition, it could be used as a baseline for post-construction monitoring (and a means to determine recovery). Please see comment 6.12 for further detail.   | Direct pipe trenchless installation is proposed in this location and is the basis for the assessment of impacts on dune slacks provided in section 3.11.2 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). Further data on the distribution and status of SSSI interest features that is necessary to inform the ES has been obtained from existing reports prepared on behalf of Lancashire Wildlife Trust and Our Future Coasts, and project-specific national vegetation classification (NVC) surveys have been carried out to confirm or update the findings of these reports where necessary. Crossing techniques at the sand dunes at Lytham St. Anne's are presented 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_0001_194_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.8 There is a lack of consideration of other impacts to Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI, particularly with regards to changes to the water table. Please see comment 6.27 for further detail. Consider changes to the water table at Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI.  | This impact is considered within section 3.11 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).  |
| TA_0001_198_231123          | S42     | Email           | Natural England's Position on Worst Case Scenario or Scenarios 6.12 Vol3; Chp 3 Table 3.11, Table 3:15 The developer recognises Lytham St. Anne's Dunes as a SSSI (Table 3.11) and it has been taken forward as an Important Ecological Feature (Table 3.15). However, as the proposed installation method is HDD it is felt the developer has not fully considered the MDS (Table 3.16) for this designated site. The current assessment for Lytham St. Anne's Dunes SSSI (para 3.9.2.8 - 3.9.2.11) notes "During construction the Transmission Assets will commit to avoiding impacts on the Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI, as the cables will be installed beneath this habitat via HDD (or other trenchless techniques) and open trenching techniques would not be used within this habitat. Accordingly, there will be no temporary or permanent loss of this habitat type. The magnitude of impact is therefore, considered to be no change." The developer goes on to note that while the sensitivity of the habitat is High, the significance of effect is no effect. However, from experience of similar projects Natural England know that on occasions HDD can fail, or the proposed development design changes and for example Transition Joint Bays need to be moved (which presumably currently will be situated on the beach)/ or additional vehicle access is required. In such scenarios by excluding any effect early in the assessment process there is a lack of detail later on if the installation methods change. Similarly full consideration of impacts should HDD not be undertaken in saltmarsh along the river Ribble (part of the Ribble Estuary SSSI). A full baseline assessment of Lytham St. Anne's Dunes SSSI should be undertaken so that should the worst-case scenario occur (i.e. HDD is not possible) sufficient ecological data is available to inform/ develop suitable mitigation measures. In | 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 likelihood of collapse that is associated with cable installation using horizontal directional drilling (HDD). The Works Plans submitted with the application for development consent (and accompanying description) allow only for direct pipe in this location. Therefore, the MDS that has been used is considered to be correct. Further data on the distribution and status of SSSI interest features that is necessary to inform the ES has been obtained from existing reports prepared on behalf of Lancashire Wildlife Trust and Our Future Coasts, and NVC surveys have been carried out to confirm or update the findings of these reports where necessary. CoT41 states that where the onshore export cable corridor or 400 kV grid connection cable corridor crosses sites of particular sensitivity, including Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI, a hydrogeological risk assessment will be undertaken to inform a site-specific crossing method statement which will also be agreed with the   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>addition, it could be used as a baseline for post-construction monitoring (and a means to determine recovery). Baseline surveys of Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI should include mapping to NVC level of the dune habitats present, with supporting quadrat sampling. Quadrat sampling should be sufficient in coverage to ensure all community types are sampled. The SSSI citation notes that the site support classic features of dune formation and ecological succession including the widest range of foredune, yellow dune, dune grassland, acid dune grassland, dune scrub and dune slack habitats found anywhere along the Fylde Coast. The site is botanically diverse with a number of rare or scarce plant species. Use of up-to-date aerial photography taken at the time of the NVC survey would be preferable. The developer should undertake a cable burial risk assessment for all the HDD work (including Lytham St. Anne's Dunes SSSI and the River Ribble (part of the Ribble Estuary SSSI) informed by geotechnical investigations. This should include an outline burial cable specification and installation plan which has a pollution* and contingency plan. This would help determine the likelihood (degree of confidence) of success of HDD at the given locations. *Note a Bentonite breakout plan is mentioned for the River Ribble but not for Lytham St. Annes Dunes</p>   | <p>relevant authorities prior to construction. The risk of bentonite breakout at Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI 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).</p>   |
| TA_0001_203_231123          | S42     | Email           | <p>6.17 N/A –General Comment One of main justification 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 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. The developer should link to any evidence to support the justification it will be less intrusive and limit impacts on ecological receptors.</p>  | <p>This impact is considered within Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES. 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. Direct pipe or microtunnelling is proposed beneath the River Ribble to ensure that there would be no direct impacts on the river habitats. 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.</p> |
| TA_0001_211_231123          | S42     | Email           | <p>Identified impacts. 6.25 There is a lack of consideration of other impacts to Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI, particularly with regards to changes to the water table. The SSSI citation highlights “the series of exceptionally large and extensive dune slacks on either side of Clifton Drive North support a wide range of species which vary according to the depth of water and degree of moisture retention in relation to the water table”. Depending on the depth of cable installation the impacts of HDD on the dune water table (i.e., the cable resulting in the dune slacks becoming drier changing the species composition) should be considered. Other impacts such as impacts of dust on the SSSIs (identified in the Air Quality chapter as being features sensitive to dust of medium sensitivity – although ruled out due to HDD methods being used and provided the dust control measures are successfully implemented, the resultant effects of the dust exposure will normally be ‘not significant’). Note nitrogen deposition to SSSIs does not appear to be covered – sand dunes are particularly sensitive to nitrogen deposition which can lead to over stabilisation through the dominance of coarse grasses. An assessment using the Air Pollution Information System (<a href="https://www.apis.ac.uk/">https://www.apis.ac.uk/</a>) should be undertaken. The effects of surface water run-off should also be considered. Consider changes to the water table at Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI. When considering habitats, it would be good to list all the potential pressures/ impacts considered.</p> | <p>Section 3.11.3 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation (document reference F3.3) provides an assessment of impacts to the SSSI, including changes in relation to the water table, changes in air quality from emissions of nitrogen, and the impact of surface runoff and pollution. Volume 3, Annex 9.1: Air quality impacts on ecological receptors of the ES (document reference F3.9.1) which states that impacts are insignificant for all pollutants at designated sites</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</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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | 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.   | 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).  |
| 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<br>2) Environment Agency Prediction of Flood Risk Forecast for 2050 for the Ribble Estuary  | The Applicants note your response.  |
| TA_0007_017_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 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. | 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. |
| TA_0007_018_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 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.   | 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).   |
| TA_0007_019_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Impact on Watercourses<br>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.   | 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.  |
| TA_0007_020_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 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.   | 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  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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).  |
| TA_0007_021_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 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 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.  | 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 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   | 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)).   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | 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.   |  |
| TA_0007_028_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 4. Geo Environmental / Geotechnical Groundwater Environment and Water Resources The application boundary for the transmission assets extends to include sandstone rock, designated as a groundwater source protection zone (SPZ 3). These are used for the abstraction of water for public water supply purposes. We request that the approach to the assessment of the impact on the groundwater environment is considered and agreed with United Utilities.   | Source Protection Zones are described in section 1.6.7 and impacts posed by the Transmission Assets are assessed in section 1.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1). Due to linkages between surface water and groundwater, reference to discussions involving groundwater will be made within sections 2.11.4 and 2.11.2 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 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 J1).  |
| TA_0007_029_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | As a nationally and regionally significant scheme, the applicant should follow 'The Environment Agency's approach to groundwater protection' 1 (hereafter referred to as 'the Environment POF PAgency's approach') in relation to protection of drinking water supply from United Utilities' groundwater abstractions. At the current time we do not have sufficient information in order to be able to assess the impact of the proposed development and associated proposals where these lie within a groundwater source protection zone, or directly overlie an abstracted aquifer, to ensure the proposals 'do not have the potential to cause pollution or harmful disturbance to groundwater flow' and to ensure 'these risks can be reduced to an acceptable level'. We wish to draw attention to Position Statements C1 and C2 of 'The Environment Agency's approach' which state: 'C1 - Nationally or regionally significant schemes The Environment Agency requires the promoters of schemes of national or regional significance to protect groundwater when choosing the location for their activity or development. In the cases where this is not possible due to national or regional interests, the Environment Agency expects to be fully involved in the scheme development to mitigate groundwater risks via EPR where applicable. Promoters are expected (via the environmental impact assessment process) to identify all the potential pollution linkages and apply best available techniques to mitigate the risks. C2 - Non-nationally significant infrastructure schemes In SPZ1 and SPZ2, the Environment Agency will only agree to proposals for infrastructure developments of non-national significance where they do not have the potential to cause pollution or harmful disturbance to groundwater flow or where these risks can be reduced to an acceptable level via EPR if applicable. | The referenced guidance has been used and is listed in paragraph 1.2.3.1 of Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F1.3). Due to linkages between surface water and groundwater, reference to discussions involving groundwater will be made within section 2.6.11.2 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES.   |
| 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 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.'  | 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 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 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: • 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 |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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_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 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 <a href="https://www.unitedutilities.com/my-account/your-bill/our-household-charges-20212022/31T">https://www.unitedutilities.com/my-account/your-bill/our-household-charges-20212022/31T</a> 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.   | The Applicants note your response.  |
| TA_0016_001_211123          | S42     | Email           | Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms: Transmission Assets Statutory Consultation Lancashire County Council is the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) for area involving this development. We have a role in the planning process as a statutory consultee for major development with surface water drainage, under the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. We also regulate consentable activities to ordinary watercourses through 'ordinary watercourse consent' under the Land Drainage Act 1991 (as amended). In this instance, the development is classified as a 'Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project' under the Planning Act 2008. Therefore, this development is exempt from applying for 'normal' planning permission from the Local Planning Authority as this will be determined by the Planning Inspectorate. It is also exempt from applying for ordinary watercourse consent from the county council as this will be managed through the Development Consent Order process. Notwithstanding this, the Lead Local Flood Authority wishes to provide the following comments and advice about the development proposals.   | The Applicants note your response.  |
| TA_0016_002_211123          | S42     | Email           | Previous comments made by the Lead Local Flood Authority The Lead Local Flood Authority has been engaged with this project at various stage of development. Through our LLFA Planning Advice Service we have liaised with the project team in relation to onshore matters to provide advice aimed at managing and mitigating the impact on surface water flood risk and ordinary watercourses in Lancashire.  | The Applicants note your response. Lancashire County Council has been included in Expert Working Groups throughout the project. Standard protective provisions for the benefit of the Lead Local Flood Authority have been included in Schedule 10, Part 11 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1).   |
| TA_0016_003_211123          | S42     | Email           | Proposed works to ordinary watercourses Any impact on ordinary watercourses should be identified, assessed, minimised and mitigated appropriately irrespective of whether the works impacting an ordinary watercourse are temporary or permanent and according to site-specific circumstances. Existing watercourses should be protected and, where appropriate, enhanced through the site layout, for example, naturalization, de-culverting, and the creation of riparian habitats. The culverting of any ordinary watercourses should be avoided. When designing a site layout, it is critical to consider the future ownership of and access to any on-site watercourses. The site layout must provide safe access to all on-site watercourses for maintenance purposes. No development should occur within 8 metres from the bank top of any ordinary watercourse to achieve this. This includes the construction of structures such as walls and fences and any activity during the construction phases of development. Failure to provide appropriate access and maintenance arrangements for ordinary watercourses can increase flood risk over the lifetime of the development, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework | Assessment of the impacts 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 presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are presented within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Volume 1, Annex 3.2: Onshore crossing schedule of the ES (document reference F1.3.2) presents crossing techniques of Ordinary Watercourses. An Outline CoCP (document reference J1) is submitted as part of the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP (document reference J1) includes measures to maintain and address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• flood protection and control measures;</li> <li>• drainage;</li> <li>• pollution prevention;</li> <li>• geology and ground conditions;</li> <li>• ecology and nature conservation (including protected species and invasive species);</li> <li>• historic environment;</li> <li>• soil management;</li> <li>• traffic and transport;</li> <li>• noise management measures;</li> <li>• air quality and dust management;</li> <li>• landscape and visual; and</li> <li>• bentonite breakout plan.</li> </ul> In addition, the Applicants are in discussion with the LLFA regarding protective provisions. |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
| TA_0016_004_211123          | S42     | Email           | <p>Ordinary Watercourse Crossings Open trench watercourse crossings should be avoided wherever possible, with trenchless construction methods such as horizontal directional drilling prioritised to minimise any unwanted effects on the bed and banks of the watercourse, and any disruption to existing flora, fauna and/or habitats. Where open trench watercourse crossings cannot be avoided, then effective construction method statements should be produced to detail, in chronological order, how the works will be undertaken from start to finish. Typically the Lead Local Flood Authority would expect this to consider, as a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How the works will be arranged to ensure there is no increase in flood risk to third parties. All reasonable precautions should be taken during the undertaking of the works so as not to obstruct or impede the flow of the watercourse. If over pumping is used, then this should only be undertaken in a manner that minimises bed disturbance, avoids movement of silt and minimises scour. A suitable screen/strainer should also be provided to prevent fish and other material being drawn in.</li> <li>• How any pollution risks will be managed and dealt with should they occur, i.e. the release of fine sediments and other pollutants into the watercourse during the construction works.</li> <li>• How the bed and banks of the watercourse will be restored once the works are complete. Material used for backfilling must be inert and not contain any material that could potentially leach out into the watercourse. Any landscaping of banks must be restricted to native species only, and invasive species such as Japanese Knotweed, if encountered, must be managed and controlled on site.</li> </ul>  | <p>The following features will be crossed by trenchless techniques not including micro-tunnelling and direct pipe as set out in the Onshore Crossing Schedule submitted as part of the application for the development consent (Volume 1, Annex 3.2: Onshore crossing schedule of the ES (document reference F1.3.2)). Trenchless techniques including micro tunnelling and direct pipe 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.</p>  |
| TA_0016_005_211123          | S42     | Email           | <p>Surface water flood risk and Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) Surface water flood risk should be identified, assessed, minimised and mitigated appropriately in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance through a flood risk assessment. Findings of the flood risk assessment(s) should be used to inform the design of sustainable drainage systems which serve impermeable surfaces, whether permanent or temporary. Surface water flood risk should also be considered during each construction phase, as heavy machinery can compact ground leading to increased surface water runoff. This can have a negative impact on nearby watercourses, such as increased sedimentation which can lead to siltation, poor water quality and an adverse effect on habitats. Surface water runoff from development should not impact on infrastructure such as roads and other infrastructure. If there is any potential for the development to impact the highway, rail or other network, then the suitability of drainage proposals should be discussed with Network Rail and/or the Highway Authority, to ensure the stability of their assets is not negatively affected. The development should maximise the opportunities presented to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding on and off-site, wherever they would be effective, in line with paragraph 161 of the National Planning Policy Framework and paragraphs 062 to 067 of the Planning Practice Guidance. This should be achieved through the design of the sustainable drainage system and, where appropriate, the use of Natural Flood Management techniques. A comprehensive sustainable drainage approach can help to alleviate flood risk as well as managing the impacts where flooding does occur, for example by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximising opportunities for infiltration of surface water through replacement of impermeable surfaces with permeable surfaces;</li> <li>• Maximising opportunities for planting and vegetated areas, in preference to engineered surfaces, to increase evapo-transpiration and provide improvements for biodiversity and wider natural capital benefits; and</li> <li>• Providing additional surface water storage over and above the minimum requirements e.g. an over-sized pond, to accommodate more extreme rainfall events (e.g. 0.5% annual exceedance probability) leading to a more flood/climate resilient electricity infrastructure network. Specifically, appropriate sustainable drainage systems should be incorporated to drain any new impermeable surfaces such as compounds, sub-stations, roads, parking areas etc. SuDS should be designed to be compliant with the requirements set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, the Planning Practice Guidance and the Defra Technical Standards for SuDS. A site-specific 'Operation and Maintenance Manual' for the lifetime of the development of each sustainable drainage component that makes up each sustainable drainage system should be compiled. Typically the Lead Local Flood Authority would expect this to include, as a minimum:</li> <li>• A timetable for its implementation;</li> <li>• Details of the maintenance, operational and access requirement for all SuDS components and connecting drainage structures, including all watercourses and their ownership;</li> <li>• Pro-forma to allow the recording of each inspection and maintenance activity, as well as allowing any faults to be recorded and actions taken to rectify issues;</li> <li>• The arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage scheme in perpetuity;</li> <li>4• Details of financial management including arrangements for the replacement of major components at the end of the manufacturer's recommended design life;</li> <li>• Details of whom to contact if pollution is seen in the system or if it is not working correctly; and</li> <li>• Means of access for maintenance and easements. Thereafter the sustainable drainage systems should be retained, managed, and maintained in accordance with the approved details. In Lancashire we provide general advice and support on SuDS design through the</li> </ul> | <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). 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 the Outline CoCP (document reference J1). 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 drainage guidance notes in consultation with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority (Lancashire County Council).</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | Lancashire SuDS Pro-forma and accompanying guidance which we recommend are used in finalising SuDS designs and for consistency in expectations in Lancashire.  |  |
| TA_0016_006_211123          | S42     | Email           | Natural Flood Management Opportunities Natural flood management techniques work with natural processes to protect, restore and emulate the natural functions of catchments, floodplains, rivers and the coast. They aim to manage the sources and pathways of flood waters whilst providing wider benefits to people, wildlife and the environment. Examples include:• Land management such as removing impermeable surfacing to maximise infiltration, planting trees to increase evapo-transpiration, or making green space where flood waters are most likely to flow or collect, or where rivers and their meanders are likely to migrate;• Watercourse restoration such as removing culverts and other capacity restrictions, reintroducing meanders to provide additional storage, or naturalising river beds and banks to slow the flow.  | Ecology and landscape mitigation is proposed within the permanent substation sites and these measures are set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2) and the Outline Ecological Management Plan (document reference J6).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 drainage guidance notes in consultation with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority (Lancashire County Council). |
| TA_0017_014_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Surveys Survey data submitted with the planning application should be current/up-to-date, in line with recognised guidelines (as summarised above). The survey area should include: • The intended location of the development footprint;• Potential working areas, compounds, storage areas and access routes;• Any land that may be used within the mitigation, compensation or biodiversity net gain proposals (on or off-site);• A suitable buffer distance, taking account of the likely zone of influence and relevant survey guidelines.  | The survey area is the area used for site-specific surveys and is generally defined as a 150 m buffer around the Onshore Order Limits. The 150 m buffer was included to take account of protected species that may occur adjacent or close to the Transmission Assets and to allow for evolution of the boundary during the site selection process. A separate survey area was used for GCN surveys. The GCN survey area is defined as a 250 m buffer around the Onshore Order Limits. Volume 3, Annex 3.8: Great crested newt survey and reptile survey technical report of the ES (document reference F3.3.8) provides further details regarding the GCN survey area. Owing to the iterative design process of the Transmission Assets, some surveys were undertaken further than 150 m from the Onshore Order Limits. Nevertheless, information from these surveys have been included in technical annexes because it provides context regarding the ecological sensitivity of the wider area.  |
| TA_0017_036_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | It should be stated how the necessary maintenance and management will be secured for the lifetime of the anticipated planning obligations.   | An Outline Ecological Management Plan (document reference J6) is provided as part of the application for development consent.  |
| TA_0017_037_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Monitoring measures should be sufficient to measure the success of mitigation and compensation measures, to inform the need for remedial measures and to inform establishment maintenance and long-term management.  | Any relevant monitoring measures are set out in section 3.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).   |
| 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_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 <a href="https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/business-and-trade/undertaking-works-on-our-property-and-our-code-of-practice">https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/business-and-trade/undertaking-works-on-our-property-and-our-code-of-practice</a> 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 | 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   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | 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.   | 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_016_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 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 to the prevention of dust generation and windblown litter and debris; measures to prevent 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. | 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"> <li>• flood protection and control measures;</li> <li>• drainage;</li> <li>• pollution prevention;</li> <li>• geology and ground conditions;</li> <li>• ecology and nature conservation (including protected species and invasive species);</li> <li>• historic environment;</li> <li>• soil management;</li> <li>• traffic and transport;</li> <li>• noise management measures;</li> <li>• air quality and dust management;</li> <li>• landscape and visual; and</li> <li>• bentonite breakout plan.</li> </ul> |
| TA_0035_009_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Flood risk: We are generally satisfied with the scope and assessment of hydrology and flood risk and consider that the proposed development could be safe without exacerbating flood risk elsewhere if the proposed flood risk mitigation measures are further developed and implemented. A number of areas need to be addressed in order to make these proposals consistent with government policy. In particular the climate change guidance needs to be applied to any assumptions currently made that underpin the Flood Risk Assessment. This should inform the design flood events being considered. You should treat this as a 'sensitivity test'. It will help assess how sensitive the proposal is to changes in the climate for different future scenarios. This will help to ensure your development can be adapted to large-scale climate change over its lifetime.   | Headroom to account for the ages of the Ribble Douglas and Ribble Estuary hydraulic models has been provided within the ES FRA to provide an up to date baseline assessment. Climate change allowances have been applied to permanent development to ensure development can be adapted to large scale climate change over its lifetime.  |
| TA_0035_012_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Groundwater: The impacts of the proposals on groundwater-dependant habitats of Lytham St Annes dunes SSSI have not been assessed.   | Section 3.11.3 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation (document reference F3.3) provides an assessment of impacts to the SSSI, including changes in relation to the water table.  |
| TA_0035_020_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 3.8.1.8 Issue<br>Lack of clarity regarding the cabling method (Horizontal Directional Drilling or open trench) across the intertidal area. Impact Potential for damage to the physical and ecological integrity of the intertidal area.<br>Solution<br>Provide further clarification including entry and exit points for HDD sites if relevant.   | Details of the works in the intertidal area are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This includes open trenching works in the intertidal area. The exit point for the direct pipe beneath the dunes is anticipated to be above Mean High Water Springs.   |
| TA_0035_029_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 1.3.2 Environment Agency flood model data P.8<br>Issue<br>Inconsistent approach in use of terminology.<br>The FRA refers to 'The flood annual exceedance probability (AEP) events'... But then uses Return Periods (years) rather than AEP.<br>Impact<br>Lack of clarity. Applicant should be aware that use of return periods can be misleading and if used at all should be in combination with AEP %, as this is the flood risk modeller accepted terminology.<br>Solution<br>Review terminology and use of AEP % rather than return period (yrs).   | References have been updated to AEP % rather than return periods (yrs).  |
| TA_0035_030_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 2.1.4 Climate change P.20-23 Issue<br>The FRA does not incorporate consideration of climate change allowances. It does not clearly state how the guidance has been followed and which peak river flow and sea level allowances are to be used in the assessment. Impact<br>Climate change has not been adequately assessed. The flood risk assessment is undermined and appropriate mitigation could be underestimated.<br>Solution<br>The following guidance should be referred to and followed in relation to peak rainfall, peak river flow and sea level rise allowances. The FRA should clearly state which allowances are to be used and why.<br>Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)  | An assessment of an increase of peak river flow and sea level rise driven by climate change has been made within the Flood Risk Assessment (Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood risk assessment of the ES, document reference F3.2.3) to the end of the construction phase for the landfall, onshore export cable corridor and 400kV grid connection cable corridor and the operation and maintenance phase for the onshore substations and has been accounted for within fluvial flood risk sections of the FRA. Peak rainfall intensity is taken into account within surface water flooding   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | sections as well as the Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan (document reference J10).  |
| TA_0035_031_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>3.2.1.3 Environment Agency Flood Model Data P.31-32 Issue</p> <p>The FRA is built on out-of-date data. The Environment Agency Flood Model data (Ribble Estuary Tidal model (2014) and the Ribble Douglas model (2010)) used to inform the FRA are at least 10 years old and do not take into account updated climate change requirements for peak river flow and Sea Level Rise (SLR).The FRA does not acknowledge that our product 6 information is supplied under the terms of our Conditional Licence.EA models may have been superseded by updated guidance and may not be suitable for site specific or scheme specific assessments.For information on the latest climate change allowances, please visit: <a href="http://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances">www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances</a>.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Potential future impact of climate change has not been incorporated into assessments thus flood risks are not understood.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Provide acknowledgement of the issue and carry out sensitivity testing as per guidance to assess how sensitive the proposal is to different climate change scenarios They should include sufficient headroom in consideration of the peak river flow and Sea Level Rise climate change impacts over the lifetime of the development. (please note remodelling is not expected)</p> | We have submitted a technical note to the Environment Agency to confirm that data provided is the most up to date as part of the Expert Working Group process. As we have not received any additional information to date, we assume this is the most up to date information the Environment Agency holds. Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood risk assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3) has will be updated to acknowledge that product 6 information is supplied under the terms of the conditional licence. |
| TA_0035_032_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>3.2.1.3 P.31 Issue</p> <p>No information is included to explain how the flood levels on site are derived Impact Ambiguity regarding the methodology used may undermine the credibility of the derived flood levels and any subsequent mitigations.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Include explanation as to how the levels have been derived. Include figures showing pick points and labelled data from the depth grid on smaller scale plane, where flood depth is identified, rather than just scheme wide extents drawings. This includes more detail on breach locations. Apply the same principles to the FRA chapters.</p>  | Flood levels within mapping were derived from the Environment Agency Product 6 data from the Ribble Douglas and Ribble Estuary hydraulic models. Additional mapping is presented within Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood risk assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3) including spot flood levels across the Onshore Infrastructure Area at risk of flooding.  |
| TA_0035_033_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Figure 4.1: Morecambe substation site option 1 (north) watercourses and flood zones P.63 And Figure 5.2: Morecambe substation site option 2 (south) watercourses and flood zones P.79 Issue The figure uses the opposite colouring convention to that used in Flood Map for Planning. The figure shows Flood Zone 3 as light blue and Flood Zone 2 as dark blue.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>The colouring convention is confusing in this context and risks mis interpretation.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Change colouring scheme to be in line with Flood Map for Planning convention. Dark blue should be Flood Zone 3 and light blue Flood Zone 2.</p>   | Noted, mapping has been updated and presented within Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood risk assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3).  |
| TA_0035_034_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>7.3.4.3 and 7.3.4.4 P.115 Issue</p> <p>Flood alerts cover large areas and the described approach to responding to flood alerts/ warnings does not allow for site specific considerations.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>The site may be evacuated when flood risk is not going to impact the site itself. This could result in unnecessary and frequent disruption to site operations.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Flood Warning and Evacuation Plans (FWEP) and relevant actions need a considered approach on a site-by-site basis, commensurate with the likelihood and consequences of any flooding.</p>   | As per CoT95 (refer to Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2.3)), the Applicants are committed to preparing flood warning and evacuation procedures as set out within the Outline CoCP (document reference J1).  |
| TA_0035_035_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>7.3.4.5 P.115 Issue</p> <p>Information regarding fluvial and tidal watercourse standoff distances is incorrect.</p> <p>Impact</p>  | Trenchless technique entry and exit points will be located at least 8 m from the banks of Ordinary Watercourses, Main Rivers and associated flood defences and 16 m from tidal Main Rivers and associated flood   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | <p>Potential for works to be carried out without the necessary permissions.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Refer to and demonstrate an understanding of Schedule 25 of: -<br/>The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 (legislation.gov.uk)</p>  | <p>defences (CoT10 as set out in Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2)).</p>  |
| TA_0035_036_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>7.3.4.9 P.116 Issue</p> <p>The potential need for the regulation of discharges arising from dewatering of trenches has not been acknowledged. This activity is likely to be required over significant areas of trenching, resulting in numerous potential dewatering discharges.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Discharge of dewatering has the potential to impact in terms of flood risk and be of regulatory interest from a FRAP perspective. Solution Please be aware of the legislative requirements above and the guidance on Flood risk activities: environmental permits - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) 7.4.2 Flood risk and 7.4.2.1 Bullet point 14 P.1163.9.3.14 P.38 Issue</p> <p>As a result of consideration of the potential for (temporary works) trench dewatering, and associated uncertainties we cannot currently agree with the statement that there will be a negligible impact to the existing hydrology and flood risk to the area. Impact The dewatering of temporary works may have an impact on flood risk in the local area.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Make clear in the FRA or make linkage to other documentation explaining how temporary works dewatering can and will be managed such that it could be considered negligible. Comments as per FRA comments above for section 7.3.4.9 regarding Cable route installation and dewatering of trenches.</p> | <p>The impact on groundwater levels in aquifer units is discussed in section 1.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1). The Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1), includes the Outline Surface Water and Groundwater Management Plan (document reference J1.9). The effects of the Transmission Assets on flood risk are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2) and discharge of dewatering will be undertaken in line with parameters set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description (document reference F1.3) and agreement with LCC and/or the Environment Agency</p> |
| TA_0035_037_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>3.9.3.16 P.38 Issue</p> <p>In areas where surface water flow paths may be encountered, there is potential to divert and concentrate flow routes of surface water as well as mobilising silt and sediment that could be transported elsewhere to undesirable effect.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Surface water flow can mobilise silts and cause pollution of the aquatic environment</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Care should be taking over the location and lengths of soil bunding. Pollution prevention in the form of silt fencing should be used where applicable.</p>  | <p>Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: hydrology and flood risk Table 2.20 (document reference F3.2). In addition, best practice with regard to remove the risk of causing pollution during construction is outlined within the Outline CoCP (document reference J1).</p>   |
| TA_0035_038_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>3.9.3.25 P.41 Issue</p> <p>Potential for risk of flooding of works compounds associated with HDD</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Flooding can be disruptive to operations, present a risk to the workforce and mobilise pollutants</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Further information should be provided on launch and reception area works compounds to facilitate HDD. Where possible these areas should be located outside areas of surface water, tidal and fluvial, and in-combination flood risk areas.</p>   | <p>The location of trenchless crossings is presented within the Onshore Crossing Schedule (Volume 1, Annex 3.2 of the ES (document reference F1.3.2)). The effects of the Transmission Assets, including crossings, on flood risk are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2).</p>   |
| TA_0035_039_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Watercourse crossings CoT10 P.58 Issue</p> <p>Incorrect use of terminology regarding classification of watercourses. The wording in this commitment incorrectly refers to 'Environment Agency ordinary watercourses'. Watercourses are either designated statutory 'main rivers' under the regulatory control of the Environment Agency or 'ordinary watercourses' under the control and regulatory powers for the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA). Incorrect designation of a watercourse may affect the required stand-off distance, and it is unclear where the current stated stand-off distance of 10m is derived from.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Confusion regarding watercourse classification may result in delays in securing relevant permissions for works from the correct authority</p>  | <p>This has been checked and updated accordingly.</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>Solution</p> <p>Reword the commitment to correct reflect to legal definitions and requirements. Ensure that stand-off distances and clearance depths are correctly justified.</p>  |  |
| TA_0035_040_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Watercourse crossings CoT10 P.58 Issue</p> <p>It is unclear how the choice of a minimum vertical clearance of 2m between the hard bed of watercourses and any flood defences has been derived and this may not be sufficient in some instances.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Geomorphologically active rivers, together with the impact of increased peak river flows can result in erosion and bed incision and subsequent exposure of infrastructure</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Demonstrate an understanding of channel morphology &amp; bed material to inform HDD strategies.</p>  | <p>It is noted within the Defra document Exempt flood risk activities: environmental permits (Section 3) (Defra, 2020) that service crossings are to be at least 1.5 m below the riverbed along its whole length. We have used the guidance to inform the trenchless technique depth below the hard bed of watercourses and any flood defences.</p>  |
| TA_0035_041_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Table 2.5: Summary of consultation relevant to this chapter August 2023 P.21 Issue</p> <p>The note says that at time of writing, a response (from EA) has yet to be received. There are no requests currently pending with the EA and the provided .ascii files should be useable. Noted that at time of production of this chapter there appears an outstanding action on EA in relation to questions about Product 6 flood model. 'The EA to investigate the missing data (flood depths and tidal data), unusable data (.txt and .ascii files) and confirm climate change allowance used within the EA fluvial model.' There is also an action on the applicant in relation to Baseline Data to contact South Ribble Borough Council to request updated flood mapping from the Fylde 2011 SFRA. Both matters are of significant importance to correctly assessing flood risk in line with current guidance.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Please make any further necessary requests if this matter is still pending.</p> | <p>We have submitted a technical note to the Environment Agency to confirm that data provided is the most up to date as part of the Expert Working Group process. As we have not received any additional information to date, we assume this is the most up to date information the Environment Agency holds. Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood risk assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3) has will be updated to acknowledge that product 6 information is supplied under the terms of the conditional licence.</p>   |
| TA_0035_042_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Table 2.7: Issues scoped out of the assessment. P.24 Issue</p> <p>Flood risk arising from damage to existing flood defences and because of additional surface water runoff during operation and maintenance have been scoped out of the assessment. This is subject to the Environmental Statement (ES) detailing any operational controls in a management plan. We are satisfied with this approach. However details of such controls have not been considered in the Table of Commitments, CoT35 only considers the Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>There remains the potential for increased flood risk arising from damage to existing flood defences and because of additional surface water runoff during the operation and maintenance of this development.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Ensure measures are included in the ES.</p>  | <p>Operational controls are set out within the Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan (document reference J10).</p>  |
| TA_0035_043_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Peak river flow 2.5.8.5-2.5.8.10 Issue</p> <p>This section does not identify what peak river flow allowance considerations are applicable to the proposed development.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>There is the potential that incorrect allowances have been used (with regards to the lifetime and vulnerability of the development), resulting in an underestimation of climate change.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Conclude the correct peak river flow allowances to be used for assessment of the scheme and carry across to the FRA Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood risk assessment</p>  | <p>An assessment of an increase of peak river flow and sea level rise driven by climate change has been made within the Flood Risk Assessment (Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood risk assessment of the ES, document reference F3.2.3) to the end of the construction phase for the landfall, onshore export cable corridor and 400kV grid connection cable corridor and the operation and maintenance phase for the onshore substations and has been accounted for within fluvial flood risk sections of the FRA. Peak rainfall intensity is taken into account within surface water flooding sections as well as the Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan (document reference J10).</p> |
| TA_0035_044_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Sea level rise 2.5.8.15-2.5.8.16 Issue</p> <p>This section does not identify what sea level rise allowance considerations are applicable to the proposed development.</p> <p>Impact</p>  | <p>Sea level rise associated with the 2069 and 2119 epoch within the Onshore Infrastructure Area has been assessed within Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3). Additional commentary is contained within Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3) as to the</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | <p>There is the potential that incorrect allowances have been used (with regards to the lifetime and vulnerability of the development), resulting in an under estimation of climate change.</p> <p>Solution<br/>Conclude the SLR allowances to be used and carry across to the FRA Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood risk assessment.</p>   | <p>climate change allowance considerations will be applied to the Onshore Infrastructure Area.</p>  |
| TA_0035_045_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Table 2.19: Measures<br/>CoT 10 P.49 See previous comments regarding the wording of CoT10</p>   | <p>It is noted within the Defra document Exempt flood risk activities: environmental permits (Section 3) (Defra, 2020) that service crossings are to be at least 1.5 m below the riverbed along its whole length. We have used the guidance to inform the trenchless technique depth below the hard bed of watercourses and any flood defences.</p> |
| TA_0035_046_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>2.8.6.4 P.58 Issue<br/>The current wording is misleading and implies that EA mapping should take account of the factors mentioned.</p> <p>Impact<br/>A potential misunderstanding of the fundamental purpose and limitations of the EA flood zone mapping and models.</p> <p>Solution<br/>Clarify that the EA does not produce hydraulic or tidal models for development planning purposes, and that it is the applicant's responsibility to satisfactorily assess flood risk. Provide an acknowledgement of the limitations of the model used, and the approach used to overcome these limitations (ie Sensitivity testing).</p>                           | <p>Noted, clarification has been added within Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3).</p>   |
| TA_0035_047_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>2.9.5.2 &amp; 2.9.5.9 The impact of increased flood risk arising from damage to existing flood defences P.66<br/>Issue Incorrect text regarding the status of sand dunes as sea defences. Beach dunes are classed as a sea defences under the North West Regional Land Drainage Byelaws (redacted for EPR 2016). Prohibitions protect the natural sea defence(s) from damage.</p> <p>Impact<br/>The incorrect consideration of the dunes as 'informal' defences may result in them not receiving the protection required. Damage to the dunes could result in increased risk of flooding.</p> <p>Solution<br/>Amend text to indicate the correct status</p> | <p>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. However the sand dunes are still classified as flood defences within the ES. Informal and formal flood defences have the same sensitivity.</p>                    |
| TA_0035_048_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>3.13.1.4 Bullet 2 P.54 Issue<br/>The section does not reference climate change driven Peak River flows and Sea Level Rise and how these may interact with the scheme.</p> <p>Impact<br/>Lack of full clarity regarding the potential impacts of climate change.</p> <p>Solution<br/>Update the section in order to include peak river flow and Seal Level Rise flood risk considerations.<br/><a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances#peak-river-flow-allowances">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances#peak-river-flow-allowances</a></p>                             | <p>This has been included within Flood Risk Assessment (Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood Risk Assessment of the ES (document reference F3.2.3)).</p>  |
| TA_0035_049_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Table 1.4: Risk scores for the Transmission Assets P. 17 Issue<br/>The risks associated with increased frequency of flood events resulting from increased precipitation intensity have been identified here, but this is not reflected in the FRA.</p> <p>Impact<br/>Potential for underestimation of the full impacts of increased rainfall intensity and peak river flows caused by climate change. Thus resulting in increased flood risk due to lack of appropriate mitigation</p> <p>Solution</p>  | <p>The Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan (document reference J10) provides drainage strategies for the onshore substations. Attenuation requirements for each substation included an uplift of 35%, the central estimate for total potential change anticipated in peak rainfall intensities for the 2070's epoch.</p>                   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | Ensure FRA assesses all potential flood risk impacts associated with climate change such as increased peak river flow, which may affect river morphology and scour which may rapidly reduce cover over transmission assets adjacent to or below river beds.   |   |
| TA_0035_051_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Disposal of sewerage from temporary construction compounds Issue There is no mention of how sewerage from toilets &amp; welfare facilities in the temporary construction compounds will be handled.</p> <p>Impact<br/>Sewerage may end up being disposed of in a less cost effective or sustainable manner (ie portaloos or disposal at an offsite facility) rather than by the preferred method of connection to foul sewer wherever possible.</p> <p>Solution<br/>Provide details regarding sewerage disposal. If the Operator intends to treat and discharge the sewage themselves they need to state this and engage with the EA about any potential permits as early as possible.</p> | The Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan (document reference J10) provides information regarding foul water drainage.   |
| TA_0035_052_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>1.3.4.1 Issue This section states "Each Principal Contractor is to be British Standard (BS) EN ISO 14001:2015 (Environmental Management System (EMS)) certified." In addition, the EMS's themselves should also be ISO 14001 certified</p> <p>Impact<br/>Any permit to discharge site drainage will require an EMS, and failure to get them ISO 14001 certified could result in non-compliance with the permit.</p> <p>Solution<br/>Amend wording to confirm the EMS's themselves will also be certified.</p>  | Included within the Outline Code Of Construction Practice (document reference J1)   |
| TA_0035_053_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>1.5.1.8 Issue Lack of clarity regarding where details of permanent pollution measures (ie interceptors) at the substations will be included. The Outline Operational Onshore Substation Drainage Management Plans will consider drainage from a flood risk perspective but there is no mention as to whether these would also detail permanent pollution prevention at these sites.</p> <p>Impact<br/>Risk of pollution to the aquatic environment arising from uncontained incidents (eg fire breakout) from substation sites.</p> <p>Solution<br/>Provide clarity as to how details regarding permanent pollution measures will be considered and covered.</p>                           | Information regarding permanent pollution measures is provided within the Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan (document reference J10).  |
| TA_0035_054_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>1.5.1.13 2nd bullet Issue<br/>Typo error<br/>Impact<br/>Lack of clarity<br/>Solution<br/>Amend text to read '... 30m away from a watercourse'</p>  | The Applicants note your response. The text has been amended.   |
| TA_0035_055_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>1.5.1.14 Issue The section describing HDD does not include clarity regarding which document will consider the management of effluent arising from HDD (potential contamination with soil conditioners etc), or from any subsequent dewatering activity.</p> <p>Impact<br/>Lack of clarity may result in pollution risk to the aquatic environment</p> <p>Solution<br/>If no such effluent is expected then this should also be clearly stated.</p>   | Details regarding the trenchless techniques and anticipated effluent are provided within Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description of the ES (document reference F1.3). The Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) sets out measures to control construction impacts, including best practice with regard to the use and storage of oils, chemicals and other wastes. (document reference J1). The CoCP also includes the following documents as annexes - an Outline Bentonite Breakout Plan (Document reference J1.13) and an Outline Pollution Prevention Plan (document reference J1.4). The impacts and effects are assessed in Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2) with regard to surface waters and Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1) with reference to groundwater. |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
| TA_0035_056_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>1.5.1.17 Issue</p> <p>No reference to the presence of emergency spill kits</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Risk of pollution to the aquatic environment</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Ensure that either the Onshore Pollution Prevention Plan or the Spillage and Emergency Response Plan mentions the requirement for emergency spill kits to be provided.</p>   | <p>Spill kits and emergency procedures are detailed within the Outline Pollution Prevention Plan (document J1.4) which forms part of the Outline CoCP (document reference J1).</p>  |
| TA_0035_058_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT10 Issue Unknown geophysical conditions with the potential for unexpected boulders in the underlying Glacial Till under the River Ribble could result in the HDD process to stop or loose direction.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Lost circulation could result in drilling muds discharged via river bottom sediments into the River Ribble.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Complete geophysical surveys to understand the relationship of the stratigraphy to be penetrated. (NB previous surveys associated with previous pipeline activity may be available to supplement new research).</p>  | <p>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.</p>  |
| TA_0035_059_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>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.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>A pathway could be established between contaminated groundwaters and surface waters of the River Ribble.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>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</p> | <p>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.</p> |
| 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; Issue Ensure the use of trenchless techniques at vulnerable locations.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Open trench cable laying methods would cause increased environmental risk at these locations</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>To be included in DCO submission</p>  | <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.</p>   |
| TA_0035_066_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT04 An Outline Onshore Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) will form part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice, which will be prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. Onshore PPP(s) will be developed in accordance with the Outline Onshore PPP and will include details of emergency spill procedures. Good practice guidance detailed in the Environment Agency's Pollution Prevention Guidance notes (including Pollution Prevention Guidance notes 01, 05, 08 and 21) will be followed where appropriate, or the latest relevant available guidance.</p> <p>Issue</p> <p>Pollution prevention risks have yet to be fully addressed</p>  | <p>An Outline Pollution Prevention Plan has been prepared and submitted as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1.4).</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>Impact</p> <p>There remains a risk of detrimental impact on the aquatic environment</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Outline onshore pollution prevention plan to be secured in the DCO submission.</p>  |  |
| TA_0035_067_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT05 During construction of piled foundations the following guidance will be used: Land Contamination Risk Management (LCRM) (July 2023) and Managing and reducing land contamination: guiding principles (GPLC), or latest relevant available guidance, where appropriate.</p> <p>Issue</p> <p>Risks associated with piled foundations have yet to be fully addressed</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Potential for contamination of ground or surface waters through the opening up of new contaminant pathways</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Piling methodology to be secured through DCO requirement See also CoT103</p>  | <p>Existing ground conditions are set out in section 1.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1). The potential for mobilisation of any existing contamination is set out in section 1.11 of that chapter. Where suspected contamination is present and piling is proposed, a detailed piling risk assessment will be developed prior to the commencement of construction. Consultation with the Environment Agency will be sought. An Outline Code of Construction Practice is provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1).</p> |
| TA_0035_068_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT09 The Outline Code of Construction Practice will be submitted as part of the application for the development consent. CoCP(s) will be developed in accordance with the outline CoCP. The Outline CoCP will include information about drainage during construction.</p> <p>Issue</p> <p>Risks associated with drainage (water quality and flood risk) have yet to be fully addressed</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>There remains a risk of detrimental impact on the aquatic environment</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Outline Drainage Management Plan to be appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission.</p>   | <p>Further information regarding construction drainage has been prepared as part of the Outline CoCP (document reference J1), which has been submitted as part of the application for development consent</p>  |
| TA_0035_069_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT10 HDD (or other trenchless methodologies) entry and exit points will be located at least 10 m away from Environment Agency ordinary watercourses and 10 m from Environment Agency surface watercourses or the landward toe of the surface watercourse flood defences. Where a surface watercourse is to be crossed by HDD (or other trenchless methodologies), the onshore export cables and 400 kV grid connection cables will be installed at least 2 m beneath the hard bed of any watercourses and the optimal clearance depth beneath watercourses will be agreed with the relevant authorities prior to construction. Where Environment Agency flood defences are present, a minimum 2 m vertical clearance will be maintained between the hard bed of the watercourse and the landward toe of those flood defences. Issue Incorrect use of terminology regarding classification of watercourses. Watercourses are either designated statutory 'main rivers' under the regulatory control of the Environment Agency or 'ordinary watercourses' under the control and regulatory powers for the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA). Incorrect designation of a watercourse may affect the required stand-off distance, and it is unclear where the current stated stand-off distance of 10m is derived from.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Confusion regarding watercourse classification may result in delays in securing relevant permissions for works from the correct authority</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Reword the commitment to correct reflect the legal definitions and requirements. Ensure that stand-off distances and clearance depths are adequately justified.</p> | <p>The Applicant notes your response. Wording and terminology has been updated for CoT10.</p>  |
| TA_0035_070_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT10 Issue It is unclear how the choice of a minimum vertical clearance of 2m between the hard bed of watercourses and any flood defences has been derived and this may not be sufficient in some instances</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Geomorphologically active rivers, together with the impact of increased peak river flows can result in erosion and bed incision and subsequent exposure of infrastructure</p> <p>Solution</p>  | <p>It is noted within the Defra document 'Exempt flood risk activities: environmental permits' (Section 3) (Defra, 2020) that service crossings are to be at least 1.5 m below the riverbed along its whole length. We have used the guidance to inform the trenchless technique depth below the hard bed of watercourses and any flood defences. It is noted that additional data regarding crossing schedules are to be ascertained post-</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | Demonstrate an understanding of channel morphology & bed material to inform HDD strategies.  | consent; e.g., additional Ground Investigations will be undertaken to ascertain drilling depth.  |
| TA_0035_071_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT11 An Outline Operational Onshore Substation Drainage Management Plan(s) will be prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. An Outline Operational Onshore Substation Drainage Management Plan(s) will be developed for the substation site(s). The Plan(s) 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 Outline Operational Onshore Substation Drainage Management Plan(s) 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>Issue<br/>Risks associated with drainage (water quality and flood risk) have yet to be fully addressed</p> <p>Impact<br/>There remains a risk of detrimental impact on the aquatic environment</p> <p>Solution<br/>Outline Operational Onshore Substation Drainage Management plan to be secured in the DCO submission.</p> | An Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan (document reference J10) has been prepared and submitted as part of the application for development consent. The document provides information regarding surface water drainage and water quality.   |
| TA_0035_077_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT33 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. The CoCP will include best practice measures in relation to air quality that will be applied where human receptors reside within 350 m of works, where required, or where sensitive ecological receptors are present within 50 m, as described in Institute of Air Quality guidance Management (IAQM, 2014) as appropriate.</p> <p>Issue<br/>Measures required to manage dust and air quality have yet to be fully addressed.</p> <p>Impact<br/>Risk to sensitive ecological receptors from poor air quality.</p> <p>Solution<br/>Outline Dust Management Plan setting out dust and air quality control measures to be appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission.</p>  | An Outline Dust Management Plan is provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1.2).  |
| TA_0035_078_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT35, 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. The CoCP will include measures to maintain and address:- 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.</p> <p>Issue<br/>Measures required to manage environmental risks have yet to be fully addressed.</p> <p>Impact<br/>Risk to the environment</p> <p>Solution<br/>Outline versions of various Plans to manage environmental risks to be appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission. See also CoT04 - Onshore pollution prevention plan CoT09 - Drainage Management Plan CoT11 - Operational Onshore Substation Drainage Management plan CoT20 - Construction Fencing Plan CoT26 - Site Waste Management Plan CoT30 - Contaminated Land and Groundwater Discovery Strategy CoT33 - Air Quality CoT73 - Biosecurity Protocol CoT76 - Outline</p>               | See the Outline CoCP (document reference J1) and the following plans submitted as part of the application for development consent: •Outline Communications Plan (document reference J1.1) •Outline Dust Management Plan (document reference J1.2) •Outline Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (document reference J1.3) •Outline Pollution Prevention Plan (document reference J1.4) •Outline Public Rights of Way (PRoW) Management Plan (document reference J1.5) •Outline Site Waste Management Plan (document reference J1.6) •Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7) •Outline Spillage and Emergency Response Plan (document reference J1.8) •Outline Surface Water and Groundwater Management Plan (document reference J1.9) •Outline Construction Fencing Plan (document reference J1.10) •Outline Construction Artificial Light Emissions Management Plan (document reference J1.11) •Outline Biosecurity Protocol (document reference J1.12) •Outline Bentonite Breakout Plan (document reference J1.13) •Outline Contaminated Land and Groundwater Discovery Strategy (document reference J1.14) |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | Ecological Management Plan CoT77 – Bentonite Breakout Plan CoT78 – Biosecurity Protocol CoT81 – Soil Management Plan CoT86 – Measures to protect minor watercourses   |  |
| TA_0035_079_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT39 Fences, walls, ditches and drainage outfalls will be retained at the landfall and along the onshore export cable corridor and 400 kV grid connection corridor, where possible. Where it is not reasonably practicable to retain them, any damage will be repaired and reinstated as soon as reasonably practical. The Environment Agency must be notified if damage occurs to any Environment Agency main river or related flood infrastructure</p> <p>Issue<br/>Potential for damage to / loss of infrastructure associated with main river or flood risk management</p> <p>Impact<br/>Increased flood risk</p> <p>Solution<br/>Secure through DCO requirement</p>  | CoT39 is to be secured as a requirement of the DCO. An Outline Construction Fencing Plan is provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference: J1.10).   |
| TA_0035_080_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT41 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 to inform a site-specific crossing method statement which will also be agreed with the relevant authorities prior to construction.</p> <p>Issue<br/>Measures to manage hydrogeological risk have yet to be fully developed, and relevant locations have yet to be identified.</p> <p>Impact<br/>Risk to the environment</p> <p>Solution<br/>Secure through DCO requirement</p>  | This measure will be secured via CoT41 as a requirement of the DCO.  |
| TA_0035_087_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT85 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. The outline CoCP will include that temporary haul road(s) will be installed using permeable gravel aggregate with a geotextile or other type of protective matting, or plastic or metal plates or grating, where possible.</p> <p>Issue<br/>Measures to reduce surface water runoff have yet to be fully developed.</p> <p>Impact<br/>Risk of increased surface water runoff contributing to localised flood risk and risk to water quality.</p> <p>Solution<br/>Measures to be included in Outline Drainage Management Plan appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission.</p> | An Outline CoCP (document reference J1) has been provided 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<br/>Measures to protect water quality and flow during trenched crossing of minor watercourses have yet to be fully developed.</p> <p>Impact<br/>Risk to the environment</p> <p>Solution</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. |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | Measures to be included in Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission.  |   |
| TA_0035_089_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT90 HDD (or other trenchless methodologies) will be used to cross the River Ribble where the 400 kV grid connection cable is proposed.</p> <p>Issue<br/>Project route requires crossing the River Ribble</p> <p>Impact<br/>Crossing could have a detrimental environmental impact at this vulnerable location.</p> <p>Solution<br/>Intention to use HDD or other trenchless methodology to cross the Ribble should be included in DCO submission and their impacts assessed.</p>   | CoT90 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 including micro tunnelling and direct pipe 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_091_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT95, CoT97 The Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) will be submitted as part of the application for the development consent. CoCP(s) will be developed in accordance with the outline CoCP. The Outline CoCP will include that during the construction phase the Principal Contractor(s) will sign up to the Flood Warning Service and will be alerted by a phone call or text when a Flood Warning becomes active. The flood warning will be applied to the entire Onshore Infrastructure Area located within Flood Zones 2 and 3 to enable site personnel to be evacuated from the site in a timely manner prior to a flood event occurring, if appropriate.</p> <p>Issue<br/>Flood Risk Management Plans have yet to be developed.</p> <p>Impact<br/>Increased risk to site and personnel from flooding.</p> <p>Solution<br/>Secure site-specific Flood Warning and Evacuation Plans (FWEP) through DCO requirement</p>  | As per CoT95, the Applicants are committed to preparing flood warning and evacuation procedures as set out within the Outline CoCP (document reference J1).   |
| TA_0035_096_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Sand dune restoration<br/>Opportunity<br/>Opportunity for targeted sand dune restoration associated with SSSI<br/>Suggestion<br/>Engage with the Fylde Sand Dune Group which is responsible for sand dune restoration along this section of the coast. This work is part funded by the EA and is a long term ongoing project.</p>  | Noted, the Applicants are in contact with Fylde Sand Dune Group, who have shared previous survey data.  |
| TA_0016_001_211123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Thank you for inviting the Lead Local Flood Authority to comment on the below consultation: Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms: Transmission Assets Statutory Consultation Lancashire County Council is the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) for area involving this development. We have a role in the planning process as a statutory consultee for major development with surface water drainage, under the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. We also regulate consentable activities to ordinary watercourses through 'ordinary watercourse consent' under the Land Drainage Act 1991 (as amended). In this instance, the development is classified as a 'Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project' under the Planning Act 2008. Therefore, this development is exempt from applying for 'normal' planning permission from the Local Planning Authority as this will be determined by the Planning Inspectorate. It is also exempt from applying for ordinary watercourse consent from the county council as this will be managed through the Development Consent Order process. Notwithstanding this, the Lead Local Flood Authority wishes to provide the following comments and advice about the development proposals. Previous comments made by the Lead Local Flood Authority The Lead Local Flood Authority has been engaged with this project at various stage of development. Through our LLFA Planning Advice Service we have liaised with the project team in relation to onshore matters to provide advice aimed at managing and mitigating the impact on surface water flood risk and ordinary watercourses in Lancashire.</p> | The Applicants note your response. Lancashire County Council has been included in Expert Working Groups throughout the project.   |
| TA_0016_002_211123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Proposed works to ordinary watercourses Any impact on ordinary watercourses should be identified, assessed, minimised and mitigated appropriately irrespective of whether the works impacting an ordinary watercourse are temporary or permanent and according to site-specific circumstances. Existing watercourses should be protected and, where appropriate, enhanced through the site layout, for example, naturalization, de-culverting, and the creation of riparian habitats. The culverting of any ordinary</p>   | Ecology and landscape mitigation is proposed within the permanent substation sites and these measures are set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2) and the Outline Ecological Management Plan (document reference J6). An Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan for the substation site(s) has   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>watercourses should be avoided. When designing a site layout, it is critical to consider the future ownership of and access to any on-site watercourses. The site layout must provide safe access to all on-site watercourses for maintenance purposes. No development should occur within 8 metres from the bank top of any ordinary watercourse to achieve this. This includes the construction of structures such as walls and fences and any activity during the construction phases of development. Failure to provide appropriate access and maintenance arrangements for ordinary watercourses can increase flood risk over the lifetime of the development, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>   | <p>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 drainage guidance notes in consultation with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority (Lancashire County Council).</p>  |
| TA_0016_003_211123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Ordinary Watercourse Crossings Open trench watercourse crossings should be avoided wherever possible, with trenchless construction methods such as horizontal directional drilling prioritised to minimise any unwanted effects on the bed and banks of the watercourse, and any disruption to existing flora, fauna and/or habitats. Where open trench watercourse crossings cannot be avoided, then effective construction method statements should be produced to detail, in chronological order, how the works will be undertaken from start to finish. Typically the Lead Local Flood Authority would expect this to consider, as a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How the works will be arranged to ensure there is no increase in flood risk to third parties. All reasonable precautions should be taken during the undertaking of the works so as not to obstruct or impede the flow of the watercourse. If over pumping is used, then this should only be undertaken in a manner that minimises bed disturbance, avoids movement of silt and minimises scour. A suitable screen/strainer should also be provided to prevent fish and other material being drawn in.</li> <li>• How any pollution risks will be managed and dealt with should they occur, i.e. the release of fine sediments and other pollutants into the watercourse during the construction works.</li> <li>• How the bed and banks of the watercourse will be restored once the works are complete. Material used for backfilling must be inert and not contain any material that could potentially leach out into the watercourse. Any landscaping of banks must be restricted to native species only, and invasive species such as Japanese Knotweed, if encountered, must be managed and controlled on site.</li> </ul>  | <p>Assessment of the impacts 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 presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are presented within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Volume 1, Annex 3.2: Onshore crossing schedule of the ES (document reference F1.3.2) presents crossing techniques of Ordinary Watercourses. An Outline CoCP (document reference J1) is submitted as part of the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP (document reference J1) includes measures to maintain and address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• flood protection and control measures;</li> <li>• drainage;</li> <li>• pollution prevention;</li> <li>• geology and ground conditions;</li> <li>• ecology and nature conservation (including protected species and invasive species);</li> <li>• historic environment;</li> <li>• soil management;</li> <li>• traffic and transport;</li> <li>• noise management measures;</li> <li>• air quality and dust management;</li> <li>• landscape and visual; and</li> <li>• bentonite breakout plan.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, the Applicants are in discussion with the LLFA regarding protective provisions.</p>  |
| TA_0016_004_211123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Surface water flood risk and Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) Surface water flood risk should be identified, assessed, minimised and mitigated appropriately in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance through a flood risk assessment. Findings of the flood risk assessment(s) should be used to inform the design of sustainable drainage systems which serve impermeable surfaces, whether permanent or temporary. Surface water flood risk should also be considered during each construction phase, as heavy machinery can compact ground leading to increased surface water runoff. This can have a negative impact on nearby watercourses, such as increased sedimentation which can lead to siltation, poor water quality and an adverse effect on habitats. Surface water runoff from development should not impact on infrastructure such as roads and other infrastructure. If there is any potential for the development to impact the highway, rail or other network, then the suitability of drainage proposals should be discussed with Network Rail and/or the Highway Authority, to ensure the stability of their assets is not negatively affected. The development should maximise the opportunities presented to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding on and off-site, wherever they would be effective, in line with paragraph 161 of the National Planning Policy Framework and paragraphs 062 to 067 of the Planning Practice Guidance. This should be achieved through the design of the sustainable drainage system and, where appropriate, the use of Natural Flood Management techniques. A comprehensive sustainable drainage approach can help to alleviate flood risk as well as managing the impacts where flooding does occur, for example by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximising opportunities for infiltration of surface water through replacement of impermeable surfaces with permeable surfaces;</li> <li>• Maximising opportunities for planting and vegetated areas, in preference to engineered surfaces, to increase evapo-transpiration and provide improvements for biodiversity and wider natural capital benefits; and</li> <li>• Providing additional surface water storage over and above the minimum requirements e.g. an over-sized pond, to accommodate more extreme rainfall events (e.g. 0.5% annual exceedance probability) leading to a more flood/climate resilient electricity infrastructure network. Specifically, appropriate sustainable drainage systems should be incorporated to drain any new impermeable surfaces such as compounds, sub-stations, roads, parking</li> </ul> | <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). 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 the Outline CoCP (document reference J1). 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 drainage guidance notes in consultation with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority (Lancashire County Council).</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>areas etc. SuDS should be designed to be compliant with the requirements set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, the Planning Practice Guidance and the Defra Technical Standards for SuDS. A site-specific 'Operation and Maintenance Manual' for the lifetime of the development of each sustainable drainage component that makes up each sustainable drainage system should be compiled. Typically the Lead Local Flood Authority would expect this to include, as a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A timetable for its implementation;</li> <li>• Details of the maintenance, operational and access requirement for all SuDS components and connecting drainage structures, including all watercourses and their ownership;</li> <li>• Pro-forma to allow the recording of each inspection and maintenance activity, as well as allowing any faults to be recorded and actions taken to rectify issues;</li> <li>• The arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage scheme in perpetuity;</li> <li>• Details of financial management including arrangements for the replacement of major components at the end of the manufacturer's recommended design life;</li> <li>• Details of whom to contact if pollution is seen in the system or if it is not working correctly; and</li> <li>• Means of access for maintenance and easements.</li> </ul> <p>Thereafter the sustainable drainage systems should be retained, managed, and maintained in accordance with the approved details. In Lancashire we provide general advice and support on SuDS design through the Lancashire SuDS Pro-forma and accompanying guidance which we recommend are used in finalising SuDS designs and for consistency in expectations in Lancashire.</p> |  |
| TA_0016_005_211123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Natural Flood Management Opportunities Natural flood management techniques work with natural processes to protect, restore and emulate the natural functions of catchments, floodplains, rivers and the coast. They aim to manage the sources and pathways of flood waters whilst providing wider benefits to people, wildlife and the environment. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land management such as removing impermeable surfacing to maximise infiltration, planting trees to increase evapo-transpiration, or making green space where flood waters are most likely to flow or collect, or where rivers and their meanders are likely to migrate;</li> <li>• Watercourse restoration such as removing culverts and other capacity restrictions, reintroducing meanders to provide additional storage, or naturalising river beds and banks to slow the flow.</li> </ul> <p>We trust you find this response constructive. If you wish to discuss any aspects of this response further with the Lead Local Flood Authority, please do so by contacting us at the email address at the top of this letter. Yours faithfully, Laura Bigley and Chris Dunderdale<br/>Principal Flood Risk Officer and Senior Flood Risk Officer</p>  | <p>Ecology and landscape mitigation is proposed within the permanent substation sites and these measures are set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2) and the Outline Ecological Management Plan (document reference J6). 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 drainage guidance notes in consultation with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority (Lancashire County Council).</p>  |
| TA_0043_004_211123          | S44     | Email           | <p>4 Drainage: Many of the clay tile systems on my farm were put in place in the early Victorian period and all will be destroyed. Simply joining pipes upon reinstatement is undermined by inevitable settling and then these systems cease to be level and then cannot work effectively. This will require re-draining which will be impossible due to the presence of the cables. Smaller scale systems of drainage such as mole drains will all be destroyed – much of this damage will be unseen.</p>  | <p>As part of the Heads of Terms, Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants, and alongside a drainage consultant will discuss existing drainage systems with interests so that a detailed drainage plan and design can be agreed for both pre and post construction. There will be provisions relating to compensation so as to address any impacts to the farming business.</p>  |
| TA_0044_002_211123          | S44     | Email           | <p><b>OBJECTIONS TO THE MORECAMBE AND MORGAN PROPOSAL</b> On the land we farm, our initial investigation show the BP cable crossing; 6 watercourses 2 roads Gas pipeline, Pegs Lane Kirkham to Blackpool railway line, We envisage MAJOR problems with land drainage, as the sheer volume of soil extraction is equivalent to open cast mining! The Fylde is already under severe pressure from flooding, due to its topography,</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 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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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).As part of the Heads of Terms, Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants, and alongside a drainage consultant will discuss existing drainage systems with interests so that a detailed drainage plan and design can be agreed for both pre and post construction. There will be provisions relating to compensation so as to address any impacts to the farming business.  |
| TA_0044_006_211123          | S44     | Email           | 6. Huge problems with drainage both in field, and ditches, as this project could last several years, damage to soil structure, compaction, localised flooding etc, etc | 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 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).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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction.As part of the Heads of Terms, Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants, and alongside a drainage consultant will discuss existing drainage systems with interests so that a detailed drainage plan and design can be agreed for both pre and post construction. There will be provisions relating to compensation so as to address any impacts to the farming business. |
| TA_0046_002_171123          | S44     | Email           | I would also like you to prove to me that you are aware the farms main drain and the water main both of which I wouldn't want damaging.                                | The impact of damage to existing field drainage is assessed section 2.13.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES. In order to manage impacts to field drainage, the Outline CoCP (document reference J1) will stipulate that the contractor will develop field drainage plans in consultation with the relevant landowners. If required, additional field drainage will be installed to ensure the existing drainage of the land   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | is maintained during construction. Field drainage will be reinstated once construction has finished.   |
| TA_0046_005_171123          | S44     | Email           | I object to the plans yourselves and BP are proposing on the knowledge I have of the area including the flood risk.   | Flood risk is considered in section 2.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Further details are provided in the Volume 3, Annex 2.3: Flood Risk Assessment (document reference 3.2.3). No significant effects in terms of flood risk are predicted  |
| TA_0119_001_071123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</p> <p>The close proximity to Carr Hill and Strike Lane schools, will also be a major concern for the many parents in the area.</p> <p>I am not against wind farms and green energy, but this must be done in a respectful way for local residents and the community.</p> <p>Surely the land surrounding the existing substation in Penwortham, would be a more viable and appropriate option.</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_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_007_171123          | S44     | Email           | 9) This area is well known for flooding and if you build these enormous substations on this land you will be creating further flooding problems for households. Do you really want to put families and children out on the streets because their homes have flooded? This could become a reality for many.  | 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 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_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,  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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_0124_009_171123          | S44     | Email           | 10.In addition the Fylde is very flat, so the flooding, which is already bad here in Newton, 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. Homes that currently are not at flood risk and therefore will be                 | 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 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_0125_005_181123          | S44     | Email           | 9.This area is well known for flooding and if you build these substations on this land you will be creating further flooding problems for households in the local area. Do you really want to put families and children out on the streets because their homes have flooded? This could become a reality for many.          | 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 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).In the event of 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 DCO. |
| 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 | 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  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>rural location. Have you even considered (I think not), the noise, disruption, &amp; the effect you will be putting on the wildlife, &amp; also the increased traffic volumes &amp; 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 &amp; 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 &amp; destroying not only the landscape but people's livelihoods, &amp; their way of life.</p> | <p>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_0130_001_191123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</p>  | <p>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.</p> |
| TA_0130_003_191123          | S44     | Email           | <p>We also know from past experience disruption to land, digging drilling etc in the area, has driven vermin into our homes! It has also caused flooding and water tables to rise. The question of noise from transmitting that amount of electricity through the corridors is also unclear. A local electrical expert that installs commercially on a large scale doubts it will be silent.</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).</p>   |
| TA_0130_005_191123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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 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.</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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>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).</p> |
| TA_0132_001_191123          | S44     | Email           | <p>I wish to register my utter disagreement with the planned wind farm, very close to my property. I believe I am the longest standing resident on REDACTED, having moved to this bungalow in September 1972, fifty one years ago. Many changes, not all for the better, have been made since then, but the thought of the absolute desecration of this rural area that this plan would bring, is devastating. The noise, disruption of traffic (already dreadful in this location), the years it will take to complete, is beyond comprehension. This country area was beautiful and has been encroached upon enough, in recent years. It also has huge drainage problems; properties and dykes are regularly waterlogged, through both Fylde (my council) and Blackpool Council inactivity. Inevitably the situation would be exacerbated should this project go ahead. Kindly register my complete disapproval.</p> | <p>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). 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.</p>  |
| TA_0134_001_191123          | S44     | Email           | <p>I am writing to express my personal views on the proposed Morecambe &amp; 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 &amp; 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</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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | <p>the roads. Without the farmers regularly maintaining the dykes in this area will most definitely see more flooding .</p>   | <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). Detailed assessments are 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 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_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.<br/> <a href="https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Fylde-Biodiversity-SPD-Adopted-11-September-2019-FINAL.pdf">https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Fylde-Biodiversity-SPD-Adopted-11-September-2019-FINAL.pdf</a> <a href="http://www.stannesonthesea-tc.gov.uk/documents/(12)%20150612-St.%20Anne%27s%20NDP%20Main%20Document%20Pre%20Submission%20Final.1.pdf">http://www.stannesonthesea-tc.gov.uk/documents/(12)%20150612-St.%20Anne%27s%20NDP%20Main%20Document%20Pre%20Submission%20Final.1.pdf</a><br/> <a href="https://www.birdguides.com/sites/europe/britain-ireland/britain/england/lancashire/lytham-moss/">https://www.birdguides.com/sites/europe/britain-ireland/britain/england/lancashire/lytham-moss/</a><br/> <a href="https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/EL6.020b-vi-Matter-6-Appendix-CA4-part-1-Oyston-Estates-050-.pdf">https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/EL6.020b-vi-Matter-6-Appendix-CA4-part-1-Oyston-Estates-050-.pdf</a> 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).</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | Detailed assessments are 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_0139_003_201123          | S44     | Email           | Morecambe & Morgan Wind Farm 3rd November 2023.1.) 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?   | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_0139_004_201123          | S44     | Email           | 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 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 <a href="https://blackpoolez.com">https://blackpoolez.com</a> ), 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 ( <a href="https://pa.fylde.gov.uk/Planning/Display/23/0758">https://pa.fylde.gov.uk/Planning/Display/23/0758</a> ).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 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. |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | 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.  |  |
| 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_0144_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.                                      | 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 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). 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   | 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,   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | 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. | 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_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 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.  | 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_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_0150_005_201123          | S44     | Email           | The development will significantly adversely impact local amenities, change of character from rural to industrial, and potential flooding due to massive displacement caused by the enormous industrial development, ruining farmland for decades and placing homes at risk.  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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                  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted 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).</p> |
| TA_0151_004_201123          | S44     | Email           | I live on the flood plain and the and have very high concern over the increased potential of further flood as newton already floods regularly.   | <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. 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.</p>   |
| TA_0154_003_201123          | S44     | Email           | Thirdly the impact of flooding does not seem to have been fully assessed. Again the consultation meeting was unable to fully provide information on this but the little data used was historical and has not taken into account changes from building in the last 2to3 years. Having driven the a road today next to the proposed site on a typical wet day there is significant flooding on the road around the dowbrook area, leading to congestion and road obstruction. There is also significant standing water on the fields. The loss of soak away from building in this area would worsen this futher and lead to flood risk, again not full considered. | <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 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</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | 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_0156_006_211123          | S44     | Email           | The development will significantly adversely impact local amenities, change of character from rural to industrial, and potential flooding due to massive displacement caused by the enormous industrial development, ruining farmland for decades and placing homes at risk.  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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). |
| TA_0160_001_211123          | S44     | Email           | All Regarding the above project, and your Transmission Assets questionnaire. I am a resident of REDACTED REDACTED Firstly, I would say I have no objections to wind Farms, they are a source of clean renewable energy, however I do have objections to the proposed route into the National Grid and the unreasonable impact it will have on my community and wildlife. My major concerns is the environmental impact to the area where the proposed substations are to be located. We have 2 villages (Freckleton and Newton) separated from Kirkham Town via High Grade Agricultural Green belt grass land in the summer, and in the winter months when we have rain , it floods and holds water until the natural water courses / dykes empty and it naturally drains away. | 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_0160_002_211123          | S44     | Email           | Where is all this water going to go if fields can't flood due to large structures covering this area?   | 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  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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 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_0161_011_211123          | S44     | Email           | •Existing flooding issues in the parish will be exacerbated by this scheme. As a minimum land will become compacted from heavy vehicles during construction. However, the enormous sites themselves will displace huge amounts of water. The water has to go somewhere and areas of the scheme are already in flood zones. These zones are set to extend according to the Climate Change Flood Zone Map for 2030. What is the plan to manage this huge amount of displaced water? We haven't seen one as part of this consultation! | 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 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_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_005_211123          | S44     | Email           | The development will significantly adversely impact local amenities, change of character from rural to industrial, and potential flooding due to massive displacement caused by the enormous industrial development, ruining farmland for decades and placing homes at risk.  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted 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).</p> |
| TA_0165_004_211123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Another significant concern is the potential exacerbation of flooding in the area due to the construction of the transformer. Newton is already prone to flooding during heavy rainfall, primarily due to inadequate drainage systems. The absence of a clear plan to address and prevent increased flooding resulting from the transformer building is alarming and requires urgent attention.</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 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>   |
| 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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>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 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_0183_002_221123          | S44     | Email           | <p>In connection to the above, not only will your proposals force local farmers out of business, but will also involve cutting through field drainage systems, exacerbating flooding, and potentially affecting local communities as well as farmland. The displacement of water caused by the development will put homes at risk and ruin farmland for decades to come. Your proposed route also disrupts land of ornithological importance. Lancashire County Heritage Sites includes the area of Lytham Moss (Site Ref: 33SEW1) as a Biological Heritage Site, or "local wildlife site". The site comprises 283 hectares of farmland which it categorises as of ornithological importance. The land provides winter feeding ground for flocks of Pink-footed Geese and Whooper Swans with bird numbers exceeding 0.5% of the British wintering population. Furthermore, Lapwings, Corn Buntings and Skylarks are already endangered species which can be found on local farmland. This project would deprive these flocks of their natural habitat, while the prolonged human activity and noise pollution associated with this project would scare these flocks away for good.</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). 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). 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 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 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.</p> |
| TA_0185_004_221123          | S44     | Email           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase of flooding from the substations will flood surrounding land.</li> </ul>   | <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</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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 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_0186_003_221123          | S44     | Email           | Flooding from the substations would cause an increase to the water table, the existing road infrastructure already is regularly under water.  | 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). 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 the Outline CoCP (document reference J1). 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 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_0188_006_221123          | S44     | Email           | Impact on food security Whilst I appreciate that we need to use renewable sources of energy in order to secure our needs for the future, and I am certainly not against the windfarm development in principle, we also need to ensure that the country can continue to produce food to feed the growing population. If this project is to go ahead as planned with the huge destruction of vast areas of the Fylde for burying the transmission cables, I am certain that many farming businesses will cease to exist afterwards. The level of invasive work that will be required will ruin a great deal of the high quality farmland in the Fylde. Field drains will be destroyed by the work, and I doubt very much whether the new drains will ever be as effective as the current system as it has taken years and years of careful management and planning. Soil structure will be massively affected by compaction and it will be impossible to return the land to how it was before no matter how carefully the soil is stored and out back. Surely at a time when food security is so high on the public agenda, the loss of valuable farmland is not a sustainable option. The effects of building on large areas of farmland will also lead to massively increased risk of flooding in the local area. The land is already under huge pressure of flooding as main drains and ditches are no longer maintained meaning that water flow is restricted. The additional run-off from the concrete sites will mean that the current system will be unable to cope and will lead to more regular flooding, not only on the land that we are farming, but also in the towns and villages as the water will have nowhere to go. | 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 (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)   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>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. 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). 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 the Outline CoCP (document reference J1). 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 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).</p> |
| TA_0189_005_221123          | S44     | Email           | 4. Flood risk caused by the run-off from these sites into ditches which are already unable to cope during periods of prolonged or heavy rain.  | <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). 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 the Outline CoCP (document reference J1). 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 drainage guidance notes in consultation with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority (Lancashire County Council).</p>  |
| TA_0189_008_221123          | S44     | Email           | 5. A number of the main watercourses that drain the surrounding farmland run through the proposed site. The land floods badly as it is without further restrictions to the drainage, and the huge amount of extra water that would drain off the site would cause very serious flooding. | <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 CoCP (document reference J1) has been</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>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 drainage guidance notes in consultation with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority (Lancashire County Council).</p>   |
| TA_0194_002_221123          | S44     | Email           | <p>The land is inter-dispersed with high water table ditches which play an intrinsic part of the water management within the Fylde Moss. Any interference with the drainage system within the area will have a huge detrimental impact, not only on the land that it goes through, but also the surrounding area. As I have mentioned previously, the land is moss and therefore doesn't have the subsoil that your clients may expect. If they break the topsoil there is very little sub soil to work with and you are just into moss, which is an unstable soil type.</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. 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.</p>   |
| TA_0194_003_221123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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.</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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>design changes since the PEIR and have 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_005_221123          | S44     | Email           | <p>The development will significantly adversely impact local amenities, change of character from rural to industrial, and potential flooding due to massive displacement caused by the enormous industrial development, ruining farmland for decades and placing homes at risk</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 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).</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</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</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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>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_0200_003_221123          | S44     | Email           | Impact on infrastructure ie: water usage, drainage, Heavy Plant movement for Approx next 5 Years  | <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. 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. 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>  |
| TA_0202_002_221123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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</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 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</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | fragile with the water infrastructure. There is only a 3-metre fall of land, that water flows from the M55 to the 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.   | 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_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_0202_008_221123          | S44     | Email           | Kill what little drainage we have on the land which passes onto other fields and other farms. • Kill the drainage in the entire region so pushing the water table onto other people's property. • As a riparian owner on an EA Drain. We would not have access to clean the water courses that need yearly attention of weeding and dyke maintenance and because of the length in years of the project we would not be able to de-silt. • As EA drains the Environment Agency would not be able to perform any of their activities and have the correct accesses to land   | 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_0203_005_231123          | S44     | Email           | The development will significantly adversely impact local amenities, change of character from rural to industrial, and potential flooding due to massive displacement caused by the enormous industrial development, ruining farmland for decades and placing homes at risk.   | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>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).</p>  |
| TA_0204_005_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>The development will significantly adversely impact local amenities, change of character from rural to industrial, and potential flooding due to massive displacement caused by the enormous industrial development, ruining farmland for decades and placing homes at risk.</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 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).</p> |
| TA_0207_002_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>3. The land is classified Grade 2 on the Agricultural Land Classification and benefits from a substantial land drainage system which is likely to be severely affected by the scheme and will require full replacement. The disruption to the land will take many years to recover and our experience has been that</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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | developers often overlook the need for a full and proper drainage scheme to be installed at the end of the scheme. We feel that alternative routes across lower quality agricultural land should be considered   | 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). 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. 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_0207_005_231123          | S44     | Email           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The land is classified Grade 2 on the Agricultural Land Classification, is low lying and comparatively level and benefits from extensive land drainage systems. There is a delicate balance in the land drainage systems and the installation of a substantial cable route across the land could very well disrupt the balance and cause losses over an extended period of time far beyond the construction period. We believe alternative routes through lower quality agricultural land should be considered. We believe that any of the above issues would have a serious effect on the viability of the family business but when combined will almost certainly have a major effect on the viability of the family business going forward. This in turn could impact the available facilities for RDA especially during the construction period</li> </ul>  | 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). 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. 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. 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_0211_005_231123          | S44     | Email           | 10 I am concerned about irreparable damage to drainage system with the resultant flooding problems. Parts of the Fylde already has well documented flooding issues. A project of this scale will inevitably cause water pollution when the heavy clay suspension gets into the dykes, pond and river.  | 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). 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 the Outline CoCP (document reference J1). 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. |
| 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 | 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   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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.</p>  | <p>(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_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</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>design changes since the PEIR and have 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_0219_002_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>No information has yet been given regarding pre and post construction drainage proposals and this will be essential in due course. We understand that the proposed depth of the cables is to give them 1.2m cover however we believe that many of the drains in this area especially on our clients land are at around 1.5m deep and therefore any cabling will need to be substantially below that in order to allow the Landowners to have safe ongoing access for drainage maintenance/repair etc. We also understand that many of the dykes are 2m deep and clearly once again any easement and cabling will have to go below the base of the drainage dykes and give sufficient cover to enable continuing maintenance of the drainage dykes to take place safely.</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</p>   |
| TA_0219_006_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Severe effect on the land drainage in the area particularly in Parcel REDACTED if the southern route is chosen.</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). 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 the Outline CoCP (document reference J1). 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.</p> |
| TA_0221_004_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>4. Flooding The Fylde is low lying and as can be seen driving around the area since August, we have had a wetter than average year, the ground is waterlogged and surface water is lying on farmland, you don't need a lot of rain to fall before the existing watercourses are overwhelmed and will potentially flood residential areas , not just farmland What will happen if watercourses, ditches and field drains are interrupted for the duration of 3 years or more. Have sufficient surveys been done to see if the route is satisfactory for such disturbance, because in our experience as second and third generation farmers , you need to work with the land not abuse it.</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). 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 the Outline CoCP (document reference J1). 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.</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | The Outline CoCP and outline surface water and groundwater management plan (document reference J1.9) includes measures in relation to drainage.  |
| TA_0225_006_231123          | S44     | Email           | Groundwater Table and Pressures on Localised Ditch Networks The area is low lying and whilst the farm drainage system is adequate to handle rainfall any introduction of hard surfaced substations will cause the water table to spread together with runoff from hardstand areas which will cause significant localised flooding on a regular basis throughout the year. There is little mitigation from the developer inserting a cut off drain as the additional volumes of rainfall collected will outfall into the local ditch network which is already at full capacity in times of persistent rainfall. | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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 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.  |
| TA_0225_012_231123          | S44     | Email           | Flood Zone 2 and 3 There are areas within this cable corridor which are within flood zones 2 and 3 which is not suitable for open trench cutting for laying cables and there is a risk of cables floating which is at significant risk at 400Kv.   | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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 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. An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. |
| TA_0226_006_231123          | S44     | Email           | Groundwater Table and Pressures on Localised Ditch Networks The area is low lying and whilst the farm drainage system is adequate to handle rainfall any introduction of hard surfaced substations will cause the  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>water table to spread together with runoff from hardstand areas which will cause significant localised flooding on a regular basis throughout the year. There is little mitigation from the developer inserting a cut off drain as the additional volumes of rainfall collected will outfall into the local ditch network which is already at full capacity in times of persistent rainfall.</p>   | <p>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 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> |
| TA_0227_004_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Groundwater Table and Pressures on Localised Ditch Networks The area is low lying and whilst the farm drainage system is adequate to handle rainfall any introduction of hard surfaced substations will cause the water table to spread together with runoff from hardstand areas which will cause significant localised flooding on a regular basis throughout the year. There is little mitigation from the developer inserting a cut off drain as the additional volumes of rainfall collected will outfall into the local ditch network which is already at full capacity in times of persistent rainfall. The permanent substation area will occupy almost 50% of the total farm area which will create uncontrollable runoff and water table spread leading to regular localised flood events.</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 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.</p>   |
| TA_0227_005_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 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.</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. The Applicants through Dalcour Maclaren and appointed drainage specialists will engage</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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_0229_004_231123          | S44     | Email           | Groundwater Table and Pressures on Localised Ditch Networks Introduction of hard surfaced substations will cause the water table to spread together with runoff from hardstand areas which will cause significant localised flooding on a regular basis throughout the year. There is little mitigation from the developer inserting a cut off drain as the additional volumes of rainfall collected will outfall into the local ditch network which is already at full capacity in times of persistent rainfall. The permanent substation area will occupy almost 50% of the total farm area which will create uncontrollable runoff and water table spread leading to regular localised flood events. | 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 Outline CoCP and outline surface water and groundwater management plan (document reference J1.9) includes measures in relation to drainage. |
| TA_0230_003_231123          | S44     | Email           | Groundwater Table and Pressures on Localised Ditch Networks Introduction of hard surfaced substations will cause the water table to spread together with runoff from hardstand areas which will cause significant localised flooding on a regular basis throughout the year. There is little mitigation from the developer inserting a cut off drain as the additional volumes of rainfall collected will outfall into the local ditch network which is already at full capacity in times of persistent rainfall. The permanent substation area will occupy almost 50% of the total farm area which will create uncontrollable runoff and water table spread leading to regular localised flood events. | 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 Outline CoCP and outline surface water and groundwater management plan (document reference J1.9) includes measures in relation to drainage. |
| TA_0231_002_231123          | S44     | Email           | Groundwater Table and Pressures on Localised Ditch Networks The area is low lying and whilst the farm drainage system is adequate to handle rainfall any introduction of hard surfaced substations will cause the water table to spread together with runoff from hardstand areas which will cause significant localised flooding on a regular basis throughout the year. There is little mitigation from the developer inserting a cut off drain as the additional volumes of rainfall collected will outfall into the local ditch network which is already at full capacity in times of persistent rainfall.  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). 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.   |
| TA_0233_002_231123          | S44     | Email           | Groundwater Table and Pressures on Localised Ditch Networks The area is low lying and whilst the farm drainage system is adequate to handle rainfall any introduction of hard surfaced substations will cause the water table to spread together with runoff from hardstand areas which will cause significant localised flooding on a regular basis throughout the year. There is little mitigation from the developer inserting a cut off drain as the additional volumes of rainfall collected will outfall into the local ditch network which is already at full capacity in times of persistent rainfall.  | 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 Outline CoCP and outline surface water and groundwater management plan (document reference J1.9) includes measures in relation to drainage.  |
| 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_006_231123          | S44     | Email           | Groundwater Table and Pressures on Localised Ditch Networks The area is low lying and whilst the farm drainage system is adequate to handle rainfall any introduction of hard surfaced substations will cause the water table to spread together with runoff from hardstand areas which will cause significant localised flooding on a regular basis throughout the year. There is little mitigation from the developer inserting a cut off drain as the additional volumes of rainfall collected will outfall into the local ditch network which is already at full capacity in times of persistent rainfall.  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>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</p>  |
| TA_0235_002_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Groundwater Table and Pressures on Localised Ditch Networks The area is low lying and whilst the farm drainage system is adequate to handle rainfall any introduction of hard surfaced substations will cause the water table to spread together with runoff from hardstand areas which will cause significant localised flooding on a regular basis throughout the year. There is little mitigation from the developer inserting a cut off drain as the additional volumes of rainfall collected will outfall into the local ditch network which is already at full capacity in times of persistent rainfall.</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). The Outline CoCP and outline surface water and groundwater management plan (document reference J1.9) includes measures in relation to drainage.</p> |
| TA_0236_003_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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)</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.</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</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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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>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_0243_006_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>The development will significantly adversely impact local amenities, change of character from rural to industrial, and potential flooding due to massive displacement caused by the enormous industrial development, ruining farmland for decades and placing homes at risk.</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 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</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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).  |
| TA_0244_006_231123          | S44     | Email           | The development will significantly adversely impact local amenities, change of character from rural to industrial, and potential flooding due to massive displacement caused by the enormous industrial development, ruining farmland for decades and placing homes at risk.   | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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). |
| 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 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 | 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  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | <p>mistrust that is beyond repair. This is another reason why I must whole heartedly Object on all parts of your proposals.</p>  | <p>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 coasts 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 coasts 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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, 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_0248_005_231123          | S44     | Email           | We have suffered severe flooding on several occasions over the last 6 years we have had our land due to the land being surrounded by tidal drainage ditches which are unable to cope with what is already in the area. The size of the proposed substations would undoubtedly have a severe effect on surface water drainage going into already less than adequate drainage system.  | 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). 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 the Outline CoCP (document reference J1). 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_0249_005_231123          | S44     | Email           | We have suffered severe flooding on several occasions over the last 6 years we have had our land due to the land being surrounded by tidal drainage ditches which are unable to cope with what is already in the area. The size of the proposed substations would undoubtedly have a severe effect on surface water drainage going into already less than adequate drainage system.  | 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). 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 the Outline CoCP (document reference J1). 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_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. | 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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.</p>  | <p>considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, 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.</p>   |
| TA_256_001_201223           | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</p> | <p>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.</p> |

## E1.16.18 Onshore ecology table of responses



## E1.16.18.1 Onshore ecology table of responses (via feedback form)

**Table E1.16.18.1: Onshore ecology and nature conservation 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 (3.3; Onshore ecology and nature conservation) 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_004_231123          | S42     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.3                          | What proposals to offset BNG, Carbon and flood mitigation measures need to be made.  | 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_008_231123          | S42     | Online feedback form | 5                      |                              | Seem to want to take up a large part of the coastline which forms soft defences and SSSI and RAMSAR sites which been heavily invested in over the years.   | An assessment of the potential impact on key receptors, including qualifying features of the 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 ES (document reference F3.4).<br>Details on the potential impacts on European sites from the Transmission Assets are contained within the ISAA (document reference E2.1, 2.2, 2.3).  |
| 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_0051_003_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.3                          | See 3.1 above<br><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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method        | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                        |                        |                              |  | 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_004_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form   | 3                      | 3.4                          | The line of established trees and wooded areas bordering the land to the rear of properties on REDACTED is a natural habitat for hundreds of animals, birds and wildlife. There can be no justification for removal of this wooded corridor, which has been in place for years, and is a natural aid to the drainage of land which has an already high water table.  | 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_0051_011_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form   | 13                     |                              | Please see previous comments<br><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_0052_001_131123          | S44     | Hardcopy feedback form | 1                      |                              | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?</li> <li>2. The easiest route is surely down the estuary, away from homes, farms, livelihoods. Why is this not an option? I know (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.</li> <li>3. What do you propose to do to make the area more attractive (i.e. trees, hedges etc)</li> <li>4. Lower Lane is a little lane and not suitable for heavy vehicles. How are you going to combat this?</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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!!!</li> <li>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?</li> </ol> | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | 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.<br>9. What is being considered (sic) with regard to screening the substations and not leaving them as a blot on the landscape!  |   |
| TA_0056_015_141123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.3                          | As previously stated<br><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<br><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_003_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      |                              | The areas planned for this disruption is a conservation natural beauty area which has wildlife that cannot be disturbed so must be protected.  | Impacts and effects on ecology are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).   |
| 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.<br>- Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2).<br>- Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3).   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | - Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4).<br>- Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5).  |
| TA_0060_007_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.5                          | The sand dunes and surrounding coastline in this area is a conservation area so must be protected.  | 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.   |
| 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_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.<br>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_0060_018_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 13                     |                              | This area is a place of natural beauty and conservation area. We must protect this land as it's a natural sea defence barrier.  | 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.<br>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_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).<br>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).<br>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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | current design are provided in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).   |
| TA_251_004_231123           | S44     | Consult Online       | NULL                   |                              | 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.<br>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.    | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_0064_003_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 2                      |                              | You have also not generated a separate box to comment here own impact of onshore works<br><br>Please note that there are bats resident in properties and trees around REDACTED.<br><br>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<br><br>Perhaps going across the north side of the airport and giving the Enterprise Authority a "big bung" might get the job done much quicker. | 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).<br>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.   |
| TA_0064_005_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.3                          | Bats and other wildlife in the REDACTED area   | Onshore ecology is considered within Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).<br>Impacts on protected species have been assessed and mitigation is provided for any unavoidable impacts, as described in section 3.8 and assessed in section 3.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).   |
| TA_0067_004_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.3                          | Huge impact on the unstable dunes, wildlife areas, environmental areas   | Detailed assessments are 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).<br>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.<br>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_0067_008_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 8                      |                              | Unightly, enormous and again detail hidden deep in the documentation. An environmental diaster.  | 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_007_181023          | S42     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.3                          | <p>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</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> | <p>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).</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"> <li>- selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets</li> <li>- refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received.</li> </ul> <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> <p>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).</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| 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>                             | <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).</p> |
| TA_0072_001_231123          | S44     | Consult Online       | NULL                   |                              | <p>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.</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>Detailed assessments are 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).</p>   |
| TA_0073_004_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 5                      |                              | <p>Disruption of sand dunes and of Clifton Drive St Annes, and the nature reserve</p>  | <p>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.</p> <p>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> <p>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).</p>  |
| TA_0074_006_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.3                          | <p>SSSI should not be disturbed at all.</p>  | <p>An assessment of the potential impact on key receptors, including qualifying features of the SPAs (e.g. Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA) as identified in section 4.6.2, is presented within section 4.11 of Volume</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | <p>3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).</p> <p>Details on the potential impacts on European sites from the Transmission Assets are contained within the ISAA (document reference E2.1, 2.2, 2.3).</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>   |
| TA_0075_002_071123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 2                      |                              | No, providing any habitat loss is reinstated or kept to a strict minimum.   | <p>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).</p>   |
| TA_0076_001_091123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How will it effect the road out side my house</li> <li>2. How will if effect the dunes facing my house</li> <li>3. How will the 'Potential biodiversity net gain, enhancement and/or mitigation areas', how will this affect the front in St Annes</li> </ol> | <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> <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 Transmission Assets.</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | <p>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.</p> <p>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_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   | <p>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.</p> <p>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_0078_001_051123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | <p>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.</p> <p>There are many areas of coastline which are less populated and where there would be much less impact to communities and indeed wildlife.</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_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 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_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_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_0080_007_201123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      | 4.1                          | I have concerns about the effects on habitats in the nature conservation area on Clifton Drive North bordering our estate .   | 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_0080_009_201123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 5                      |                              | <p>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.</p> <p>I am also concerned about the size and the location of the transition joint boxes. I would like more information please.</p> <p>I'm also concerned about the impact on the habitats of the nature reserve bordering our estate .</p> <p>Also we have concerns about the windfarm development causing radar disruption at Blackpool airport and safety issues.</p> | <p>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.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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).</p>  |
| 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)  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | 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_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_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_0085_001_191123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      |                              | <p>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:</p> <p>Concerns about the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The impact of the wide corridor immediately next to our properties, but also will it go under our land?<br/>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!</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>4) Vermin - we know from other local digging, drilling that this has driven vermin into our homes!</li> <li>5) Noise from the amount of electricity being transmitted right by our homes.</li> <li>6) Impact on the local wildlife in the area</li> <li>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</li> <li>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 specific 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.</li> <li>9) What access will be required to land involving access down REDACTED - this question has not been adequately answered at consultation meetings.</li> <li>10) Disruptive lighting at the bottom of our gardens/land during works</li> <li>11) Major concerns re traffic disruption to the local area during construction as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>11.1 - REDACTED has limited access and currently Blackpool council are proposing reclosing the Midgeland Road access again, which leaves</li> </ul> </li> </ol> | <p>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.</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | 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.<br>11.2 - Traffic and works disruption impact to neighbouring roads in St Annes using these routes to join up with land by REDACTED  |   |
| TA_0085_004_191123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.3                          | Impact to local nature, but also concerns that digging drilling etc in the fields at the bottom of our gardens will drive vermin into our homes. This has happened to us before locally so a major concern.  | 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_0085_010_191123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 5                      |                              | This will cross the sand dunes and has impact to the nature of these as well as potential structure of the actual hills  | 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_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.<br>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<br>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. 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.<br>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<br>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 | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | Lanes on the Fylde Coast, many residents have horses and chose to live here for that reason.<br>We don't want any interruption to farmlands either, we need them.<br>So I strongly object to these proposals   |   |
| 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_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_0092__002_151123         | S44     | Online feedback form | 7                      |                              | 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.<br>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__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.<br>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__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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | J3).<br>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_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.<br>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.<br><br>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__020_151123         | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.3                          | This is important to preserve in this area and particularly across the Fylde Coast  | Onshore ecology is considered within Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).<br><br>Impacts on protected species have been assessed and mitigation is provided for any unavoidable impacts, as described in section 3.8 and assessed in section 3.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).  |
| TA_0093_002_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | As a resident on REDACTED, REDACTED, my house is on the main road opposite the beach. I walk my dog on the beach and nature reserve multiple times per day or week and use the Clifton Drive cycle lane regularly instead of my car. I have been living here almost 8 years and chose this area specifically for the quiet, rural feel. I am extremely concerned about what this project will do to my quality of life, general health and cost of living if I have to sit in construction traffic jams and drive to be able to find somewhere remote to take a walk, especially if it takes years to complete. Many of my neighbours are retired or elderly and chose to live here for a better quality of life in their later years. This will have a huge impact on our wellbeing. | Detailed assessments are 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). 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 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 appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards.  |
| 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_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_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"> <li>- selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets</li> <li>- refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received.</li> </ul> <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> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| 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 and experience as residents situated closest to the monstrous constructions being proposed | <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). 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).</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_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 | <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). Visualisations have been presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5)</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | <p>(document reference F3.12, Part 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>  |
| TA_0096_003_131123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 7                      |                              | <p>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</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). 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).</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> |

| 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_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 | <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). 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).</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_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  | <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   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | and experience as residents situated closest to the monstrous constructions being proposed   | <p>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).</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_0097_006_171123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.3                          | This is not good for any wildlife in this area   | <p>Onshore ecology is considered within Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).</p> <p>Impacts on protected species have been assessed and mitigation is provided for any unavoidable impacts, as described in section 3.8 and assessed in section 3.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).</p>  |
| TA_0098_004_081123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.3                          | It will obviously all be disturbed by the noise and the disturbance of the area they inhabit.  | <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 Transmission Assets 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_0098_005_081123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.4                          | <p>As above. all uprooted and disturbed.</p> <p>We cant even cut hedges in nesting season so how can this possibly be acceptable ?</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.</p> <p>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</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | Statement (document reference J11) utilises the latest biodiversity metric published by Defra (4.0).   |
| TA_0098_019_081123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 12                     |                              | Make big bankings, plant thousands of trees before you even start.   | 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_0252_001_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | 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.   | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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. |
| TA_0252_004_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 5                      |                              | 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. | 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | <p>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_0252_005_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 7                      |                              | Extremely disruptive to the local farming community, the local environment and visual impact especially from the substations and other infrastructure. | <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).</p> <p>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. Detailed assessments are 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 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_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.                              | <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). 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>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| TA_0101_009_121123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 9                      |                              | Yes. I reject due to disturbances to local wildlife  | Detailed assessments are 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_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.<br>we have worked hard to develop REDACTED and improve the grazing and natural habitats not only for horses but other wild life too.<br>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).<br>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.<br>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.<br>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.<br>i cant imagine losing any land to pipes etc, the land we are on is marshy 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.<br>i could not more strongly oppose the development | This consultee is not 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).<br>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_006_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.3                          | as mentioned the local wildlife has been impacted here already due to housing developments. many owls and foxes being displaced  | Onshore ecology is considered within Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).<br>Impacts on protected species have been assessed and mitigation is provided for any unavoidable impacts, as described in section 3.8 and assessed in section 3.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).  |
| 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   | 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.  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | 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 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_003_101123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 5                      |                              | Passing through a number of green belt by lytham moss, visually damaging to the environment as well as physically damaging green belt 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.<br>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_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).<br>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | <p>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 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_0106_007_281023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.3                          | The proposed routing is directly through a nature reserve and a designated green zone. Has the planning considered all the ordinances surrounding the use of green zone land and airport land in general. | <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. 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). 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_0106_012_281023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      | 4.2                          | Does the propose development impact ordinances concerning airport/greenbelt land and its use.   | <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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method        | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                        |                        |                              |   | Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.  |
| 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).<br>Detailed assessments are 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_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. 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).<br>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.<br>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).<br>In addition, during an iterative process of EIA, locations where  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method        | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                        |                        |                              |   | trenchless techniques will be used to avoid impacts on IEFs. have been identified.<br>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.<br>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_004_131123          | S44     | Hardcopy feedback form | 3                      | 3.3                          | The Lytham St Annes Nature reserve is an SSSI and should not be used in any way for this project.   | 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.   |
| TA_0111_011_131123          | S44     | Hardcopy feedback form | 4                      |                              | Landfall is at the wrong site, both for damage and access to the beach, and interference to the Nature Reserve (which as an SSSI should not 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).<br>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).<br>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 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_0111_012_131123          | S44     | Hardcopy feedback form | 4                      | 4.1                          | The landfall site on the beach will obviously damage visually and for access, this part of the beach forever.   | 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.   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method        | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                        |                        |                              |   | 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 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_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 (REDACTED) will have major cable (sic) at the end of their gardens with risk to health, property values and saleability will be badly affected. | <p>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.</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.</p> <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).</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 a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (<a href="http://www.gov.uk">www.gov.uk</a>)<br/>Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p> |
| TA_0111_016_131123          | S44     | Hardcopy feedback form | 13                     |                              | Too much damage will be done during construction.   | <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>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.</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method        | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                        |                        |                              |   | <p>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.</p> <p>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_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 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).</p> |
| 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   | <p>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).</p>  |
| 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>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | <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_0115_005_051123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 13                     |                              | I can't see how there is any gain, but can see considerable loss with there being disruption to the dunes which are a conservation area, conservation area which has families of foxes living opposite. | <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 Transmission Assets.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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> |

## E1.16.18.2 Onshore ecology table of responses (via all other methods)

**Table E1.16.18.2: Onshore ecology table of responses (via all other methods)**

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
| TA_0001_187_231123          | S42     | Email           | <p>6.1 The proposed cabling route falls within an area of deep peaty soils as identified here. Further evidence required to determine presence of deep peaty soils. Natural England advises that either further information is provided to demonstrate the extent of deep peat in the area of the cable route, or that the proposed developments are amended to avoid any work within these particular areas. Natural England advise that it may be useful to refer to existing borehole data from the British Geological Survey (BGS) but if there is a lack of data across the proposed development site then a peat survey may be required. A peat survey should be undertaken by a soils scientist and should determine the presence of peat, it's depth and the presence of any spoil/waste materials that would impact the restoration ability. Natural England advise that peat surveys are carried out in line with the IUCN peatland programme field protocol</p> <p>6.1 3.9.3.3 and 3.9.5.8<br/>Both these sections include list of pre- construction surveys to be undertaken for the caballing routes. The caballing routes fall within the deep peaty soils layer – peat can be damaged from cabling works. In Cheshire to Lancashire, for onshore projects, Natural England request that evidence for anyproject which may impact peat needs to demonstrate that a) either peat is not present within the area, or b) it cannot be restored. As the proposed cabling route falls within an area of deep peaty soils, Natural England advises that the developer provides information detailing the presence or absence of peat along the cable route. Further information on the location of deep peaty soils can be found here. Natural England do not support the principle of developing on peat. Peat is an irreplaceable asset that once gone is lost for ever and can never be restored to sequester carbon which is difficult to justify in a climate emergency. Natural England advises that any ground works, such as cutting a trench in the peat or drift deposits under or adjacent to the peat will have impacts both on ground water and water levels within the peat. Peat habitat is very sensitive to modification to water levels, this means these works can impact a wide area of the peat mass. Natural England therefore advises that either further information is provided to demonstrate the extent of deep peat in these areas or that the proposed developments are amended to avoid any work within these particular areas. Natural England advises that it may be useful to refer to existing borehole data from the British Geological Survey (BGS) but if there is a lack of data across the proposed development site then aa peat survey may be required. A peat survey should be undertaken by a soils scientist and should determine the presence of peat, it's depth and the presence of any spoil/waste materials that would impact the restoration ability. Natural England advise that peat surveys are carried out in line with the IUCN peatland programme field protocol.</p> | <p>The EIA process has taken into account both existing information (including details of BGS boreholes) and site survey. Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1) sets out details of ground conditions.</p> <p>Peaty soils are considered within Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). This chapter includes details of soil surveys undertaken. 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). The assessment has considered the presence of peaty soils located within the Transmission Assets Order Limits.</p>   |
| TA_0001_188_231123          | S42     | Email           | <p>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.</p>   | <p>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.</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
| TA_0001_189_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.3 Incomplete surveys with data gaps. The current assessment does not include a range of surveys including reptile and invertebrates. These surveys may change some of the conclusions. For reptile surveys, sand lizard surveys should be undertaken as sand lizards have been successfully re-established within coastal dunes of which the assets will pass through. As this assessment is based on incomplete/ missing surveys, the submitted ES needs to present the assessment with full survey data. Specific Sand Lizard surveys also need to be carried out for the section of coastal dune habitat that the transmission cable corridor crosses. Detail of the methodology that should be followed for the Sand Lizard survey is provided in comment 6.19 Please also see comment 6.12 for further detail on our baseline survey guidance. | As discussed in the Expert Working Group Meetings, further surveys have taken place to support the ES which are detailed in section 3.6.2 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). No surveys for sand lizard are proposed as impacts will be avoided through the use of direct pipe trenchless installation. Data on their distribution in 2022 and 2023, following their introduction to the Fylde dunes in 2018 has been provided by the sand dune project. Further surveys are considered to cause unnecessary disturbance to dune habitats given that the data from would not improve the basis for assessment. The impacts and effects on sand lizards have been included in section 3.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology sand nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).                                  |
| TA_0001_190_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.4 The assessment of ecological receptors in Volume 3, Chapter 3 does not seem to account for the supporting habitat that some ecological receptors provide to qualifying bird species. This means that some doubt remains around the conclusions for impacts on these ecological receptors. When assessing the habitat within the ecological chapters, as part of the assessment of its value, the developer needs to consider the role it plays in providing this supporting habitat to important bird species, as this contributes towards the overall function and value of the habitat.   | The impact of loss of habitat has been considered separately to that of disturbance in section 4.13.3 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4). In addition the functionally linked land at Lytham Moss has been assessed separately.   |
| TA_0001_191_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.5 There is a lack of assessment on impacts to SSSIs. The documents only seem to assess impacts on notified bird species in SSSIs not other notified features such as various habitats. An assessment is required for all SSSIs, including all direct and indirect impacts on notified features.   | The impact on SSSIs (designated for reasons other than ornithological interest) has been provided in section 3.11.2 and 3.11.3 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).<br><br>Features of internationally and nationally designated sites were considered when identifying the list of Important Ecological Features listed in section 4.6.6 of Volume 3 Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4). The potential for impacts from the Transmission Assets has been assessed in section 4.11 of that chapter.   |
| TA_0001_192_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.6 No detail has been provided for what is happening at the Fairhaven site. From aerial photos, this area appears to be coastal habitats with dunes and saltmarsh (although not designated, this would still be a Priority Habitat). Part of this area falls within the geological site – Lytham Coastal Changes SSSI. Please provide further detail for this area in the submitted ES.  | The referenced site is proposed for ornithological mitigation – details are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4) and the Outline Ecological Management Plan (document reference J6). Any impacts on designated geological sites are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1) sets out details of ground conditions.   |
| TA_0001_193_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.7 As the proposed installation method for to avoid Lytham St. Anne's SSSI is HDD, it is felt that the developer has not fully considered the Maximum Design Scenario (MDS) for this designated site. Please see comment 6.12 for further detail. A full baseline assessment of Lytham St. Anne's Dunes SSSI should be undertaken, and presented within the submitted ES, so that should the worst-case scenario occur (i.e. HDD is not possible) sufficient ecological data is available to inform/ develop suitable mitigation measures. In addition, it could be used as a baseline for post-construction monitoring (and a means to determine recovery). Please see comment 6.12 for further detail.   | Direct pipe trenchless installation is proposed in this location and is the basis for the assessment of impacts on dune slacks provided in section 3.11.2 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). Further data on the distribution and status of SSSI interest features that is necessary to inform the ES has been obtained from existing reports prepared on behalf of Lancashire Wildlife Trust and Our Future Coasts, and project-specific national vegetation classification (NVC) surveys have been carried out to confirm or update the findings of these reports where necessary. Crossing techniques at the sand dunes at Lytham St. Anne's are presented 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. |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| TA_0001_194_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.8 There is a lack of consideration of other impacts to Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI, particularly with regards to changes to the water table. Please see comment 6.27 for further detail. Consider changes to the water table at Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI.  | This impact is considered within section 3.11 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).  |
| TA_0001_195_231123          | S42     | Email           | Project Description 6.9The 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 1.3 I - 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_197_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.11 5.4.6 This section sets out the mitigation hierarchy. However, from the measures listed that will be implemented, it's not clear if the full hierarchy is being followed.i.e - avoid, minimise, rectify, reduce and off-set.Provide clarification on how the measures adopted will follow the full mitigation hierarchy. In this section, there seems to be a lot of discussion around reducing, off- setting or enhancing but there's not much focus on avoidance or rectifying. Natural England advises that the developer should follow the mitigation hierarchy table and set out how they will avoid and minimise in first instance in their approach.  | 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.  |
| TA_0001_198_231123          | S42     | Email           | Natural England's Position on Worst Case Scenario or Scenarios 6.12Vol3; Chp 3 Table 3.11,Table 3:15 The developer recognises Lytham St. Anne's Dunes as a SSSI (Table 3.11) and it has been taken forward as an Important Ecological Feature (Table 3.15). However, as the proposed installation method is HDD it is felt the developer has not fully considered the MDS (Table 3.16) for this designated site. The current assessment for Lytham St. Anne's Dunes SSSI (para 3.9.2.8 - 3.9.2.11) notes "During construction the Transmission Assets will commit to avoiding impacts on the Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI, as the cables will be installed beneath this habitat via HDD (or other trenchless techniques) and open trenching techniques would not be used within this habitat.Accordingly, there will be no temporary or permanent loss of this habitat type. The magnitude of impact is therefore, considered to be no change." The developer goes on to note that while the sensitivity of the habitat is High, the significance of effect is no effect. However, from experience of similar projects Natural England know that on occasions HDD can fail, or the proposed development design changes and for example Transition Joint Bays need to be moved (which presumably currently will be situated on the beach)/ or additional vehicle access is required. In such scenarios by excluding any effect early in the assessment process there is a lack of detail later on if the installation methods change.Similarly full consideration of impacts should HDD not be undertaken in saltmarsh along the river Ribble (part of the Ribble Estuary SSSI). A full baseline assessment of Lytham St. Anne's Dunes SSSI should be undertaken so that should the worst-case scenario occur (i.e. HDD is not possible) sufficient ecological data is available to inform/ develop suitable mitigation measures. In addition, it could be used as a baseline for post-construction monitoring (and a means to determine recovery).Baseline surveys of Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI should include mapping to NVC level of the dune habitats present, with supporting quadrat sampling. Quadrat sampling should be sufficient in coverage to ensure all community types are sampled. The SSSI citation notes that the site support classic features of dune formation and ecological succession including the widest range of foredune, yellow dune, dune grassland, acid dune grassland, dune scrub and dune slack habitats found anywhere along the Fylde Coast. The site is botanically diverse with a number of rare or scarce plant species.Use of up-to-date aerial photography taken at the time of the NVC survey would be preferable. The developer should undertake a cable burial risk assessment for all the HDD work (including Lytham St. Anne's Dunes SSSI and the River Ribble (part of the Ribble Estuary SSSI) informed by geotechnical investigations. This should include an outline burial cable specification and installation plan which has a pollution* and contingency plan. This would help determine the | 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 likelihood of collapse that is associated with cable installation using horizontal directional drilling (HDD). The Works Plans submitted with the application for development consent (and accompanying description) allow only for direct pipe in this location. Therefore, the MDS that has been used is considered to be correct. Further data on the distribution and status of SSSI interest features that is necessary to inform the ES has been obtained from existing reports prepared on behalf of Lancashire Wildlife Trust and Our Future Coasts, and NVC surveys have been carried out to confirm or update the findings of these reports where necessary.CoT41 states that where the onshore export cable corridor or 400 kV grid connection cable corridor crosses sites of particular sensitivity, including Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI, a hydrogeological risk assessment will be undertaken to inform a site-specific crossing method statement which will also be agreed with the relevant authorities prior to construction.The risk of bentonite breakout at Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI 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). |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | likelihood (degree of confidence) of success of HDD at the given locations. *Note a Bentonite breakout plan is mentioned for the River Ribble but not for Lytham St. Annes Dunes   |   |
| TA_0001_199_231123          | S42     | Email           | Survey Data Acquisition 6.13 Para 3.8.5.4 (page 60) The report notes that “botanical surveys will be undertaken in 2023 and 2024 for all necessary land parcels to clarify and provide more detailed Phase 1 survey habitat results, as required. In addition, habitat parcels with potential to provide botanical diversity will have National Vegetation Classification (NVC) surveys undertaken by qualified botanists.” Please ensure this includes areas where HDD are proposed. Currently the Phase 1 Habitat Survey report notes that around 63% of the Phase 1 survey area has been surveyed. Some of this has not yet been digitised (including the habitats covering Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI and saltmarsh along the river Ribble). It is noted that some of the target notes shown in Fig 1.3a-i (Vol 3. Annex 3.2 Interim Phase 1 Habitat Survey Technical Report) are missing i.e., TN233 and TN610. Baseline surveys of Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI and saltmarsh along the River Ribble (Ribble Estuary SSSI) should include mapping to NVC level of the dune and saltmarsh habitats present, with supporting quadrat sampling. Quadrat sampling should be sufficient in coverage to ensure all community types are sampled. Additional attributes based on the Common Standards Monitoring Guidelines for sand dune ( <a href="https://data.jncc.gov.uk/data/7607ac0b-f3d9-4660-9dda-0e538334ed86/CSM-SandDuneHabitats-2004.pdf">https://data.jncc.gov.uk/data/7607ac0b-f3d9-4660-9dda-0e538334ed86/CSM-SandDuneHabitats-2004.pdf</a> ) and saltmarsh ( <a href="https://data.jncc.gov.uk/data/7607ac0b-f3d9-4660-9dda-0e538334ed86/CSM-SaltmarshHabitats-2004.pdf">https://data.jncc.gov.uk/data/7607ac0b-f3d9-4660-9dda-0e538334ed86/CSM-SaltmarshHabitats-2004.pdf</a> ) should also be included. Botanical surveys for sand dunes should be undertaken in May/ June, while saltmarsh surveys can be undertaken between May and August. Use of up-to-date aerial photography taken at the time of the NVC survey would be preferable. | Volume 3, Annex 3.3: Phase 1 habitat and national vegetation classification and hedgerow survey technical report of the ES (document reference F3.3.3) contains the findings of the phase 1 habitat, NVC and hedgerow surveys, for which coverage for surveys is over 90% and mapping is fully digitised and target notes are complete and consecutive. Further data on the distribution and status of SSSI interest features that is necessary to inform the ES has been obtained from existing reports prepared on behalf of Lancashire Wildlife Trust and Our Future Coasts, and NVC surveys have been carried out to confirm or update the findings of these reports where necessary.   |
| TA_0001_200_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.14 Table 3:10 Morecambe Bay and Duddon Estuary SPA is missing from the designated site list. Only Morecambe Bay SAC and Ramsar are mentioned. It also does not list the Ramsar qualifying features in the relevant qualifying interest section. Note for correction.   | Information on designated sites for which birds are a reason for designation is provided in Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4). Further assessment of internationally designated sites is provided in the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (ISAA) report (document reference E2.1, 2.2, 2.3).   |
| TA_0001_201_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.15 Table 3:10 For national sites, it mentions Martin Mere, Burscough SSSI – this SSSI is also underpinned by an SPA – Martin Mere SPA which is not included in list. Note for correction.  | Information on designated sites for which birds are a reason for designation is provided in Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4). Further assessment of internationally designated sites is provided in the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (ISAA) report (document reference E2.1, 2.2, 2.3).   |
| TA_0001_202_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.16 Table 3:15 The description for Lytham Moss BHS is wrong – It is not also known as the Queensway Farmland Conservation Area (FCA). The FCA is a specific area within the BHS site which is managed for qualifying bird species as mitigation provided within a planning application, the BHS itself is separate. The BHS site (which has a wider boundary) is a designated by Lancashire County Council using a set of published guidelines. This needs to be updated, the document needs to clearly set out the correct information for Lytham Moss BHS, its correct boundaries and why it has been designated a Biological Heritage Site. The FCA should be defined with information on its purpose. It is specific mitigation land for qualifying bird species and managed as such. It is also secured under Section 106 agreement between developer and Fylde BC.  | The Applicants note your response. All relevant BHSs are considered within Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).   |
| TA_0001_203_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.17 N/A – General Comment One of main justification 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 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. The developer should link to any evidence to support the justification it will be less intrusive and limit impacts on ecological receptors.   | This impact is considered within Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES. 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. Direct pipe or microtunnelling is proposed beneath the River Ribble to ensure that there would be no direct impacts on the river habitats. 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 |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | the ES (document reference F1.3.2) which is submitted as part of the application for development consent.  |
| TA_0001_204_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.18 Table 3.18 As well as BNG Metric 4 calculator, there are other tools that can be used to identify opportunities to enhance wider benefits from nature. Advise that as well as Metric, Natural England's Environmental Benefits from Nature tool may be used to identify opportunities to enhance wider benefits from nature and to avoid and minimise any negative impacts. It is designed to work alongside the Biodiversity Metric and is available as a beta test version.  | The calculation undertaken for the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11) utilises the latest biodiversity metric published by Defra (4.0).   |
| TA_0001_206_231123          | S42     | Email           | Data Gaps 6.19 3.8.5.5 The current assessment does not include range of surveys including reptile and invertebrates. These surveys may change some of assessment conclusions, especially for impacts on Coastal Dune Habitat and Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI. The ongoing Fylde Dune Project successfully re-established Sand Lizards in these dunes the other year and without the correct surveys being undertaken, the proposed development may impact these species. Sand Lizards are a European Protected Species. Natural England advises that these surveys are undertaken by the developer. This is especially important for Sand Lizard surveys within the section of coastal dune habitat that the cable intersects. The developer needs to undertake the outstanding surveys listed, and an additional sand lizard survey and present these results in the submitted ES. For Sand Lizard surveys, Natural England would expect a minimum of 20 visits carried out in suitable weather conditions, focussing primarily on the months of April and May for adults and late August to October for hatchling observations. After these surveys have been undertaken, the developer will then need to reassess the impacts on ecological receptors to see if there are any changes to the conclusions, especially looking if the species or NVC communities play an essential role in maintaining the functioning/ecosystem of the ecological receptors, and if they will be impacted by the proposed development, especially in relation to the coastal sand dunes. | No surveys for sand lizard have been undertaken as direct impacts will be avoided though the use of direct pipe trenchless installation. Further surveys would cause unnecessary disturbance to dune habitats and the data from would not improve the basis for assessment. Further data on the distribution and status of SSSI interest features that is necessary to inform the ES has been obtained from existing reports prepared on behalf of Lancashire Wildlife Trust and Our Future Coasts, and national vegetation classification (NVC) surveys have been carried out to confirm or update the findings of these reports where necessary. The potential impacts from habitat disturbance are assessed in section 3.11.3 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). |
| TA_0001_206_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.20 N/A – General Comment This chapter does not account for impacts of ecological receptors providing habitat to supporting bird species. It is acknowledged that a specific chapter has been dedicated to impacts to onshore birds, ecological receptors assessed in this chapter play a supporting role in supporting qualifying and other significant important bird species. Therefore, the role and value that these habitats have in terms of providing supporting habitat to important bird species needs to be assessed here. The role and value that certain habitats have in terms of providing supporting habitat to important bird species needs to be assessed within the ecological chapters. This is important to consider in line with the overall function and value of these supporting habitats, especially in relation to saltmarsh, FLL habitat, and the Lytham Moss area.  | Any areas of terrestrial habitat of importance for birds, including waders and waterbirds, are discussed in Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4). This includes discussion of the presence of functionally linked land within the Onshore Order Limits and the potential for adverse effects from the loss and disturbance of this habitat.   |
| TA_0001_207_231123          | S42     | Email           | Analysis, Modelling and Reporting 6.21 3.9.2.9 and 3.9.3.14 Natural England cannot agree with the conclusion that impacts on coastal sand dunes will have no effect. See comments regarding lack of surveys above.  | The assessment of impacts on the sand dunes that form the reason for statutory and non-statutory designated sites is provided in sections 3.11.3 and 3.11 of Volume 3, Onshore Ecology and Nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). Impacts on sand dunes a priority habitat are set out in section 3.11.8. Assessment of impacts on key associated species: reptiles, plants and invertebrates is provided in sections 3.11.11 and 3.11.15 of that chapter.   |
| TA_0001_208_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.22 3.9.2.15 and 3.9.3.18 Natural England do not agree that the effect for coastal flood plain grazing marsh will be minor adverse. See comments regarding data above.   | The assessment of impacts on priority habitats provided in section 3.11 of Volume 3, Onshore Ecology and Nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). This has been updated to reflect the current design, as well as increased survey coverage.   |
| TA_0001_209_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.23 3.9.2.21 and 3.9.3.22 Natural England do not agree that the effect on coastal saltmarsh will be minor adverse. See comments regarding bird data above.   | The assessment of impacts on priority habitats provided in section 3.11 of Volume 3, Onshore Ecology and Nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). This has been updated to reflect the current design, as well as increased survey coverage.<br><br>Impacts on birds are considered in Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).  |
| TA_0001_210_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.24 3.9.2.27 and 3.3.9.27 Natural England do not agree that the effect on Lytham Moss BHS will be minor adverse. See comments regarding bird data above.   | The assessment of impacts on BHSs is provided in section 3.11 of Volume 3, Onshore Ecology and Nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). This has been updated to reflect   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | the current design, as well as increased survey coverage.<br><br>Impacts on birds are considered in Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).   |
| TA_0001_211_231123          | S42     | Email           | Identified impacts.6.25 There is a lack of consideration of other impacts to Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI, particularly with regards to changes to the water table. The SSSI citation highlights “the series of exceptionally large and extensive dune slacks on either side of Clifton Drive North support a wide range of species which vary according to the depth of water and degree of moisture retention in relation to the water table”. Depending on the depth of cable installation the impacts of HDD on the dune water table (i.e., the cable resulting in the dune slacks becoming drier changing the species composition) should be considered. Other impacts such as impacts of dust on the SSSIs (identified in the Air Quality chapter as being features sensitive to dust of medium sensitivity – although ruled out due to HDD methods being used and provided the dust control measures are successfully implemented, the resultant effects of the dust exposure will normally be ‘not significant’.).Note nitrogen deposition to SSSIs does not appear to be covered – sand dunes are particularly sensitive to nitrogen deposition which can lead to over stabilisation through the dominance of coarse grasses. An assessment using the Air Pollution Information System ( <a href="https://www.apis.ac.uk/">https://www.apis.ac.uk/</a> ) should be undertaken. The effects of surface water run-off should also be considered. Consider changes to the water table at Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI. When considering habitats, it would be good to list all the potential pressures/ impacts considered. | Section 3.11.3 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation (document reference F3.3) provides an assessment of impacts to the SSSI, including changes in relation to the water table, changes in air quality from emissions of nitrogen, and the impact of surface runoff and pollution. Volume 3, Annex 9.1: Air quality impacts on ecological receptors of the ES (document reference F3.9.1) which states that impacts are insignificant for all pollutants at designated sites   |
| TA_0001_212_231123          | S42     | Email           | Screening 6.26 N/A – General Comment on Chapter 3 Onshore Ecology and nature conservation Lack of assessment of identified nationally designated sites within chapter. Table 3.10 identifies the proposed development falls near several SSSIs including Newton Marsh SSSI, Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI, Lytham Coastal Changes and several others, including falling WITHIN Ribble Estuary SSSI. It also identified several EU sites. However, impacts on these sites, except Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI is not assessed within this chapter, as would be expected. If some sites are not being taken forward for detailed assessment, then Natural England would expect discussion on why they have been ‘scoped out’, including detailed justification.. Ribble Estuary SSSI has different notified features than Ribble & Alt SPA including habitat, so it should be assessed within this chapter. An assessment is required for all nearby nationally designated sites, especially for the SSSIs as they will not be covered within the HRA. The developer needs to undertake an assessment of all direct and indirect impacts on the notified features of the SSSIs (not just birds), especially Ribble Estuary SSSI. If it’s decided that some SSSIs do not need detailed assessment, then the report should clearly state this, and provide justification why this conclusion was reached.   | The impact on SSSIs (designated for reasons other than ornithological interest) has been provided in section 3.11 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). The impacts on qualifying features of the Ribble and Alt Estuaries Ramsar site and the Ribble Estuary SSSI in terms of ornithological interest are assessed in Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4). Please refer to Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES regarding Lytham Coastal Changes SSSI.  |
| TA_0001_213_231123          | S42     | Email           | Assessment 6.27 See earlier comments regarding sand dunes at Lytham St. Anne’s Dune SSSI and saltmarsh along the River Ribble.  | The Applicants note your response and have responded accordingly, see unique reference TA_0001.  |
| TA_0001_214_231123          | S42     | Email           | Biodiversity Net Gain 6.28 Table 3.18 As well as BNG Metric 4 calculator there are other tools that can be used. Natural England advises that as well as the Metric, Natural England’s Environmental Benefits from Nature tool may be used to identify opportunities to enhance wider benefits from nature and to avoid and minimise any negative impacts. It is designed to work alongside the Biodiversity Metric and is available as a beta test version.  | 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_0001_215_231123          | S42     | Email           | Soils and Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land 6.29 Table 3.41 Natural England welcome the reference to the Construction Code of Practice for Sustainable Use on Construction Sites. There is also other standard guidance that Natural England also refer too. Any soils handling methods should also follow the Institute of Quarrying Good  | 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings which provides detailed advice on the choice of machinery and method of their use for handling soils at various phases, which we strongly recommend is followed. The British Society of Soil Science has published the Guidance Note Benefitting from Soil Management in Development and Construction which also contains useful guidance.  | 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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefitting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction. |
| TA_0001_220_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.5 Natural England do not consider that a 'whole project alone' assessment has been undertaken for the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA. For further detail, please see comment 7.46. The submitted ES should contain a 'whole project alone' assessment so the totality of potential impacts on the SPA (and other receptors where relevant) are properly quantified and appropriate mitigation put in place where needed. In particular, the assessment should fully consider how the construction pressures impact both the SPA itself and its functionally linked land.  | 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) and in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5). 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). Both the ES and the ISAA consider construction impacts, including impacts on functionally linked land.  |
| TA_0001_221_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.6 Part of the justification for no adverse impacts on onshore birds is that the cable route will not pass through significant Functionally Linked Land habitat (Lytham Moss BHS). This is not accurate as the final decision of which cable route to use has not been finalised and Option 2 will pass through this habitat. This justification can only be applied once the final decision has been made regarding the cable route. Natural England advises that route Option 1 is chosen to avoid FLL habitat.  | The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). An assessment of effects in relation to birds, including consideration of functionally linked land, is provided in Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).  |
| TA_0001_235_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.19 Vol 3, Annex 4.2 1.4.3.5 Note that much of the survey area is of significant usage as FLL by SPA species. The assessment of impacts in the submitted ES should ensure that the potential impacts on Functionally Linked Land is fully assessed in terms of impacts to SPA species and apply the mitigation hierarchy as required.  | An assessment of the potential impact on key receptors, including qualifying features of the SPAs, is identified in section 4.6.2 and is presented within section 4.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4). This assessment includes the potential impact at areas of functionally linked land identified.<br><br>The findings of the HRA process are set out in the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (ISAA) report (document reference E2.1, 2.2, 2.3).  |
| TA_0001_244_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.29 1.11.3.31 Part of reasoning for justification for no adverse and loss of habitat for onshore cable corridor is that route will not pass through the area around Lytham Moss. This cannot be justified at this stage as the final route has not been decided. The submitted documents presents two options where option one will avoid this area but option two will not. As the final phase of cable route has not been decided, thereasoning here cannot be applied until the final route is decided. This justification can only be applied once the final decision has been made regarding the cable route. Natural England advises the developer to go with route option 1. Option 1 will have the least ecological impact as it will stay closest towards the current developed areas, without going through significant FLL, and is also the option that will go through the least peat habitat. | The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). An assessment of effects in relation to birds, including consideration of functionally linked land, is provided in Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).  |
| TA_0001_245_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.30 1.11.3.177 See comments above regarding cable route – cannot be used as justification. See above.  | The Applicants note your response to individual items raised and have provided responses accordingly.   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
| TA_0001_249_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.34 1.11.3.4 Without being more specific on the location of the onshore substation, the impact of habitat loss or disturbance impact of the substation cannot be assessed as it is not clear where it is in relation to environmental receptors. The submitted ES should provide more specific detail for the location of the onshore substation in order to fully assess the impact of habitat loss or disturbance.  | The design has been further refined since submission of the PEIR and this is reflected in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has been taken into account in the updated assessment provided in section 4.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).   |
| TA_0001_250_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.35 Table 1.374 Natural England notes that impacts from the cable installation will be for 66 months (5yr 6mths) but it is not quantified in the HRA where or when the risk will be, or the likely plant used to assess risks. In the updated assessment, specify where and when the potential impacts risks (to ornithological features) will occur during the cable installation phase. The likely plant used in these assessments should also be outlined.   | The assessment of the effects due to disturbance and displacement from the presence of vehicles and/or heavy machinery associated with construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning activities is presented within section 4.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).   |
| TA_0001_251_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.36 1.11.3.8 It is not possible to meaningfully assess risks without a provisional alignment. Natural England notes that some areas within the development redline boundary have not been surveyed for ornithological risks, and it is not clear if they are in the red line boundary because they are identified as a potential impact site or a possible mitigation or Net Gain area. n/a   | The design has been further refined since submission of the PEIR and this is reflected in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This chapter also provides details of the areas proposed for construction and those proposed for biodiversity, mitigation and/or enhancement. This has been taken into account in the updated assessment provided in section 4.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).   |
| TA_0001_253_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.38 1.11.3.19 This section identifies the area directly impacted but these impact timings assume instant recovery post works. It will take some time for areas to normalise after impact. The assessment of habitat impact is also spatially framed with reference to the SPA using the whole SPA as the reference measure - not the extent of the habitat affected which will be a better reference frame for species which are closely associated with the specific habitat. The submitted ES should update the impact timings to consider realistic recovery timescales. The assessment of habitat impact should also be framed with reference to the extent of the habitat that is affected, rather than the extent of the whole SPA. | The comments from Natural England are noted. The Applicants have worked to refine the project design with respect to installation of cables in the intertidal and the onshore cable route to address Section 42 comments from Natural England on potential effects on ornithological receptors. This includes further detail on the area, duration and timing of potential impacts on ornithology species and additional information and further justification to address the comments raised. These have been addressed in sections 1.5 and 1.6 of the ISAA Part 3 (document reference E2.3) |
| TA_0001_255_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.41 1.11.3.29 The assessment does not quantify what proportion of resource will be lost at any one time. The submitted ES should present the information for temporary habitat loss within the onshore export cable corridor in terms of what proportion of resources will be lost at any one time, along with the total area.  | The assessment of temporary habitat loss is included in section 4.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).  |
| TA_0001_256_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.41 1.11.3.32 It is identified that no works are proposed in Newton Marsh SSSI, but it does not rule them out. Natural England note that the SSSI remains in the redline boundary and the disturbance zone as marked on survey maps. If works are not proposed in Newton Marsh SSSI, this should be secured as a condition in the submitted DCO/dML. As they are currently not ruled out, any assessment of features connected to Newton Marsh SSSI should consider the impacts to the SSSI and its features.   | Features of designated sites, including Newton Marsh SSSI, are identified in section 4.6.6 and the potential for impacts from the Transmission Assets has been assessed in section 4.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4) and in section 1.5 of the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (ISAA) report.   |
| TA_0001_258_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.43 1.11.3.42 Natural England do not agree with the conclusion that there is no risk of an adverse effect on the integrity of the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site as a result of temporary habitat loss/disturbance and changes in prey availability with respect to the construction and decommissioning phases of the Transmission Assets. This disagreement is based on the robustness of evidence provided. The submitted ES Provide further robust evidence to support this conclusion or apply the mitigation hierarchy to ensure adverse effects cannot arise.  | 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_259_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.44 As a general point the separation of the impacts on the working corridor and the disturbance caused during the work period is not particularly helpful as, other than the habitat recovery time, the two pressure pathways are completely linked; and the recovery time lag is not discussed. The impacts on the working corridor and the impacts from disturbance caused during the work period should be considered together in the submitted ES as the two pressure pathways are linked. The recovery time lag should also be considered when assessing these impacts.   | The Applicants note your response.  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
| TA_0001_260_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.45 1.11.3.84 Natural England considers the 300m disturbance zone will be reasonable for most species.<br>n/a   | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0001_261_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.46 1.11.3.85 The statement "The extent of disturbance and displacement from presence of vehicles/heavy machinery will be substantially smaller during the operation and maintenance phase when compared to the construction and decommissioning phases" has no evidence to back it up. If this statement is to be retained, the submitted ES should provide a clear rationale to detail why the disturbance caused by plant will be different during the operation and maintenance phase when compared to the construction and decommissioning phases.   | The assessment of the effects due to disturbance and displacement from the presence of vehicles and/or heavy machinery associated with construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning activities is presented within section 4.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4). The potential for impacts associated with cable maintenance is minimal. Details of operational activities are provided in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).  |
| 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_276_231123          | S42     | Email           | Natural England's Structure/Framework for Attributing Risk The comments provided within this letter and its Annexes have been colour coded using the structure/framework as specified in the risk table in Appendix I of this letter. In this letter, the coloured headings are coded based on the highest risk associated with the topic in question. Natural England would like to highlight that at this stage all comments highlighted as yellow, amber, or red need to be addressed, with the potential for these issues to become more significant if not resolved at application.   | The Applicants note your response.   |
| 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_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). |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| TA_0001_302_231123          | S42     | Email           | Onshore and Intertidal Ecology The proposed cabling route falls within an area of deep peaty soils. We therefore advise that either further information is provided to demonstrate the extent of deep peat in these areas, or that the proposed developments are amended to avoid any work within these particular areas. | The EIA process has taken into account both existing information (including details of BGS boreholes) and site survey. Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1) sets out details of ground conditions. Peaty soils are considered within Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). This chapter includes details of soil surveys undertaken. 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). The assessment has considered the presence of peaty soils located within the Transmission Assets Order Limits.  |
| TA_0001_303_231123          | S42     | Email           | It is noted that the current assessment is incomplete with a range of surveys missing, including those for reptiles and invertebrates. Further notes on these surveys have been provided in Annex 6.  | The Applicants can confirm that comments with Annex 6 have been addressed within these tables, using the unique identifier TA_0001.  |
| TA_0001_304_231123          | S42     | Email           | There is a lack of assessment on impacts to SSSIs. The documents only seem to assess impacts on notified bird species in SSSIs not other notified features such as various habitats.  | The impact on SSSIs (designated for reasons other than ornithological interest) has been provided in section 3.11 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).<br><br>Features of internationally and nationally designated sites were considered when identifying the list of Important Ecological Features listed in section 4.6.6 of Volume 3 Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4). The potential for impacts from the Transmission Assets has been assessed in section 4.11 of that chapter.   |
| TA_0001_305_231123          | S42     | Email           | No detail has been provided for what is happening at the Fairhaven site. From aerial photos, this area appears to be coastal habitats with dunes and saltmarsh (although not designated, this would still be a Priority Habitat). Part of this area falls within the geological site – Lytham Coastal Changes SSSI.       | 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_306_231123          | S42     | Email           | As the proposed installation method for to avoid Lytham St. Anne's SSSI is HDD, it is felt that the developer has not fully considered the MDS for this designated site. Please see comment 6.15 in Annex 6 for further detail.   | 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). Because these commitments are in place, the MDS that has been used is considered to be correct. The risk of bentonite breakout at Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI will be controlled through the Bentonite Breakout Plan as part of the Code of Construction Practice. An Outline Bentonite Breakout Plan is provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1.13). |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| TA_0001_307_231123          | S42     | Email           | There is a lack of consideration of other impacts to Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI, particularly with regards to changes to the water table. Please see comment 6.29 in Annex 6 for further detail.  | This impact is considered within section 3.11 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).  |
| TA_0001_310_231123          | S42     | Email           | <p>Appendix 1 The following Framework has been used in Natural England's advice to attribute risk to the project:</p> <p>Structure / Framework Risk<br/>Purple<br/>Note for the developer.</p> <p>Red<br/>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.<br/>Addressing these concerns may require the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• new baseline or survey data; and/or</li> <li>• significant revisions to baseline characterisation and/or impact modelling and/or</li> <li>• significant design changes; and/or</li> <li>• significant mitigation</li> </ul> <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<br/>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.<br/>Natural England considers that these matters may be resolved through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provision of additional evidence or justification to support conclusions; and/or</li> <li>• revisions to impact assessment methodology and/or assessment conclusions; and/or</li> <li>• minor to moderate revisions to impact modelling; and/or</li> <li>• well-designed mitigation measures that are adequately secured through the draft DCO/dML and/or</li> <li>• amendments to draft plans</li> </ul> <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<br/>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<br/>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)). |
| TA_0002_012_171123          | S42     | Email           | 8. Environmental Impact – Assessment and Proposals<br>Great emphasis was being placed on the plans to minimise the impact on the environment by encouraging development of biodiversity off the route of the development. However, no proper account was made for the existing activities being undertaken on the sensitive sites, by farm owners and the owners of the Freckleton and Newton / Clifton marshes, where the efforts already being made are producing a substantial benefit to the local wildlife and protected species to be found in these areas of the Fylde. It did appear as if anything already established here was going to be claimed by the project as an offset to the environmental disaster that would be created by the development of the whole tract of land across the whole of the Fylde, with all the consequence of disturbance that ensues to farms, marshes, drains and watercourses – some of which are protected rivers that feed the Ribble and Alt RAMSAR sites. Nothing seemed to indicate a benefit that would be demonstrated, other than the “green” source of electricity. No firm ideas were presented, despite one of the conditions being that they spend a percentage of their funds on new measures to enhance biodiversity. The only   | 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).                        |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | suggestion to date was the acquisition of bird boxes and this for an area that is primarily populated by ground nesting birds. A lot of boxes would be needed to make up the implied funding levels talked about!  |   |
| TA_0002_014_171123          | S42     | Email           | There have been concerns raised regarding possible electro-magnetic issues associated with the high-power transmissions and the possible impact of this and the need for screening that might result.  | 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_0003_010_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | The indicated width of the construction corridor is 122m. Much of this is accounted for by the proposed linear storage of topsoil and subsoil during construction. The utilisation of a series of top and subsoil storage areas could reduce the width of the construction corridor by approximately 40% and reduce the adverse impact not only on agricultural holdings but on ecology, transport infrastructure and reduce the development footprint of the project as a whole.  | The project 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_0003_014_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Impact on Wildlife and Habitat Fylde Council notes that the views of Natural England have been sought as part of the consultation process and so are content that they take the lead in the assessment of any ecological impacts. It is noted that the consultation material includes proposals to use Horizontal Direction Drilling to minimise impact on sensitive habitats. In the event that consent is granted for the development, it is considered essential that this aspect of the proposal is continued through to delivery of the project and is not "watered down" as a result of any future review of the project.  | This commitment remains in place. Trenchless techniques are proposed beneath the sand dunes at Lytham St Annes and beneath the River Ribble, as well as at additional locations identified 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 details are provided in the response to comments from Natural England.  |
| 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_0012_007_221123          | S42     | Email           | We also have concerns about the impact on the sand dunes where these cables come ashore and the eco systems that has been worked on over the years. We feel that there will need to be road closures as the building work is started in an area that has limited access in and out of St Anne's. The town has suffered over the years when roads have been closed, snarling up the town. These construction times will be over years not weeks or months and will have a negative economic impact on our town.   | 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). 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,   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).   |
| TA_0017_002_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | I note you have consulted the historic environment record, but not the local environment record; the Lancashire Environmental Records Network should be consulted for records of all statutory and non-statutory designated sites, irreplaceable habitats, habitats of principal importance, protected and priority species that could potentially be affected by the proposed development   | Records from Lancashire Environmental Record Network were obtained in March 2024 and are included in section 3.6.1 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation (document reference F3.3).   |
| TA_0017_003_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Known Ecological Constraints Subject to final route selection, a preliminary desk-based assessment indicates that the proposed scheme could potentially have implications for designated sites and habitats including (but not restricted to):<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Statutory Designated Sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SPA§ Ribble &amp; Alt Estuaries§ Liverpool Bayo SSSI§ Newton Marsh§ Ribble Estuary§ Lytham St Anne's Dunes§ Sefton Coasto NNR§ Ribble Estuary o MCZ§ Ribble Estuary§ Fyldeo LNR§ Lytham St Anne's LNR</li> </ul> </li> <li>Non-statutory designated sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lytham St Anne's Dunes Geological Siteo Lytham Foreshore Dunes &amp; Saltmarsh BHS 32NW01o Lytham Moss Copses BHS 32NW04o St Anne's Old Links Golf Course and Blackpool South Railway Line BHS 33SW02o Lytham Moss BHS 33SEW1o Westby Clay Pit BHS 33SE01o Pippy Lane Banks BHS 42NE01o Savick Bridge BHS 42NE04o Mason's Wood BHS 42NE07o Booths Plantation BHS 42NE09o Freshfield Farm Pond South BHS 43SW05o Freshfield Farm Pond North BHS 43SW06o Black Poplar at Newton Crossroads BHS 43SW07o Mill Brook Valley BHS 52NW01o Howick Hall Ponds BHS 52NW11o Kirkham Prison proposed BHSo Queensway Biodiversity Verge</li> </ul> </li> <li>Habitats of Principal Importance and Irreplaceable habitats: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coastal Sand Duneso Coastal Saltmarsho Mudflatso Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsho Ponds o Rivers and streamso Deciduous woodlando Traditional orchardo Peat (Great Marton Moss and Lytham Moss)</li> </ul> </li> <li>Mitigation schemes to offset the ecological impacts of earlier infrastructure projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>M5 to Heyhouses – Queensway Conservation Area</li> </ul> </li> <li>Important and Sensitive Bird Areas and potential SPA functionally linked land.</li> <li>Amber Risk Zones for great crested newts. There are also likely to be adverse impacts on protected and priority species. Owing to the scale of the proposed development, these preliminary comments do not include a comprehensive review of likely impacts on species populations.</li> </ul> | An assessment of the impacts and effects on key onshore ecological receptors (except birds), including qualifying features of the SPAs and SSSIs, is presented within section 3.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). An assessment of the impacts and effects on key onshore and intertidal ornithological receptors, including qualifying features of the SPAs and SSSIs, is presented within section 4.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).  |
| TA_0017_004_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | As discussed below, in addition to a data search, the impact assessment should be informed by a comprehensive programme of ecological assessments.   | Ecological surveys have been carried out in 2022, 2023 and 2024. The scope of surveys has been informed through consultation (through Expert Working Group meetings), review of desk study records and the results of preliminary surveys that established suitability for protected and notable species. This is discussed further 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).  |
| TA_0017_006_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | The Biodiversity net gain areas should be informed by the emerging Local Nature Recovery Strategy for Lancashire and should contribute to its delivery. The strategy will be developed throughout 2024. Preliminary strategic maps are expected to be published in early 2024.   | The status of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy for Lancashire is summarised in section 3.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). Step 1 of the strategy, to map areas of particular importance for biodiversity, is complete. Accordingly, section 3.11 of the chapter includes assessment of areas of particular importance such as statutory and non-statutory designated sites. Information on biodiversity net gain is provided in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11). Please also refer to the Outline Ecological Management Plan (document reference J6). |
| TA_0017_007_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | General Requirements As well as the proposed ecological measures stated within the consultation documents, it needs to be ensured that all of the matters discussed below are fully addressed.   | The Applicants note your response. Responses provided on a comment by comment basis, see unique reference TA_0017.  |
| TA_0017_008_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Professional competence The application to the Planning Inspectorate should include evidence that all ecological surveys, assessments and mitigation/compensation proposals have been undertaken and prepared by appropriately qualified, licenced and experienced ecologists.   | Competency standards required for surveyors carrying out ecological surveys are provided in Volume 3, Annex 3.2: Onshore ecology survey methodologies technical report of the ES (document reference F3.3.2).   |
| TA_0017_010_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Policy 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):<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Policy Statements, including for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1)</li> <li>National Policy Statement for Renewable</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  | 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   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>Energy Infrastructure (EN-3);o National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5)• The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF); • Local Plan policies. 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: • 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> | <p>(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_013_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Data searchThe planning application should include the results of an ecological data search. This should include data from the local records centre (Lancashire Environmental Records Network). Relevant data sources include:• Lancashire Environmental Records Network (LERN)• NBN Gateway• Multi-Agency Geographical Information for the Countryside (MAGIC)• Risk Zones relating to statutory designated sites• Ancient Woodland Inventory• Centre for Ecology and Hydrology Environmental Information Data Centre• RSPB• Local recorder groups for badgers, bats, amphibians, reptiles, birds etc• Ecological data from earlier or neighbouring planning applications• Risk zones for district level licensing. It should be demonstrated that the data has informed the scope of field surveys, the design of the proposed development and mitigation/ compensation measures. The data search should not be used as a substitute for field surveys. An absence of records should not be taken as absence of species or habitats. Records over 10 years old should not be discounted. These can still provide useful contextual information and an absence of more recent records may only indicate a lack of survey.</p>  | <p>The data sources included in the desk study are identified in section 3.5.1 and section 3.6.1 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). Additionally, LERN confirmed that their data for records for onshore ecology and nature conservation was sufficient and no further requests to other organisations were considered necessary. Information gained from planning applications is considered in the baseline for amphibians in section 3.6.1 and in the cumulative assessment in section 3.13. District level licensing is considered in the assessment of impacts on GCN in section 3.11.10. The findings of the data search are provided in Volume 3, Annex 3.1: Onshore ecology desk study technical report of the ES (document reference F3.3.1)..</p>  |
| TA_0017_014_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Surveys Survey data submitted with the planning application should be current/up-to-date, in line with recognised guidelines (as summarised above). The survey area should include: • The intended location of the development footprint;• Potential working areas, compounds, storage areas and access routes;• Any land that may be used within the mitigation, compensation or biodiversity net gain proposals (on or off-site);• A suitable buffer distance, taking account of the likely zone of influence and relevant survey guidelines.</p>   | <p>The survey area is the area used for site-specific surveys and is generally defined as a 150 m buffer around the Onshore Order Limits. The 150 m buffer was included to take account of protected species that may occur adjacent or close to the Transmission Assets and to allow for evolution of the boundary during the site selection process. A separate survey area was used for GCN surveys. The GCN survey area is defined as a 250 m buffer around the Onshore Order Limits. Volume 3, Annex 3.8: Great crested newt survey and reptile survey technical report of the ES (document reference F3.3.8) provides further details regarding the GCN survey area. Owing to the iterative design process of the Transmission Assets, some surveys were undertaken further than 150 m from the Onshore Order Limits. Nevertheless, information from these surveys have been included in technical annexes because it provides context regarding the ecological sensitivity of the wider area.</p> |
| TA_0017_015_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>The ecological surveys/assessments should include a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, undertaken in accordance with recognised guidelines. This should be used to determine any necessary further surveys/assessments required to inform the planning application.</p>  | <p>A phase 1 habitat survey, including scoping for protected and notable species, was carried out as part of the PEIR and findings have contributed to determine the scope and location of species surveys. Survey has continued since the publication of the PEIR, in areas that were not previously accessible or were originally surveyed at a suboptimal time. Findings have informed the requirement for further surveys. This is further detailed in Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation (document reference F3.3)</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
| TA_0017_016_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Survey results should include UKHab habitat classifications, condition assessments and all necessary data to inform an assessment of Biodiversity Net Gain. The area of each habitat (or length of linear habitats) and their biodiversity value should be quantified, using the current DEFRA biodiversity metric. Habitats of nature conservation significance, including Habitats of Principal Importance (NERC Act, 2006) and irreplaceable habitats should be identified and clearly mapped.                                      | Habitat survey has been completed for over 90% of the Onshore Order Limits, and within a 150 m buffer where access was granted and was carried out using the JNCC phase 1 habitat survey method. This has been converted to UKHab to provide the baseline for the biodiversity benefit calculation of permanent habitat loss, which has been carried out using the statutory biodiversity metric. Habitats of nature conservation significance, including priority habitats, that represent important ecological features, are identified in section 3.10 and assessed in section 3.11.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation (document reference F3.3). Further information on priority and other notable habitats is provided in Volume 3, Annex 3.1: Onshore ecology desk study technical report of the ES (document reference F3.3.1) and Volume 3, Annex 3.3: Phase 1 habitat, national vegetation classification and hedgerow survey technical report of the ES (document reference F3.3.3). The maps provided in these annexes show the distribution of habitats but maps of priority and notable habitats only are not provided. |
| TA_0017_017_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | The planning application should also include the results of more detailed phase 2 vegetation/habitat surveys of any semi-natural habitats, priority habitats and other features with the potential to support ecologically significant species. Results should include mapped plant communities and full species lists showing relative abundance. Any quadrat data and locations should be included. Any hedgerows affected by the proposals should be assessed according to the criteria specified in the Hedgerow Regulations 1997. | NVC surveys have been carried out where required, as informed by the desk study, results of the phase 1 habitat survey and predicted impacts of the Transmission Assets. Where necessary, surveys of the Fylde sand dune have been carried out to confirm or update surveys carried out in 2016.  |
| TA_0017_018_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Habitat surveys should include an assessment of the potential of habitats to support protected species, species of principal importance and other species of nature conservation significance (for example, red list species). Any evidence of such species should be recorded.  | Phase 1 habitat surveys have identified the potential for habitats to support species of nature conservation interest. The results of this process are provided in Appendix 1 of Volume 3, Annex 3.3: Phase 1 habitat, national vegetation classification and hedgerow survey technical report of the ES (document reference F3.3.3). The findings of habitat evaluation for protected and notable species that has taken place since the production of the PEIR are reflected in the findings of the relevant technical annexes (Volume 3, Annexes 3.4 to 3.14 of the ES, document reference F3.3.4 to F3.3.14).   |
| TA_0017_019_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | A comprehensive assessment of faunal interest should also be undertaken. This should include necessary species surveys identified during the preliminary ecological appraisal. The planning application should include the results of surveys for species of nature conservation value, including: • Protected species, • Species of Principal Importance (NERC Act 2006), • Red list species, • Nationally or locally rare or scarce species.   | Baseline data for protected, priority, and threatened fauna of relevance to the assessment is provided in section 3.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation (document reference F3.3) and in the following technical Volume 3, Annexes 3.3 to 3.14 of the ES (document reference F3.3.3 to F3.3.14).  |
| TA_0017_020_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | The planning application should include an assessment of the ornithological interest of the site and the predicted Zone of Influence. This should include breeding and wintering birds.  | This is provided within Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).  |
| TA_0017_021_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | All surveys should be carried out at an appropriate time of year, in accordance with recognised methodologies and best practice guidelines, and be carried out by suitably competent and experienced individuals. All survey methods used should be detailed in the ES, along with any survey limitations and a rationale for any unavoidable departures from recognised survey standards.   | Survey methods and competency standards required for surveyors carrying out ecological surveys are provided in Volume 3, Annex 3.2: Onshore ecology survey methodologies technical report of the ES (document reference F3.3.2). Limitations relevant to different surveys are identified in the technical reports.   |
| TA_0017_022_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Evaluation<br>An evaluation should be provided for all sites, habitats, species populations and other ecological features identified during the surveys, including identification of irreplaceable habitats. A rationale should be provided for the evaluation given to each ecological feature.   | An evaluation of important ecological features considered in the assessment is provided in section 3.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).   |
| 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 •   | 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | 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.  | 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_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_0017_026_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Irreplaceable habitats should be identified and it should be demonstrated that detrimental impacts on such habitats will be avoided. If the development would have a detrimental impact on any irreplaceable habitat, then the planning submission will need to include a robust statement of alternatives explored to avoid the loss of irreplaceable habitats and why they were not feasible.  | Measures to avoid loss of irreplaceable habitat have been adopted through the route selection process. The iterative design process has avoided many impacts, for example through amendment of a construction corridor to avoid a veteran tree and direct pipe installation of export cables beneath the Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI, Ribble and Alt Estuary SSSI and Lytham Foreshore Dunes and Saltmarsh BHS. Further information is provided in section 3.8, with impacts assessed in section 3.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).         |
| TA_0017_027_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Statutory Designated Sites The planning application should address the possibility of impacts on statutory designated sites, taking account of impact risk zones. Natural England should be consulted if there may be impacts on a statutory designated site. The planning application should include sufficient information to address the requirements of the Habitats Regulations (See Planning Inspectorate Advice Note Ten: Habitats Regulations Assessment relevant to nationally significant infrastructure projects).  | Impacts on statutory designated sites have been assessed and mitigation is provided for any unavoidable impacts, as described in section 3.8 and as assessed in sections 3.11.2 and 3.11.3 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).Information to address the requirements of the Habitats Regulations is provided in Information to Support the Appropriate Assessment report (document reference E2.1, 2.2, 2.3).   |
| TA_0017_028_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Non-Statutory Designated Sites The NPPF states that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing sites of biodiversity value (Paragraph 174). The planning application should address likely direct or indirect impacts on Biological Heritage Sites or other non-statutory designated sites. Impingement onto Biological Heritage Sites should be avoided and it should be demonstrated how impacts on Biological Heritage Sites will be avoided during and after the proposed development. If it can be demonstrated that impacts on designated sites are unavoidable, then the planning application should demonstrate that there will be adequate mitigation/compensation measures to provide an overall net gain in biodiversity value. Mitigation/compensation proposals should be informed by a comprehensive ecological survey of the areas affected, with reference to the qualifying features of each site.   | Impacts on non-statutory designated sites have been assessed and mitigation is provided for any unavoidable impacts, as described in section 3.8 and assessed in section 3.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).  |
| TA_0017_029_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Protected Species Potential impacts on protected species will need to be fully assessed prior to determination of the application. This should be informed by a desk study, an assessment of habitat suitability and a comprehensive programme of species surveys, including (but not restricted to) consideration of the following species:• Great crested newts• Bats• Otters• Water Vole• Badgers• Reptiles• Breeding birds   | Impacts on protected species have been assessed and mitigation is provided for any unavoidable impacts, as described in section 3.8 and assessed in section 3.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).   |
| TA_0017_030_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | DEFRA Circular 01/2005 (ODPM Circular 06/2005), referenced in Footnote 61 of NPPF 2021, states that “It is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted” and that “the survey should be completed and any necessary measures to protect the species should be in place, through conditions and/or planning obligations, before the permission is granted” (Paragraph 99).The planning application therefore needs to include habitat assessments and survey data for all protected species that could potentially be present and affected by the proposals. The survey methods used should be detailed in the planning submission. These should comply with recognised guidelines. The planning application should demonstrate that relevant species protection legislation will be adhered to and should include mitigation/compensation proposals for unavoidable impacts on such species and their habitats. If any European protected species (such as bats, great crested newts or otters) are present, then | 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).The Applicants will apply for mitigation licenses if there are unavoidable impacts on fully protected species, with the information necessary to allow the application to be determined. |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | the planning application should include measures to avoid any breach of The Habitats Regulations. If such a breach would be unavoidable, then a Natural England Licence would be required before development work could commence. The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) state that a competent authority, in exercising any of its functions, must have regard to the requirements of the Directives. The application will therefore need to include sufficient information to enable the determining authority to meet this requirement.   |  |
| TA_0017_031_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Other species The planning application will need to include an assessment of likely impacts on species of nature conservation value and mitigation/compensation measures for unavoidable impacts. This should include Species of Principal Importance (NERC Act 2006), red list species and any nationally or locally rare or scarce species.  | Likely impacts on species of nature conservation value and mitigation/compensation measures for unavoidable impacts have been considered and the assessment is provided in section 3.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).   |
| TA_0017_032_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Invasive/Injurious Weeds Surveys for invasive or injurious weeds should be carried out. If such species are present the planning application should demonstrate how the spread of these species will be avoided during the proposed development works and how the species will be eradicated from the site. This should follow recognised guidelines   | Surveys of Invasive Non-native Species have been carried out and they are considered in section 3.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). See also Volume 3, Annex 3.14: Invasive non-native species technical report of the ES (document reference F3.3.14).  |
| TA_0017_033_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Impact Assessment Unavoidable impacts on sites, habitats, species and features of ecological value will need to be assessed in accordance with recognised guidelines (see examples above). All temporary and permanent impacts should be stated and assessed, including (but not limited to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• habitat loss,</li> <li>• habitat degradation and disturbance,</li> <li>• habitat fragmentation, severance and isolation,</li> <li>• ecological impacts arising from hydrological changes,</li> <li>• potential killing, injury and disturbance of protected and priority species,</li> <li>• destruction or disturbance of habitats used by protected and priority species,</li> <li>• impacts arising from lighting, noise, vibration, dust etc.</li> <li>• Impacts of all construction and related works should be included in the assessment, including the construction footprint, compounds, storage areas, access routes etc.</li> </ul> The area and biodiversity value of each habitat type that would be lost, damaged, re-established, enhanced or brought into favourable management should be quantified in order to illustrate that the impacts of the development will be fully off-set and that overall biodiversity gains will be delivered. The current DEFRA biodiversity metric should be used.  | The scope of impacts considered in section 3.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3) have been established through consultation with the Expert Working Group and through review of consultation responses.   |
| TA_0017_034_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Mitigation, Compensation and Biodiversity Net Gain The results of surveys and impact assessments undertaken should inform the design of the proposed development and associated mitigation, restoration, compensation and enhancement measures. It should be demonstrated that impacts will be mitigated, that compensation will be provided for all unavoidable impacts and that enhancement measures will provide an overall net gain in biodiversity value. It should be demonstrated that mitigation and compensation proposals meet the requirements of legislation, policy and guidance listed above. Mitigation measures should include protection of retained habitats, species and features of ecological value, including tree root protection measures. Evidence of a gain in biodiversity value should be submitted and should include complete DEFRA biodiversity metric calculations (not just headline results), along with supporting plans. Use of the metric will be a statutory requirement when mandatory biodiversity net gain is in force. Current requirements for biodiversity gains, stated within the NPPF are summarised above. It is anticipated that the mandatory requirement for 10% biodiversity net gain, arising from the Environment Act 2021, will come into force during 2025 for national infrastructure projects. It will need to be ensured that the proposed development provides overall biodiversity gains compliant with the requirements in place at the time of the planning submission. The planning application should include proposals for maintaining, restoring and enhancing habitat connectivity within the application area and the wider landscape. Habitat creation should not be at the expense of existing habitats or features of ecological importance. Habitat creation proposals should comprise native plant communities appropriate to the location, soils, hydrology and site conditions. Guidance on native species selection is given on the Lancashire County Council's Ecology webpages: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/council/planning/planning-application-process/ecology/ecology-advice-for-developers/habitat-re-establishment.aspx">http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/council/planning/planning-application-process/ecology/ecology-advice-for-developers/habitat-re-establishment.aspx</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Plant-species-appropriate-for-habitat-creation-in-Lancashire.pdf</a></li> </ul> | 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. In addition, during an iterative process of EIA, locations where trenchless techniques will be used to avoid impacts 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. 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). |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| TA_0017_035_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Establishment maintenance and long-term management and monitoring proposals for retained, restored and replacement habitats should be provided. The timescale of the management and monitoring commitment should be stated. It is recommended that this should cover a 30-year period. This will be a statutory requirement when mandatory biodiversity net gain is in force.   | An Outline Ecological Management Plan (document reference J6) is provided as part of the application for development consent.  |
| TA_0017_036_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | It should be stated how the necessary maintenance and management will be secured for the lifetime of the anticipated planning obligations.  | An Outline Ecological Management Plan (document reference J6) is provided as part of the application for development consent.  |
| TA_0017_037_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Monitoring measures should be sufficient to measure the success of mitigation and compensation measures, to inform the need for remedial measures and to inform establishment maintenance and long-term management.   | Any relevant monitoring measures are set out in section 3.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).   |
| TA_0019_028_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | The potential biodiversity net gain areas do not provide detail of what will actually be required. They need to be properly specified with some measurable and enforceable results. The protection of existing ecology on the surrounding land needs to be documented and at least maintained. Equestrian landowners and smallholders are concerned about the welfare of their animals in particular with regard to reduction in grazing land and the impact of major disruption including light pollution, noise and vibration potentially causing stress, spread of plants toxic to certain animals and other health impacts. The biodiversity net gain approach can lead to a loss of green spaces, when there is a failure to deliver ecological improvements biodiversity will be lost overall so it is essential that the governance mechanisms regulating these future gains are watertight. Parts of the biodiversity net gain areas are disconnected from each other. In order to adequately support wildlife habitats and the natural spread of native flora and fauna these areas should be joined together to form corridors. | 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).  |
| TA_0025_003_231123          | S42     | Email           | There is also a 13km radius wildlife zone. The Aerodrome at Warton needs to be consulted on any developments that have the potential to attract wildlife. Birds are the main concern, particularly large, over-wintering birds. In relation to this, BAE Systems have initial concerns about the proposal to develop an "Onshore and Intertidal Net Gain Enhancement Plan...to identify areas where biodiversity net gain is proposed. This will include details of the measures proposed, including details of any enhancement measures proposed for waterbirds." (Preliminary Environmental Information Report Non-Technical Summary, October 2023). BAE Systems is particularly concerned about any enhancement measures in the wildlife zone that will increase the attractiveness of the area for birds (including new areas of standing water) as this has significant potential to negatively affect air safety.   | The Applicants welcome BAE Systems' engagement and proactive approach to the Transmission Assets planning and development. This comment was taken into consideration at the mitigation stage when the project was undertaking site selection activities to locate areas where mitigation could be provided. Due to BAE Systems concerns, any biodiversity benefit, mitigation and enhancement has been sited outside of the wildlife zone.   |
| TA_0029_018_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Ecology Savick Bridge Biological Heritage Site contains the Long-stalked orache (which is nationally scarce). The area would benefit from biodiversity enhancement. In terms of the Lea Marsh Biological Heritage Site this is also noted as containing the Long-stalked orache. Otters are also known to frequent the eastern side of the site. We would be happy to discuss further with the promoter the potential for biodiversity enhancement along our waterways.   | The effects on Biological Heritage Sites (including Savick Brook) are set out in section 3.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).   |
| TA_0035_010_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG): Further clarification is required regarding the approach to BNG. It's unclear at this time how this will be implemented. We would urge the applicant to engage with the developing Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) to explore BNG options that could align with the LNRS strategic approach (further comments in Appendix C).  | The status of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy for Lancashire is summarised in section 3.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). Step 1 of the strategy, to map areas of particular importance for biodiversity, is complete. Accordingly, section 3.11 of the chapter includes assessment of areas of particular importance such as statutory and non-statutory designated sites. 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). |
| TA_0035_013_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Ecological surveys: A number of further ecology surveys are required to ensure suitable baseline assessment of protected habitats and species especially in respect to CRoW assessments for onshore SSSIs, and water voles.   | Surveys have been carried out in 2022, 2023 and 2024 in order to confirm the presence or indicate the likely absence of protected species. See Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). This has informed the assessments set out in section 3.11 of that chapter. This includes details of the effects on SSSIs and other designated sites. No effects on water voles are considered likely.   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
| 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<br>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.<br>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).<br><br>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_020_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 3.8.1.8 Issue Lack of clarity regarding the cabling method (Horizontal Directional Drilling or open trench) across the intertidal area Impact Potential for damage to the physical and ecological integrity of the intertidal area. Solution Provide further clarification including entry and exit points for HDD sites if relevant.   | Details of the works in the intertidal area are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This includes open trenching works in the intertidal area. The exit point for the direct pipe beneath the dunes is anticipated to be above Mean High Water Springs.  |
| TA_0035_022_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 3.11 Biodiversity Net Gain Issue At this time the site does not have a suitable BNG strategy. Impact The proposals do not accord with government policy. There is the potential for missed opportunities for environmental gains from this project. In addition, the delivery of BNG has not been incorporated into the application and implications of this activity have not been assessed.<br>Solution The strategy for Biodiversity Net Gain to be clearly defined and delivery mechanisms to be incorporated into the DCO. The implications of delivering BNG to be incorporated into assessment documents.<br>Applicant advised to consider opportunities in Local Nature Recovery Strategies and any mitigation measures listed for the affected waterbodies under WFD. Lancashire Wildlife Trust have been working on BNG habitat options within this wider area. See Annex D for further consideration | 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.<br>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.<br><br>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).<br><br>The status of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy for Lancashire is summarised in section 3.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). Step 1 of the strategy, to map areas of particular importance for biodiversity, is complete. Accordingly, section 3.11 of the chapter includes assessment of areas of particular importance such as statutory and non-statutory designated sites. |
| TA_0035_026_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 3.9.2.18-3.9.2.21 Issue The impacts on saltmarsh are considered low magnitude and of minor significance Impact We disagree that loss in coastal saltmarsh habitat be considered as low magnitude/temporary since it takes years (potentially 10+) for saltmarsh to naturally regenerate. Solution Review the impacts on saltmarsh, taking into account the long timescale it takes to establish.  | The assessment of impacts on priority habitats provided in section 3.11 of Volume 3, Onshore Ecology and Nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). This has been updated to reflect the current design, as well as increased survey coverage. No impacts on saltmarsh habitat are anticipated.   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| TA_0035_027_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Section 3.5.3 & Table 3.13 : Site specific surveysIssueWater vole baseline is insufficient. Water vole survey was not carried out in accordance with best practice protocol. Only one survey was undertaken, and the dry spring of 2023 meant survey results were impacted with signs of water voles being more limited in this period – as washighlighted in the survey report.Impact Lack of understanding of protected species in area andresultant ecological mitigation strategy is undermined.Solution There should be at least 2 surveys for each site that has been scoped in as providing suitable habitat for water vole. Surveys should be carried out in accordance with the survey best practice. Results to be presented in Environmental Statement.  | Surveys have provided scattered and unconfirmed evidence of water vole, predominantly in the form of mammal burrows. There is infrequent but widespread evidence of mink Neogale vison, which is a significant predator of water vole, in and near the survey area. Findings of the surveys are set out in Volume 3, Annex 3.9: Water vole technical report of the ES (document reference F3.3.9). Water vole surveys have been carried out with the understanding that the Ribble Estuary SSSI and NNR is considered to be a stronghold for water vole, and all accessible areas in and in the vicinity of the SSSI and NNR were surveyed to establish the current status of the population. Survey data indicates that the population has declined, potentially due to the presence of mink, as there is very little confirmed evidence of water vole. The feeding remains and a nearby unconfirmed burrow near Penwortham indicate the transient presence of water vole rather than an established population. Water vole are therefore considered to be of local importance and have not been taken forward as an important ecological feature for assessment. |
| TA_0035_028_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Section 3.7 & Table 3.17 Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets Issue The scope of ecological assessment is insufficient. Further assessment of the ordinary watercourses and other waterfeatures will need to be considered.ImpactThe presence of watervole may be underestimated as these smaller water features may still provide habitat for both fish andother species such as water vole.SolutionAll watercourses in the area should be surveyed for water voles not just main rivers.   | Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3) provides an assessment of effects for all important ecological features taken forward to assessment, including watercourses and species they support (such as fish). See comment above re water voles specifically.   |
| TA_0035_072_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | CoT20All temporary working areas for the onshore export cable corridor, 400 kV grid connection cable corridor, temporary compounds and the onshore substation sites will be clearly marked and secured with appropriate fencing. The permanent onshore substation sites will be secured with appropriate fencing.Issue Risks to wildlife associated with site fencing have yet to be addressed ImpactThere remains a risk that wildlife may become entrapped in site fencing Solution In association with CoT17 ensure provision is made to avoid the entrapment of any animals within relevant construction areas. Checks will be made prior to the start of any works to ensure no animals are trapped.Appropriate checks will be made as required by the ecological clerk of works Secure these measures through Outline Fencing Management Plan secured in the DCO submission.                | Measures to protect wildlife during construction are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1). This includes an Outline Construction Fencing Plan (document reference J1.10).  |
| TA_0035_076_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | CoT31 Ponds identified during the route planning and site selection process have been avoided where possible. During construction any newly identified ponds will be avoided through micro- siting of the onshore export cable corridor and 400 kV grid connectioncorridor where reasonably practicable. Issue The potential for route to result in the loss of pondsImpactRisk to the aquatic environmentSolutionSecure as DCO requirement   | Details of the impacts on ponds are set out in section 3.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). This includes consideration of the impacts on pond habitats, as well as species supported by this habitat. Section 3.8 of that chapter sets out the measures proposed as part of the project, including provision of new ponds and a commitment to taking part in the District Level Licensing scheme for great crested newts.  |
| TA_0035_077_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | CoT33 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. The CoCP will include best practice measures in relation to air quality that will be applied where human receptors reside within 350 m of works, where required, or where sensitive ecological receptors are present within 50 m, as described in Institute of Air Quality guidance Management (IAQM,2014) as appropriate.Issue Measures required to manage dust and airquality have yet to be fully addressed.ImpactRisk to sensitive ecological receptors frompoor air quality.Solution Outline Dust Management Plan setting out dust and air quality control measures to be appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission.  | An Outline Dust Management Plan is provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1.2).  |
| TA_0035_078_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | CoT35, 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. The CoCP will include measures to maintain and address:- 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. Issue Measures required to manage environmental risks have yet to be fully addressed. Impact Risk to the environment Solution Outline versions of various Plans to manage environmental risks to be appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO | See the Outline CoCP (document reference J1) and the following plans submitted as part of the application for development consent:•Outline Communications Plan (document reference J1.1)•Outline Dust Management Plan (document reference J1.2)•Outline Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (document reference J1.3)•Outline Pollution Prevention Plan (document reference J1.4)•Outline Public Rights of Way (PRoW) Management Plan (document reference J1.5)•Outline   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | submission. See also CoT04 - Onshore pollution prevention plan CoT09 - Drainage Management Plan CoT11 - Operational Onshore Substation Drainage Management plan CoT20 - Construction Fencing Plan CoT26 - Site Waste Management Plan CoT30 - Contaminated Land and Groundwater Discovery Strategy CoT33 - Air Quality CoT73 - Biosecurity Protocol CoT76 - Outline Ecological Management Plan CoT77 - Bentonite Breakout Plan CoT78 - Biosecurity Protocol CoT81 - Soil Management Plan CoT86 - Measures to protect minor watercourses  | Site Waste Management Plan (document reference J1.6)•Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7)•Outline Spillage and Emergency Response Plan (document reference J1.8)•Outline Surface Water and Groundwater Management Plan (document reference J1.9)•Outline Construction Fencing Plan (document reference J1.10)•Outline Construction Artificial Light Emissions Management Plan (document reference J1.11)•Outline Biosecurity Protocol (document reference J1.12)•Outline Bentonite Breakout Plan (document reference J1.13)•Outline Contaminated Land and Groundwater Discovery Strategy (document reference J1.14) |
| TA_0035_084_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | CoT73 & CoT78A Biosecurity Protocol will be prepared as part of the Outline CoCP and submitted as part of the application for the development consent. CoCP(s) will be developed in accordance with the outline CoCP. Issue Measures to manage biosecurity have yet to be fully developed. Impact Risk to the environment Solution Outline Biosecurity Protocol to be to be secured in the DCO submission.  | An Outline Biosecurity Protocol has been provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1.12).  |
| TA_0035_085_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | CoT76 Ecological Management Plan(s) (EMP) will be developed in accordance with the Outline Ecological Management Plan (OEMP). The Outline Ecological Management Plan will be submitted as part of the application for the development consent and will include but not be limited to pre-construction, construction and post-mitigation measures relating to habitats and protected or notable species, where relevant. The Outline Ecological Management Plan will also include a Breeding Bird Protection Plan which will set out mitigation measures such as vegetation clearance in winter (e.g., hedgerows), pre-construction breeding bird survey, appropriate protection zones upon confirmation of nest building/breeding taking place of key protected or sensitive species. The Ecological Management Plan will also include details of any long term mitigation and management measures relevant to onshore ecology and nature conservation and in relation to onshore and intertidal ornithology. This will include the management of ecological mitigation areas. The Ecological Management Plan will be developed in consultation with the relevant responsible authorities. Issue Measures to manage ecological risk have yet to be fully developed Impact Risk to habitats and species Solution Outline Ecological Management Plan to be included in DCO submission | This commitment remains in place and an Outline Ecological Management Plan (document reference J6) is provided as part of the application for development consent.  |
| TA_0035_086_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | CoT83 An Onshore and Intertidal Net Gain Enhancement Plan will be developed and submitted as part of the application to identify areas where biodiversity net gain and/or opportunities for any enhancement are proposed. This will include details of the measures proposed. Issue The identification of areas for mitigation, BNG or enhancement have yet to be fully developed. and may alter the red line boundary on the DCO submission. Impact The clarification of BNG intentions may alter the red line boundary on the DCO submission. Solution An Outline Net Gain Enhancement Plan to be included in DCO submission  | CoT83 has been removed, as the Applicants' approach to undertaking enhancement opportunities is set out the Outline Ecological Management Plan (document reference J6), and the approach to biodiversity benefit is set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11).   |
| TA_0035_096_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Sand dune restoration Opportunity Opportunity for targeted sand dune restoration associated with SSSI Suggestion Engage with the Fylde Sand Dune Group which is responsible for sand dune restoration along this section of the coast. This work is part funded by the EA and is a long term ongoing project.   | Noted, the Applicants are in contact with Fylde Sand Dune Group, who have shared previous survey data.  |
| TA_0035_097_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Saltmarsh Opportunity Opportunity for targeted saltmarsh creation / restoration along the length of the Ribble and Douglas Estuaries, including consideration of options outside of the area already highlighted for BNG enhancement/ mitigation (i.e. further down the estuary). Suggestion Engage with local partners who have experience of saltmarsh creation from Hesketh Outmarsh and can support discussions around opportunities. Best done through the Ribble Life and Douglas Catchment Partnerships respectively. Potential for managed realignment opportunities along Main Drain where the existing embankment is below required condition. Potential for managed realignment opportunities to the north and south of the River Ribble to the east of Freckleton and west of Higher Penwortham to allow for tidal inundation of the current agricultural land and the formation of saltmarsh.  | Measures to protect habitats are set out in section 3.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). The assessment of impacts on priority habitats provided in section 3.11 of Volume 3, Onshore Ecology and Nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). This has been updated to reflect the current design, as well as increased survey coverage. No impacts on saltmarsh habitat are anticipated.  |
| TA_0038_007_181123          | S44     | Email           | 7. What are the potential biodiversity net gain areas to comprise of? Why are they disjointed -they do not appear to provide ecology corridors.?  | An assessment of the impact and effects on affected receptors has been carried out. Mitigation measures committed to by the project 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_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  | 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   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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 REDACTED through sections identified as REDACTED. My client's land is contained within legal title REDACTED. 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 REDACTED with an access track leading off REDACTED 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 un-necessary. My client's land is going to be severed and the triangle portions between REDACTED 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 REDACTED. Access would be directly off REDACTED 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 REDACTED is identified as longer-term land for alternate purposes – there is a linear residential development along REDACTED 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.</p> | <p>will include provisions for compensation of severed land and impact on farming operations.</p>  |
| TA_0040_001_191123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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 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.</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). 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.</p> |
| TA_0041_001_191123          | S44     | Email           | <p>As a trustee and marsh owner of REDACTED 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</p>  | <p>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.</p>   |
| TA_0042_001_191123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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 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</p>  | <p>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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | 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. | (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_0043_013_211123          | S44     | Email           | 13 My grandfather planted a windbreak which now consists of 30-40-meter-tall trees. This provides fabulous habitat for farmland birds and will be irreplaceable for decades. The cable route appears to threaten this valuable woodland habitat.   | 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_0043_018_211123          | S44     | Email           | 18 Environmental impacts: We are aware there has been an impact survey on our land, but as yet the results have not been shared with ourselves or the wider public. We support large numbers of farmland birds, many of which are with us all year and others are either Summer or Winter visitors. We have, amongst many others- skylarks, curlews, pink footed geese, lapwing, Shoveler ducks, breeding teal, kestrels, sparrow hawks and a wide variety of owls. A variety of mammals, invertebrates and amphibians also make our farmland their home.  | A number of environmental surveys have been undertaken and are reported in the ES. These include, in particular, surveys for ecology, the historic environment, agricultural land quality and tree surveys. These are reported in Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation, Volume 3, Chapter 5: Historic environment, Volume 3: Chapter 6: Land use and recreation and Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES (document reference F3.3, F3.5, F3.6 and F3.10). These have informed the assessments presented in these chapters.   |
| TA_0046_003_171123          | S44     | Email           | After a planning application I had and the ecology reports I've had done on the same land I would like to see your ecology reports to compare the findings.I have drone footage of the land from Ballam Road to Hillock Lane showing the natural wildlife from barn owls, buzzards, foxes, deer's also pictures of newts, hedgehogs and other small animals that provide food for these larger animals.What will you do to protect these animals.  | Surveys have been carried out in 2022, 2023 and 2024 in order to confirm the presence or indicate the likely absence of protected species. See Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). This has informed the assessments set out in section 3.11 of that chapter. The survey findings are set out in Volume 3, Annex 3.3 to 3.14 of the ES (document reference F3.3.3 to F3.3.14).   |
| 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_001_071123          | S44     | Email           | As a resident of Freckleton I wish to strongly register my objection to the planned substations in our area. My husband and I chose to retire here 5 years ago because of the access to the open countryside which surrounds this area. It is a valuable habitat to much wildlife including bats, great crested newts and hedgehogs, foxes, etc. We also   | 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | have curlew, lapwing and oystercatcher in this area. These key species are being displaced at an alarming rate and greatly rely on these coastal resources to overwinter successfully.  | Assets are 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.  |
| 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).   |
| 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 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_006_171123          | S44     | Email           | 7. 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.   | Detailed assessments are 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  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted 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_0127_001_191123          | S44     | Email           | we strongly object to any windfarm along the Queensway. We have a small private stable yard at the top of REDACTED which runs along the Queensway. We originally fenced along the queensway 15 foot in to protect the trees and wildlife and to cause least disruption to the area as possible.we observe bats otters newts ratweasels voles moles to name the least.the end field we own has recently had a tree cut out without our permission?also i turn my horses out along there and one horse is a rescue that does not tolerate any heavy machinery and is very nervous.so any disruption would seriously damage the area animals and wildlife.therefore we strongly object thankyou  | 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). 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).   |
| 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 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   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
| TA_0130_005_191123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</p> | <p>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). 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).</p> |
| TA_0133_003_191123          | S44     | Email           | <p>(iv) The Compound would destroy an area of the Countryside<br/>This would impact the the local countryside and animals</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.</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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)<br>The Planning Statement (document reference J28) sets out an assessment on the impact on the countryside and location of the substations.   |
| TA_0133_005_191123          | S44     | Email           | (ii) The Corridor would affect an area of the Countryside This would impact the the local countryside and animals We attended the Consultation Event at Newton.We look forward to hearing from you.   | 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 Planning Statement (document reference J28) sets out an assessment on the impact on the countryside and location of the substations.   |
| TA_0134_003_191123          | S44     | Email           | The farmland and wildlife that will be effected by this concerns me greatly. You have stated in your report that you will replant hedgerows etc... But these can take up to 30 years to regenerate. Where will the wildlife that lives in these hedgerows go? and shocks me that the substation will last 35 years (4.6.1.6)<br>The substation will ruin our rural location and turn it into an industrial site. In this village we are lucky to have lots of wildlife including bats, redshanks, oystercatchers, great crested newts, and seval types of owls and kestrels.  | 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).   |
| 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_0138_001_201123          | S44     | Email           | I would like to formally lodge my opposition to the proposed disruption to the St Annes area from the offshore wind farm.<br><br>I attended the recent consultation at the local Cricket Club and was alarmed by the proposal to take the cables through the roads of St Annes. It will cause untold disruption to local residents and will also lead to the destruction of green spaces (eg on Blackpool Rd) and wildlife. I am a resident of REDACTED and I simply can't imagine how difficult it will be to have trenches running along the nearby roads (especially Queensway) for "weeks". I suspect the "weeks" will become months very easily. Look how long it took to do a very simple road reconfiguration around Common Edge!! | Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, 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). |

| 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. <a href="https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Fylde-Biodiversity-SPD-Adopted-11-September-2019-FINAL.pdf">https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Fylde-Biodiversity-SPD-Adopted-11-September-2019-FINAL.pdf</a> <a href="http://www.stannesonthesea-tc.gov.uk/documents/(12)%20150612-St.%20Anne%27s%20NDP%20Main%20Document%20Pre%20Submission%20Final.1.pdf">http://www.stannesonthesea-tc.gov.uk/documents/(12)%20150612-St.%20Anne%27s%20NDP%20Main%20Document%20Pre%20Submission%20Final.1.pdf</a> <a href="https://www.birdguides.com/sites/europe/britain-ireland/britain/england/lancashire/lytham-moss/">https://www.birdguides.com/sites/europe/britain-ireland/britain/england/lancashire/lytham-moss/</a> <a href="https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/EL6.020b-vi-Matter-6-Appendix-CA4-part-1-Oyston-Estates-050-.pdf">https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/EL6.020b-vi-Matter-6-Appendix-CA4-part-1-Oyston-Estates-050-.pdf</a> 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_003_201123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Morecambe &amp; Morgan Wind Farm 3rd November 2023 1.) 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.)</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</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | 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?  | (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_0139_004_201123          | S44     | Email           | 10th November 2023 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 Whopper Swans.18.) Why have you asked some residents on the same street of REDACTED 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 <a href="https://blackpool.ez.com">https://blackpool.ez.com</a> ), 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 ( <a href="https://pa.fylde.gov.uk/Planning/Display/23/0758">https://pa.fylde.gov.uk/Planning/Display/23/0758</a> ).26.) The Lytham moss land is wet and very low lying. - could cause flooding to us on REDACTED how will this be combated.27.) What is the proximity of the cable corridor to properties on REDACTED.28.) How will you stop settlement on properties adjacent to the projects, path?29.) Fylde size of REDACTED 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. REDACTED REDACTED | 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. |
| TA_0140_006_201123          | S44     | Email           | There will surely be a negative impact on Blackpool Airport and also the St Anne's Nature Reserve.  | The Applicants have engaged with the airport operators. The impacts on aviation have been considered at Volume 3, Chapter 11: Aviation and radar of the ES (document reference: F3.11).   |
| 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 Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation code. The code sets out   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | <p>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_0143_001_201123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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. 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 land Prime agricultural land, potentially rendering the land useless In an area of separation Way too close to two schools Way too close to residential properties Flooding Visual impact Noise, light, vibration Wildlife Congestion Decreasing the value of land and property Safety hazard Surely there must be other options available with far less intrusion on the whole of the Fylde.</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_0144_001_201123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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 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). 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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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_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_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 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.   | 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_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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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_0151_006_201123          | S44     | Email           | My investigations show enormous concerns and implications to the village, not only to the residents but the local wildlife. Owls, hawks, buzzards, redshanks, oyster catchers, long tailed tits, bats, great crested newts and many more.  | Detailed assessments are 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_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 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. | 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_0159_002_211123          | S44     | Email           | 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.   | 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 |



| 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_0160_001_211123          | S44     | Email           | All Regarding the above project, and your Transmission Assets questionnaire.I am a resident of REDACTEDREDACTED Firstly, I would say I have no objections to wind Farms, they are a source of clean renewable energy, however I do have objections to the proposed route into the National Grid and the unreasonable impact it will have on my community and wildlife. My major concerns is the environmental impact to the area where the proposed substations are to be located. We have 2 villages (Freckleton and Newton) separated from Kirkham Town via High Grade Agricultural Green belt grass land in the summer, and in the winter months when we have rain , it floods and holds water until the natural water courses / dykes empty and it naturally drains away.   | 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_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_0165_005_211123          | S44     | Email           | Moreover, the proposed construction of the transformer will result in the loss of valuable farm land in the Newton area. This loss is concerning not only from an agricultural perspective but also in terms of the environmental impact on our community. I urge the developers to provide detailed information on how they plan to mitigate the loss of farm land and any plans for compensatory measures.  | 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_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 |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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_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 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. Detailed assessments are 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_0188_007_221123          | S44     | Email           | 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 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? | 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 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). |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
| TA_0194_001_221123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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 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>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 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_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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>design process, is set out in Volume 1, 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_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 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 offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted 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_0200_008_221123          | S44     | Email           | Impact on Wildlife and Humans  | Detailed assessments are 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_0202_005_221123          | S44     | Email           | MitigationIf these supposed mitigation sites, go ahead we most certainly not farm, or use are land as we would like too. We love our wildlife and have all sorts of creatures upon it. We have barn owls, long eared owls, tawny owls, and bats. We have water voles, greater crested newts (in places). Deer, pink footed geese, swans, and a few years ago a puma was sited for several years in our Christmas Trees. We have lapwings, field fares, curlews and many other species. There is no reference or proposals to the type of mitigation you require! | 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)  |
| TA_0211_004_231123          | S44     | Email           | 9 I am concerned about environmental damage to wildlife that has made its home on my land. We have a number of kestrels, lapwing, sparrowhawks and owl species. Shoveler ducks as well as various mammals, invertebrates, and Great Crested Newts. I understand that there is to be 'environmental mitigation' of the damage caused. This may involve taking additional prime agricultural land out of food production and therefore making our arming business potentially even more unviable.  | 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 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 (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_0214_003_231123          | 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). 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   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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).  |
| TA_0215_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| 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>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). 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_0222_003_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Question 3.6 Again, it is difficult for our clients to provide specific comment on the proposed and take, as this is not defined in the vicinity of their property, which is covered by the 400Kv grid connection cable corridor search area. However, it is our clients' general view that the proposed land take, particularly in respect of mitigation/biodiversity net gain (BNG) is excessive. It is suggested that both this, and the land proposed to be taken for the route corridor, could and should be reduced, potentially through the conjunction of the two schemes, to minimize the impact on agricultural land, and those whose businesses depend thereon.</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 Transmission Assets. For the Transmission Assets, biodiversity benefit will be delivered within identified biodiversity benefit areas within the Transmission</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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_0222_006_231123          | S44     | Email           | Question 4 Our clients are of the opinion that, based on the limited site specific information provided to date by Morecambe & Morgan, that is proposed land take for the scheme is excessive, particularly in respect of BNG. It is considered that, save for any such associated directly with any site specific mitigation/landscaping, there is no need for large scale compulsory acquisition under any DCO for BNG purposes, as any necessary BNG credits could be acquired, on commercial terms, in the open market. Please also see the comments made at Question 3 above, concerning the lack of site specific information provided, and therefore the difficulty in providing meaningful comments and feedback as part of this consultation. | 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_0222_011_231123          | S44     | Email           | Question 13 Our clients consider that the proposed quantity of land proposed for BNG or mitigation s excessive. It is suggested that save for any site specific mitigation, BNG should not be acquired by compulsory means under any DCO, as such credit which may be required to support the Morecambe & Morgan schemes, could be obtained commercially on the open market.   | Detailed assessments are 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. |
| 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  | 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  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | 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 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_017_231123          | S44     | Email           | Question 3.6 It is our client's view that the proposed land take, particularly in respect of BNG, is excessive. Such should not be permitted to interfere with their existing development, or the land which supports this development in respect of the REDACTED and REDACTED (see above).   | 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_0222_025_231123          | S44     | Email           | Question 13 Our clients consider that the proposed quantity of land proposed for BNG or Mitigation is excessive. It is suggested that save for any site specific mitigation, BNG should not be acquired by compulsory means under any DCO, as any such credits which may be required to support the Morecambe & Morgan projects could be obtained commercially on the open market. Notwithstanding this, our clients further believe that should land be acquired for BNG, this should not be acquired in areas where it may conflict with existing undertakings in respect of conservation or biological mitigation purposes, such as those associated with their development. | Detailed assessments are 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. |
| TA_0225_013_231123          | S44     | Email           | Priority Habitat Zone<br>The whole area which includes [REDACTED] is within a Priority Habitat zone.  | 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_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  | 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>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.</p> | <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 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).</p> |
| TA_0225_018_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_0225_025_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Newton Marsh SSSI Newton Marsh SSSI does not feature in pretty much any of the PEIR documentation and isn't listed in the table of SSSI Sites ! There is brief mention of breeding godwits but then completely disregarded in any determination in favour of Zone 1 ? Newton and Freckleton Marshes are both managed by RSPB. These wind farm</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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | projects highlight both marshes for potential Biodiversity Net Gain which is a ludicrous proposal given their current nature conservation status together with approximately 50% of this land mass being a SSSI.  | 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. 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_0225_028_231123          | S44     | Email           | 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.   | 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).  |
| 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 |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | undertaken for the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11) utilises the latest biodiversity metric published by Defra (4.0).   |
| TA_0226_010_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_0226_019_231123          | S44     | Email           | Newton Marsh SSSI Newton Marsh SSSI does not feature in pretty much any of the PEIR documentation and isn't listed in the table of SSSI Sites ! There is brief mention of breeding godwits but then completely disregarded in any determination in favour of Zone 1 ? Newton and Freckleton Marshes are both managed by RSPB. These wind farm projects highlight both marshes for potential Biodiversity Net Gain which is a ludicrous proposal given their current nature conservation status together with approximately 50% of this land mass being a SSSI.  | 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_0226_022_231123          | S44     | Email           | 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.   | 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.  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5)</li> <li>- Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).</li> </ul>  |
| TA_0227_006_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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_0227_010_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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_0228_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | This consultation feedback is made on behalf of the [redacted] who are the owners of REDACTED and a 50% share of ownership of [redacted] REDACTED is a SSSI which does not feature in pretty much any of the PEIR documentation and isn't listed in the table of SSSI Sites ! There is brief mention of breeding godwits but then completely disregarded in any determination in favour of Zone 1 ? Newton and Freckleton Marshes are both managed by RSPB and Natural England.  | 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_002_231123          | S44     | Email           | These wind farm projects highlights Newton Marsh for potential Biodiversity Net Gain. Newton Marsh should be removed following this statutory consultation as the land mass is a 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:<br><br>- Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5)<br>- Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).   |
| TA_0228_005_231123          | S44     | Email           | The projects are not sustainable;-Given the extensive development impact within the Green Belt and Open Countryside on agricultural businesses which will impact Food Security.-Significant loss of the most productive grassland in the UK which in turn causes a significant loss in Carbon Sequestration (Carbon Capture).-Major impact on the diverse wildlife and ecology within Rural Fylde and Rural Preston areas for many years to come.-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.-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 |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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_0228_009_231123          | S44     | Email           | 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.   | 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_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | This consultation feedback is made on behalf of the [REDACTED] who are the owners of Freckleton Marsh and a 50% share of ownership of [REDACTED]. REDACTED is an open expanse of extensively grazed by livestock grassland which has tidal gullies and is therefore an ideal land area for ground nesting birds which together with Newton Marsh SSSI which has rare breeding bird success. Newton Marsh SSSI does not feature in pretty much any of the PEIR documentation and isn't listed in the table of SSSI Sites ! There is brief mention of breeding godwits but then completely disregarded in any determination in favour of Zone 1 ? Newton and Freckleton Marshes are both managed by RSPB and Natural England. | 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_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)-   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).   |
| TA_0210_005_231123          | S44     | Email           | The projects are not sustainable;-Given the extensive development impact within the Green Belt and Open Countryside on agricultural businesses which will impact Food Security.-Significant loss of the most productive grassland in the UK which in turn causes a significant loss in Carbon Sequestration (Carbon Capture).-Major impact on the diverse wildlife and ecology within Rural Fylde and Rural Preston areas for many years to come.-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.-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_0210_009_231123          | S44     | Email           | 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.  | 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_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   | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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>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_0229_009_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
| TA_0230_004_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</p> | <p>Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).</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_008_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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,</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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_0231_006_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_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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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_007_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.   | 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). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_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  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>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_0234_011_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_0234_020_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Newton Marsh SSSI Newton Marsh SSSI does not feature in pretty much any of the PEIR documentation and isn't listed in the table of SSSI Sites ! There is brief mention of breeding godwits but then completely disregarded in any</p>   | <p>An iterative EIA process has been used to avoid impacts where practicable, in addition to mitigating remaining impacts. The</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | determination in favour of Zone 1 ? Newton and Freckleton Marshes are both managed by RSPB. These wind farm projects highlight both marshes for potential Biodiversity Net Gain which is a ludicrous proposal given their current nature conservation status together with approximately 50% of this land mass being a SSSI.  | 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. 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.  |
| TA_0234_022_231123          | S44     | Email           | 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.   | 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:<br><br>- Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5)<br>- Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).   |
| TA_0235_006_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. | 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). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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_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_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 am 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_0237_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | 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.   | 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,   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>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 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</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>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_0241_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>REDACTED is open to the prospect of provisions being made for BNG on his land<br/>If you have any queries then, please do not hesitate to get in touch.</p>   | <p>The Applicant notes the response.</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</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, 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 coasts 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 coasts 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 offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted 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> |

## E1.16.19 Onshore and intertidal ornithology table of responses

## **E1.16.19.1 Onshore and intertidal ornithology table of responses (via feedback form)**

**Table E1.16.19.1: Onshore and intertidal ornithology 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 (3.4; Onshore and intertidal 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_0050_008_231123          | S42     | Online feedback form | 5                      |                              | Seem to want to take up a large part of the coastline which forms soft defences and SSSI and RAMSAR sites which been heavily invested in over the years.  | An assessment of the potential impact on key receptors, including qualifying features of the 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 ES (document reference F3.4).<br>Details on the potential impacts on European sites from the Transmission Assets are contained within the ISAA (document reference E2.1, 2.2, 2.3).   |
| TA_0051_004_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.4                          | The line of established trees and wooded areas bordering the land to the rear of properties on REDACTED is a natural habitat for hundreds of animals, birds and wildlife. There can be no justification for removal of this wooded corridor, which has been in place for years, and is a natural aid to the drainage of land which has an already high water table. | 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_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:<br>- Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5)<br>- Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).   |
| TA_0056_016_141123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.4                          | As previously stated<br><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.<br>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.<br>An assessment of the impact and effects on affected receptors has been  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | 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_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_0092__021_151123         | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.4                          | This is important to preserve in this area and particularly across the Fylde Coast   | 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).<br>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).<br>Both the ES and the ISAA consider construction impacts, including impacts on functionally linked land.   |
| 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 and experience as residents situated closest to the monstrous constructions being proposed | <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). 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).</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  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
| TA_0096_002_131123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      |                              | <p>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</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). 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).</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_0096_003_131123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 7                      |                              | <p>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</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). 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).</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | <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_0096_004_131123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 8                      |                              | <p>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</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). 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).</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  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| 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 and experience as residents situated closest to the monstrous constructions being proposed | <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). 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).</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_0098_005_081123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.4                          | As above. all uprooted and disturbed.<br><br>We cant even cut hedges in nesting season so how can this possibly be acceptable ?  | <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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method        | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| TA_0102_006_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form   | 3                      | 3.3                          | as mentioned the local wildlife has been impacted here already due to housing developments. many owls and foxes being displaced  | Onshore ecology is considered within Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). Impacts on protected species have been assessed and mitigation is provided for any unavoidable impacts, as described in section 3.8 and assessed in section 3.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).   |
| TA_0111_005_131123          | S44     | Hardcopy feedback form | 3                      | 3.4                          | Nature Reserve has important bird colonies including heron, owls, a breeding pair of lesser kestrels, ducks, moorhens, shelducks, together with crows and magpies which regularly breed there. | 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 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. |

## **E1.16.19.2 Onshore and intertidal ornithology table of responses (via all other methods)**

**Table E1.16.19.2: Onshore and intertidal ornithology table of responses (via all other methods)**

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' 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. |
| TA_0001_191_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.5 There is a lack of assessment on impacts to SSSIs. The documents only seem to assess impacts on notified bird species in SSSIs not other notified features such as various habitats. An assessment is required for all SSSIs, including all direct and indirect impacts on notified features.   | The impact on SSSIs (designated for reasons other than ornithological interest) has been provided in section 3.11.2 and 3.11.3 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). Features of internationally and nationally designated sites were considered when identifying the list of Important Ecological Features listed in section 4.6.6 of Volume 3 Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4). The potential for impacts from the Transmission Assets has been assessed in section 4.11 of that chapter.   |
| TA_0001_192_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.6 No detail has been provided for what is happening at the Fairhaven site. From aerial photos, this area appears to be coastal habitats with dunes and saltmarsh (although not designated, this would still be a Priority Habitat). Part of this area falls within the geological site – Lytham Coastal Changes SSSI. Please provide further detail for this area in the submitted ES.  | The referenced site is proposed for ornithological mitigation – details are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4) and the Outline Ecological Management Plan (document reference J6). Any impacts on designated geological sites are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1) sets out details of ground conditions.  |
| TA_0001_193_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.7 As the proposed installation method for to avoid Lytham St. Anne's SSSI is HDD, it is felt that the developer has not fully considered the Maximum Design Scenario (MDS) for this designated site. Please see comment 6.12 for further detail. A full baseline assessment of Lytham St. Anne's Dunes SSSI should be undertaken, and presented within the submitted ES, so that should the worst-case scenario occur (i.e. HDD is not possible) sufficient ecological data is available to inform/ develop suitable mitigation measures. In addition, it could be used as a baseline for post-construction monitoring (and a means to determine recovery). Please see comment 6.12 for further detail. | Direct pipe trenchless installation is proposed in this location and is the basis for the assessment of impacts on dune slacks provided in section 3.11.2 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). Further data on the distribution and status of SSSI interest features that is necessary to inform the ES has been obtained from existing reports prepared on behalf of Lancashire Wildlife Trust and Our Future Coasts, and project-specific national vegetation classification (NVC) surveys have been carried out to confirm or update the findings of these reports where necessary. Crossing techniques at the sand dunes at Lytham St. Anne's are presented 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_0001_194_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.8 There is a lack of consideration of other impacts to Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI, particularly with regards to changes to the water table. Please see comment 6.27 for further detail. Consider changes to the water table at Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI.  | This impact is considered within section 3.11 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).  |
| 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | however, been concluded that there will be no impact on Lytham Coastal Changes SSSI, which lies outside the Transmission Assets Order Limits.  |
| TA_0001_197_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.11 5.4.6 This section sets out the mitigation hierarchy. However, from the measures listed that will be implemented, it's not clear if the full hierarchy is being followed i.e - avoid, minimise, rectify, reduce and off-set. Provide clarification on how the measures adopted will follow the full mitigation hierarchy. In this section, there seems to be a lot of discussion around reducing, off- setting or enhancing but there's not much focus on avoidance or rectifying. Natural England advises that the developer should follow the mitigation hierarchy table and set out how they will avoid and minimise in first instance in their approach.  | 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.   |
| TA_0001_198_231123          | S42     | Email           | Natural England's Position on Worst Case Scenario or Scenarios 6.12 Vol3; Chp 3 Table 3.11, Table 3:15 The developer recognises Lytham St. Anne's Dunes as a SSSI (Table 3.11) and it has been taken forward as an Important Ecological Feature (Table 3.15). However, as the proposed installation method is HDD it is felt the developer has not fully considered the MDS (Table 3.16) for this designated site. The current assessment for Lytham St. Anne's Dunes SSSI (para 3.9.2.8 - 3.9.2.11) notes "During construction the Transmission Assets will commit to avoiding impacts on the Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI, as the cables will be installed beneath this habitat via HDD (or other trenchless techniques) and open trenching techniques would not be used within this habitat. Accordingly, there will be no temporary or permanent loss of this habitat type. The magnitude of impact is therefore, considered to be no change." The developer goes on to note that while the sensitivity of the habitat is High, the significance of effect is no effect. However, from experience of similar projects Natural England know that on occasions HDD can fail, or the proposed development design changes and for example Transition Joint Bays need to be moved (which presumably currently will be situated on the beach)/ or additional vehicle access is required. In such scenarios by excluding any effect early in the assessment process there is a lack of detail later on if the installation methods change. Similarly full consideration of impacts should HDD not be undertaken in saltmarsh along the river Ribble (part of the Ribble Estuary SSSI). A full baseline assessment of Lytham St. Anne's Dunes SSSI should be undertaken so that should the worst-case scenario occur (i.e. HDD is not possible) sufficient ecological data is available to inform/ develop suitable mitigation measures. In addition, it could be used as a baseline for post-construction monitoring (and a means to determine recovery). Baseline surveys of Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI should include mapping to NVC level of the dune habitats present, with supporting quadrat sampling. Quadrat sampling should be sufficient in coverage to ensure all community types are sampled. The SSSI citation notes that the site support classic features of dune formation and ecological succession including the widest range of foredune, yellow dune, dune grassland, acid dune grassland, dune scrub and dune slack habitats found anywhere along the Fylde Coast. The site is botanically diverse with a number of rare or scarce plant species. Use of up-to-date aerial photography taken at the time of the NVC survey would be preferable. The developer should undertake a cable burial risk assessment for all the HDD work (including Lytham St. Anne's Dunes SSSI and the River Ribble (part of the Ribble Estuary SSSI) informed by geotechnical investigations. This should include an outline burial cable specification and installation plan which has a pollution* and contingency plan. This would help determine the likelihood (degree of confidence) of success of HDD at the given locations. *Note a Bentonite breakout plan is mentioned for the River Ribble but not for Lytham St. Annes Dunes | 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 likelihood of collapse that is associated with cable installation using horizontal directional drilling (HDD). The Works Plans submitted with the application for development consent (and accompanying description) allow only for direct pipe in this location. Therefore, the MDS that has been used is considered to be correct. Further data on the distribution and status of SSSI interest features that is necessary to inform the ES has been obtained from existing reports prepared on behalf of Lancashire Wildlife Trust and Our Future Coasts, and NVC surveys have been carried out to confirm or update the findings of these reports where necessary. CoT41 states that where the onshore export cable corridor or 400 kV grid connection cable corridor crosses sites of particular sensitivity, including Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI, a hydrogeological risk assessment will be undertaken to inform a site-specific crossing method statement which will also be agreed with the relevant authorities prior to construction. The risk of bentonite breakout at Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI 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). |
| TA_0001_200_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.14 Table 3:10 Morecambe Bay and Duddon Estuary SPA is missing from the designated site list.<br>Only Morecambe Bay SAC and Ramsar are mentioned. It also does not list the Ramsar qualifying features in the relevant qualifying interest section.<br>Note for correction.   | Information on designated sites for which birds are a reason for designation is provided in Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4). Further assessment of internationally designated sites is provided in the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (ISAA) report (document reference E2.1, 2.2, 2.3).  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
| TA_0001_201_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.15 Table 3:10 For national sites, it mentions Martin Mere, Burscough SSSI – this SSSI is also underpinned by an SPA – Martin Mere SPA which is not included in list. Note for correction.   | Information on designated sites for which birds are a reason for designation is provided in Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4). Further assessment of internationally designated sites is provided in the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (ISAA) report (document reference E2.1, 2.2, 2.3).   |
| TA_0001_202_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.16 Table 3:15 The description for Lytham Moss BHS is wrong – It is not also known as the Queensway Farmland Conservation Area (FCA). The FCA is a specific area within the BHS site which is managed for qualifying bird species as mitigation provided within a planning application, the BHS itself is separate. The BHS site (which has a wider boundary) is a designated by Lancashire County Council using a set of published guidelines. This needs to be updated, the document needs to clearly set out the correct information for Lytham Moss BHS, its correct boundaries and why it has been designated a Biological Heritage Site. The FCA should be defined with information on its purpose. It is specific mitigation land for qualifying bird species and managed as such. It is also secured under Section 106 agreement between developer and Fylde BC.                       | The Applicants note your response. All relevant BHSs are considered within Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).   |
| TA_0001_203_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.17 N/A –General Comment One of main justification 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 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. The developer should link to any evidence to support the justification it will be less intrusive and limit impacts on ecological receptors.   | This impact is considered within Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES. 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. Direct pipe or microtunnelling is proposed beneath the River Ribble to ensure that there would be no direct impacts on the river habitats. 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. |
| TA_0001_204_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.18 Table 3.18 As well as BNG Metric 4 calculator, there are other tools that can be used to identify opportunities to enhance wider benefits from nature. Advise that as well as Metric, Natural England's Environmental Benefits from Nature tool may be used to identify opportunities to enhance wider benefits from nature and to avoid and minimise any negative impacts. It is designed to work alongside the Biodiversity Metric and is available as a beta test version.  | The calculation undertaken for the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11) utilises the latest biodiversity metric published by Defra (4.0).  |
| TA_0001_206_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.20 N/A –General Comment This chapter does not account for impacts of ecological receptors providing habitat to supporting bird species. It is acknowledged that a specific chapter has been dedicated to impacts to onshore birds, ecological receptors assessed in this chapter play a supporting role in supporting qualifying and other significant important bird species. Therefore, the role and value that these habitats have in terms of providing supporting habitat to important bird species needs to be assessed here. The role and value that certain habitats have in terms of providing supporting habitat to important bird species needs to be assessed within the ecological chapters. This is important to consider in line with the overall function and value of these supporting habitats, especially in relation to saltmarsh, FLL habitat, and the Lytham Moss area. | Any areas of terrestrial habitat of importance for birds, including waders and waterbirds, are discussed in Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4). This includes discussion of the presence of functionally linked land within the Onshore Order Limits and the potential for adverse effects from the loss and disturbance of this habitat.  |
| TA_0001_216_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.1 The presented information within the PEIR is incomplete and there are further surveys to be reported. Currently, Natural England disagree that the survey effort is sufficient to rely on 1% rule of thumb as a screening tool. As well as numbers, the frequency of, or period of occupancy is important. The survey areas presented here require further explanation as to why the core survey area was selected as a subset of the red line boundary. Without sufficient reasoning for this, further survey coverage is needed. Provide a full assessment with all complete surveys in the submitted ES. This is particularly important in terms of presenting a minimum of two survey seasons. Provide an updated survey effort along with  | Additional surveys have been completed and reported within the ES. The 1% screening tool has not been used for ES purposes. The survey coverage is reported within Volume 3, Annex 4.1: Breeding birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.1), Volume 3, Annex 4.2: Wintering and migratory birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.2) and Volume 3, Annex 4.3: Intertidal birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.3) and is considered sufficiently robust to fully characterise the baseline used in this assessment.   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | full survey coverage and data analysis in the submitted ES in order to justify using the 1% rule of thumb as a screening tool. Without this, Natural England do not agree with its use.  |   |
| TA_0001_217_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.2 It is not clear why the core survey area was selected as a subset of the red line boundary. This is not appropriate unless the developer is committed to avoiding impacts outside this zone. The submitted ES should provide further justification on why the core survey area only covers a subset of the red line boundary.  | Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4) and its supporting annexes set out details of the survey coverage in relation to the Onshore Order Limits and Intertidal Infrastructure Area. The survey coverage is reported within Volume 3, Annex 4.1: Breeding birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.1), Volume 3, Annex 4.2: Wintering and migratory birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.2) and Volume 3, Annex 4.3: Intertidal birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.3) and is considered sufficiently robust to fully characterise the baseline used in this assessment. |
| TA_0001_218_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.3 Due to the shortcomings in the surveys and assessments, Natural England are not able to rule out adverse effect on the integrity of the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site. For further details on this, please see comments 7.24 and 7.35. The submitted ES should provide further robust evidence to support this conclusion or apply the mitigation hierarchy to ensure adverse effects cannot arise.   | 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_219_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.4 A key part of the HRA assessment is correctly identifying SPA/Ramsar site features as breeding, non-breeding, and assemblage features. With SPA/ Ramsar sites, correctly identify features as breeding, non-breeding and assemblage features throughout the submitted ES.  | 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_220_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.5 Natural England do not consider that a 'whole project alone' assessment has been undertaken for the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA. For further detail, please see comment 7.46. The submitted ES should contain a 'whole project alone' assessment so the totality of potential impacts on the SPA (and other receptors where relevant) are properly quantified and appropriate mitigation put in place where needed. In particular, the assessment should fully consider how the construction pressures impact both the SPA itself and its functionally linked land.               | 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) and in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5). 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). Both the ES and the ISAA consider construction impacts, including impacts on functionally linked land.  |
| TA_0001_221_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.6 Part of the justification for no adverse impacts on onshore birds is that the cable route will not pass through significant Functionally Linked Land habitat (Lytham Moss BHS). This is not accurate as the final decision of which cable route to use has not been finalised and Option 2 will pass through this habitat. This justification can only be applied once the final decision has been made regarding the cable route. Natural England advises that route Option 1 is chosen to avoid FLL habitat.   | The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). An assessment of effects in relation to birds, including consideration of functionally linked land, is provided in Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).  |
| TA_0001_222_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.7 The developer has concluded no adverse effects for impacts via heavy machinery/people to disturbance of qualifying bird species for Liverpool Bay, Ribble & Alt and Morecambe Bay. The assessment has not accounted for visual & noise disturbance for qualifying bird species utilising surrounding area which has potential to be disturbed. Natural England do not concur with these conclusions. These impacts need to be included within the assessment in order to ensure the robustness of the HRA, and determine the scope of any required additional mitigation measures. | 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. The findings of the HRA process are set out in the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (ISAA) report (document reference E2.1, 2.2, 2.3).  |
| TA_0001_223_231123          | S42     | Email           | Survey Data Acquisition 7.8 Vol 3, Annex 4.1 1.3.1.6 (Table 5) Newton Marsh SSSI (which lies within the red line and adjacent to the core survey area) has a breeding bird assemblage interest feature. This has not been included in the report. Include Newton Marsh SSSI with the breeding bird assemblage feature wherever appropriate in the submitted ES.  | Features of designated sites, including Newton Marsh SSSI, are identified in section 4.6.6 and the potential for impacts from the Transmission Assets has been assessed in section 4.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
| TA_0001_224_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.9 Vol 3, Annex 4.1 1.4.1.1 It is noted that the presented information is incomplete with further surveys to report. Provide complete information and full survey coverage in the submitted ES.   | Additional surveys have been completed and reported within the ES. Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4) and its supporting annexes set out details of the survey coverage in relation to the Onshore Order Limits and Intertidal Infrastructure Area.<br>The survey coverage is reported within Volume 3, Annex 4.1: Breeding birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.1), Volume 3, Annex 4.2: Wintering and migratory birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.2) and Volume 3, Annex 4.3: Intertidal birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.3) and is considered sufficiently robust to fully characterise the baseline used in this assessment. |
| TA_0001_225_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.10 It is not clear why the core survey area was selected as a subset of the red line boundary. This is not appropriate unless the developer is committed to avoiding impacts outside this zone. The submitted ES should provide further justification on why the core survey area only covers a subset of the red line boundary.   | Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4) and its supporting annexes set out details of the survey coverage in relation to the Onshore Order Limits and Intertidal Infrastructure Area. The survey coverage is reported within Volume 3, Annex 4.1: Breeding birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.1), Volume 3, Annex 4.2: Wintering and migratory birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.2) and Volume 3, Annex 4.3: Intertidal birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.3) and is considered sufficiently robust to fully characterise the baseline used in this assessment.   |
| TA_0001_226_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.11 Vol 3, Annex 4.1 1.4.1.10 The CBC methodology described (4 visits) will be insufficient to fully characterise the breeding bird community (a) because survey effort is insufficient to fully record the detectable species (7 visits recommended) and (b) because the methodology is not tailored to detect hard to detect species that may be present (e.g. secretive waders; nocturnal species; species best surveyed by play-back; waterfowl) which require additional targeted visits to allow full characterisation. Update the CBC methodology to fully characterise the breeding bird community. | Two years of breeding bird surveys have now been completed with 9 visits in total. Please see Volume 3, Annex 4.1: Breeding birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.1) for full details.  |
| TA_0001_227_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.12 Vol 3, Annex 4.1 Fig 1.6 to 1.44 These plots are misleading as they map species records against the red line boundary not against the area of survey. It implies an absence of breeding birds in significant areas within the red line when actually the areas were not surveyed. The submitted ES should include updated figures for the species records against the area of survey to better represent the results.   | Figures outlining the extent of survey coverage and study area are presented within Volume 3, Annex 4.1: Breeding birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.1), Volume 3, Annex 4.2: Wintering and migratory birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.2) and Volume 3, Annex 4.3: Intertidal birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.3).   |
| TA_0001_228_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.13 Vol 3, Annex 4.1 1.4.3.4/1.4.3.5/1.5.1.7 It is noted that the presented survey is incomplete with reported information only relating to 2022, and not the 2023 survey season. Provide complete information and full survey coverage in the submitted ES.  | Additional surveys have been completed and reported within the ES. Survey coverage is reported within Volume 3, Annex 4.1: Breeding birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.1), Volume 3, Annex 4.2: Wintering and migratory birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.2) and Volume 3, Annex 4.3: Intertidal birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.3).   |
| TA_0001_229_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.14 Vol 3, Annex 4.2 1.1.1.4 Data is incomplete – April 2023 data not included. Also, only a single survey season has been reported on. Provide full survey data in the submitted ES. A minimum of two survey seasons would be expected.  | Additional surveys have been completed and reported within the ES. Survey coverage is reported within Volume 3, Annex 4.1: Breeding birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.1), Volume 3, Annex 4.2: Wintering and migratory birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.2) and Volume 3, Annex 4.3: Intertidal birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.3).   |
| TA_0001_230_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.15 Vol 3, Annex 4.2 Table 1.3 and 1.1,1,5<br>The SPA Assemblage Features (non-breeding waterbirds here, but also breeding seabirds) are SPA and Ramsar features in their own right. Therefore they should be identified and assessed as such, not just by addressing key feature species. The submitted ES should identify and assess SPA/ Ramsar assemblage features in their own right.  | An assessment of the potential impact on key receptors, including qualifying features of the SPAs such as assemblage features are identified in section 4.6.2 and presented within section 4.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).<br><br>The findings of the HRA process are set out in the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (ISAA) report (document reference E2.1, 2.2, 2.3).  |
| TA_0001_231_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.16 Vol 3, Annex 4.2 1.4.1.9 and 1.4.1.1.0 Wintering land bird surveys only took place in one winter period (not two) and did not cover January in that winter period – this is unlikely to fully characterise the winter bird community. Provide full survey coverage in the submitted ES which should include at least two winter periods.  | Additional surveys have been completed and reported within the ES. For wintering birds, site-specific surveys were undertaken within the survey area between September 2022 to March 2023 and September 2023 to March 2024 (two wintering periods). Survey coverage is reported within Volume 3, Annex 4.2: Wintering and migratory birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.2).   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| TA_0001_232_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.17 Vol 3, Annex 4.2 1.4.1.12 / Fig 1.5<br>Survey area only a subset of the red line area – and a different survey footprint to the breeding bird survey (albeit to accommodate recognised extent of potential disturbance beyond core area of interest). The submitted ES should provide further justification on why the core survey area only covers a subset of the red line boundary.   | Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4) and its supporting annexes set out details of the survey coverage in relation to the Onshore Order Limits and Intertidal Infrastructure Area.<br>The survey coverage is reported within Volume 3, Annex 4.1: Breeding birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.1), Volume 3, Annex 4.2: Wintering and migratory birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.2) and Volume 3, Annex 4.3: Intertidal birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.3) and is considered sufficiently robust to fully characterise the baseline used in this assessment. |
| TA_0001_233_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.18 Vol 3, Annex 4.2 1.4.1.11 April 2023 survey not included. Provide full survey coverage in the submitted ES.  | Additional surveys have been completed and reported within the ES. Survey coverage is reported within Volume 3, Annex 4.1: Breeding birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.1), Volume 3, Annex 4.2: Wintering and migratory birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.2) and Volume 3, Annex 4.3: Intertidal birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.3).  |
| TA_0001_235_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.19 Vol 3, Annex 4.2 1.4.3.5 Note that much of the survey area is of significant usage as FLL by SPA species. The assessment of impacts in the submitted ES should ensure that the potential impacts on Functionally Linked Land is fully assessed in terms of impacts to SPA species and apply the mitigation hierarchy as required.  | An assessment of the potential impact on key receptors, including qualifying features of the SPAs, is identified in section 4.6.2 and is presented within section 4.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4). This assessment includes the potential impact at areas of functionally linked land identified.<br><br>The findings of the HRA process are set out in the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (ISAA) report (document reference E2.1, 2.2, 2.3).   |
| TA_0001_235_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.2 Vol 3, Annex 4.2 Fig 1.6 to 1.16 The mapping of species distribution against area of concern (as denoted by dashed black line) is misleading as not all areas in dashed line were surveyed. Some areas may be blank because they were not surveyed, not because birds were absent. For figures mapping species distribution against area of concern, the submitted ES should provide clarifying text that explains blank areas were not surveyed and therefore do not represent absence of birds. | Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4) and its supporting annexes set out details of the survey coverage in relation to the Onshore Order Limits and Intertidal Infrastructure Area. The survey coverage is reported within Volume 3, Annex 4.1: Breeding birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.1), Volume 3, Annex 4.2: Wintering and migratory birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.2) and Volume 3, Annex 4.3: Intertidal birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.3) and is considered sufficiently robust to fully characterise the baseline used in this assessment.    |
| TA_0001_236_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.21 Vol 3, Ch4 Table 4.18 Table 4.18 lists bird species found within surveys and identified if they are SPA or Ramsar species. It states that Black-headed gulls and mallards are not SPA/Ramsar species. This is incorrect – Black-headed gulls are part of the seabird assemblage species for Ribble & Alt Estuaries SPA, and Mallard are part of the waterbird assemblage species for Morecambe Bay and Duddon Estuaries SPA. Note for correction.  | The Applicants note the response and this is clarified in section 4.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).  |
| TA_0001_237_231123          | S42     | Email           | Screening 7.22 Table 1.8 The correct sites have been scoped out.<br>n/a   | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0001_238_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.23 Table 1.9 The correct sites have been scoped in.<br>n/a  | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0001_239_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.24 Table 1.23 Assemblage features need to be identified for relevant SPAs (non-breeding waterbird assemblage; breeding seabird assemblage) Identify the assemblage features for the relevant SPAs (non-breeding waterbird assemblage; breeding seabird assemblage).   | An assessment of the potential impact on key receptors, including qualifying features of the 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 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).   |
| TA_0001_240_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.25 Table 1.25 Detail has not been provided on the operations that are expected to occur throughout the lifetime of the cables. Without knowing what operations are going to occur, the risk of significant disturbance cannot be ruled out. The submitted ES should provide full detail on the expected operations that may occur during the life of the cables. Without this information, significant disturbance cannot be ruled out.   | The assessment of the effects due to disturbance and displacement from the presence of vehicles and/or heavy machinery associated with construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning activities is presented within section 4.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4). The potential for impacts associated with cable maintenance is minimal.  |
| TA_0001_241_231123          | S42     | Email           | Screening 7.26 1.1.2 152 As with other SPA/Ramsar sites, features need to be identified as breeding, non-breeding, and assemblage features. This is integral to the HRA   | An assessment of the potential impact on key receptors, including qualifying features of the 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 ES (document reference F3.4). Details on the impacts on European sites from the   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | assessment of the features. With SPA/ Ramsar sites, the submitted ES should identify features as breeding, non- breeding and assemblage features.   | Transmission Assets are contained within the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (ISAA) report (document reference E2.1, 2.2, 2.3). This includes identification of features of internationally and nationally designated sites in section 1.5 of Part 3 of the ISAA.   |
| TA_0001_242_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.27 1.1.2.1 5.4, 1.1.2.1.57 and 1.1.2.1.127<br>Natural England do not agree with the conclusion of no AEoI for Ribble and Alt SPA based on information provided.<br>The submitted ES should provide further robust evidence to support this conclusion or apply the mitigation hierarchy to ensure adverse effects cannot arise.   | 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).<br><br>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_243_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.28 1.11.3.3 and 1.11.3.87 Natural England note the lengthy 77 month (6yr) risk period. This is noted as lengthy as it has implications for the duration of disturbance effects on SPA waterbirds.n/a  | The Applicants note your response. Updated details regarding construction periods are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).  |
| TA_0001_244_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.29 1.11.3.31 Part of reasoning for justification for no adverse and loss of habitat for onshore cable corridor is that route will not pass through the area around Lytham Moss. This cannot be justified at this stage as the final route has not been decided. The submitted documents presents two options where option one will avoid this area but option two will not. As the final phase of cable route has not been decided, the reasoning here cannot be applied until the final route is decided.<br>This justification can only be applied once the final decision has been made regarding the cable route. Natural England advises the developer to go with route option 1. Option 1 will have the least ecological impact as it will stay closest towards the current developed areas, without going through significant FLL, and is also the option that will go through the least peat habitat. | The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).<br><br>An assessment of effects in relation to birds, including consideration of functionally linked land, is provided in Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4). |
| TA_0001_245_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.30 1.11.3.177 See comments above regarding cable route – cannot be used as justification.<br>See above.   | The Applicants note your response.  |
| TA_0001_246_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.3 11.11.3.127 Natural England do not agree with the conclusion of no adverse impacts for the Ribble & Alt Estuaries. Whilst assessment has discussed loss of habitat, and recorded bird distance from habitat it has not assessed noise and visual impacts, these impact pathways can have impacts on species that are not in immediate area but are present in the surrounding areas. No detailed information, such as predicted noise levels, has been provided so at this stage adverse impacts cannot be ruled out See above.   | 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_247_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.3 21.11.3.146 See comments above. It is a similar issue with noise and visual impacts not being fully considered for Morecambe Bay and Duddon Estuaries SPA. This should include assessment for qualifying species utilising area outside and surrounding the corridor such as Golden Plover. For example, section 1.11.3.134 states there will be no impacts from presence of people/machinery on lapwing as the closest significant number was recorded 100m away from proposed corridor. Natural England would advise these still have the potential to be impacted through noise and visual disturbance. Natural England consider any FLL within 200m to be potentially impacted and therefore further evidence is required to demonstrate if certain bird features will be impacted or not.  | 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_248_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.33 1.11.3.149<br>See comments above – same advice applies to Morecambe Bay Ramsar as it does for Morecambe Bay and Duddon Estuaries<br>See above.   | 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).<br>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_249_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.3 41.11.3.4 Without being more specific on the location of the onshore substation, the impact of habitat loss or disturbance impact of the substation cannot be assessed as it is   | The design has been further refined since submission of the PEIR and this is reflected in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This has  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | not clear where it is in relation to environmental receptors. The submitted ES should provide more specific detail for the location of the onshore substation in order to fully assess the impact of habitat loss or disturbance.  | been taken into account in the updated assessment provided in section 4.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).  |
| TA_0001_250_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.35 Table 1.374<br>Natural England notes that impacts from the cable installation will be for 66 months (5yr 6mths) but it is not quantified in the HRA where or when the risk will be, or the likely plant used to assess risks.<br>In the updated assessment, specify where and when the potential impacts risks (to ornithological features) will occur during the cable installation phase. The likely plant used in these assessments should also be outlined.   | The assessment of the effects due to disturbance and displacement from the presence of vehicles and/or heavy machinery associated with construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning activities is presented within section 4.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).   |
| TA_0001_251_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.3 61.11.3.8 It is not possible to meaningfully assess risks without a provisional alignment. Natural England notes that some areas within the development redline boundary have not been surveyed for ornithological risks, and it is not clear if they are in the red line boundary because they are identified as a potential impact site or a possible mitigation or Net Gain area.n/a  | The design has been further refined since submission of the PEIR and this is reflected in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This chapter also provides details of the areas proposed for construction and those proposed for biodiversity, mitigation and/or enhancement. This has been taken into account in the updated assessment provided in section 4.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).   |
| TA_0001_252_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.37 1.11.3.16 Natural England disagree that the survey effort is sufficient to rely on 1% rule of thumb as a screening tool. As well as numbers, the frequency of, or period of occupancy is important.<br>See also 1.11.3.102.<br>Provide an updated survey effort along with full survey coverage and data analysis in the submitted ES in order to justify using the 1% rule of thumb as a screening tool. Without this, Natural England do not agree with its use.  | Additional surveys have been completed and reported within the ES. The 1% screening tool has not been used for ES purposes.<br>The survey coverage is reported within Volume 3, Annex 4.1: Breeding birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.1), Volume 3, Annex 4.2: Wintering and migratory birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.2) and Volume 3, Annex 4.3: Intertidal birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.3) and is considered sufficiently robust to fully characterise the baseline used in this assessment.                |
| TA_0001_253_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.38 1.11.3.19 This section identifies the area directly impacted but these impact timings assume instant recovery post works. It will take some time for areas to normalise after impact. The assessment of habitat impact is also spatially framed with reference to the SPA using the whole SPA as the reference measure - not the extent of the habitat affected which will be a better reference frame for species which are closely associated with the specific habitat. The submitted ES should update the impact timings to consider realistic recovery timescales. The assessment of habitat impact should also be framed with reference to the extent of the habitat that is affected, rather than the extent of the whole SPA. | The comments from Natural England are noted. The Applicants have worked to refine the project design with respect to installation of cables in the intertidal and the onshore cable route to address Section 42 comments from Natural England on potential effects on ornithological receptors. This includes further detail on the area, duration and timing of potential impacts on ornithology species and additional information and further justification to address the comments raised. These have been addressed in sections 1.5 and 1.6 of the ISAA Part 3 (document reference E2.3) |
| TA_0001_254_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.39 1.11.3.23 The logic that impacts are unlikely to be significant because the bird species are 'long lived' has no ecological merit. The works will take a significant timeframe which will affect long lived species every bit as much as shorter lived species. With reference to table 1.377, mudflat/sandflat specialists like bar-tailed godwit, dunlin, ringed plover and sanderling are particularly at risk. The submitted ES should remove all reference to impacts being unlikely to be significant where the reasoning is that a species is 'long lived'.  | The Applicants note your response. Assessments have been amended and updated.   |
| TA_0001_255_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.4 1.11.3.29 The assessment does not quantify what proportion of resource will be lost at any one time. The submitted ES should present the information for temporary habitat loss within the onshore export cable corridor in terms of what proportion of resources will be lost at any one time, along with the total area.   | The assessment of temporary habitat loss is included in section 4.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).  |
| TA_0001_256_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.4 11.11.3.32 It is identified that no works are proposed in Newton Marsh SSSI, but it does not rule them out. Natural England note that the SSSI remains in the redline boundary and the disturbance zone as marked on survey maps. If works are not proposed in Newton Marsh SSSI, this should be secured as a condition in the submitted DCO/dML. As they are currently not ruled out, any assessment of features connected to Newton Marsh SSSI should consider the impacts to the SSSI and its features.   | Features of designated sites, including Newton Marsh SSSI, are identified in section 4.6.6 and the potential for impacts from the Transmission Assets has been assessed in section 4.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4) and in section 1.5 of the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (ISAA) report.   |
| TA_0001_257_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.42 1.11.3.24 In this section, it is stated that shelduck and black-tailed godwit can just go somewhere else. This is an unevidenced statement.   | The Applicants note your response. Assessments have been amended and updated.   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | The submitted ES should remove this statement, unless robust evidence is presented to suggest otherwise.   |   |
| TA_0001_258_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.43 1.11.3.42 Natural England do not agree with the conclusion that there is no risk of an adverse effect on the integrity of the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site as a result of temporary habitat loss/disturbance and changes in prey availability with respect to the construction and decommissioning phases of the Transmission Assets. This disagreement is based on the robustness of evidence provided. The submitted ES Provide further robust evidence to support this conclusion or apply the mitigation hierarchy to ensure adverse effects cannot arise.  | 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_259_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.44 As a general point the separation of the impacts on the working corridor and the disturbance caused during the work period is not particularly helpful as, other than the habitat recovery time, the two pressure pathways are completely linked; and the recovery time lag is not discussed. The impacts on the working corridor and the impacts from disturbance caused during the work period should be considered together in the submitted ES as the two pressure pathways are linked. The recovery time lag should also be considered when assessing these impacts.   | The Applicants note your response.  |
| TA_0001_260_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.45 1.11.3.84 Natural England considers the 300m disturbance zone will be reasonable for most species.<br>n/a   | The Applicants note your response.  |
| TA_0001_261_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.46 1.11.3.85 The statement "The extent of disturbance and displacement from presence of vehicles/heavy machinery will be substantially smaller during the operation and maintenance phase when compared to the construction and decommissioning phases" has no evidence to back it up. If this statement is to be retained, the submitted ES should provide a clear rationale to detail why the disturbance caused by plant will be different during the operation and maintenance phase when compared to the construction and decommissioning phases.   | The assessment of the effects due to disturbance and displacement from the presence of vehicles and/or heavy machinery associated with construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning activities is presented within section 4.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4). The potential for impacts associated with cable maintenance is minimal. Details of operational activities are provided in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).                                       |
| TA_0001_262_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.47 1.11.3.89 No rationale for change in the disturbance zone from 300m to 200m with consequent reduction in area identified as being at risk– Is this indicating different plant, different activities, different screening, different species? Although the main habitat affected is agricultural Functionally Linked Land, this also overlaps the SPA wherever the corridor will cross the Ribble, so will likely also affect saltmarsh, mudflat and estuarine open water. If the 200m disturbance zone is not a typo, the submitted ES should provide a rationale for this change in disturbance zone area or revert to 300m. | Details provided in section 10.5 of Part 3 of the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (ISAA) report.  |
| TA_0001_263_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.48 Table 1.385 Bullet 2<br>Reference to from 'MLWS to MLWS' is presumably a typo for from 'MLWS to MHWS'<br>Correct typo.  | The Applicants note your response.  |
| TA_0001_264_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.49 1.11.3.102 As at 1.11.3.16, Natural England disagree that the survey effort is sufficient to rely on 1% rule of thumb as a screening tool. As well as numbers, the frequency of, or period of occupancy is important. The submitted ES should provide an updated survey effort along with full survey coverage and data analysis in the ES in order to justify using the 1% rule of thumb as a screening tool. Without this, Natural England do not agree with its use.   | Additional surveys have been completed and reported within the ES. The 1% screening tool has not been used for ES purposes. The survey coverage is reported within Volume 3, Annex 4.1: Breeding birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.1), Volume 3, Annex 4.2: Wintering and migratory birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.2) and Volume 3, Annex 4.3: Intertidal birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.3) and is considered sufficiently robust to fully characterise the baseline used in this assessment.                   |
| TA_0001_265_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.5 1.11.3.105 While SPA loss maybe 1.56% loss during works, the proportional loss of the specific foraging habitat will be much higher.<br>The submitted ES should present this percentage loss in terms of loss of specific foraging habitat rather than the percentage of the whole SPA. This will likely result in a higher proportional loss of the specific foraging habitat.  | The comments from Natural England are noted. The Applicants have worked to refine the project design with respect to installation of cables in the intertidal and the onshore cable route to address Section 42 comments from Natural England on potential effects on ornithological receptors. This includes further detail on the area, duration and timing of potential impacts on ornithology species and additional information and further justification to address the comments raised. These have been addressed in sections 1.5 and 1.6 of the ISAA Part 3 (document reference E2.3) |
| TA_0001_266_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.5 11.11.3.107 and 108 The uncertainty around the specific period of risk or timing of risk is unhelpful. Assessment that risk is unlikely to be as bad as worse case scenario is not   | The comments from Natural England are noted. The Applicants have worked to refine the project design with respect to installation of cables in the intertidal and the onshore   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | very precise. The specific period of risk or timing of risk should be presented in clearer terms in the submitted ES.  | cable route to address Section 42 comments from Natural England on potential effects on ornithological receptors. This includes further detail on the area, duration and timing of potential impacts on ornithology species and additional information and further justification to address the comments raised. These have been addressed in sections 1.5 and 1.6 of the ISAA Part 3 (document reference E2.3)   |
| TA_0001_267_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.52 1.11.3.109 Loss of a potentially significant area of key habitat for half a winter period cannot be described as not significant without some evidence base. The submitted ES should provide a referenced evidence base to back this statement up or the assessment revised accordingly.  | The comments from Natural England are noted. The Applicants have worked to refine the project design with respect to installation of cables in the intertidal and the onshore cable route to address Section 42 comments from Natural England on potential effects on ornithological receptors. This includes further detail on the area, duration and timing of potential impacts on ornithology species and additional information and further justification to address the comments raised. These have been addressed in sections 1.5 and 1.6 of the ISAA Part 3 (document reference E2.3) |
| TA_0001_268_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.53 1.11.3.108 As comment on for 1.1.3.32. Although not anticipated at the current time the area remains in the red line boundary so cannot be excluded. If works are not proposed in Newton Marsh SSSI, this should be secured as a condition. As they are currently not ruled out, any assessment of features connected to Newton Marsh SSSI should fully consider the impacts to the SSSI and its features.  | Features of designated sites, including Newton Marsh SSSI, are identified in section 4.6.6 and the potential for impacts from the Transmission Assets has been assessed in section 4.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4) and in section 1.5 of the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (ISAA) report.   |
| TA_0001_269_231123          | S42     | Email           | In- combination 7.54 This proposal currently presents 4 different construction zones with 2 risk pathways, and 4 different operation zones as one proposal. In particular, for the construction pressures, there is a potential for the 4 construction zones and 2 risk pathways to simultaneously impact both the Ribble and Alt SPA, and its functionally linked land. We note that no 'whole project alone' assessment has been made to consider these impacts. The submitted ES should contain a 'whole project alone' assessment so the totality of potential impacts on the SPA (and other receptors where relevant) are properly quantified and appropriate mitigation put in place where needed. In particular, the assessment should fully consider how the construction pressures impact both the SPA itself and its functionally linked land.   | 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) and in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5). 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). Both the ES and the ISAA consider construction impacts, including impacts on functionally linked land.                    |
| 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_276_231123          | S42     | Email           | Natural England's Structure/Framework for Attributing Risk The comments provided within this letter and its Annexes have been colour coded using the structure/framework as specified in the risk table in Appendix I of this letter. In this letter, the coloured headings are coded based on the highest risk associated with the topic in question. Natural England would like to highlight that at this stage all comments highlighted as yellow, amber, or red need to be addressed, with the potential for these issues to become more significant if not resolved at application.   | The Applicants note your response.  |
| 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.  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
| 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_298_231123          | S42     | Email           | Similarly, Natural England disagrees 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 (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_300_231123          | S42     | Email           | The presented information within the PEIR is incomplete and there are further surveys to be reported. Currently, Natural England disagree that the survey effort is sufficient to rely on 1% rule of thumb as a screening tool. The survey areas presented here require further explanation as to why the core survey area was selected as a subset of the red line boundary. Without sufficient reasoning for this, further survey coverage is needed. It is also not clear why the core survey area was selected as a subset of the red line boundary. This is not appropriate unless the developer is committed to only causing impacts within this zone. | Additional surveys have been completed and reported within the ES. The 1% screening tool has not been used for ES purposes. The survey coverage is reported within Volume 3, Annex 4.1: Breeding birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.1), Volume 3, Annex 4.2: Wintering and migratory birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.2) and Volume 3, Annex 4.3: Intertidal birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.3) and is considered sufficiently robust to fully characterise the baseline used in this assessment.                          |
| TA_0001_301_231123          | S42     | Email           | Part of the justification for no adverse impacts to onshore birds is that the cable route will not pass through significant Functionally Linked Land habitat (Lytham Moss BHS). This is not accurate as the final decision of which cable route to use has not been finalised and Option 2 will pass through this habitat. Natural England advises that route Option 1 is chosen to avoid FLL habitat.   | <p>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) and in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5).</p> <p>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).</p> <p>Both the ES and the ISAA consider construction impacts, including impacts on functionally linked land.</p>      |
| TA_0001_304_231123          | S42     | Email           | There is a lack of assessment on impacts to SSSIs. The documents only seem to assess impacts on notified bird species in SSSIs not other notified features such as various habitats.   | The impact on SSSIs (designated for reasons other than ornithological interest) has been provided in section 3.11 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). Features of internationally and nationally designated sites were considered when identifying the list of Important Ecological Features listed in section 4.6.6 of Volume 3 Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4). The potential for impacts from the Transmission Assets has been assessed in section 4.11 of that chapter.        |
| 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</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  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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.</p> <p>Addressing these concerns may require the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• new baseline or survey data; and/or</li> <li>• significant revisions to baseline characterisation and/or impact modelling and/or</li> <li>• significant design changes; and/or</li> <li>• significant mitigation</li> </ul> <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.</p> <p>Natural England considers that these matters may be resolved through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provision of additional evidence or justification to support conclusions; and/or</li> <li>• revisions to impact assessment methodology and/or assessment conclusions; and/or</li> <li>• minor to moderate revisions to impact modelling; and/or</li> <li>• well-designed mitigation measures that are adequately secured through the draft DCO/dML and/or</li> <li>• amendments to draft plans</li> </ul> <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. 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_0002_012_171123          | S42     | Email           | <p>8. Environmental Impact – Assessment and Proposals</p> <p>Great emphasis was being placed on the plans to minimise the impact on the environment by encouraging development of biodiversity off the route of the development. However, no proper account was made for the existing activities being undertaken on the sensitive sites, by farm owners and the owners of the Freckleton and Newton / Clifton marshes, where the efforts already being made are producing a substantial benefit to the local wildlife and protected species to be found in these areas of the Fylde. It did appear as if anything already established here was going to be claimed by the project as an offset to the environmental disaster that would be created by the development of the whole tract of land across the whole of the Fylde, with all the consequence of disturbance that ensues to farms, marshes, drains and watercourses – some of which are protected rivers that feed the Ribble and Alt RAMSAR sites. Nothing seemed to indicate a benefit that would be demonstrated, other than the "green" source of electricity. No firm ideas were presented, despite one of the conditions being that they spend a percentage of their funds on new measures to enhance biodiversity. The only suggestion to date was the acquisition of bird boxes and this for an area that is primarily populated by ground nesting birds. A lot of boxes would be needed to make up the implied funding levels talked about!</p>  | <p>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).</p>  |
| TA_0002_014_171123          | S42     | Email           | <p>There have been concerns raised regarding possible electro-magnetic issues associated with the high-power transmissions and the possible impact of this and the need for screening that might result.</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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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_0003_014_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Impact on Wildlife and Habitat Fylde Council notes that the views of Natural England have been sought as part of the consultation process and so are content that they take the lead in the assessment of any ecological impacts. It is noted that the consultation material includes proposals to use Horizontal Direction Drilling to minimise impact on sensitive habitats. In the event that consent is granted for the development, it is considered essential that this aspect of the proposal is continued through to delivery of the project and is not "watered down" as a result of any future review of the project.   | This commitment remains in place. Trenchless techniques are proposed beneath the sand dunes at Lytham St Annes and beneath the River Ribble, as well as at additional locations identified 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 details are provided in the response to comments from Natural England.  |
| 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_0012_007_221123          | S42     | Email           | We also have concerns about the impact on the sand dunes where these cables come ashore and the eco systems that has been worked on over the years. We feel that there will need to be road closures as the building work is started in an area that has limited access in and out of St Anne's. The town has suffered over the years when roads have been closed, snarling up the town. These construction times will be over years not weeks or months and will have a negative economic impact on our town.  | 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). 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_0017_002_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | I note you have consulted the historic environment record, but not the local environment record; the Lancashire Environmental Records Network should be consulted for records of all statutory and non-statutory designated sites, irreplaceable habitats, habitats of principal importance, protected and priority species that could potentially be affected by the proposed development  | Records from Lancashire Environmental Record Network were obtained in March 2024 and are included in section 3.6.1 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation (document reference F3.3).   |
| TA_0017_003_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Known Ecological Constraints Subject to final route selection, a preliminary desk-based assessment indicates that the proposed scheme could potentially have implications for designated sites and habitats including (but not restricted to):<br>• Statutory Designated Sites:<br>o SPA§ Ribble & Alt Estuaries§ Liverpool Bayo SSSI§ Newton Marsh§ Ribble Estuary§ Lytham St Anne's Dunes§ Sefton Coasto NNR§ Ribble Estuary o MCZ§ Ribble Estuary§ Fyldeo LNR§ Lytham St Anne's LNR<br>• Non-statutory designated sites:<br>o Lytham St Anne's Dunes Geological Siteo Lytham Foreshore Dunes & Saltmarsh BHS 32NW01o Lytham Moss Copses BHS 32NW04o St Anne's Old Links Golf Course and Blackpool South Railway Line BHS 33SW02o Lytham Moss BHS 33SEW1o Westby Clay Pit BHS 33SE01o Pippy Lane Banks BHS 42NE01o Savick Bridge BHS 42NE04o Mason's Wood BHS 42NE07o Booths Plantation BHS 42NE09o Freshfield Farm Pond South BHS 43SW05o Freshfield Farm Pond North BHS 43SW06o Black Poplar at Newton Crossroads BHS 43SW07o Mill Brook Valley BHS 52NW01o Howick Hall Ponds BHS 52NW11o | An assessment of the impacts and effects on key onshore ecological receptors (except birds), including qualifying features of the SPAs and SSSIs, is presented within section 3.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). An assessment of the impacts and effects on key onshore and intertidal ornithological receptors, including qualifying features of the SPAs and SSSIs, is presented within section 4.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | Kirkham Prison proposed BHSo Queensway Biodiversity Verge• Habitats of Principal Importance and Irreplaceable habitats: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Coastal Sand Duneso Coastal Saltmarsho Mudflatso Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsho Ponds o Rivers and streamso Deciduous woodlando Traditional orchardo Peat (Great Marton Moss and Lytham Moss)• Mitigation schemes to offset the ecological impacts of earlier infrastructure projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o M55 to Heyhouses – Queensway Conservation Area• Important and Sensitive Bird Areas and potential SPA functionally linked land. • Amber Risk Zones for great crested newts. There are also likely to be adverse impacts on protected and priority species. Owing to the scale of the proposed development, these preliminary comments do not include a comprehensive review of likely impacts on species populations.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  |  |
| TA_0017_004_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | As discussed below, in addition to a data search, the impact assessment should be informed by a comprehensive programme of ecological assessments.   | Ecological surveys have been carried out in 2022, 2023 and 2024. The scope of surveys has been informed through consultation (through Expert Working Group meetings), review of desk study records and the results of preliminary surveys that established suitability for protected and notable species. This is discussed further 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).   |
| TA_0017_006_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | The Biodiversity net gain areas should be informed by the emerging Local Nature Recovery Strategy for Lancashire and should contribute to its delivery. The strategy will be developed throughout 2024. Preliminary strategic maps are expected to be published in early 2024.   | The status of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy for Lancashire is summarised in section 3.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). Step 1 of the strategy, to map areas of particular importance for biodiversity, is complete. Accordingly, section 3.11 of the chapter includes assessment of areas of particular importance such as statutory and non-statutory designated sites. Information on biodiversity net gain is provided in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11). Please also refer to the Outline Ecological Management Plan (document reference J6).  |
| TA_0017_007_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | General Requirements<br>As well as the proposed ecological measures stated within the consultation documents, it needs to be ensured that all of the matters discussed below are fully addressed.  | The Applicants note your response. Responses provided on a comment by comment basis.   |
| TA_0017_008_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Professional competence<br>The application to the Planning Inspectorate should include evidence that all ecological surveys, assessments and mitigation/compensation proposals have been undertaken and prepared by appropriately qualified, licenced and experienced ecologists.  | Competency standards required for surveyors carrying out ecological surveys are provided in Volume 3, Annex 3.2: Onshore ecology survey methodologies technical report of the ES (document reference F3.3.2).  |
| TA_0017_010_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | PolicyThe 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): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Policy Statements, including for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1)</li> <li>o National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3);</li> <li>o National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF);</li> <li>• Local Plan policies.</li> </ul> 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 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). |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | the planning application will therefore need to demonstrate that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• all elements of the development would be located and designed to avoid or minimise harm to biodiversity, and</li> <li>• adequate mitigation/compensation for any unavoidable impacts, as well as net gains for biodiversity, will be provided.</li> </ul>   |   |
| TA_0017_013_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Data search The planning application should include the results of an ecological data search. This should include data from the local records centre (Lancashire Environmental Records Network). Relevant data sources include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lancashire Environmental Records Network (LERN)</li> <li>• NBN Gateway</li> <li>• Multi-Agency Geographical Information for the Countryside (MAGIC)</li> <li>• Risk Zones relating to statutory designated sites</li> <li>• Ancient Woodland Inventory</li> <li>• Centre for Ecology and Hydrology Environmental Information Data Centre</li> <li>• RSPB</li> <li>• Local recorder groups for badgers, bats, amphibians, reptiles, birds etc</li> <li>• Ecological data from earlier or neighbouring planning applications</li> <li>• Risk zones for district level licensing.</li> </ul> It should be demonstrated that the data has informed the scope of field surveys, the design of the proposed development and mitigation/ compensation measures. The data search should not be used as a substitute for field surveys. An absence of records should not be taken as absence of species or habitats. Records over 10 years old should not be discounted. These can still provide useful contextual information and an absence of more recent records may only indicate a lack of survey. | The data sources included in the desk study are identified in section 3.5.1 and section 3.6.1 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). Additionally, LERN confirmed that their data for records for onshore ecology and nature conservation was sufficient and no further requests to other organisations were considered necessary. Information gained from planning applications is considered in the baseline for amphibians in section 3.6.1 and in the cumulative assessment in section 3.13. District level licencing is considered in the assessment of impacts on GCN in section 3.11.10. The findings of the data search are provided in Volume 3, Annex 3.1: Onshore ecology desk study technical report of the ES (document reference F3.3.1)..  |
| TA_0017_014_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Surveys Survey data submitted with the planning application should be current/up-to-date, in line with recognised guidelines (as summarised above). The survey area should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The intended location of the development footprint;</li> <li>• Potential working areas, compounds, storage areas and access routes;</li> <li>• Any land that may be used within the mitigation, compensation or biodiversity net gain proposals (on or off-site);</li> <li>• A suitable buffer distance, taking account of the likely zone of influence and relevant survey guidelines.</li> </ul>  | The survey area is the area used for site-specific surveys and is generally defined as a 150 m buffer around the Onshore Order Limits. The 150 m buffer was included to take account of protected species that may occur adjacent or close to the Transmission Assets and to allow for evolution of the boundary during the site selection process. A separate survey area was used for GCN surveys. The GCN survey area is defined as a 250 m buffer around the Onshore Order Limits. Volume 3, Annex 3.8: Great crested newt survey and reptile survey technical report of the ES (document reference F3.3.8) provides further details regarding the GCN survey area. Owing to the iterative design process of the Transmission Assets, some surveys were undertaken further than 150 m from the Onshore Order Limits. Nevertheless, information from these surveys have been included in technical annexes because it provides context regarding the ecological sensitivity of the wider area.   |
| TA_0017_015_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | The ecological surveys/assessments should include a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, undertaken in accordance with recognised guidelines. This should be used to determine any necessary further surveys/assessments required to inform the planning application.   | A phase 1 habitat survey, including scoping for protected and notable species, was carried out as part of the PEIR and findings have contributed to determine the scope and location of species surveys. Survey has continued since the publication of the PEIR, in areas that were not previously accessible or were originally surveyed at a suboptimal time. Findings have informed the requirement for further surveys. This is further detailed in Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation (document reference F3.3)  |
| TA_0017_016_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Survey results should include UKHab habitat classifications, condition assessments and all necessary data to inform an assessment of Biodiversity Net Gain. The area of each habitat (or length of linear habitats) and their biodiversity value should be quantified, using the current DEFRA biodiversity metric. Habitats of nature conservation significance, including Habitats of Principal Importance (NERC Act, 2006) and irreplaceable habitats should be identified and clearly mapped.  | Habitat survey has been completed for over 90% of the Onshore Order Limits, and within a 150 m buffer where access was granted and was carried out using the JNCC phase 1 habitat survey method. This has been converted to UKHab to provide the baseline for the biodiversity benefit calculation of permanent habitat loss, which has been carried out using the statutory biodiversity metric. Habitats of nature conservation significance, including priority habitats, that represent important ecological features, are identified in section 3.10 and assessed in section 3.11.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation (document reference F3.3). Further information on priority and other notable habitats is provided in Volume 3, Annex 3.1: Onshore ecology desk study technical report of the ES (document reference F3.3.1) and Volume 3, Annex 3.3: Phase 1 habitat, national vegetation classification and hedgerow survey technical report of the ES (document reference F3.3.3). The maps provided in these annexes show the distribution of habitats but maps of priority and notable habitats only are not provided. |
| TA_0017_017_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | The planning application should also include the results of more detailed phase 2 vegetation/habitat surveys of any semi-natural habitats, priority habitats and other features with the potential to support ecologically significant species. Results should include mapped plant communities and full species lists showing relative abundance. Any quadrat   | NVC surveys have been carried out where required, as informed by the desk study, results of the phase 1 habitat survey and predicted impacts of the Transmission Assets. Where necessary, surveys of the Fylde sand dune have been carried out to confirm or update surveys carried out in 2016.  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | data and locations should be included. Any hedgerows affected by the proposals should be assessed according to the criteria specified in the Hedgerow Regulations 1997.  |  |
| TA_0017_020_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | The planning application should include an assessment of the ornithological interest of the site and the predicted Zone of Influence. This should include breeding and wintering birds.  | This is provided within Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).   |
| TA_0017_021_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | All surveys should be carried out at an appropriate time of year, in accordance with recognised methodologies and best practice guidelines, and be carried out by suitably competent and experienced individuals. All survey methods used should be detailed in the ES, along with any survey limitations and a rationale for any unavoidable departures from recognised survey standards.   | Survey methods and competency standards required for surveyors carrying out ecological surveys are provided in Volume 3, Annex 3.2: Onshore ecology survey methodologies technical report of the ES (document reference F3.3.2). Limitations relevant to different surveys are identified in the technical reports.  |
| TA_0017_022_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Evaluation<br>An evaluation should be provided for all sites, habitats, species populations and other ecological features identified during the surveys, including identification of irreplaceable habitats. A rationale should be provided for the evaluation given to each ecological feature.   | An evaluation of important ecological features considered in the assessment is provided in section 3.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).  |
| 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_0017_030_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | DEFRA Circular 01/2005 (ODPM Circular 06/2005), referenced in Footnote 61 of NPPF 2021, states that "It is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted" and that "the survey should be completed and any necessary measures to protect the species should be in place, through conditions and/or planning obligations, before the permission is granted" (Paragraph 99). The planning application therefore needs to include habitat assessments and survey data for all protected species that could potentially be present and affected by the proposals. The survey methods used should be detailed in the planning submission. These should comply with recognised guidelines. The planning application should demonstrate that relevant species protection legislation will be adhered to and should include mitigation/compensation proposals for unavoidable impacts on such species and their habitats. If any European protected species (such as bats, great crested newts or otters) are present, then the planning application should include measures to avoid any breach of The Habitats Regulations. If such a breach would be unavoidable, then a Natural England Licence would be required before development work could commence. The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) state that a competent authority, in exercising any of its functions, must have regard to the requirements of the Directives. The application will therefore need to include sufficient information to enable the determining authority to meet this requirement. | 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). The Applicants will apply for mitigation licenses if there are unavoidable impacts on fully protected species, with the information necessary to allow the application to be determined. |
| TA_0017_033_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Impact Assessment Unavoidable impacts on sites, habitats, species and features of ecological value will need to be assessed in accordance with recognised guidelines (see examples above). All temporary and permanent impacts should be stated and assessed, including (but not limited to): • habitat loss, • habitat degradation and disturbance, • habitat fragmentation, severance and isolation, • ecological impacts arising from hydrological changes, • potential killing, injury and disturbance of protected and priority species, • destruction or disturbance of habitats used by protected and priority species, • impacts arising from lighting, noise, vibration, dust etc. • Impacts of all construction and related works should be included in the assessment, including the construction footprint, compounds, storage areas, access routes etc. The area and biodiversity value of each habitat type that would be lost, damaged, re-established, enhanced or brought into favourable management should be quantified in order to illustrate that the impacts of the  | The scope of impacts considered in section 3.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3) have been established through consultation with the Expert Working Group and through review of consultation responses.   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | development will be fully off-set and that overall biodiversity gains will be delivered. The current DEFRA biodiversity metric should be used.   |  |
| TA_0017_034_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Mitigation, Compensation and Biodiversity Net Gain The results of surveys and impact assessments undertaken should inform the design of the proposed development and associated mitigation, restoration, compensation and enhancement measures. It should be demonstrated that impacts will be mitigated, that compensation will be provided for all unavoidable impacts and that enhancement measures will provide an overall net gain in biodiversity value. It should be demonstrated that mitigation and compensation proposals meet the requirements of legislation, policy and guidance listed above. Mitigation measures should include protection of retained habitats, species and features of ecological value, including tree root protection measures. Evidence of a gain in biodiversity value should be submitted and should include complete DEFRA biodiversity metric calculations (not just headline results), along with supporting plans. Use of the metric will be a statutory requirement when mandatory biodiversity net gain is in force. Current requirements for biodiversity gains, stated within the NPPF are summarised above. It is anticipated that the mandatory requirement for 10% biodiversity net gain, arising from the Environment Act 2021, will come into force during 2025 for national infrastructure projects. It will need to be ensured that the proposed development provides overall biodiversity gains compliant with the requirements in place at the time of the planning submission. The planning application should include proposals for maintaining, restoring and enhancing habitat connectivity within the application area and the wider landscape. Habitat creation should not be at the expense of existing habitats or features of ecological importance. Habitat creation proposals should comprise native plant communities appropriate to the location, soils, hydrology and site conditions. Guidance on native species selection is given on the Lancashire County Council's Ecology webpages:<br>• <a href="http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/council/planning/planning-application-process/ecology/ecology-advice-for-developers/habitat-re-establishment.aspx">http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/council/planning/planning-application-process/ecology/ecology-advice-for-developers/habitat-re-establishment.aspx</a> • Plant-species-appropriate-for-habitat-creation-in-Lancashire.pdf | 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. In addition, during an iterative process of EIA, locations where trenchless techniques will be used to avoid impacts 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. 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). |
| TA_0017_035_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Establishment maintenance and long-term management and monitoring proposals for retained, restored and replacement habitats should be provided. The timescale of the management and monitoring commitment should be stated. It is recommended that this should cover a 30-year period. This will be a statutory requirement when mandatory biodiversity net gain is in force.  | An Outline Ecological Management Plan (document reference J6) is provided as part of the application for development consent.  |
| TA_0017_036_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | It should be stated how the necessary maintenance and management will be secured for the lifetime of the anticipated planning obligations.   | An Outline Ecological Management Plan (document reference J6) is provided as part of the application for development consent.  |
| TA_0017_037_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Monitoring measures should be sufficient to measure the success of mitigation and compensation measures, to inform the need for remedial measures and to inform establishment maintenance and long-term management.  | Any relevant monitoring measures are set out in section 3.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).   |
| TA_0019_028_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | The potential biodiversity net gain areas do not provide detail of what will actually be required. They need to be properly specified with some measurable and enforceable results. The protection of existing ecology on the surrounding land needs to be documented and at least maintained. Equestrian landowners and smallholders are concerned about the welfare of their animals in particular with regard to reduction in grazing land and the impact of major disruption including light pollution, noise and vibration potentially causing stress, spread of plants toxic to certain animals and other health impacts. The biodiversity net gain approach can lead to a loss of green spaces, when there is a failure to deliver ecological improvements biodiversity will be lost overall so it is essential that the governance mechanisms regulating these future gains are watertight. Parts of the biodiversity net gain areas are disconnected from each other. In order to adequately support wildlife habitats and the natural spread of native flora and fauna these areas should be joined together to form corridors.  | 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).  |
| TA_0025_003_231123          | S42     | Email           | There is also a 13km radius wildlife zone. The Aerodrome at Warton needs to be consulted on any developments that have the potential to attract wildlife. Birds are the main concern, particularly large, over-wintering birds. In relation to this, BAE Systems   | The Applicants welcome BAE Systems' engagement and proactive approach to the Transmission Assets planning and development. This comment was taken into consideration at the mitigation stage when the project was undertaking site selection   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | have initial concerns about the proposal to develop an “ Onshore and Intertidal Net Gain Enhancement Plan...to identify areas where biodiversity net gain is proposed. This will include details of the measures proposed, including details of any enhancement measures proposed for waterbirds.” (Preliminary Environmental Information Report Non-Technical Summary, October 2023). BAE Systems is particularly concerned about any enhancement measures in the wildlife zone that will increase the attractiveness of the area for birds (including new areas of standing water) as this has significant potential to negatively affect air safety.  | activities to locate areas where mitigation could be provided. Due to BAE Systems concerns, any biodiversity benefit, mitigation and enhancement has been sited outside of the wildlife zone.  |
| 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_0035_010_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG): Further clarification is required regarding the approach to BNG. It's unclear at this time how this will be implemented. We would urge the applicant to engage with the developing Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) to explore BNG options that could align with the LNRS strategic approach (further comments in Appendix C).   | The status of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy for Lancashire is summarised in section 3.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). Step 1 of the strategy, to map areas of particular importance for biodiversity, is complete. Accordingly, section 3.11 of the chapter includes assessment of areas of particular importance such as statutory and non-statutory designated sites.<br>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).  |
| TA_0035_013_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Ecological surveys: A number of further ecology surveys are required to ensure suitable baseline assessment of protected habitats and species especially in respect to CRoW assessments for onshore SSSIs, and water voles.  | Surveys have been carried out in 2022, 2023 and 2024 in order to confirm the presence or indicate the likely absence of protected species. See Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). This has informed the assessments set out in section 3.11 of that chapter. This includes details of the effects on SSSIs and other designated sites. No effects on water voles are considered likely.   |
| TA_0035_020_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 3.8.1.8 Issue<br>Lack of clarity regarding the cabling method (Horizontal Directional Drilling or open trench) across the intertidal area<br>Impact<br>Potential for damage to the physical and ecological integrity of the intertidal area.<br>Solution<br>Provide further clarification including entry and exit points for HDD sites if relevant.   | Details of the works in the intertidal area are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). This includes open trenching works in the intertidal area. The exit point for the direct pipe beneath the dunes is anticipated to be above Mean High Water Springs.   |
| TA_0035_022_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 3.11 Biodiversity Net Gain Issue<br>At this time the site does not have a suitable BNG strategy. Impact<br>The proposals do not accord with government policy. There is the potential for missed opportunities for environmental gains from this project. In addition, the delivery of BNG has not been incorporated into the application and implications of this activity have not been assessed. Solution<br>The strategy for Biodiversity Net Gain to be clearly defined and delivery mechanisms to be incorporated into the DCO. The implications of delivering BNG to be incorporated into assessment documents. Applicant advised to consider opportunities in Local Nature Recovery Strategies and any mitigation measures listed for the affected waterbodies under WFD. Lancashire Wildlife Trust have been working on BNG habitat options within this wider area. See Annex D for further consideration | 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 |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | published by Defra (4.0).The status of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy for Lancashire is summarised in section 3.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). Step 1 of the strategy, to map areas of particular importance for biodiversity, is complete. Accordingly, section 3.11 of the chapter includes assessment of areas of particular importance such as statutory and non-statutory designated sites.   |
| TA_0035_026_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 3.9.2.18-3.9.2.21 Issue<br>The impacts on saltmarsh are considered low magnitude and of minor significance. We disagree that loss in coastal saltmarsh habitat be considered as low magnitude/temporary since it takes years (potentially 10+) for saltmarsh to naturally regenerate. Review the impacts on saltmarsh, taking into account the long timescale it takes to establish.   | The assessment of impacts on priority habitats provided in section 3.11 of Volume 3, Onshore Ecology and Nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). This has been updated to reflect the current design, as well as increased survey coverage. No impacts on saltmarsh habitat are anticipated.  |
| TA_0035_072_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | CoT20 All temporary working areas for the onshore export cable corridor, 400 kV grid connection cable corridor, temporary compounds and the onshore substation sites will be clearly marked and secured with appropriate fencing. The permanent onshore substation sites will be secured with appropriate fencing. Risks to wildlife associated with site fencing have yet to be addressed. There remains a risk that wildlife may become entrapped in site fencing. In association with CoT17 ensure provision is made to avoid the entrapment of any animals within relevant construction areas. Checks will be made prior to the start of any works to ensure no animals are trapped. Appropriate checks will be made as required by the ecological clerk of works. Secure these measures through Outline Fencing Management Plan secured in the DCO submission.  | Measures to protect wildlife during construction are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1). This includes an Outline Construction Fencing Plan (document reference J1.10).  |
| TA_0035_077_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | CoT33 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. The CoCP will include best practice measures in relation to air quality that will be applied where human receptors reside within 350 m of works, where required, or where sensitive ecological receptors are present within 50 m, as described in Institute of Air Quality guidance Management (IAQM, 2014) as appropriate. Measures required to manage dust and air quality have yet to be fully addressed. Impact Risk to sensitive ecological receptors from poor air quality. Solution Outline Dust Management Plan setting out dust and air quality control measures to be appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission.  | An Outline Dust Management Plan is provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1.2).  |
| TA_0035_078_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | CoT35, 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. The CoCP will include measures to maintain and address:- 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. Measures required to manage environmental risks have yet to be fully addressed. Impact Risk to the environment. Solution Outline versions of various Plans to manage environmental risks to be appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission. See also CoT04 - Onshore pollution prevention plan CoT09 - Drainage Management Plan CoT11 - Operational Onshore Substation Drainage Management plan CoT20 - Construction Fencing Plan CoT26 - Site Waste Management Plan CoT30 - Contaminated Land and Groundwater Discovery Strategy CoT33 - Air Quality CoT73 - Biosecurity Protocol CoT76 - Outline Ecological Management Plan CoT77 - Bentonite Breakout Plan CoT78 - Biosecurity Protocol CoT81 - Soil Management Plan CoT86 - Measures to protect minor watercourses | See the Outline CoCP (document reference J1) and the following plans submitted as part of the application for development consent:<br>•Outline Communications Plan (document reference J1.1)<br>•Outline Dust Management Plan (document reference J1.2)<br>•Outline Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (document reference J1.3)<br>•Outline Pollution Prevention Plan (document reference J1.4)<br>•Outline Public Rights of Way (PRoW) Management Plan (document reference J1.5)<br>•Outline Site Waste Management Plan (document reference J1.6)<br>•Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7)<br>•Outline Spillage and Emergency Response Plan (document reference J1.8)<br>•Outline Surface Water and Groundwater Management Plan (document reference J1.9)<br>•Outline Construction Fencing Plan (document reference J1.10)<br>•Outline Construction Artificial Light Emissions Management Plan (document reference J1.11)<br>•Outline Biosecurity Protocol (document reference J1.12)<br>•Outline Bentonite Breakout Plan (document reference J1.13)<br>•Outline Contaminated Land and Groundwater Discovery Strategy (document reference J1.14) |
| TA_0035_084_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | CoT73 & CoT78 A Biosecurity Protocol will be prepared as part of the Outline CoCP and submitted as part of the application for the development consent. CoCP(s) will be developed in accordance with the outline CoCP. Measures to manage biosecurity have yet to be fully developed. Impact Risk to the environment. Solution Outline Biosecurity Protocol to be secured in the DCO submission.   | An Outline Biosecurity Protocol has been provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1.12).   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| TA_0035_085_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | CoT76 Ecological Management Plan(s) (EMP) will be developed in accordance with the Outline Ecological Management Plan (OEMP). The Outline Ecological Management Plan will be submitted as part of the application for the development consent and will include but not be limited to pre-construction, construction and post-mitigation measures relating to habitats and protected or notable species, where relevant. The Outline Ecological Management Plan will also include a Breeding Bird Protection Plan which will set out mitigation measures such as vegetation clearance in winter (e.g., hedgerows), pre-construction breeding bird survey, appropriate protection zones upon confirmation of nest building/breeding taking place of key protected or sensitive species. The Ecological Management Plan will also include details of any long term mitigation and management measures relevant to onshore ecology and nature conservation and in relation to onshore and intertidal ornithology. This will include the management of ecological mitigation areas. The Ecological Management Plan will be developed in consultation with the relevant responsible authorities. Issue Measures to manage ecological risk have yet to be fully developed. Impact Risk to habitats and species. Solution Outline Ecological Management Plan to be included in DCO submission | This commitment remains in place and an Outline Ecological Management Plan (document reference J6) is provided as part of the application for development consent.   |
| TA_0035_086_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | CoT83 An Onshore and Intertidal Net Gain Enhancement Plan will be developed and submitted as part of the application to identify areas where biodiversity net gain and/or opportunities for any enhancement are proposed. This will include details of the measures proposed. Issue The identification of areas for mitigation, BNG or enhancement have yet to be fully developed. and may alter the red line boundary on the DCO submission. Impact The clarification of BNG intentions may alter the red line boundary on the DCO submission. Solution An Outline Net Gain Enhancement Plan to be included in DCO submission  | CoT83 has been removed, as the Applicants' approach to undertaking enhancement opportunities is set out the Outline Ecological Management Plan (document reference J6), and the approach to biodiversity benefit is set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11).  |
| TA_0035_096_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Sand dune restoration Opportunity<br>Opportunity for targeted sand dune restoration associated with SSSI Suggestion<br>Engage with the Fylde Sand Dune Group which is responsible for sand dune restoration along this section of the coast. This work is part funded by the EA and is a long term ongoing project.   | Noted, the Applicants are in contact with Fylde Sand Dune Group, who have shared previous survey data.   |
| TA_0035_097_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Saltmarsh Opportunity<br>Opportunity for targeted saltmarsh creation / restoration along the length of the Ribble and Douglas Estuaries, including consideration of options outside of the area already highlighted for BNG enhancement/ mitigation (i.e. further down the estuary). Suggestion Engage with local partners who have experience of saltmarsh creation from Hesketh Outmarsh and can support discussions around opportunities. Best done through the Ribble Life and Douglas Catchment Partnerships respectively. Potential for managed realignment opportunities along Main Drain where the existing embankment is below required condition. Potential for managed realignment opportunities to the north and south of the River Ribble to the east of Freckleton and west of Higher Penwortham to allow for tidal inundation of the current agricultural land and the formation of saltmarsh.   | Measures to protect habitats are set out in section 3.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). The assessment of impacts on priority habitats provided in section 3.11 of Volume 3, Onshore Ecology and Nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). This has been updated to reflect the current design, as well as increased survey coverage. No impacts on saltmarsh habitat are anticipated.   |
| 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 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   | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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). Following route refinement and landowner engagement, the impact |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | <p>fyld 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.</p>  | <p>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.</p>   |
| TA_0041_001_191123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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</p>  | <p>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.</p>   |
| TA_0042_001_191123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</p> | <p>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.</p> |
| TA_0043_018_211123          | S44     | Email           | <p>18 Environmental impacts: We are aware there has been an impact survey on our land, but as yet the results have not been shared with ourselves or the wider public. We support large numbers of farmland birds, many of which are with us all year and others are either Summer or Winter visitors. We have, amongst many others- skylarks, curlews, pink footed geese, lapwing, Shoveler ducks, breeding teal, kestrels, sparrow hawks and a wide variety of owls. A variety of mammals, invertebrates and amphibians also make our farmland their home.</p>   | <p>A number of environmental surveys have been undertaken and are reported in the ES. These include, in particular, surveys for ecology, the historic environment, agricultural land quality and tree surveys. These are reported in Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation, Volume 3, Chapter 5: Historic environment, Volume 3: Chapter 6: Land use and recreation and Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES (document reference F3.3, F3.5, F3.6 and F3.10). These have informed the assessments presented in these chapters.</p>   |
| TA_0118_001_071123          | S44     | Email           | <p>As a resident of Freckleton I wish to strongly register my objection to the planned substations in our area. My husband and I chose to retire here 5 years ago because of the access to the open countryside which surrounds this area. It is a valuable habitat to much wildlife including bats, great crested newts and hedgehogs, foxes, etc. We also have</p>   | <p>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 contained within the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (ISAA) report</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | curlew, lapwing and oystercatcher in this area. These key species are being displaced at an alarming rate and greatly rely on these coastal resources to overwinter successfully.  | (document reference E2.1, 2.2, 2.3).Both the ES and the ISAA consider construction impacts, including impacts on functionally linked land.   |
| 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).   |
| TA_0124_006_171123          | S44     | Email           | 7.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.   | Detailed assessments are 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_0127_001_191123          | S44     | Email           | we strongly object to any windfarm along the queensway. we have a small private stable yard at the top of REDACTED which runs along the queensway.we originally fenced along the queensway 15 foot in to protect the trees and wildlife and to cause least disruption to the area as possible. We observe bats otters newts rat weasels voles moles to name the least. The end field we own has recently had a tree cut out without our permission? Also i turn my horses out along there and one horse is a rescue that does not tolerate any heavy machinery and is very nervous.so any disruption would seriously damage the area animals and wildlife.therefore we strongly object thankyou  | 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). 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).   |
| 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  | 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   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | 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 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.   | 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_0134_003_191123          | S44     | Email           | The farmland and wildlife that will be effected by this concerns me greatly. You have stated in your report that you will replant hedgerows etc... But these can take up to 30 years to regenerate. Where will the wildlife that lives in these hedgerows go? and shocks me that the substation will last 35 years (4.6.1.6) The substation will ruin our rural location and turn it into an industrial site. In this village we are lucky to have lots of wildlife including bats, redshanks, oystercatchers, great crested newts, and seval types of owls and kestrels.  | 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).  |
| 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_0139_003_201123          | S44     | Email           | 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?  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_0139_004_201123          | S44     | Email           | 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 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 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 | 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 |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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 <a href="https://blackpoolez.com">https://blackpoolez.com</a>), 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 (<a href="https://pa.fylde.gov.uk/Planning/Display/23/0758">https://pa.fylde.gov.uk/Planning/Display/23/0758</a>).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>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_0143_001_201123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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 North View, 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.</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_0144_001_201123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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 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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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). 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_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_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 hazard- Traffic congestion in the areas surrounding the potential sitel am sure there must be other places this substation could be built within Fylde that would have considerably less impact on people's livelihoods.  | 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_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  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).   |
| TA_0151_006_201123          | S44     | Email           | My investigations show enormous concerns and implications to the village, not only to the residents but the local wildlife. Owls, hawks, buzzards, redshanks, oyster catchers, long tailed tits, bats, great crested newts and many more.   | Detailed assessments are 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_002_221123          | S44     | Email           | In connection to the above, not only will your proposals force local farmers out of business, but will also involve cutting through field drainage systems, exacerbating flooding, and potentially affecting local communities as well as farmland. The displacement of water caused by the development will put homes at risk and ruin farmland for decades to come. Your proposed route also disrupts land of ornithological importance. Lancashire County Heritage Sites includes the area of Lytham Moss (Site Ref: 33SEW1) as a Biological Heritage Site, or "local wildlife site". The site comprises 283 hectares of farmland which it categorises as of ornithological importance. The land provides winter feeding ground for flocks of Pink-footed Geese and Whooper Swans with bird numbers exceeding 0.5% of the British wintering population. Furthermore, Lapwings, Corn Buntings and Skylarks are already endangered species which can be found on local farmland. This project would deprive these flocks of their natural habitat, while the prolonged human activity and noise pollution associated with this project would scare these flocks away for good. | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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). 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). 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 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 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.   |
| TA_0188_007_221123          | S44     | Email           | 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 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?  | 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 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). |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
| TA_0202_005_221123          | S44     | Email           | Mitigation If these supposed mitigation sites, go ahead we most certainly not farm, or use are land as we would like too. We love our wildlife and have all sorts of creatures upon it. We have barn owls, long eared owls, tawny owls, and bats. We have water voles, greater crested newts (in places) . Deer, pink footed geese, swans, and a few years ago a puma was sited for several years in our Christmas Trees. We have lapwings, field fares, curlews and many other species. There is no reference or proposals to the type of mitigation you require! | 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)   |
| TA_0211_004_231123          | S44     | Email           | 9 I am concerned about environmental damage to wildlife that has made its home on my land. We have a number of kestrels, lapwing, sparrowhawks and owl species. Shoveler ducks as well as various mammals, invertebrates, and Great Crested Newts. I understand that there is to be 'environmental mitigation' of the damage caused. This may involve taking additional prime agricultural land out of food production and therefore making our arming business potentially even more unviable.  | 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 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 (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_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_0225_025_231123          | S44     | Email           | Newton Marsh SSSI Newton Marsh SSSI does not feature in pretty much any of the PEIR documentation and isn't listed in the table of SSSI Sites ! There is brief mention of breeding godwits but then completely disregarded in any determination in favour of Zone 1 ?Newton and Freckleton Marshes are both managed by RSPB. These wind farm projects highlight both marshes for potential Biodiversity Net Gain which is a ludicrous proposal given their current nature conservation status together with approximately 50% of this land mass being a SSSI.      | 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.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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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_0225_028_231123          | S44     | Email           | 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.  | 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). |
| TA_0226_019_231123          | S44     | Email           | Newton Marsh SSSI Newton Marsh SSSI does not feature in pretty much any of the PEIR documentation and isn't listed in the table of SSSI Sites ! There is brief mention of breeding godwits but then completely disregarded in any determination in favour of Zone 1 ? Newton and Freckleton Marshes are both managed by RSPB. These wind farm projects highlight both marshes for potential Biodiversity Net Gain which is a ludicrous proposal given their current nature conservation status together with approximately 50% of this land mass being a SSSI. | 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_0226_022_231123          | S44     | Email           | 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.  | 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).<br>An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken within the ES, including the following with reference to ornithology:<br>- Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5)<br>- Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).  |
| TA_0228_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | This consultation feedback is made on behalf of the [redacted] who are the owners of REDACTED and a 50% share of ownership of [redacted] Newton Marsh is a SSSI which does not feature in pretty much any of the PEIR documentation and isn't listed in the table of SSSI Sites ! There is brief mention of breeding godwits but then completely disregarded in any determination in favour of Zone 1 ? Newton and Freckleton Marshes are both managed by RSPB and Natural England.  | 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_002_231123          | S44     | Email           | These wind farm projects highlights Newton Marsh for potential Biodiversity Net Gain. Newton Marsh should be removed following this statutory consultation as the land mass is a 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).<br>An assessment of the impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets has been undertaken within the ES, including the following with reference to ornithology:<br>- Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5)<br>- Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
| TA_0228_009_231123          | S44     | Email           | 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.  | 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_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | This consultation feedback is made on behalf of the [REDACTED] who are the owners of Freckleton Marsh and a 50% share of ownership of [REDACTED] Freckleton Marsh is an open expanse of extensively grazed by livestock grassland which has tidal gullies and is therefore an ideal land area for ground nesting birds which together with Newton Marsh SSSI which has rare breeding bird success. Newton Marsh SSSI does not feature in pretty much any of the PEIR documentation and isn't listed in the table of SSSI Sites ! There is brief mention of breeding godwits but then completely disregarded in any determination in favour of Zone 1 ? Newton and Freckleton Marshes are both managed by RSPB and Natural England. | 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_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 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_009_231123          | S44     | Email           | 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.  | 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:-<br>- Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5)<br>- Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4). |
| TA_0234_022_231123          | S44     | Email           | 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.  | 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).          |

## E1.16.20 Historic environment table of responses

## E1.16.20.1 Historic environment table of responses (via feedback form)



**Table E1.16.20.1: Historic environment 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 (3.5; Historic environment) 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_0051_005_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.5                          | Please see 3.3 above<br><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_0055_002_051123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.5                          | Blackpool Airport is an historical important airport and a popular airport for local training of pilots.<br><br>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?<br><br>Electromagnetic radiation - has this been considered for usage of this airport? | 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.   |
| TA_0056_017_141123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.5                          | As previously stated<br><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.<br>The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation,  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method         | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                         |                        |                              |  | 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_007_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form    | 3                      | 3.5                          | The sand dunes and surrounding coastline in this area is a conservation area so must be protected.   | 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.   |
| TA_0066_005_171023          | S44     | Online feedback form    | 3                      | 3.5                          | Any historic buildings or sites must be protected.   | The Transmission Assets 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_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_0085_005_191123          | S44     | Online feedback form    | 3                      | 3.5                          | Bridle (sic) paths these have been here many years and are a major part of the Moss area - there are a number of local bridle paths for horse owners and these will be disrupted and cause concerns for animals and owners alike | 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_0092__002_151123         | S44     | Online feedback form    | 7                      |                              | 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__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  | Under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008, local planning authorities and Historic England are considered statutory consultees  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method        | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                        |                        |                              | community on significant decisions, the local authority and Historic England.  | 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_022_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form   | 3                      | 3.5                          | Need to ensure continue to work with the local authorities and Historic England to ensure all negative impacts of the project are mitigated and the historic environment is preserved as it the current status where possible. Specific consultation will need to be carried out for any direct impacts with the local community.  | 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_0098_006_081123          | S44     | Online feedback form   | 3                      | 3.5                          | There is a Roman settlement in Kirkham.<br><br>Very close to the substations supposedly being built.   | The Transmission Assets 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). Section 5.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 5: Historic environment of the ES (document reference F3.5) describes the archaeological potential based on current information.   |
| TA_0111_006_131123          | S44     | Hardcopy feedback form | 3                      | 3.5                          | The Nature Reserve is an historic environment enjoyed daily by many people. Apparently according to your staff, the public may not have access during construction. The medieval village of Kilgrimol was in the area of the Nature Reserve and Golf Course.   | The Transmission Assets 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). Section 5.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 5: Historic environment of the ES (document reference F3.5) describes the archaeological potential based on current information.   |
| TA_0113_001_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form   | 3                      | 3.5                          | We live in a listed building - REDACTED and do not consider that the proposed compound behind our house or the potential siting of the substations are appropriate for the environs of a listed building. The property was built circa 1777 and we are very concerned that the cable corridor in the field close to our property will have an impact on the structure of the building.   | 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_0115_001_051123          | S44     | Online feedback form   | 1                      |                              | 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.<br><br>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 | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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)  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | <p>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> <p>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.</p> | <p>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> |

## E1.16.20.2 Historic environment table of responses (via all other methods)

**Table E1.16.20.2: Historic Environment table of responses (via all other methods)**

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
| TA_0002__007_221123         | S42     | Email           | Further, there is a historic burial ground situated at what is now known as Quakers Wood, which is marked on the Freckleton Tithe map of 1838. The latest burials here took place in the late 19th century. However, on the other side of Lower Lane opposite Quakers Wood, there are two other Burial Yards marked. These are extensions to the Burial Ground that were used to bury members of the Quaker community in Freckleton once the Burial Ground was full.   | 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)  |
| TA_0017_014_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Surveys Survey data submitted with the planning application should be current/up-to-date, in line with recognised guidelines (as summarised above). The survey area should include: • The intended location of the development footprint; • Potential working areas, compounds, storage areas and access routes; • Any land that may be used within the mitigation, compensation or biodiversity net gain proposals (on or off-site); • A suitable buffer distance, taking account of the likely zone of influence and relevant survey guidelines. | The survey area is the area used for site-specific surveys and is generally defined as a 150 m buffer around the Onshore Order Limits. The 150 m buffer was included to take account of protected species that may occur adjacent or close to the Transmission Assets and to allow for evolution of the boundary during the site selection process. A separate survey area was used for GCN surveys. The GCN survey area is defined as a 250 m buffer around the Onshore Order Limits. Volume 3, Annex 3.8: Great crested newt survey and reptile survey technical report of the ES (document reference F3.3.8) provides further details regarding the GCN survey area. Owing to the iterative design process of the Transmission Assets, some surveys were undertaken further than 150 m from the Onshore Order Limits. Nevertheless, information from these surveys have been included in technical annexes because it provides context regarding the ecological sensitivity of the wider area. |
| TA_0017_038_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Historic Environment The HET will not be providing any detailed comment on the geoarchaeological survey as this is an that lies outside our professional competence, and we would in any case defer to the opinions expressed by Historic England's Regional Science Advisor. The HET's SLA with the relevant LPAs does not include provision to offer advice on the impact of proposals on the setting of designated heritage assets. We would defer in this matter to the relevant LPA Conservation Officers and/or Historic England.            | The Applicants note your response.  |
| TA_0017_039_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | My comments are therefore as follows:<br>Preliminary Environmental Information Report, Volume 3, Chapter 5: Historic environment<br>• I note the use of both non-designated and undesignated throughout the PEIR, it should be non-designated, except of course where it is being quoted from another document.  | This correct terminology is used throughout the ES, including the Annexes.  |
| TA_0017_040_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | • p. 5, Table 5.1 in the section How and where considered in the PEIR – Field evaluation has been undertaken should more accurately read "Limited and, as yet, non-intrusive field evaluation has been undertaken".  | Further survey work has been undertaken. Section 5.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 5: Historic environment of the ES (document reference F3.5) sets out the current situation regarding field evaluation. Further details are provided in Volume 3, Annex 5.2: Onshore archaeological geophysical survey report and 5.6: trial trenching report of the ES (document references F3.5.2 and F3.5.6).   |
| TA_0017_041_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | p. 12 – the lack of a full walkover is a problem. This is an important part of any assessment, as it has the potential to identify previously unknown sites of interest. See my comments below in relation to the DBA.   | Section 5.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 5: Historic environment of the ES (document reference F3.5) sets out the current situation regarding the walkover survey. It is noted that the geophysical survey was agreed to be used as a proxy for the walkover, where access allowed.   |
| TA_0017_042_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | • p. 19, 5.4.4.4-5.4.4.8 – Site specifics surveys. As the assessment is yet to be finished, it should be acknowledged that the current stated archaeological potential of the proposals may therefore change.  | Section 5.5 of Volume 3, Chapter 5: Historic environment of the ES (document reference F3.5) sets out the current situation regarding field evaluation, whilst section 5.6 describes the archaeological potential based on current information. This takes into account surveys undertaken for the ES.  |
| TA_0017_043_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 5.5.1.1. – I have no record of being consulted as to the content of the DBA, and this is the first time we have had sight of the DBA (it is subject to separate comments that follow these).   | The desk-based assessment has been updated following comments received as part of the statutory consultation and also from additional research and fieldwork. It is presented as Volume 3, Annex 5.1: Historic environment desk-based assessment of the ES (document reference F3.5.1) and is summarised in section 5.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 5: Historic environment of the ES (document reference F3.5).   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
| TA_0017_044_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 5.5.5.3 – inconsistent, and therefore incomplete use of PRNs, this doesn't make it easy to cross-check.  | This has been updated within section 5.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 5: Historic environment and also within Volume 3, Annex 5.1: Historic environment desk-based assessment of the ES.  |
| TA_0017_045_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | p. 40, Table 5.13 – Are the Low & Negligible Sensitivity definition/examples meant to be the same?   | This was an error which has now been corrected within Table 5.12 of Volume 3, Chapter 5: Historic environment of the ES (document reference F3.5).  |
| TA_0017_046_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | p. 42, Table 5.15 – Surely the negligible column for magnitude of impact on a Very High sensitivity receptor should be Minor or Moderate, not just Minor.  | This has now been corrected within Table 5.13 of Volume 3, Chapter 5: Historic environment of the ES (document reference F3.5).   |
| TA_0017_047_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 5.9.2.6 – Why is the potential here considered to be very low?   | This has been reconsidered. Section 5.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 5: Historic environment of the ES (document reference F3.5) describes the archaeological potential based on current information.   |
| TA_0017_048_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 5.9.2.12 – preferably ahead of construction, but if as part of construction, still ahead of the actual construction work.  | Yes, other than where the proposed programme of further archaeological work includes archaeological monitoring during construction. The proposed programme of further archaeological work is set out in the Outline Onshore and Intertidal Written Scheme of Investigation (document reference J9).   |
| TA_0017_049_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 5.9.2.13 – Surely a permanent and irreversible impact should be assessed as being high, even if the receptor is of a low significance.   | The magnitude of impact includes consideration of the spatial extent of the archaeological site or the deposit of geoarchaeological interest i.e., if a deposit extends or is likely to extend over a wide area and the impact of the proposed development on that deposit it within a small part of that extent, then the magnitude of impact may be low or even negligible. |
| TA_0017_050_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 5.9.4.7 – On the basis of what evidence?   | Section 5.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 5: Historic environment of the ES (document reference F3.5) describes the archaeological potential based on current information.   |
| TA_0017_051_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 5.9.5.11 – The preparation of the Outline Landscape Management Plan in itself will not reduce the overall impact and effect, but that will rather be achieved through the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, whatever they might be.  | The embedded mitigation is set out in Table 5.9 of Volume 3, Chapter 5: Historic environment of the ES. See also the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2).   |
| TA_0017_052_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 5.14.1.3 – This statement is considered to be somewhat premature – the non-intrusive archaeological surveys of the site remain to be completed, and no intrusive work has yet to be undertaken. Indeed the word 'unknown' appears 17 times in the document. I would suggest that it therefore cannot be said, at the moment, there will be no significant effects, but rather that none has so far been identified.<br>Consequently I would refer you to 5.9.2.8 "As survey work is ongoing, the potential discovery of features or deposits of national importance during construction cannot be entirely ruled out. At this stage when surveys are yet to be completed, the sensitivity of the receptor is therefore considered to be unknown." The HET would consider this to be a better starting point from which to operate, and could be accompanied by a statement of intent such as "appropriate mitigation measures, such as open-area archaeological excavation and recording, where necessary, will be undertaken to reduce the impact and effects on the receptor(s) to an acceptable level." | The assessment presented within section 5.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 5: Historic environment of the ES (document reference F3.5) has been updated since publication of the PEIR and is based on all available information, including further surveys undertaken during 2024.  |
| TA_0017_053_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | We would also advise that consideration, even at this early stage, should be given to the wider social benefits of the archaeological works that could be achieved through activities such as educational visits and public open days, if warranted and practicable, being offered to the local public and the results, if necessary, being disseminated to as wide an audience as possible through talks to interested local groups, publication in a regional journal and/or a monograph, such as that produced for the Heysham to M6 Link – From Mesolithic Encampment to Medieval Estate: The Archaeology of the Bay Gateway (OAN, 2018).  | The Applicants agree and further information on this is presented within the Outline Onshore and Intertidal Written Scheme of Investigation (document reference J9).  |
| TA_0017_054_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 5.15.1.1 – Given the poor quality of the extant BGS data and the high level of geoarchaeological potential across the proposed development the suggested further works would seem entirely reasonable and necessary.   | The Applicants note your response.  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| TA_0017_055_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 5.15.1.5 – The intention to carry out the works as recommended in 3.2.1.2 of the Intertidal archaeological survey report is noted. Preliminary Environmental Information Report, Volume 3, Annex 5.1 Historic Environment desk based assessment   | The proposed programme of intertidal survey is set out in the Outline Onshore and Intertidal Written Scheme of Investigation (document reference J9).  |
| TA_0017_056_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | I have no record of the HET being consulted on the content of the DBA, but we had expected that section 3.2.4 would be followed.<br><br>"For desk-based assessment within the planning framework, a brief/project outline will usually be prepared by the planning archaeologist or curator and issued by the commissioning body or their agents. The brief/project outline or a specification may be prepared by the commissioning body or their agents, but should be agreed in advance with the planning archaeologist.", or that the HET would at least be able to see a draft version prior to its publication.                            | This was discussed at the Expert Working Group (EWG) in February 2024. The comments raised and the responses from the EWG are summarised in Volume 3, Chapter 5: Historic environment of the ES (document reference F3.5).   |
| TA_0017_057_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 1.2.3.1 – This is not the latest version of the ClfA Standard & guidance for Archaeological Desk Based Assessment, subject to minor revision in 2020.   | The most up-to-date versions of the ClfA guidance documents are now referenced within Volume 3, Annex 5.1: Historic environment desk-based assessment of the ES (document reference F3.5.1).   |
| TA_0017_058_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 1.2.3.3 – What is meant by good coverage? Which parts of the redline boundary weren't accessed during the site visit? What records are there for the site visit? Why aren't those areas mapped? A walkover of the whole of the site is usually a standard requirement the HET expects contractors to work to, but in this instance, given the large land-take (and possible access issues) it might be best undertaken once the route has been finalised (see also my comments above in relation to Vol. 3, Chapter 5).   | Land within the onshore export cable corridor, the 400 kV grid connection corridor and the onshore substation sites has now been subject to geophysical survey and/or walkover survey where access was available. Further information on this is set out within Volume 3, Annex 5.1: Historic environment desk-based assessment of the ES (document reference F3.5.1).                                   |
| TA_0017_059_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | The reproduction of the tithe maps should be such that the numbers are legible, and they should be accompanied by the apportionments. A list of potentially significant sites identified by the field names accompanied by their mapping would be helpful.  | Agreed. The information regarding the tithe maps is set out in Appendix G of Volume 3, Annex 5.1: Historic environment desk-based assessment of the ES (document reference F3.5.1), with the tithe maps reproduced in Appendix G of that annex.  |
| TA_0017_060_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 4.1.1.7 – Mesolithic to Bronze Age sites could be of regional or even national significance/importance, but no level of significance/importance has been given to those of an Iron Age/Romano-British date in 4.1.1.9.  | The relevant text within Volume 3, Annex 5.1: Historic environment desk-based assessment of the ES (document reference F3.5.1) has been updated.   |
| TA_0017_061_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 4.1.1.10 – We would suggest that Medieval sites should be considered to have the potential to be of regional or national rather than local significance/importance.   | The relevant text within Volume 3, Annex 5.1: Historic environment desk-based assessment of the ES (document reference F3.5.1) has been updated.   |
| TA_0017_062_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 4.1.1.11 – Do I take it from the absence of any mention of any potential for sites dating to the Post-medieval or later periods of any significance/importance to be found that none are anticipated?   | The relevant text within Volume 3, Annex 5.1: Historic environment desk-based assessment of the ES (document reference F3.5.1) has been updated.   |
| TA_0017_063_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | There is no mention of the North West Regional Research Framework (NWRRF) research questions that the project has the potential to address, despite the fact that the NWRRF has been included in the Bibliography.  | The relevant text within Volume 3, Annex 5.1: Historic environment desk-based assessment of the ES (document reference F3.5.1) has been updated.   |
| TA_0017_064_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | The Figures do not have the full title of the mapping used, e.g. Yates' 1786 map has the title The county Palatine of Lancaster, 1842 Ordnance Survey Map (this is missing whether this is the published or surveyed date, the Sheet No., edition & scale).   | The relevant text within Volume 3, Annex 5.1: Historic environment desk-based assessment of the ES (document reference F3.5.1) has been updated.   |
| TA_0017_065_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Preliminary Environmental Information Report, Vol 3, Annex 5.2: Onshore archaeological geophysical survey report<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A1 Table of Survey Considerations – No survey areas 30 &amp; 31</li> <li>• No list of figures</li> <li>• No figures 22 &amp; 23</li> <li>• Figures 20 &amp; 21 – Area 30 shown simply as text</li> <li>• No figures showing area 31</li> <li>• The report is however considered to have identified a number of areas which will require a further stage of archaeological investigation (trial trenching) should they be directly impacted by the proposed development.</li> </ul> | The results of the full programme of geophysical survey are presented within Volume 3, Annex 5.2: Onshore geophysical survey report of the ES (document reference F3.5.2)<br>A programme of archaeological investigation by way of trial trenching has been agreed with the HET at Lancashire County Council. The locations of the trial trenches are informed by the results of the geophysical survey. |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| TA_0017_066_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Preliminary Environmental Information Report, Vol 3, Annex 5.3: Intertidal archaeological survey report• The recommendations for further work seem to be both appropriate and necessary.  | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0017_067_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Preliminary Environmental Information Report, Vol 3, Annex 5.4: Geoarchaeological desk-based assessment report<br>• The recommendations for further work seem to be both appropriate and necessary.   | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0017_068_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | The above should however not be taken as an indication that the HET is unhappy with the methodology being followed. The mitigation proposed in Table 5.12 of Volume 3, Chapter 5 is considered to be appropriate and does contain within it the means to ensure that proportionate measures will be employed to mitigate any adverse impacts on the archaeological resource that might result from the proposals.   | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0018_001_061123          | S42     | Email           | Advice These proposed windfarms will not have a direct impact on any historic assets in Wales or in Welsh waters. The nearest any of the masts will be to the Welsh coast is over 50km away. As such it would be only in exceptional circumstances (if then) that the windfarms will be visible from Wales and therefore we do not envisage that the proposed wind farms will have any significant impact on the settings of any designated historic assets in Wales.   | 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_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_0035_077_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | CoT33An 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. The CoCP will include best practice measures in relation to air quality that will be applied where human receptors reside within 350 m of works, where required, or where sensitive ecological receptors are present within 50 m, as described in Institute of Air Quality guidance Management (IAQM,2014) as appropriate.IssueMeasures required to manage dust and airquality have yet to be fully addressed.ImpactRisk to sensitive ecological receptors frompoor air quality.SolutionOutline Dust Management Plan setting out dust and air quality control measures to be appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission.   | An Outline Dust Management Plan is provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1.2).  |
| TA_0035_078_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | CoT35,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. The CoCP will include measures to maintain and address:- 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.IssueMeasures required to manage environmental risks have yet to be fully addressed.ImpactRisk to the environmentSolutionOutline versions of various Plans to manage environmental risks to be appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission.See alsoCoT04 - Onshore pollution prevention plan CoT09 - Drainage Management Plan CoT11 - Operational Onshore Substation Drainage Management planCoT20 – Construction Fencing Plan CoT26 – Site Waste Management Plan CoT30 – Contaminated Land and Groundwater Discovery Strategy CoT33 – Air QualityCoT73 – Biosecurity ProtocolCoT76 – Outline Ecological Management PlanCoT77 – Bentonite Breakout Plan CoT78 – Biosecurity Protocol CoT81 – Soil Management Plan CoT86 – Measures to protect minor watercourses | See the Outline CoCP (document reference J1) and the following plans submitted as part of the application for development consent:•Outline Communications Plan (document reference J1.1)•Outline Dust Management Plan (document reference J1.2)•Outline Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (document reference J1.3)•Outline Pollution Prevention Plan (document reference J1.4)•Outline Public Rights of Way (PRoW) Management Plan (document reference J1.5)•Outline Site Waste Management Plan (document reference J1.6)•Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7)•Outline Spillage and Emergency Response Plan (document reference J1.8)•Outline Surface Water and Groundwater Management Plan (document reference J1.9)•Outline Construction Fencing Plan (document reference J1.10)•Outline Construction Artificial Light Emissions Management Plan (document reference J1.11)•Outline Biosecurity Protocol (document reference J1.12)•Outline Bentonite Breakout Plan (document reference J1.13)•Outline Contaminated Land and Groundwater Discovery Strategy (document reference J1.14) |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| TA_0046_001_171123          | S44     | Email           | I would like to express my concerns regarding the work that passes our farm on REDACTED. We have 25 horses here and the horses hack out daily around the area the hassle this work is going to cause our business could see us close. I would like to know what efforts you're going to make not to affect the wellbeing of our customers and their horses. From the rare breed of Suffolk Punch and competition horses they need daily exercise, a great deal of care and access to the farm is required at all time.  | Impacts and effects on recreational users (including horse rides) and public rights of way are set out in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Details of the management of these routes during construction are set out in the Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (document reference J1.5).   |
| TA_0049_019_231123          | S42     | Email           | <u>Volume 3, Chapter 5 Historic environment</u><br>Table 5.13 (Sensitivity criteria) grade II listed buildings are identified as being of Medium sensitivity. We disagree with this as grade II listed buildings are considered to be nationally significant and, therefore, warrant identification as being of High sensitivity.   | National planning policy as set out in the NPPF (paragraph 206) and in NPS EN-1 (paragraphs 5.9.29 and 5.9.30) makes a clear distinction between designated heritage assets of the highest significance (including grade I and II* listed buildings) and other designated heritage assets (including grade II listed buildings). The sensitivity or value of heritage assets as used within the assessment methodology set out in Table 5.1 of Volume 3, Chapter 5: Historic environment of the ES (document reference F3.5) reflects that distinction.  |
| TA_0049_020_231123          | S42     | Email           | Section 5.5.4 (Site-specific surveys) It is noted that the result of the geophysical surveys presented in Volume 3, Annex 5.2 represent work undertaken up to the end of June 2023. It is also noted that geophysical surveys are ongoing and aim to examine all relevant land as appropriate.  | Magnetometer surveys have been undertaken across land within the onshore export cable corridor, the 400 kV grid connection corridor and the onshore substation sites where the land use is suitable for this technique and where access has been available. The extent of the magnetometer survey is indicated in Volume 3, Annex 5.2: Onshore archaeological geophysical survey report of the ES (document reference F3.5.2).   |
| TA_0049_021_231123          | S42     | Email           | Table 5.4 It is noted that purposive fieldwork will be undertaken leading to the production of geoarchaeological deposit models as appropriate, the results of which will be reported in the ES. It would be beneficial to see the WSI for the proposed works based on the geoarchaeological desk-based assessment (DBA) and subsequent results.  | The WSI for the programme of trial trenching and geoarchaeological investigation was agreed in advance with Historic England. The methodologies for any further fieldwork aimed at retrieving information to assist in the production of geoarchaeological deposit models will be agreed in advance with Historic England.   |
| TA_0049_022_231123          | S42     | Email           | Section 5.4.4.5 It is noted that geophysical survey will be carried out within the export cable route area and that land identified as having potential for geoarchaeological deposit modelling will not be subjected to surface geophysical survey. It would be beneficial to understand the reasoning behind this choice of survey area; for instance, is it highlighting areas of deep alluvium that will form part of the deposit model but made up of sediments that will mask any features normally picked up in the geophysical survey? It is usually advised to carry out geoarchaeological surveys before geophysical surveys in order to understand the geology, sediments and topography of the area before further surveys are chosen. Section 5.15 We support a further phase of intertidal surveys following refinement of the cable route in the form of a borehole survey to examine the potential for deposits of geoarchaeological and/or palaeoenvironmental interest.   | Magnetometer surveys have been undertaken across land within the onshore export cable corridor, the 400 kV grid connection corridor and the onshore substation sites where the land use is suitable for this technique and where access has been available. The extent of the magnetometer survey is indicated in Volume 3, Annex 5.2: Onshore archaeological geophysical survey report of the ES (document reference F3.5.2). Other techniques have been utilised in the investigation of the archaeological and geoarchaeological potential of areas of former wetland. These techniques were agreed with Historic England and the HET at Lancashire County Council. The proposed programme of intertidal survey is set out in the Outline Onshore and Intertidal Written Scheme of Investigation (document reference J9). |
| TA_0049_023_231123          | S42     | Email           | <u>Vol 3 Annex 5.4 Geoarchaeological desk-based assessment report</u> We welcome the thorough Geoarchaeological DBA that has highlighted the potential of palaeoenvironmental organic remains and stratigraphic sequences that could contribute to a deposit model for the study area. It has been identified that much of the existing British Geological Survey (BGS) borehole data is inadequate, reiterating the importance of carrying out further Geotechnical Investigation (GI) works and geoarchaeological prospection across the area. We support recommendations that a watching brief on planned GI works would allow a geoarchaeologist to directly observe the potential of sediment sequences as the two disciplines use different recording methodologies. Therefore, having a geoarchaeologist present will result in more meaningful datasets being generated. Further purposive borehole/trial pit surveys will allow for the development of a deposit model and enable samples for palaeoenvironmental assessments and radiocarbon dating. We look forward to seeing a WSI for planned GI works and a geoarchaeological assessment for the onshore cable route. | An archaeological watching brief was undertaken during planned ground investigation works and the sediment sequences were recorded by a geoarchaeologist. The results of this work are described within the geoarchaeological desk-based assessment (Volume 3, Annex 5.4: Geoarchaeological desk-based assessment report of the ES, document reference F3.5.4) and will be utilised within the programme of geoarchaeological deposit modelling which will be presented ahead of or during Examination of the application for consent.   |
| TA_0049_024_231123          | S42     | Email           | <u>Vol 3 Annex 5.3 Intertidal archaeological survey report</u> The survey has provided some evidence for the potential of archaeological remains within the intertidal zone. There is potential for the survival of peat deposits on the shore and it would be beneficial to carry out further palaeoenvironmental investigations in the form of borehole transects as part of the geotechnical investigations on the onshore cable route phase once the specific route in the intertidal zone has been refined and clarified.  | The proposed programme of intertidal survey is set out in the Outline Onshore and Intertidal Written Scheme of Investigation (document reference J9).  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
| TA_0049_025_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)( <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/deposit-modelling-andarchaeology/">https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/deposit-modelling-andarchaeology/</a> )   | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0160_003_211123          | S44     | Email           | 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.  | 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).   |
| TA_0161_013_211123          | S44     | Email           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•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 Hornbys 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?</li> <li>• 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?</li> </ul> | 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. |
| TA_0225_008_231123          | S44     | Email           | [REDACTED] is a Grade II listed building.  | The Applicants note your response.   |

## E1.16.21 Land use and recreation table of responses

## E1.16.21.1 Land use and recreation table of responses (via feedback form)

**Table E1.16.21.1: Land use and recreation 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 (3.6; Land use and recreation) 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_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<br><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_002_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.2                          | The natural drainage of the land is already working to its maximum capacity, and any disruption to this natural process would severely impact our properties with an unacceptable risk of flooding. Although it is proposed that the transmission cable corridor would be re-instated, studies have suggested that it could take up to 40 years for the disturbed land to return to its natural state.   | 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).<br>Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2).<br>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.<br><br>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_0051_006_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | See 3.1 above<br><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). |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
| TA_0053_004_171123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 2                      |                              | Totally unacceptable see Q1<br><br>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_006_171123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | Totally unacceptable,we will lose our natural environment and green kand  | Detailed assessments are 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_012_171123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 5                      |                              | There again will impact on only my own land and business but many others,lanes too narrow,too close to residential area   | 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_003_051123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | The proximity to children's and youth's football and cricket fields and the health effects of the magnitude of magnetic radiation emitted from this project. These are decisions which are made by adults, but how are the young being protected? | 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).   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| TA_0056_018_141123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | As previously stated<br><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>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, 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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | <p>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_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).</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>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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | <p>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_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).</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</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | <p>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_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).</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>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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | <p>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_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).</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>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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | <p>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_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).</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>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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | <p>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_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).</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>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</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | <p>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_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).</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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | <p>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_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).</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>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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | <p>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_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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | <p>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_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.</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 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. 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.</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| 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 disprove 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.</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 significant benefits of the Project mean that there are Very Special Circumstances that outweigh any potential harm to the Green Belt.</p> |
| TA_0060_008_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | <p>Conservation area green belt land are being used everyday for recreation nature and wildlife</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_016_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 8                      |                              | <p>Why has it been placed there?</p> <p>Is this not green belt / farm 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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method         | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                         |                        |                              |  | <p>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). 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> <p>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_0064_006_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form    | 3                      | 3.6                          | Blackpool Road Playing Fields are an area of community interest owned by Fylde Borough Council   | 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_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?                                    | <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:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)<br/>Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>   |
| TA_0068_003_231123          | S44     | Hard copy feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | Golf club and cricket club how will these be affected? Will the public be able to continue to use them during the project? How will it effect the local shops will the residents be able to access them?   | A full impact assessment on socio-economics is presented in Volume 4 Chapter 2 of the ES (document reference F4.2).   |
| TA_0070_001_231123          | S44     | Online feedback form    | 7                      |                              | <p>Concern over destruction and availability of good agricultural land.</p> <p>The planning for use and access to farmland.</p> <p>Land will be divided and not usable. Also the economic impact of no crops.</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).</p> <p>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_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 | 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      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | business is not acceptable. Our cows produce milk for Tesco. More of a necessity than wild life. Take issue with Natural England and route up the south side of the Ribble.   | Detailed assessments are 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_0074_007_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | Restriction to access of beach and dunes in any form for long period is unacceptable  | 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 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_0076_001_091123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How will it effect the road out side my house</li> <li>2. How will if effect the dunes facing my house</li> <li>3. How will the 'Potential biodiversity net gain, enhancement and/or mitigation areas', how will this affect the front in St Annes</li> </ol> | <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). 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Further details of the approach to biodiversity benefit are provided in</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | 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_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).  |
| 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_0080_001_201123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | <p>Concern about noise from the wind farm should the distance to the shore be too close.</p> <p>Concern about contamination of bathing water during the development of the project . This is an area of tourism with swimming, windsurfing and families enjoying the beach .</p>  | <p>In regards to noise, 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.</p> <p>Increased suspended sediment concentrations and associated deposition affecting recreational diving sites and designated bathing water site is assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 9: Other sea users of the ES (document reference F2.9). This assessment concludes a negligible significance.</p> <p>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 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.</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| TA_0082_001_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | Lytham Moss is an area used for recreation, I use the area for dog walking and running as do many others. I have also seen the area used by walkers and horse riders. The proposed secondary cable route through Lytham Moss would impact a recreation area for many residents. I would not choose to exercise or dog walk in the area during or after the installation of cables due to the health risks associated with exposure to EMF's.   | 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.<br>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.<br>See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4). |
| TA_0083_012_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | Do not allow planning permission   | The Applicants note your response.  |
| 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:<br><br>Concerns about the following:<br>1) The impact of the wide corridor immediately next to our properties, but also will it go under our land?<br>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!<br>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.<br>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.<br>4) Vermin - we know from other local digging, drilling that this has driven vermin into our homes!<br>5) Noise from the amount of electricity being transmitted right by our homes.<br>6) Impact on the local wildlife in the area | 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).<br>Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2).<br>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>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</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 specific 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_005_191123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.5                          | <p>Bridle (sic) paths these have been here many years and are a major part of the Moss area - there are a number of local bridle paths for horse owners and these will be disrupted and cause concerns for animals and owners alike</p>  | <p>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_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. 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</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</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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p>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. 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. So I strongly object to these proposals</p> | Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).   |
| 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.  | <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).</p> <p>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> <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> |
| 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.   | <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_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_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_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 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).<br>Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, 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.<br>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.<br>Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register 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 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.  |
| TA_0092__023_151123         | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | Assume the project will follow its stated aims  | Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3). If approved the project will be required to adhere to this.   |
| 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 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_0093_002_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | As a resident on REDACTED, REDACTED, my house is on the main road opposite the beach. I walk my dog on the beach and nature reserve multiple times per day or week and use the Clifton Drive cycle lane regularly instead of my car. I have been living here almost 8 years and chose this area specifically for the quiet, rural feel. I am extremely concerned about what this project will do to my quality of life, general health and cost of living if I have to sit in construction traffic jams and drive to be able to find somewhere remote to take a walk, especially if it takes years to complete. Many of my neighbours are retired or elderly and chose to live here for a better quality of life in their later years. This will have a huge impact on our wellbeing. | Detailed assessments are 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). 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 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 appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards.   |
| 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   | Detailed assessments are 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | 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.  | the ES (document reference F1.5.3).<br>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).<br>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_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).  |
| 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"> <li>- selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets</li> <li>- refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received.</li> </ul> <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_0170_002_151023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | <p>As already advised<br/><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>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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <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>process, is set out in Volume 1, 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. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)<br/>Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>  |
| TA_0096_001_131123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | <p>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</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). 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).</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  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
| TA_0096_002_131123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      |                              | <p>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</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). 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).</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_0096_003_131123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 7                      |                              | <p>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</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). 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).</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | <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_0096_004_131123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 8                      |                              | <p>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</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). 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).</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  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| 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 and experience as residents situated closest to the monstrous constructions being proposed | <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). 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).</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_0098_007_081123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | <p>Farmers land all going to be ruined.</p> <p>Farming is difficult enough and there are very few farmers left, so the fact you can use their land at a very low price is absolutely disgusting, and you should all be ashamed.</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>   |
| TA_0098_016_081123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 8                      |                              | <p>This area is vast and situated between Kirkham, Newton and Freckleton, and far too close to all three.</p> <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>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <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>effects. Mitigation measures adopted 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:</p> <p>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>  |
| TA_0252_005_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 7                      |                              | <p>Extremely disruptive to the local farming community, the local environment and visual impact especially from the substations and other infrastructure.</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).</p> <p>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> <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>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_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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | <p>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). 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 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_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   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | 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.<br>we have worked hard to develop REDACTED and improve the grazing and natural habitats not only for horses but other wild life too.<br>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).<br>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.<br>the noise would also impact the horses as they have much more sensitive hearing than us.<br>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.<br>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.<br>i cant imagine losing any land to pipes etc, the land we are on is marshy 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.<br>i could not more strongly oppose the development | 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).<br>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_004_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      |                              | 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.<br>the noise would also impact the horses as they have much more sensitive hearing than us.<br>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.   | 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).<br>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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p>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.</p> <p>i cant imagine losing any land to pipes etc, the land we are on is marshy 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>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>   |
| TA_0102_007_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | <p>the land use is and should remain rural in and around newton, much of it is greenbelt and farming land and is used for outdoor hobbies</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_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_0103_002_051123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | <p>Will the recreational park at the end of Blackpool Road north be affected?</p>   | <p>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.</p>   |
| TA_0104_001_101123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      |                              | <p>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</p>  | <p>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.</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | 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 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_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.  |
| TA_0104_003_101123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 5                      |                              | Passing through a number of green belt by lytham moss, visually damaging to the environment as well as physically damaging green belt 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.<br>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_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).<br>Statutory consultation is a key part of the planning process, one which  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | <p>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> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' 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   | Applicants' 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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | process, is set out in Volume 1, 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_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>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' 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_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</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  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | and damaging impact on this area and I really do think you need to have a rethink.  | 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.<br>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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                     |                              | 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.<br><br>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).<br>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.<br>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_011_231123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 16                     |                              | 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.  | 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | 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. | targeted consultations have also taken place (November 2023 to October 2024).<br>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.<br>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_0106_008_281023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | Whereas it is almost possible to tell as the information is so vague, the proposed site would appear to be close to Blackpool Road playing fields that attract large number of visitors. Knowing that contractors are inept at traffic management, how can this square with supporting the continued recreational use of the fields.  | 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_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).<br>Detailed assessments are 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_0107_002_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | How is the Lytham Moss being cared for in these plans?  | The impact of loss of habitat has been considered separately to that of disturbance in section 4.13.3 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4). In addition the functionally linked land at Lytham Moss has been assessed separately.  |
| TA_0108_001_231123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | The plans do not include any images or drawings of the planned proposals. Why not?<br>The proposed cable corridor will render acres of farmland redundant, making families & livelihoods defunct.<br>The plans go against all the green belt land restrictions, areas of separation and Grade A agricultural land. It will cause complete disruption  | 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  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | and chaos to many families and businesses as well as have a huge impact on the value of these properties.     | <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). 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> <p>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_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 | <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).</p> <p>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_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 | <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 potential impacts 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 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_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. |
| 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 | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | 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_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 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_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 infrastructure associated with the Morgan and Morecambe   |

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

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method        | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| 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. |
| TA_0110_003_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form   | 3                      | 3.6                          | See above. Magnetic fields (sic) above and around the cables are threat to Human Health.<br><i>("What are the protection measures for Human Health relating to the extensive onshore cabling and substations. The PEIR seems to conclude that no mitigation is required and does not specify how exposures to EMFs will be assured to be within regulations.</i><br><br><i>In particular, burying underground cables does not, per se, limit magnetic fields into the surface environments. The Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report of October 2022. In Part 2: Transmission Assets, section 10.2.1 provides only a short description of the positioning with regards to Human Health and, regarding the onshore transmission cables, paragraph 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". This might be considered misleading as it only refers to the electric field and is silent on the magnetic fields.")</i> | 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_0111_007_131123          | S44     | Hardcopy feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | The Nature Reserve and Sand Dunes (on the opposite side of Clifton Drive North) are used daily by many people for recreation, dog walking and sites of interest.   | 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | Routes (NCRs), Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Transmission Assets.   |
| TA_0112_004_231123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | The local dunes, pier, seafront is a tourist draw to the Lytham St Annes that has little else in the way of commerce. We rely on tourism and a pleasant environment to attract visitors, disrupting that I believe would have lasting effects. Also not knowing how long and what form works would take will disrupt access to facilities etc for residents and disrupt their right to quiet enjoyment of their environment. | <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).</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>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 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.</p> |



## E1.16.21.2 Land use and recreation table of responses (via all other methods)

**Table E1.16.21.2: Land use and recreation table of responses (via all other methods)**

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| TA_0001_187_231123          | S42     | Email           | <p>6.1 The proposed cabling route falls within an area of deep peaty soils as identified here. Further evidence required to determine presence of deep peaty soils. Natural England advises that either further information is provided to demonstrate the extent of deep peat in the area of the cable route, or that the proposed developments are amended to avoid any work within these particular areas.</p> <p>Natural England advise that it may be useful to refer to existing borehole data from the British Geological Survey (BGS) but if there is a lack of data across the proposed development site then a peat survey may be required. A peat survey should be undertaken by a soils scientist and should determine the presence of peat, it's depth and the presence of any spoil/waste materials that would impact the restoration ability. Natural England advise that peat surveys are carried out in line with the IUCN peatland programme field protocol 6.1 3.9.3.3 and 3.9.5.8</p> <p>Both these sections include list of pre- construction surveys to be undertaken for the caballing routes. The caballing routes fall within the deep peaty soils layer – peat can be damaged from cabling works. In Cheshire to Lancashire, for onshore projects, Natural England request that evidence for any project which may impact peat needs to demonstrate that a) either peat is not present within the area, or b) it cannot be restored. As the proposed cabling route falls within an area of deep peaty soils, Natural England advises that the developer provides information detailing the presence or absence of peat along the cable route. Further information on the location of deep peaty soils can be found here. Natural England do not support the principle of developing on peat. Peat is an irreplaceable asset that once gone is lost for ever and can never be restored to sequester carbon which is difficult to justify in a climate emergency.</p> <p>Natural England advises that any ground works, such as cutting a trench in the peat or drift deposits under or adjacent to the peat will have impacts both on ground water and water levels within the peat.</p> <p>Peat habitat is very sensitive to modification to water levels, this means these works can impact a wide area of the peat mass.</p> <p>Natural England therefore advises that either further information is provided to demonstrate the extent of deep peat in these areas or that the proposed developments are amended to avoid any work within these particular areas.</p> <p>Natural England advises that it may be useful to refer to existing borehole data from the British Geological Survey (BGS) but if there is a lack of data across the proposed development site then aa peat survey may be required. A peat survey should be undertaken by a soils scientist and should determine the presence of peat, it's depth and the presence of any spoil/waste materials that would impact the restoration ability. Natural England advise that peat surveys are carried out in line with the IUCN peatland programme field protocol.</p> | <p>The EIA process has taken into account both existing information (including details of BGS boreholes) and site survey. Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1) sets out details of ground conditions.</p> <p>Peaty soils are considered within Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). This chapter includes details of soil surveys undertaken. 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). The assessment has considered the presence of peaty soils located within the Transmission Assets Order Limits.</p>  |
| TA_0001_196_231123          | S42     | Email           | <p>6.10 3.9.33 and 3.9.5.8. Both these sections include list of pre- construction surveys to be undertaken for the caballing routes. The caballing routes fall within the deep peaty soils layer – peat can be damaged from cabling works. In Cheshire to Lancashire, for onshore projects, Natural England request that evidence for any project which may impact peat needs to demonstrate that a) either peat is not present within the area, or b) it cannot be restored. As the proposed cabling route falls within an area of deep peaty soils, Natural England advises that the developer provides information detailing the presence or absence of peat along the cable route. Further information on the location of deep peaty soils can be found here. Natural England do not support the principle of developing on peat. Peat is an irreplaceable asset that once gone is lost for ever and can never be restored to sequester carbon which is difficult to justify in a climate emergency. Natural England advises that any ground works, such as cutting a trench in the peat or drift deposits, under or adjacent to the peat will have impacts both on ground water and water levels within the peat. Peat habitat is very sensitive to modification to water levels, this means these works can impact a wide area of the peat mass. Natural England therefore advises that either further information is provided to demonstrate the extent of deep peat in these areas or that the proposed developments are amended to avoid any work within these particular areas. Natural</p>   | <p>The EIA process has taken into account both existing information (including details of BGS boreholes) and site survey. Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1) sets out details of ground conditions. Peaty soils are considered within Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). This chapter includes details of soil surveys undertaken. 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). The assessment has considered the presence of peaty soils located within the Transmission Assets Order Limits. Further detailed information regarding the methodology, scope and results of the soil surveys, which were undertaken by a soils specialist, is provided in Volume 3, Annex 6.2: Soil surveys data technical report of the ES (document reference F3.6.2).</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | England advises that it may be useful to refer to existing borehole data from the British Geological Survey (BGS) but if there is a lack of data across the proposed development site the aa peat survey may be required. A peat survey should be undertaken by a soils scientist and should determine the presence of the peat, its depth and the presence of any spoil/waste materials that would impact the restoration ability. Natural England advise that leat surveys are carried out in line with the IUCN peatland programme field protocol.   |  |
| TA_0001_215_231123          | S42     | Email           | Soils and Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land 6.29 Table 3.41 Natural England welcome the reference to the Construction Code of Practice for Sustainable Use on Construction Sites. There is also other standard guidance that Natural England also refer too. Any soils handling methods should also follow the Institute of Quarrying Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings which provides detailed advice on the choice of machinery and method of their use for handling soils at various phases, which we strongly recommend is followed. The British Society of Soil Science has published the Guidance Note Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction which also contains useful guidance.  | 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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction. |
| TA_0002_001_171123          | S42     | Email           | 1. Summary Freckleton Parish Council and the local community has no inherent objections to the principles of establishment of Off-Shore Wind Farms as a means of meeting the Energy Targets from renewable sources. However, there are deep concerns regarding the Proposal that is currently being placed before us because of the potentially disastrous implications for the future of The Fylde as a farming community and as a place of amenity for the residents and the many visitors who enjoy the facilities and environment that the Fylde currently affords. This note attempts to summarise these views and provides the overall conclusion that we must object to the proposals as presented as the impact is too high when compared to both the Local and National Benefit to be accrued. The note provides details of the logic behind this conclusion, especially relating to the programme consultation process, maturity of definition and likely cost issues arising.  | The Applicant notes your response. Responses to detailed comments provided in turn associated to each topic raised (see unique reference TA_0002).   |
| TA_0002_005_171123          | S42     | Email           | 3. Agriculture in The Fylde – A Background Before looking at the issues with this project further, it is worth examining the nature of rural Fylde and its agricultural background. Historically, many farms are small with little of the conglomeration that has happened elsewhere in the UK. Most farms have been family run, self-sufficient, capable of supporting the farm and the family living there. They are characterised by a rich, marl type soil, which is good for grassland for dairy and sheep and winter fodder. Many farms have subsequently been divided between heirs, resulting in the fields being scattered, sometimes over a considerable area. There have been changes of ownership and acquisition which has sometimes brought land together, but not in the original packages, further complicating the land distribution. This can be seen clearly from the air, where the Fylde appears as a patchwork of fields, which in major part adds to the overall character of the area. The track of the proposed development crosses many such farms, where the landowner may not live immediately adjacent to the proposed track of development. There is evidence that not all the affected landowners have been properly and fully consulted about the proposed development across their properties. | Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicant have been in discussions with landowners and occupiers along the onshore order limits to discuss the impacts on their agricultural operations and ways in which losses can be mitigated. Ownership data has been obtained through HM Land Registry services and where land is unregistered, due diligence including site noticing has been undertaken to establish ownership. Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicant have been meeting with landowners and occupiers and will continue to do so to secure the land rights being sought.   |
| TA_0002_006_221123          | S42     | Email           | This embedded figure shows an extract from the Fylde Local Plan to 2032. This clearly shows the areas designated Green Belt and Countryside. Much of the proposed route of the underground cabling and the sites of the proposed sub-stations fall within the Green Belt situated between Freckleton and Kirkham. Development of the size and type proposed for the sub-stations is not appropriate in the locations proposed and will create permanent harm to the area, even following the completion of the projected build and restoration of land involved in the project.   | 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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). 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_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 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 Applicants note your response. Responses to detailed comments provided in turn associated to each topic raised (see unique reference TA_0002).  |
| TA_0003_009_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Impact on Agriculture The cable routing crosses large parts of the rural Fylde that are in active agricultural production. The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Magic Maps indicate that much of route is classified Grade 2 and so regarded as Best and Most Versatile land (BMV). Agricultural activity in Fylde is characterised by a relatively large number of small agricultural holdings, but taken in combination, their contribution to the rural economy of Fylde is significant. The proposed cable routing crosses numerous agricultural units that would therefore inevitably be subdivided during the construction phase. The width of the construction corridor will have a relatively greater impact on these smaller agricultural holdings than would be the case on larger farms, as the land taken during construction would be proportionally greater. In the longer term, cable easements would mean that the availability of land to site agricultural buildings would be restricted and would have an impact on the sustainability of individual businesses, the rural economy as a whole and ultimately the character of the wider rural area. The siting of access points to the cable joints would also potentially impact on the efficiency of agricultural holdings. It is considered that greater consideration needs to be given to the routing of cables across individual agricultural holdings in order to prevent subdivision and loss of productive land. This is a further example of how the consultation on this project appears to be premature as the necessary design details that would allow more effective consultation are simply not available. | 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_0003_010_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | The indicated width of the construction corridor is 122m. Much of this is accounted for by the proposed linear storage of topsoil and subsoil during construction. The utilisation of a series of top and subsoil storage areas could reduce the width of the construction corridor by approximately 40% and reduce the adverse impact not only on agricultural holdings but on ecology, transport infrastructure and reduce the development footprint of the project as a whole.   | The project 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_0003_011_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Finally on this point, as the majority of the agricultural land that the project crosses is regarded as BMV, if the project goes ahead, it is essential that the land be reinstated to a  | 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 include the commitment to reinstate land to be temporarily  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | high quality that does not impact upon the long term viability and sustainability of the individual agricultural units.  | affected following construction of the Transmission Assets as soon as practicable. Reinstatement would be undertaken in accordance with procedures set out in the Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7).  |
| TA_0012_006_221123          | S42     | Email           | The consultation meetings left many questions unanswered but losing Grade A farmland at the heart of our precious greenbelt, with the wider impact on homes and infrastructure will do real damage to Fylde and St Anne's in particular.   | The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets on agricultural land use 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). This includes the preparation of a Code of Construction Practice in general accordance with the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) submitted with the application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Code of Construction Practice seek to limit disruption to the community. 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. |
| TA_0017_014_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Surveys Survey data submitted with the planning application should be current/up-to-date, in line with recognised guidelines (as summarised above). The survey area should include: • The intended location of the development footprint; • Potential working areas, compounds, storage areas and access routes; • Any land that may be used within the mitigation, compensation or biodiversity net gain proposals (on or off-site); • A suitable buffer distance, taking account of the likely zone of influence and relevant survey guidelines.   | The survey area is the area used for site-specific surveys and is generally defined as a 150 m buffer around the Onshore Order Limits. The 150 m buffer was included to take account of protected species that may occur adjacent or close to the Transmission Assets and to allow for evolution of the boundary during the site selection process. A separate survey area was used for GCN surveys. The GCN survey area is defined as a 250 m buffer around the Onshore Order Limits. Volume 3, Annex 3.8: Great crested newt survey and reptile survey technical report of the ES (document reference F3.3.8) provides further details regarding the GCN survey area. Owing to the iterative design process of the Transmission Assets, some surveys were undertaken further than 150 m from the Onshore Order Limits. Nevertheless, information from these surveys have been included in technical annexes because it provides context regarding the ecological sensitivity of the wider area.  |
| TA_0017_036_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | It should be stated how the necessary maintenance and management will be secured for the lifetime of the anticipated planning obligations.   | An Outline Ecological Management Plan (document reference J6) is provided as part of the application for development consent.  |
| TA_0017_037_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Monitoring measures should be sufficient to measure the success of mitigation and compensation measures, to inform the need for remedial measures and to inform establishment maintenance and long-term management.  | Any relevant monitoring measures are set out in section 3.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).   |
| 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 | 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,  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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 &amp; 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.</p> | <p>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_0019_020_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>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</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_0019_021_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Amenity. The consultation has not explained how existing bridleways and public rights of way and access tracks used by many residents will be impacted - is access to be permanently or temporarily denied or restricted? Many parishioners use Parrox Lane, Thames Street, Lund Way bridleway and other routes for their recreational exercise, dog walking etc. The increased type and volume of heavy goods vehicle will severely impact the existing recreational use.</p>   | <p>Impacts and effects on public rights of way are set out in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Details of the management of these routes during construction are set out in the Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (document reference J1.5).</p>   |
| TA_0029_014_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Visual Impacts Based on the details it would appear that the substations and above ground infrastructure will be set well away from our assets. As the cabling will be installed underground then the longer-term visual impacts would likely be limited. The main visual impact will therefore be during the construction phase in relation to our interests. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) needs to consider the impact on boaters/towpath users as sensitive receptors. The waterway users will pass the position of the crossings at a relative low speed so will be susceptible to changes to the local landscape which need to be considered. We would welcome the waterway crossing of Savick Brook to be assessed via the LVIA. Any construction compounds near the river corridor should consider views during the construction phase and efforts should be made to minimise any visual impact. We would ask that the design for the crossing of the waterway are shared with the Trust at an early stage so that we can review the design in principle and its appropriateness within the waterways setting. This should also include any landscape</p>  | <p>The effects of the Transmission Assets on landscape and visual resources, including users of waterways, is considered in Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES (document reference F3.10), where appropriate.</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | design work associated with the works that could have visual impacts upon setting or character, for example parcels of screening vegetation buffers.   |   |
| TA_0035_024_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>3.9.3.5<br/>Issue<br/>Lack of CRoW assessment means that potential impacts of HDD under Lytham St Annes sand dunes SSSI has not been adequately assessed</p> <p>Impact<br/>Indirect disturbance to SSSI habitat due to HDD activity</p> <p>Solution<br/>Carry out CRoW assessment to be submitted with DCO application</p>  | <p>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). This includes consideration of disturbance. 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.</p> |
| TA_0035_025_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>3.9.35<br/>Issue<br/>Lack of CRoW assessment means that potential impacts of HDD under Ribble Estuary SSSI has not been adequately assessed</p> <p>Impact<br/>Indirect disturbance to SSSI habitat due to HDD activity</p> <p>Solution<br/>Carry out CRoW assessment to be submitted with DCO application</p>   | <p>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). This includes consideration of disturbance.</p> <p>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.</p>            |
| TA_0035_073_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT25 Topsoil and subsoil will be stored in separate stockpiles in line with the Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites (PB13298) or the latest relevant available guidance. Any suspected or confirmed contaminated soils will be appropriately separated, contained and tested before removal (if required).</p> <p>Issue<br/>Risks associated with soil management have yet to be fully addressed.</p> <p>Impact<br/>Risk of pollution to the aquatic environment from soils</p> <p>Solution<br/>Outline Soil Management Plan to be to be appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission.</p>  | <p>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 a commitment to 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 application for development consent.</p>  |
| TA_0035_077_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT33 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. The CoCP will include best practice measures in relation to air quality that will be applied where human receptors reside within 350 m of works, where required, or where sensitive ecological receptors are present within 50 m, as described in Institute of Air Quality guidance Management (IAQM,2014) as appropriate.</p> <p>Issue<br/>Measures required to manage dust and air quality have yet to be fully addressed.</p> <p>Impact<br/>Risk to sensitive ecological receptors from poor air quality.</p> <p>Solution<br/>Outline Dust Management Plan setting out dust and air quality control measures to be appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission.</p> | <p>An Outline Dust Management Plan is provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1.2).</p>  |
| TA_0035_078_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT35, 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</p>  | <p>See the Outline CoCP (document reference J1) and the following plans submitted as part of the application for development consent: •Outline</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>the outline CoCP. The CoCP will include measures to maintain and address:- 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.</p> <p>Issue</p> <p>Measures required to manage environmental risks have yet to be fully addressed.ImpactRisk to the environment</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Outline versions of various Plans to manage environmental risks to be appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission.See alsoCoT04 - Onshore pollution prevention plan CoT09 - Drainage Management planCoT11 - Operational Onshore Substation Drainage Management planCoT20 – Construction Fencing Plan CoT26 – Site Waste Management Plan CoT30 – Contaminated Land and Groundwater Discovery Strategy CoT33 – Air QualityCoT73 – Biosecurity ProtocolCoT76 – Outline Ecological Management PlanCoT77 – Bentonite Breakout Plan CoT78 – Biosecurity Protocol CoT81 – Soil Management Plan CoT86 – Measures to protect minor watercourses</p> | <p>Communications Plan (document reference J1.1)•Outline Dust Management Plan (document reference J1.2)•Outline Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (document reference J1.3)•Outline Pollution Prevention Plan (document reference J1.4)•Outline Public Rights of Way (PRoW) Management Plan (document reference J1.5)•Outline Site Waste Management Plan (document reference J1.6)•Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7)•Outline Spillage and Emergency Response Plan (document reference J1.8)•Outline Surface Water and Groundwater Management Plan (document reference J1.9)•Outline Construction Fencing Plan (document reference J1.10)•Outline Construction Artificial Light Emissions Management Plan (document reference J1.11)•Outline Biosecurity Protocol (document reference J1.12)•Outline Bentonite Breakout Plan (document reference J1.13)•Outline Contaminated Land and Groundwater Discovery Strategy (document reference J1.14)</p> |
| TA_0035_092_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT98</p> <p>The Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) will be submitted as part of the application for the development consent. CoCP(s) will be developed in accordance with the outline CoCP. The Outline CoCP will include measures to minimise potential impacts to recreational users on the beach, where reasonably practicable</p> <p>Issue</p> <p>Impacts on amenity of the beach in theLandfall Area.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Potential restricted access or disruption to beach users.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Secure as DCO requirement. There are a number of stakeholders who can support messaging around access etc. and advise on appropriate timings of work. Engage with beach managers and the Turning TidesPartnership to help anticipate the most pertinent issues and communicate with the public.</p>   | <p>CoT98 remains in place. The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to recreational resources, including the coastal area 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). This includes the commitment to retain access to coastal area during construction of the Transmission Assets.</p>   |
| TA_0035_098_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Beach amenity</p> <p>Issue</p> <p>Impact on amenity of the beaches in the Landfall Area.Potential restricted access or disruption to beach users. There are lots of stakeholders in this field who can support messaging around access etc. and advise on appropriate timings of work.</p> <p>Suggestion</p> <p>Engage with beach managers and the Turning Tides Partnership to help communicate with the public and anticipate the most pertinent issues.</p>  | <p>The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to recreational resources, including the coastal area 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). This includes the commitment to retain access to coastal area during construction of the Transmission Assets</p>  |
| TA_0037_001_271023          | S44     | Email           | <p>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</p>  | <p>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 alongside a range of</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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</p> | <p>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).</p> |
| TA_0038_025_181123          | S44     | Email           | <p>3. The proposal of two very large substations in close proximity, resulting in over intensive development and industrialisation of Zone 1, will have a significant adverse impact on local amenities and a change in the local character from rural/agricultural to industrial.</p>   | <p>Details of the impacts and effects in relation to landscape character are set out in section 10.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES (document reference F3.10).</p>   |
| TA_0038_032_181123          | S44     | Email           | <p>10. These two ESSs will result in significant loss of pasture land to dairy farms in Zone 1. This impacts our food-security and would render them commercially non-viable with consequently adverse socio-economic impact.</p>  | <p>The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets on agricultural land use 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). This includes consideration of the effects of all elements of the Transmission Assets, including onshore substations on the viability existing farming businesses. 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 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_0038_033_181123          | S44     | Email           | <p>11. If any of the farms that suffer adverse socio-economic impact are owned by the Hornbie Trust then this would reduce the financial support that can be provided to the local Newton Bluecoat Primary School. Was this considered by M&amp;M during their assessment of zones?</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 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>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
| 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 un-necessary. 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 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   | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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). 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 |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | 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.   | 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 REDCATED. 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_0043_002_211123          | S44     | Email           | 2 Dairy farming involves regular movements of large number of animals at least twice daily for 9 months of the year. The essential prerequisite to this movement is flexibility. It can be weather dependent. Hedges, gateways, field boundaries and farm tracks are all deliberately positioned to facilitate this. The entire structure of the farm will be damaged during construction of this project.   | 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.   |
| TA_0043_009_211123          | S44     | Email           | 9 Several footpaths on my farm are involved- presumably these will have to be relocated(temporarily?). This will further impact on our farming practices.  | Impacts and effects on agricultural land use and public rights of way are set out in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Details of the management of rights of way during construction are set out in the Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (document reference J1.5).   |
| TA_0043_017_211123          | S44     | Email           | 17 All our access tracks are used 365 days a year and we need flexibility to use these tracks – easement contractors cannot simply adopt their use.  | 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 includes accesses, and 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_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,   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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_001_071123          | S44     | Email           | As a resident of Freckleton I wish to strongly register my objection to the planned substations in our area. My husband and I chose to retire here 5 years ago because of the access to the open countryside which surrounds this area. It is a valuable habitat to much wildlife including bats, great crested newts and hedgehogs, foxes, etc. We also have curlew, lapwing and oystercatcher in this area. These key species are being displaced at an alarming rate and greatly rely on these coastal resources to overwinter successfully.   | 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 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.  |
| 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). |
| 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_003_171123          | S44     | Email           | Reason for Objection- Substations I am writing this email, all of which is my strong objection to your proposals to build 2 enormous substations on greenbelt land where there are many properties in very close proximity. The land you propose to use is good grade A agricultural land which is used by farmers to provide them with a living. I also strongly object to your proposals for the substations on the grounds of: -1) My husband and I chose to retire here 5.5 years ago for a beautiful, large back garden and the peacefulness of the area and   | 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,  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | beautiful front views across open fields with cattle or sheep grazing after moving from the village. Had we known your intentions then we would never have bought the property.  | and Annex 4.3, respectively (document references F1.4.1, F1.4.2 and F1.4.3).   |
| 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_0122_001_171123          | S44     | Email           | I wish to object against the proposals to build two high (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_0124_008_171123          | S44     | Email           | 9.if you pave 36 acres of good farmland (which can grow crops), you can destroy our food security.   | 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_0124_012_171123          | S44     | Email           | 13.The farmers are going to lose vast amounts of land rendering many of them without commercial income. This will have an adverse socio economic impactive spoken with many  | The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss of best and   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | angry residents over the past weeks and have just been at a meeting organised by Newton Residents Association with Mark Menzies, where the anger in the room was palpable. Im sure you will receive many emails like this one, showing extreme opposition to your plans ahead of the 23rd November.  | 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_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 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. | 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_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_0126_004_181123          | S44     | Email           | 5. The proximity of the development to the current residential area shows no sign of consideration. The area would be changed from its current agricultural outlook to an industrial development ruining the character of the area. The loss of the agricultural land in   | The Planning Statement (document reference J28) sets out an assessment on the impact on the countryside and location of the substations. The impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets in terms of noise are set  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>zone 1 will have a negative socio-economic impact to the area. There is no indication of noise, light and EMF emission levels resulting from the development which will affect the immediate area and therefore residents.</p>  | <p>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). 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_0127_001_191123          | S44     | Email           | <p>we strongly object to any windfarm along the Queensway. We have a small private stable yard at the top of REDACTED which runs along the Queensway. We originally fenced along the queensway 15 foot in to protect the trees and wildlife and to cause least disruption to the area as possible. We observe bats otters newts rat weasels voles moles to name the least. The end field we own has recently had a tree cut out without our permission? also i turn my horses out along there and one horse is a rescue that does not tolerate any heavy machinery and is very nervous. so any disruption would seriously damage the area animals and wildlife. Therefore we strongly object thankyou</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). 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). 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>  |
| TA_0129_002_191123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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). 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</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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_003_191123          | S44     | Email           | We also know from past experience disruption to land, digging drilling etc in the area, has driven vermin into our homes! It has also caused flooding and water tables to rise. The question of noise from transmitting that amount of electricity through the corridors is also unclear. A local electrical expert that installs commercially on a large scale doubts it will be silent.   | 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_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_0131_001_191123          | S44     | Email           | I write to reject your proposal for the offshore windfarm at Morecambe. The reasons are as follows, and are mainly based on the cable route: 1) Impact on the land and local farms. 2) The endless disruption on roads and transport in the area of Squires Gate Lane / Clifton Drive North / Queensway which has had constant road works and delays in recent times. I am not prepared to put up with having 1 of only 2 available routes to my house with a long term traffic issue. It is absolutely unbearable. The queues are horrific.   | 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). 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). |
| TA_0132_001_191123          | S44     | Email           | I wish to register my utter disagreement with the planned wind farm, very close to my property. I believe I am the longest standing resident on REDACTED, having moved to this bungalow in September 1972, fifty one years ago. Many changes, not all for the better, have been made since then, but the thought of the absolute desecration of this rural area that this plan would bring, is devastating. The noise, disruption of traffic (already dreadful in this location), the years it will take to complete, is beyond comprehension. This country area was beautiful and has been encroached upon enough, in recent years. It also has huge drainage problems; properties and dykes are regularly waterlogged, through both Fylde (my council) and Blackpool Council inactivity. Inevitably the situation would be exacerbated should this project go ahead. Kindly register my complete disapproval.  | 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). 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_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 Wrea Green Equitation Centre - 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_0133_003_191123          | S44     | Email           | (iv) The Compound would destroy an area of the Countryside This would impact the the local countryside and animals   | 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>section 3.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference: F3.3)<br/>The Planning Statement (document reference J28) sets out an assessment on the impact on the countryside and location of the substations.</p>  |
| TA_0133_004_191123          | S44     | Email           | <p>2.THE ONSHORE EXPORT CABLE CORRIDOR – REDACTED We join all our neighbours in opposing this corridor(i) The Corridor would affect 2 FarmsThe Corridor would affect the day to day operationThe Corridor would affect the financial viability</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).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_0134_003_191123          | S44     | Email           | <p>The farmland and wildlife that will be effected by this concerns me greatly. You have stated in your report that you will replant hedgerows etc... But these can take up to 30 years to regenerate. Where will the wildlife that lives in these hedgerows go? and shocks me that the substation will last 35 years (4.6.1.6) The substation will ruin our rural location and turn it into an industrial site. In this village we are lucky to have lots of wildlife including bats, redshanks, oystercatchers, great crested newts, and seval types of owls and kestrels.</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).</p>   |
| TA_0135_003_191123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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_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_0138_001_201123          | S44     | Email           | I would like to formally lodge my opposition to the proposed disruption to the St Annes area from the offshore wind farm.<br><br>I attended the recent consultation at the local Cricket Club and was alarmed by the proposal to take the cables through the roads of St Annes. It will cause untold disruption to local residents and will also lead to the destruction of green spaces (eg on Blackpool Rd) and wildlife. I am a resident of Kilnhouse Lane and I simply can't imagine how difficult it will be to have trenches running along the nearby roads (especially Queensway) for "weeks". I suspect the "weeks" will become months very easily. Look how long it took to do a very simple road reconfiguration around Common Edge!!   | Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, 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_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 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. <a href="https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Fylde-Biodiversity-SPD-Adopted-11-September-2019-FINAL.pdf">https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Fylde-Biodiversity-SPD-Adopted-11-September-2019-FINAL.pdf</a> <a href="http://www.stannesonthesea-tc.gov.uk/documents/(12)%20150612-St.%20Anne%27s%20NDP%20Main%20Document%20Pre%20Submission%20Final.1.pdf">http://www.stannesonthesea-tc.gov.uk/documents/(12)%20150612-St.%20Anne%27s%20NDP%20Main%20Document%20Pre%20Submission%20Final.1.pdf</a> <a href="https://www.birdguides.com/sites/europe/britain-ireland/britain/england/lancashire/lytham-moss/">https://www.birdguides.com/sites/europe/britain-ireland/britain/england/lancashire/lytham-moss/</a> <a href="https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/EL6.020b-vi-Matter-6-Appendix-CA4-part-1-Oyston-Estates-050-.pdf">https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/EL6.020b-vi-Matter-6-Appendix-CA4-part-1-Oyston-Estates-050-.pdf</a> We as residents look forward to your response in writing to these questions and look forward to your site visit. | 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                |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | <p>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_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_0143_001_201123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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:-<br/>Green Belt land<br/>Prime agricultural land, potentially rendering the land useless<br/>In an area of separation<br/>Way too close to two schools<br/>Way too close to residential properties<br/>Flooding<br/>Visual impact<br/>Noise, light, vibration<br/>Wildlife<br/>Congestion<br/>Decreasing the value of land and property<br/>Safety hazard<br/>Surely there must be other options available with far less intrusion on the whole of the Fylde.</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_0144_001_201123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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</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</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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.</p>  | <p>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 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). 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_0145_005_201123          | S44     | Email           | <p>There will also be a significant loss of pastureland to dairy farms in zone 1 that would make them commercially non-viable, ending their farming businesses.</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 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 (<a href="http://www.gov.uk">www.gov.uk</a>) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>   |
| TA_0146_001_201123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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_0147_001_201123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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</p>   | <p>The route planning site selection process, and consideration of alternatives have been provided in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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 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.</p>                                     | <p>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_0148_001_201123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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_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 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_0151_009_201123          | S44     | Email           | <p>This will turn lovely little village into a vast horrendous ugly industrial business area, compounding the area with over development concerns. Zone 1 lies within Kirkham/ Newton area of separation zone and FBC green belt, this is not rated appropriately in the RAG report. The proximity to residential development is not factored in the RAG selection</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,</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | assessment for zones. Please take this email as showing my extreme opposition to your plans!   | 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_002_201123          | S44     | Email           | 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.  | 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_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 land to be built on represents demarcation land between local villages and parishes. Losing this and effectively placing industrial units between them will not only join these villages but cause the loss of "rural fylde", again 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_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_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   | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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:   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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.</p>   | <p>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_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</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | provided in section 6.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6).  |
| 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 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_0162_003_211123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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_0165_005_211123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Moreover, the proposed construction of the transformer will result in the loss of valuable farm land in the Newton area. This loss is concerning not only from an agricultural perspective but also in terms of the environmental impact on our community. I urge the developers to provide detailed information on how they plan to mitigate the loss of farm land and any plans for compensatory measures.</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_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</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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | <p>matters and hope all residents will be given this information in due course. Thank you for your understanding and cooperation.</p>   | <p>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 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_0166_001_131123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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>   |
| TA_0167_006_171023          | S44     | Email           | <p>How will you deal with closures of Clifton Drive North a key route to St Annes on the Sea and Lytham towns? What is the effect on tourism, which both towns depend on economically, if access to these is significantly disturbed? How will you cross the Preston to Blackpool South railway line if open excavation is necessary without closing this and severely impacting on its use by both locals and visitors? In 8.7.5.4 of the Non-Technical Summary you talk of some requirement to close the beach to public access during the construction phase. This is surely inevitable given the need to build transition joint bays, tunnel under the Sand Dunes, Clifton Road North and the Nature Reserve, Railway Line, Golf Club and or Blackpool Airport, lay and joint eighteen High Voltage cables, carry out</p>   | <p>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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | remedial works etc. No timescale for the works in this area is given but it is inconceivable that the works will not be significant or lengthy. The attraction of visitors to St Annes on the Sea (you will hopefully appreciate that Lytham St Annes is a generic term covering the town of St Annes-on-the-Sea, Andsell, Fairhaven and the town of Lytham) lies in its traditional seaside appeal encompassing the town, the beach and significantly the extensive and unspoilt sand dunes. Closures of the beach and the intrusive nature of the proposed works will do nothing to help the economy of St Annes nor its essential visitors on whom local businesses depend for their seasonal spending.  | 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 J1.5), which includes measures to minimise potential impacts. 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_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 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. Detailed assessments are 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_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 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. |
| TA_0183_001_221123          | S44     | Email           | We are sending this email as part of the public consultation period to strongly OBJECT to your proposals regarding the proposed offshore wind farm cable routing and substation locations across the Fylde area. The proposed route of cables involves the destruction of greenbelt Grade A agricultural land. The land is used by farmers for the growing of crops, the grazing of animals and the spreading of farmyard manure which gives nutrients to the soil. Local farmers, who have been in this area for generations, rely on this land for their livelihoods. The sheer scale of your proposal would rip through the land of numerous farmers; to go ahead with the project would both bankrupt the farmers themselves and have a knock-on effect for local businesses who rely on these farms for goods, sales, and services. It amazes us how you are perfectly willing to tunnel under the golf course, but will                             | 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 (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  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | not do similar to avoid impacting upon the livelihoods of farmers and the businesses for which they provide.   | 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_0185_001_221123          | S44     | Email           | I am writing to advise that I object to the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farm substation, easement and transmission asset proposals as these will have a direct impact on my dairy farm business and leave it unviable. The Farm is an award winning (both locally and nationally) dairy unit. We supply the Cooperative Arla and are part of the Arla Care brand. The farms that supply the Arla Care brand have been selected for the grazing system and have a requirement to produce them against enhanced standards. These enhanced standards include higher welfare and environmental standards and provide a lower carbon footprint. We operate a grassland grazing system, which requires the cows to have grazing access to all of the grazing land. Heavy investment has been made in a track system that allows efficient movement of cows to and from the grazing paddock with minimum labour. In addition, the track system allows the grass crop management (which is measured on a weekly basis) to provide optimum quantity and quality feed for the grazing herd. The proposal of the Morgan substation and temporary site takes a large area of land away from the unit and we await to understand the roads and easements for this substation for the full impact. Then if the Morecambe site is selected as Morecambe 2 this would take away the land and block the usage of the remaining land and this would devastate the whole farm business. If Morecambe 1 is selected as the preferred site this would also impact on the farm as it would take a major amount of land for the access roads and return easements to Penwortham. Either option Morecambe or Morecambe would leave the farm unviable. | 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). |
| TA_0185_003_221123          | S44     | Email           | In addition to the extremely poor communications, I also site these objections / observations:• The access roads and easements have not been declared and therefore the full extent of the land impact is not fully declared.• Parcels of land that will remain based on the information provided so far, will not be accessible for farming.  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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 including any severance and injurious affection.   |
| TA_0185_005_221123          | S44     | Email           | • Running Sand has been found in the area where the Morecambe 2 site has been proposed.• Slurry spreading area would be decreased and create an environmental problem.• The farm employs from the local community a team of 5 people as well as employing local subcontractors which will have a direct impact on the local economy.• The farm is part of a stewardship scheme for managing hedgerows and biodiversity gain.• Bio security issues and contamination between farm units would have detrimental effects.• Management of livestock during the construction period, when contractors come on there is potential hazard of livestock escaping. (This has been experienced in the past with other schemes).  | 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  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | <p>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_0185_008_221123          | S44     | Email           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public footpaths would have to be re-directed.</li> </ul>  | <p>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_0186_001_221123          | S44     | Email           | <p>I am writing to advise that I object to the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farm substation, easement and transmission asset proposals as these will have a direct impact on our dairy farm business and leave it unviable. We run the farm as an efficient business utilizing local labour, and local contractors returning the monies into the local economy. The Farm is an award winning (both locally and nationally) dairy unit. We supply the Co-operative Arla and are part of the Arla Care brand. The farms that supply the Arla Care brand have been selected for the grazing system and have a requirement to produce them against enhanced standards. These enhanced standards include higher welfare and environmental standards and provide a lower carbon footprint. We operate a grassland grazing system, which requires the cows to have grazing access to all of the grazing land. Heavy investment has been made in a track system that allows efficient movement of cows to and from the grazing paddock with minimum labour. In addition, the track system allows the grass crop management (which is measured on a weekly basis) to provide optimum quantity and quality feed for the grazing herd. The proposal of the Morgan substation and temporary site takes a large area of land away from the unit and we await to understand the roads and easements for this substation for the full impact. Then if the Morecambe site is selected as Morecambe 2 this would take away the land and block the usage of the remaining land and this would devastate the whole farm business. If Morecambe 1 is selected as the preferred site this would also impact on the farm as it would take a major amount of land for the access roads and return easements to Penwortham. Either option Morecambe 1 or Morecambe 2 would leave the farm unviable. There have been two meetings with the Dalcour McLaren representatives with my husband and at no point was there mention of a substation, the discussion was only as a cable corridor.</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> |
| TA_0188_003_221123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Destruction of numerous farm businesses Our farming business is very closely linked to our neighbour, [REDACTED] at [REDACTED], as we rear all his replacement heifers for his dairy herd. If the proposals go ahead as planned it will mean that our neighbour's farm will no longer be viable, and as a result our business will also be devastated. To try and run your business each day with that level of uncertainty hanging over you, in addition to all the other variables affecting farming that we have no control over, is very difficult and stressful. All the farms which will be affected by the proposed development are livestock farms, with many of the stock being moved twice daily for milking. The level of disruption</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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | <p>that will be caused by having to negotiate fences, construction work and new access points to fields will be huge as cattle do not like change and are very easily upset by a change in routine, thus affecting their productivity. In addition to this, the loss of land that is currently used for growing crops for the livestock to eat cannot be replaced as there will be no spare land available locally, and so inevitably farmers will have to reduce their stock numbers which could render their business unviable.</p>  | <p>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_0188_004_221123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Access to the site and dangerous traffic operations I am particularly concerned about the access which will be required to the sites, as these routes are not detailed in the plans as yet, and so I expect that additional land will need to be taken from us for the construction of access roads. Our farm is down a single-track road, which is also a busy public footpath and bridleway. It is absolutely unacceptable that this lane can even be considered for access to the sites as it simply is not suitable for large construction vehicles and increased traffic. There are young children living here and the thought that we could have an increased volume of traffic coming through our yard is very worrying from a safety perspective. The yard is also a working farmyard and any additional traffic will affect farming operations and disrupt the running of our business. REDACTED is a small country road which is already in a very poor state of repair and regularly floods. If this is used to access the sites this will cause further damage and increased traffic which is dangerous and inconvenient.</p>   | <p>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.</p>  |
| TA_0188_006_221123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Impact on food security Whilst I appreciate that we need to use renewable sources of energy in order to secure our needs for the future, and I am certainly not against the windfarm development in principle, we also need to ensure that the country can continue to produce food to feed the growing population. If this project is to go ahead as planned with the huge destruction of vast areas of the Fylde for burying the transmission cables, I am certain that many farming businesses will cease to exist afterwards. The level of invasive work that will be required will ruin a great deal of the high quality farmland in the Fylde. Field drains will be destroyed by the work, and I doubt very much whether the new drains will ever be as effective as the current system as it has taken years and years of careful management and planning. Soil structure will be massively affected by compaction and it will be impossible to return the land to how it was before no matter how carefully the soil is stored and out back. Surely at a time when food security is so high on the public agenda, the loss of valuable farmland is not a sustainable option. The effects of building on large areas of farmland will also lead to massively increased risk of flooding in the local area. The land is already under huge pressure of flooding as main drains and ditches are no longer maintained meaning that water flow is restricted. The additional run-off from the concrete sites will mean that the current system will be unable to cope and will lead to more regular flooding, not only on the land that we are farming, but also in the towns and villages as the water will have nowhere to go.</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. 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. 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 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (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 the Outline CoCP (document reference J1). 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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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 drainage guidance notes in consultation with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority (Lancashire County Council).   |
| TA_0189_006_221123          | S44     | Email           | 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.  | 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. 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_0189_010_221123          | S44     | Email           | 7. Any land that was used as a cable corridor would be useless from an agricultural perspective for at least 30 years afterwards due to the damage to the soil, despite developers saying that it would be reinstated properly. The land and soil have taken years of improvement and careful management to create the productive land that we farm today. | 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 (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  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | measures to be implemented as part of the Code of Construction Practice seek to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.  |
| TA_0189_011_221123          | S44     | Email           | 8. We are very concerned that developers may try to use the farm lane for their access to the site. That would be completely unacceptable for health and safety reasons as there are often small children and livestock in the yard. The lane is too narrow and not passable for large vehicles.   | 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).<br>Details of the operation and maintenance phases are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).<br>Onshore maintenance would be limited to essential maintenance and/or emergency works.   |
| 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_0189_013_221123          | S44     | Email           | 10. The map shows the temporary substation compound crossing the farm track, which is also a public footpath and bridleway. This must be kept open at all times to allow livestock movement and tractor access to the land.  | 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_0192_003_221123          | S44     | Email           | The topography of the land is steeply sloping from west to east and a traditional ridge and furrow permanent pasture grassland which is species rich therefore we cannot understand for the amount of ecology reports and non-intrusive surveys that the design team have not highlighted this as a practical constraint   | Detailed assessments are 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_0193_001_221123          | S44     | Email           | Further to our meeting at my client's property a few weeks ago, thank you again for your time attending my client's property in order that they could discuss the potential impact of the transmission and the cable route through my client's holding.<br>To aid, I have just attached a plan that identifies my client's land holding [REDACTED] showing that the cable route completely severs and disrupts the majority of that parcel of land. My client have an intensive dairy herd of approximately 250 Montbeliard dairy cows complete with over 400 head of youngstock, therefore the land to the north of the farm is vital to the dairy business as there is very little land holding to the south with the buildings therefore all of the dairy herd graze the land to the north and it is also the land that the majority of the silage provision is made. | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).<br>Following route refinement, Dalcour McLaren 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   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | The route cuts through the landholding which could make it impractical for crossing for grazing, and the lack of forage, which then brings into the viability of the farming business going forward. The land taken out also creates a slurry disposal issue. My client does not have sufficient land then to spread slurry to meet with necessary guidelines and then would be forced to reduce their dairy herd, increasing the volatility and bringing into question the viability of the farming business.  | livestock will be carefully considered to ensure safety at all times. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).  |
| TA_0193_003_221123          | S44     | Email           | The drawings also indicate an access off [REDACTED] which is immediately adjacent to the farm buildings therefore it creates a highways and security risk to the farm buildings which are agricultural and semi-commercial which is occupied by REDACTED for her well established flower business. This access is incidental and not required and any access that is needed can easily be obtained from REDACTED when the cable crosses.  | Operational accesses have where possible utilised existing access routes and tracks to limited the impact on a holding. 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. 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_0193_004_221123          | S44     | Email           | My client objects to the route and the principles of the transmission cable in its strongest extent. The construction of the cable will materially affect my client's farming business, jeopardising the established dairy herd due to the lack of grazing, silage provisions, lack of land for spreading slurry and day to day inconvenience of severing the land holding and crossing points.   | 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. 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 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. | 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 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_0194_002_221123          | S44     | Email           | The land is inter-dispersed with high water table ditches which play an intrinsic part of the water management within the Fylde Moss. Any interference with the drainage system within the area will have a huge detrimental impact, not only on the land that it goes through, but also the surrounding area. As I have mentioned previously, the land is moss and therefore doesn't have the subsoil that your clients may expect. If they break the topsoil there is very little sub soil to work with and you are just into moss, which is an unstable soil type.   | 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | and groundwater management plan (document reference J1.9) includes measures in relation to drainage.   |
| 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 measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted 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_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 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</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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | 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.  | 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_0200_014_221123          | S44     | Email           | Substations & Cabling Routes will cut into large areas of quality Farmland affecting Food Security, Peoples Livelihoods & Leisure Activities.  | 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 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 (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_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 | 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  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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.</p> | <p>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).</p>  |
| TA_0207_002_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>3. The land is classified Grade 2 on the Agricultural Land Classification and benefits from a substantial land drainage system which is likely to be severely affected by the scheme and will require full replacement. The disruption to the land will take many years to recover and our experience has been that developers often overlook the need for a full and proper drainage scheme to be installed at the end of the scheme. We feel that alternative routes across lower quality agricultural land should be considered</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). 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. 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.</p>   |
| TA_0207_005_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>• The land is classified Grade 2 on the Agricultural Land Classification, is low lying and comparatively level and benefits from extensive land drainage systems. There is a delicate balance in the land drainage systems and the installation of a substantial cable route across the land could very well disrupt the balance and cause losses over an extended period of time far beyond the construction period. We believe alternative routes through lower quality agricultural land should be considered. We believe that any of the above issues would have a serious effect on the viability of the family business but when combined will almost certainly have a major effect on the viability of the family business going forward. This in turn could impact the available facilities for RDA especially during the construction period</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). 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. 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. 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_0211_004_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>9 I am concerned about environmental damage to wildlife that has made its home on my land. We have a number of kestrels, lapwing, sparrowhawks and owl species. Shoveler ducks as well as various mammals, invertebrates, and Great Crested Newts. I understand that there is to be 'environmental mitigation' of the damage caused. This may involve taking additional prime agricultural land out of food production and therefore making our arming business potentially even more unviable.</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 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</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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_0214_002_231123          | s44     | Email           | .I would like to ensure that these objections are logged:I object to the building of substations on what is currently agricultural land. This will be a substantial change in the character of this semi-rural area and likely have a detrimental effect on the views enjoyed by so many of the local area and beyond.   | 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 (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.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_0214_004_231123          | s44     | Email           | I object to the use of land within residential areas as construction compounds including the two indicated on REDACTED. 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  | 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_0214_005_231123          | s44     | Email           | I object to any disruption to the use of REDACTED. 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.   | 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_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 | 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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.</p>  | <p>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).</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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>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_0219_003_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>The proposals will cause severe damage to the land within the agricultural holding. The land is classified Grade 2 on the agricultural land classification and we believe alternative routes crossing poorer agricultural land should be considered. The proposed schemes will also have a deleterious effect on the sporting on the property most especially during the construction period and bearing in mind that the proposals would appear to affect some 40 to 50 acres of land (excluding compounds, additional access points and wider working areas at road, rail and ditch crossing and the effect of areas lost due to being severed and unfarmable) this means that somewhere towards 25% of the total area of the farm possibly moving towards 30% or more when the additional areas are added in will be affected and lost to production. This will also have a severe effect on the sporting on the farm especially during the construction period. We also note that substantial areas have been identified for biodiversity net gain but have received no substantive commentary regarding what is required or where and we are therefore unable to comment on that at the present time. There has been no information given as to the proximity to dwelling houses which the cable route can take and whether there is any exclusion zone.</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. 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_0222_003_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Question 3.6 Again, it is difficult for our clients to provide specific comment on the proposed and take, as this is not defined in the vicinity of their property, which is covered by the 400Kv grid connection cable corridor search area. However, it is our clients' general view that the proposed land take, particularly in respect of mitigation/biodiversity net gain (BNG) is excessive. It is suggested that both this, and the land proposed to be taken for the route corridor, could and should be reduced, potentially through the conjunction of the two schemes, to minimize the impact on agricultural land, and those whose businesses depend thereon.</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 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).</p>           |
| TA_0222_006_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Question 4 Our clients are of the opinion that, based on the limited site specific information provided to date by Morecambe &amp; Morgan, that is proposed land take for the scheme is excessive, particularly in respect of BNG. It is considered that, save for any such associated directly with any site specific mitigation/landscaping, there is no need for large scale compulsory acquisition under any DCO for BNG purposes, as any necessary BNG credits could be acquired, on commercial terms, in the open market. Please also see the comments made at Question 3 above, concerning the lack of site specific information provided, and</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 Transmission Assets. For the Transmission Assets, biodiversity benefit will be delivered within identified biodiversity benefit areas within the Transmission Assets Order Limits: Onshore</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | therefore the difficulty in providing meaningful comments and feedback as part of this consultation.   | (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_0222_011_231123          | S44     | Email           | Question 13 Our clients consider that the proposed quantity of land proposed for BNG or mitigation is excessive. It is suggested that save for any site specific mitigation, BNG should not be acquired by compulsory means under any DCO, as such credit which may be required to support the Morecambe & Morgan schemes, could be obtained commercially on the open market.  | Detailed assessments are 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. |
| TA_0222_017_231123          | S44     | Email           | Question 3.6 It is our client's view that the proposed land take, particularly in respect of BNG, is excessive. Such should not be permitted to interfere with their existing development, or the land which supports this development in respect of the REDACTED and REDACTED (see above).  | 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_0222_021_231123          | S44     | Email           | Question 4 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). It is considered that, save for any such associated with any site specific mitigation/landscape mitigation etc, there is no need for large scale compulsory acquisition of land under any DCO for BNG, as any necessary BNG credits could be acquired elsewhere, on commercial terms in the open market. Notwithstanding this, it is considered essential that the imposition of any BNG should not be allowed to impact on unilateral undertakings given by our client in respect of their existing development (see above). The publishing plans for the consultation include the provision of a construction compound on land included in our client's Farmland Conservation Area. It is considered that this may have potential implications in respect of this sensitive site, and it is suggested that, in the absence of any information as to how the compounds could be provided without impacting this sensitive site, this should be sited elsewhere. | Detailed assessments are 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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.   |
| TA_0222_025_231123          | S44     | Email           | Question 13 Our clients consider that the proposed quantity of land proposed for BNG or Mitigation is excessive. It is suggested that save for any site specific mitigation, BNG should not be acquired by compulsory means under any DCO, as any such credits which may be required to support the Morecambe & Morgan projects could be obtained commercially on the open market. Notwithstanding this, our clients further believe that should land be acquired for BNG, this should not be acquired in areas where it may conflict with existing undertakings in respect of conservation or biological mitigation purposes, such as those associated with their development. | Detailed assessments are 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.  |
| 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  | 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>from [REDACTED] to it's 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 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>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 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_016_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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</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</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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.</p>  | <p>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).</p> |
| TA_0225_018_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_0225_022_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Agricultural Land Classification<br/>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 <a href="https://bp-mmmt.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/transmission/PEIR/Volume+3/Volume+3+Annexes/Transmission+Assets+PEIR+Vol+3+Annex+6.1.pdf">https://bp-mmmt.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/transmission/PEIR/Volume+3/Volume+3+Annexes/Transmission+Assets+PEIR+Vol+3+Annex+6.1.pdf</a> 1.3.5 Agricultural Land Classification<br/>Morgan substation site – Grade 3b<br/>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 a wetness limitation.<br/>Morecambe substation site option 2 (south)<br/>Grade 3a<br/>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</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>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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 <a href="https://naturalengland-defra.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/provisional-agricultural-land-classification">https://naturalengland-defra.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/provisional-agricultural-land-classification</a> England/explore Morgan Substation Site Grade 3 ALC Grades (Provisional) © ADAS &amp; Defra: GEOGEXT 5 Morecambe Substation Site Options Grade 2 ALC Grades (Provisional) © ADAS &amp; Defra: GEOGEXT 5 Protecting the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land from significant, inappropriate or unsustainable development proposals <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land</a></p> |   |
| TA_0225_023_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 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_0225_024_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 Morgan is 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_0225_027_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>The proposals will completely disrupts the ease of moving livestock at [REDACTED]</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>  |
| TA_0225_029_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Morecambe substation Option 2 siting is within Grade 2 agricultural land. Zone 1 is Grade 2 and 3, being the best and most versatile agricultural land and should be avoided as a primary consideration of site selection.</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> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
| TA_0226_002_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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_0226_010_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_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</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,</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | should be sourced off-site and outside Zone 1 as this whole area is productive grassland or arable land.  | 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_016_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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 <a href="https://bp-mmmt.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/transmission/PEIR/Volume+3/Volume+3+Annexes/Transmission+Assets+PEIR+Vol+3+Annex+6.1.pdf">https://bp-mmmt.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/transmission/PEIR/Volume+3/Volume+3+Annexes/Transmission+Assets+PEIR+Vol+3+Annex+6.1.pdf</a></p> <p>1.3.5 Agricultural Land Classification Morgan substation site – Grade 3b</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Morecambe substation site option 1 (north) – Grade 3a and 3b</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Morecambe substation site option 2 (south) Grade 3a</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Published by: Natural England Last updated: 20 May 2020. Source: Natural England Open Data Publication Defra group ArcGIS Online organisation <a href="https://naturalengland-defra.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/provisional-agricultural-land-classification-alc-england/explore">https://naturalengland-defra.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/provisional-agricultural-land-classification-alc-england/explore</a></p> <p>Morgan Substation Site Options Grade 3 ALC Grades (Provisional) © ADAS &amp; Defra: GEOGEXT 5 Morecambe Substation Site Options Grade 2 ALC Grades (Provisional) © ADAS &amp; Defra: GEOGEXT 5</p> <p>Protecting the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land from significant, inappropriate or unsustainable development proposals <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land</a></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.                                      |
| TA_0226_017_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</p> <p>Natural England uses these policies to advise on development proposals as a statutory consultee in the planning process.</p> <p>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>  | 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_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 Morgan is 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_023_231123          | S44     | Email           | Morecambe substation Option 2 siting is within Grade 2 agricultural land. Zone 1 is Grade 2 and 3, being the best and most versatile agricultural land and should be avoided as a primary consideration of site selection.  | 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_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_010_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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | <p>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).</p> |
| TA_0227_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_0227_016_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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 <a href="https://bp-mmmt.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/transmission/PEIR/Volume+3/Volume+3+Annexes/Transmission+Assets+PEIR+Vol+3+Annex+6.1.pdf">https://bp-mmmt.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/transmission/PEIR/Volume+3/Volume+3+Annexes/Transmission+Assets+PEIR+Vol+3+Annex+6.1.pdf</a> 1.3.5 Agricultural Land Classification 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. My findings are that Morecambe substation site option 1 (north) has an ALC Grade of Grade 2. Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Published by: Natural England Last updated: 20 May 2020. Source: Natural England Open Data Publication Defra group ArcGIS Online organisation <a href="https://naturalengland-defra.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/provisional-agricultural-land-classification-alc-england/explore">https://naturalengland-defra.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/provisional-agricultural-land-classification-alc-england/explore</a> Morecambe Substation Site Options Grade 2 ALC Grades (Provisional) © ADAS &amp; Defra: GEOEXT 5 Protecting the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land from significant, inappropriate or unsustainable development</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>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | proposals <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land</a>  |   |
| TA_0227_017_231123          | S44     | Email           | Policies to protect agricultural land and soil<br>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<br>Natural England uses these policies to advise on development proposals as a statutory consultee in the planning process.<br>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)<br>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<br>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.<br>In summary, as the land identified for both Morecambe substation site options is Grade 2 and Morgan is 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_0228_002_231123          | S44     | Email           | These wind farm projects highlights Newton Marsh for potential Biodiversity Net Gain.<br>Newton Marsh should be removed following this statutory consultation as the land mass is a 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_005_231123          | S44     | Email           | The projects are not sustainable;-Given the extensive development impact within the Green Belt and Open Countryside on agricultural businesses which will impact Food Security.- Significant loss of the most productive grassland in the UK which in turn causes a significant loss in Carbon Sequestration (Carbon Capture).-Major impact on the diverse wildlife and ecology within Rural Fylde and Rural Preston areas for many years to come.-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.-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 |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>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_0210_002_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>These wind farm projects highlights 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.</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).</p>   |
| TA_0210_005_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>The projects are not sustainable;-Given the extensive development impact within the Green Belt and Open Countryside on agricultural businesses which will impact Food Security.- Significant loss of the most productive grassland in the UK which in turn causes a significant loss in Carbon Sequestration (Carbon Capture).-Major impact on the diverse wildlife and ecology within Rural Fylde and Rural Preston areas for many years to come.-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.-35 year projects will not benefit the next generation. This is not sustainable 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. 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).</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
| TA_0229_005_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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_0229_009_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_0229_011_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</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</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | should be sourced off-site and outside Zone 1 as this whole area is productive grassland or arable land.  | 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_014_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Agricultural Land Classification</p> <p>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 <a href="https://bp-mmmt.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/transmission/PEIR/Volume+3/Volume+3+Annexes/Transmission+Assets+PEIR+Vol+3+Annex+6.1.pdf">https://bp-mmmt.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/transmission/PEIR/Volume+3/Volume+3+Annexes/Transmission+Assets+PEIR+Vol+3+Annex+6.1.pdf</a></p> <p>1.3.5 Agricultural Land Classification</p> <p>Morecambe substation site option 1 (north) – Grade 3a and 3b</p> <p>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 awetness 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. My findings are that Morecambe substation site option 1 (north) has an ALC Grade of Grade 2.</p> <p>Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Published by: Natural England Last updated: 20 May 2020. Source: Natural England Open Data Publication Defra group ArcGIS Online organisation <a href="https://naturalengland-defra.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/provisional-agricultural-land-classification-alc-england/explore">https://naturalengland-defra.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/provisional-agricultural-land-classification-alc-england/explore</a></p> <p>Morecambe Substation Site Options Grade 2 ALC Grades (Provisional) © ADAS &amp; Defra: GEOGEXT 5 Protecting the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land from significant, inappropriate or unsustainable development proposals <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land</a></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.   |
| TA_0229_015_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Policies to protect agricultural land and soil</p> <p>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</p> <p>Natural England uses these policies to advise on development proposals as a statutory consultee in the planning process.</p> <p>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>   | 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           | <p>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</p> <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</p> <p>Use ALC survey data</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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | 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.  | (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_0230_004_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 substationsite 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_0230_008_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. |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | Mitigation measures adopted 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_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_013_231123          | S44     | Email           | Agricultural Land Classification<br>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 <a href="https://bp-mmmt.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/transmission/PEIR/Volume+3/Volume+3+Annexes/Transmission+Assets+PEIR+Vol+3+Annex+6.1.pdf">https://bp-mmmt.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/transmission/PEIR/Volume+3/Volume+3+Annexes/Transmission+Assets+PEIR+Vol+3+Annex+6.1.pdf</a> 1.3.5 Agricultural Land Classification<br>Morecambe substation site option 1 (north) – Grade 3a and 3b<br>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. My findings are that Morecambe substation site option 1 (north) has an ALC Grade of Grade 2.<br>Agricultural Land Classification (ALC)<br>Published by: Natural England Last updated: 20 May 2020. Source: Natural England Open Data Publication Defra group ArcGIS Online organisation <a href="https://naturalengland-defra.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/provisional-agricultural-land-classification-uk-england/explore">https://naturalengland-defra.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/provisional-agricultural-land-classification-uk-england/explore</a><br>Morecambe Substation Site Options Grade 2 ALC Grades (Provisional) © ADAS & Defra: GEOGEXT 5<br>Protecting the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land from significant, inappropriate or unsustainable development proposals <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land</a> | 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_0230_014_231123          | S44     | Email           | Policies to protect agricultural land and soil<br>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<br>Natural England uses these policies to advise on development proposals as a statutory consultee in the planning process.<br>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.   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
| TA_0230_015_231123          | S44     | Email           | 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 poorerquality land instead of higher quality land-prevent soil, air, water, or noise pollution, or land instability from new and existing developmentUse 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 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_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 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_006_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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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_0231_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.   | 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_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_014_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 <a href="https://bp-mmmt.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/transmission/PEIR/Volume+3/Volume+3+Annexes/Transmission+Assets+PEIR+Vol+3+Annex+6.1.pdf">https://bp-mmmt.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/transmission/PEIR/Volume+3/Volume+3+Annexes/Transmission+Assets+PEIR+Vol+3+Annex+6.1.pdf</a> 1.3.5 Agricultural Land Classification Morgan  | 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | <p>substation site – Grade 3b1.4.5.2 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 3b1.4.5.3 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 3a1.4.5.4 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 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 <a href="https://naturalengland-defra.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/provisional-agricultural-land-classification-alc-england/explore">https://naturalengland-defra.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/provisional-agricultural-land-classification-alc-england/explore</a> Morgan Substation Site Grade 3 ALC Grades (Provisional) © ADAS &amp; Defra: GEOGEXT 5 Protecting the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land from significant, inappropriate or unsustainable development proposals <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land</a></p> | <p>(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 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 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_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 Morgan is 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_0233_007_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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</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</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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.</p>   | <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. 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).</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 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_0233_012_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p><b>Proposed Substation Footprints</b> 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.</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). 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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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_015_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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 <a href="https://bp-mmmt.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/transmission/PEIR/Volume+3/Volume+3+Annexes/Transmission+Assets+PEIR+Vol+3+Annex+6.1.pdf">https://bp-mmmt.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/transmission/PEIR/Volume+3/Volume+3+Annexes/Transmission+Assets+PEIR+Vol+3+Annex+6.1.pdf</a></p> <p>1.3.5 Agricultural Land Classification Morgan substation site – Grade 3b</p> <p>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 a wetness limitation. Morecambe substation site option 1 (north) – Grade 3a and 3b</p> <p>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 a 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</p> <p>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 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 <a href="https://naturalengland-defra.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/provisional-agricultural-land-classification-alc-england/explore">https://naturalengland-defra.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/provisional-agricultural-land-classification-alc-england/explore</a> Morgan Substation Site Grade 3 Morecambe Substation Site Options Grade 2 ALC Grades (Provisional) © ADAS &amp; Defra: GEOGEXT 5 Protecting the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land from significant, inappropriate or unsustainable development proposals <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land</a></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. |
| 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   | 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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 is Grade 3, this would cause the permanent loss of up to 50 acres of BMV land as currently proposed.</p>  | <p>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_0234_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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 &amp; 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 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>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.</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
| TA_0234_002_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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_0234_011_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_0234_013_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</p>  | <p>As set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11), the Transmission Assets are not subject to a mandatory net</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | should be sourced off-site and outside Zone 1 as this whole area is productive grassland or arable land.   | 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_017_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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 <a href="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">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</a></p> <p>1.3.5 Agricultural Land Classification Morgan substation site – Grade 3b</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Morecambe substation site option 1 (north) – Grade 3a and 3b</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Morecambe substation site option 2 (south) Grade 3a</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Published by: Natural England Last updated: 20 May 2020. Source: Natural England Open Data Publication Defra group ArcGIS Online organisation <a href="https://naturalengland-defra.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/provisional-agricultural-land-classification-alc-england/explore">https://naturalengland-defra.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/provisional-agricultural-land-classification-alc-england/explore</a></p> <p>Morgan Substation Site Grade 3 ALC Grades (Provisional) © ADAS &amp; Defra: GEOGEXT 5</p> <p>Morecambe Substation Site Options Grade 2 ALC Grades (Provisional) © ADAS &amp; Defra: GEOGEXT 5</p> <p>Protecting the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land from significant, inappropriate or unsustainable development proposals <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land</a></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_0234_018_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</p> <p>Natural England uses these policies to advise on development proposals as a statutory consultee in the planning process.</p> <p>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 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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.   |
| TA_0234_019_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_0234_020_231123          | S44     | Email           | Newton Marsh SSSI Newton Marsh SSSI does not feature in pretty much any of the PEIR documentation and isn't listed in the table of SSSI Sites ! There is brief mention of breeding godwits but then completely disregarded in any determination in favour of Zone 1 ? Newton and Freckleton Marshes are both managed by RSPB. These wind farm projects highlight both marshes for potential Biodiversity Net Gain which is a ludicrous proposal given their current nature conservation status together with approximately 50% of this land mass being a SSSI.   | 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. 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.   |
| TA_0234_023_231123          | S44     | Email           | Morecambe substation Option 2 siting is within Grade 2 agricultural land. Zone 1 is Grade 2 and 3, being the best and most versatile agricultural land and should be avoided as a primary consideration of site selection.   | 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_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: 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 |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
| TA_0235_006_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</p> | <p>undertaken for the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11) utilises the latest biodiversity metric published by Defra (4.0).</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). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_0235_008_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 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>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
| TA_0235_011_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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_0235_014_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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 <a href="https://bp-mmmt.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/transmission/PEIR/Volume+3/Volume+3+Annexes/Transmission+Assets+PEIR+Vol+3+Annex+6.1.pdf">https://bp-mmmt.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/transmission/PEIR/Volume+3/Volume+3+Annexes/Transmission+Assets+PEIR+Vol+3+Annex+6.1.pdf</a></p> <p>1.3.5 Agricultural Land Classification Morgan substation site – Grade 3b</p> <p>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 a wetness limitation.</p> <p>Morecambe substation site option 1 (north) – Grade 3a and 3b</p> <p>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 a 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.</p> <p>Morecambe substation site option 2 (south) Grade 3a</p> <p>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 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 <a href="https://naturalengland-defra.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/provisional-agricultural-land-classification-alc-england/explore">https://naturalengland-defra.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/provisional-agricultural-land-classification-alc-england/explore</a></p> <p>Morgan Substation Site Grade 3 Morecambe Substation Site Options Grade 2 ALC Grades (Provisional) © ADAS &amp; Defra: GEOGEXT 5 Protecting the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land from significant, inappropriate or unsustainable development proposals <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land</a></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_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</p> <p>Natural England uses these policies to advise on development proposals as a statutory</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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | 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   | (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_0235_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 Morgan is 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_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 am 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_005_231123          | S44     | Email           | The Fylde coast is a productive dairy farming area these businesses are going to be massively affected when the cable is routed. Affecting the production of forage to feed cows and the return of cow slurry back to the land to fertilise the land. I believe the viability of farming business will be challenged and many farmers will go out of business as a direct result of this proposed operation.  | 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_0239_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | 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 areas, 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 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   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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>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_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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>PEIR and have 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 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_007_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>I am completely opposed to the project as it is currently presented. You would be taking away good quality farm land, destroying the countryside and destroying a rural community. There must be more suitable sites available that would not cause the problems and disruption on the scale proposed in both Newton and St Annes.</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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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_0249_007_231123          | S44     | Email           | I am completely opposed to the project as it is currently presented. You would be taking away good quality farm land, destroying the countryside and destroying a rural community. There must be more suitable sites available that would not cause the problems and disruption on the scale proposed in both Newton and St Annes.   | The Applicant notes your response. We are committed to working with local communities and landowners that may be impacted by the project.   |
| 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   | 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   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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.</p> | <p>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.</p>   |
| TA_258_001_201223           | S44     | Email           | <p>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 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>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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). 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> |

## E1.16.22 Traffic and transport table of responses

## E1.16.22.1 Traffic and Transport table of responses (via feedback form)



**Table E1.16.22.1: Traffic and transport 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 (3.7; Traffic and Transport) 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_005_231123          | S42     | Online feedback form   | 3                      | 3.7                          | Existing infrastructure is already poor - all need upgrading.  | 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).<br>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_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_0051_007_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form   | 3                      | 3.7                          | Major road works on Queensway and Common Edge Road have already caused serious disruption over several months to the traffic flow along those roads, and in particular to REDACTED. Further disruption, without significant alternative routes , would be unacceptable.  | The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. 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).<br>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.<br>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_0052_001_131123          | S44     | Hardcopy feedback form | 1                      |                              | 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?<br>2. The easiest route is surely down the estuary, away from homes, farms, livelihoods. Why is this not an option? I know (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.  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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).   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <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 the 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>Detailed assessments are 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_0053_007_171123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | Roads unsuitable for construction vehicles  | <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_0055_004_051123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | <p>The promotional material generally lightly skirts over road management. This is a major issue for which contractors and the councils have a well-founded local reputation in the Lytham St Annes area for being inept. There are for example only two main routes from north St Anne's and there has been considerable interruption to traffic flows for the smallest of junction changes. This can seriously impact the local community, extending to business and health (for the latter when people have to visit the hospitals but are faced with delays of over an hour).</p> <p>I have for example viewed the approval steps for the traffic management arrangements associated with a small junction change at the Queensway road (one of the only two main roads from St Annes) - this was grossly optimistic in terms of the interruption to traffic flows and not borne out in reality.</p> <p>Note Lytham St Annes has a relatively aged population and the main hospital is in Blackpool. In addition there are a number of leisure facilities close to the Airport that are heavily patronised - already football days have parking issues that are barely containable.</p> | <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> <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_0055_009_051123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 6                      |                              | <p>Lytham St Annes has a relatively aged population and the main hospital is in Blackpool. In addition there are a number of leisure facilities close to the Airport that are heavily patronised - already football days have parking issues that are barely containable.</p> <p>The impact on an already burdened transport route will be massive!</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),</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8).   |
| TA_0056_019_141123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | As previously stated<br><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_0058_003_201123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 14                     |                              | Object on the basis of unknown health risks, foundation problems to residential properties on sand based land and total disruption to road traffic and associated delays that will be created.   | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_0060_009_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | Clifton Drive north coastal road is a main road which leads to major traffic congestion throughout the Fyld area thus affecting businesses nationwide.   | 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).<br>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.<br>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_0060_014_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 6                      |                              | Many vehicles in such a small space pollution from vehicles exhaust and dripping oil from their engines will cause massive damage to the area.   | 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).<br>Details of the operation and maintenance phases are set out in   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | 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_0061_002_161123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | There are only two routes into the St, Annes area from the M55 motorway. Minor roadworks have historically created long delays of more than 45mins in both directions and on both routes during any works being carried out. If option two is chosen then the disruption will be even worse. It will be totally unacceptable for residents and businesses to accept such disruption for long periods.  | 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).<br>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.<br>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_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).<br>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_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_002_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | 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.<br>Should option 2 go ahead this will totally devastate our lives.<br>I will, object and campaign to exhaustion against this development ruining our lives.<br>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.<br>I am too old to start all over again and all this is giving me mental health issues making me extremely ill.<br>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.<br>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 | The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.<br>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.<br>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  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p>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 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 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.</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>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> |
| 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 REDACT 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>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
| TA_0064_007_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | Leach Lane and Blackpool Road North are 20mph Bus Routes<br><br>Please identify the extent of possible transport disruption   | 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).<br>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.<br>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_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) 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).<br>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_0066_006_171023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | There are not enough roads out of and into Lytham St Annes, especially in the direction of Blackpool. The project looks like it will impact Clifton Drive A584 and Queensway B5261. That will create gridlock in all the surrounding area. The M55 Heyhouses Link Road has been under construction for too long and the contractors must focus on final completion and use to mitigate this. HGV traffic should only be allowed along roads as Heyhouses Road during specific hours only. The contractors on the project must stay on site until completion and not be allowed to go off and leave stages in limbo. | 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).<br>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.<br>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_0067_005_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | The proposed route would involve routing underneath a major road (the only direct road connecting St Annes and Blackpool and beyond) an airfield approach zone and a railway. Other alternatives must be sought to prevent major disruption.  | 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).<br>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.<br>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  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method         | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                         |                        |                              |   | community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).   |
| 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_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 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 | 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).<br>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_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:<br>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)<br>Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.   |
| TA_0068_004_231123          | S44     | Hard copy feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | How will it effect the public transport, which is a vital resource for all local people? Will cars be able to use the road?   | The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.<br>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).<br>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.<br>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                      |                              | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>The Nature Reserve on Clifton Drive North, Lytham St Annes is unsuitable for the location of the project landfall area and cable corridor  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | 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.   | 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_0071_001_161123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | Clifton Drive North is a very busy main Rd which has recently gone through major changes with a very wide cycle lane this narrowing the road considerably which caused major upheaval to emergency services bus times delays and all commuters residents access, tail backs in traffic as far as the eye could see in every direction. This is an extremely busy junction with two way traffic lights at Highbury Rd West and Clifton Drive North and the entrance to the Coast Guard at North Beach Car Park also the pedestrian entrance to the beach.<br>The scheme that you are proposing is enormous and this route shout (sic) not be considered as an option. | The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.<br>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).<br>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.<br>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_0073_002_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | Careful consideration is needed here for any disruption along Queensway B5261: as this causes severe delays in the surrounding area, as experienced recently when Blackpool Council were making provision for a wider entrance to their EZ zone, it went on for months   | 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).<br>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.<br>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_0073_005_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 6                      |                              | Disruption to all roads in the area carrying equipment to these compounds  | 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).<br>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.<br>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_0074_008_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | Roads around airport and dune area are already busy and very narrow. Definitely not suitable for heavy plant.  | 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).<br>Details of the operation and maintenance phases are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description 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 F1.3). Onshore maintenance would be limited to essential maintenance and/or emergency works.   |
| TA_0075_004_071123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | HGVs travelling to a compound/storage site must be held accountable to drive in a very safe, considerate manner.  | 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).<br>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_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).<br>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_001_091123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | 1. How will it effect the road out side my house<br>2. How will if effect the dunes facing my house<br>3. How will the 'Potential biodiversity net gain, enhancement and/or mitigation areas', how will this affect the front in St Annes | 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).<br>Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, 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).<br>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.<br>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.<br>Further details of the approach to biodiversity benefit are provided in |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | 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_0076_006_091123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | Will this increase the traffic on Clifton Drive North and this is already a very busy road   | 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).<br>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_0078_005_051123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | Detailed assessments are 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).   | 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).<br>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.<br>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_0079_003_131123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | Squires Gate Lane is one of only two roads linking Blackpool with Lytham St Anne's. Whenever there's an accident or roadworks on either it causes considerable disruption to the area.   | 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).<br>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_0080_005_201123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | Clifton Drive North is the only route out of our estate , I have concerns about access to and from our property during construction. The road is also prone to heavy traffic as it is one of only two roads linking Blackpool to St Annes. Even minor roadworks have caused tailbacks and major disruption.  | 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).<br>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.<br>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_0082_002_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | Access into Lytham & St Annes from the M55 is limited to 2 routings currently, The most popular being the route along Queensway. This route is used by several groups which should be considered. Ambulance services, Ambulances travel along Queensway regularly attending emergencies in Lytham & St Annes. delays caused by queueing traffic on this road put local lives at risk. Tourists visiting Lytham & St Annes are also likely to be impacted possibly resulting in fewer visitors who choose not to visit due to work being carried out on the main route into the towns. Whilst another route is available along Clifton Drive, this became | 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).<br>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.<br>Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3:  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p>congested also during a recent period of temporary lights on Queensway. As a result of potentially fewer visitors during the installation phase, there would likely be an impact on businesses.</p> <p>I am a resident of REDACTED in St Annes, a development located directly off Queensway. We have one access point onto and off of the estate which would also be impacted by the use of Queensway making it even more difficult to access the estate.</p>   | 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_0082_004_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 7                      |                              | <p>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. Please do all you can to run these cables directly out of the airport and into the countryside.</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. 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_0083_013_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | Do not allow planning permission to go ahead  | The Applicants note your response.  |
| TA_0085_001_191123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      |                              | <p>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:</p> <p>Concerns about the following:</p> <p>1) The impact of the wide corridor immediately next to our properties, but also will it go under our land?<br/>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!</p> <p>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</p>  | <p>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).</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  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p>as a 6 lane motorway, I'd suggest it will impact REDACTED whichever you choose.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>4) Vermin - we know from other local digging, drilling that this has driven vermin into our homes!</p> <p>5) Noise from the amount of electricity being transmitted right by our homes.</p> <p>6) Impact on the local wildlife in the area</p> <p>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</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 specific 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_006_191123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | <p>Major concerns re traffic disruption to the local area during construction as follows:</p> <p>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>2 - Traffic and works disruption impact to neighbouring roads in St Annes using these routes to join up with land by REDACTED</p>   | <p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. 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).</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' 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. 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</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. 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. 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_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"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- It feels like someone has just looked at a map and decided these are the easiest places, with little other consideration.</li> <li>- Your website is hard to navigate and does not provide large scale detailed maps. It is difficult to determine exact proposed areas.</li> <li>- There has been little consideration of potential flood risks and lack of information to local residents about how this would be managed.</li> <li>- There is no information about why any Fylde or Blackpool Council enterprise zones or brown field sites have not been considered.</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- There is no information about how any access to the sites would be</li> </ul>   | <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> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p>obtained, and no assessment about impact on local traffic and roads.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- This is an area of quite countryside and would involve significant loss of a local amenity and change to the local environment.</li> <li>- Potential loss of value to local property.</li> <li>- Two large sub stations are proposed quite near to each other, making a significant impact on the local amenity.</li> <li>- 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</li> <li>- I have attended public consultation meetings which have been poorly presented with representatives being poorly prepared and unable to answer most questions</li> </ul> | <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> |
| TA_0092__001_151123         | S44     | Online feedback form | 6                      |                              | Just the volume of traffic including any plant that will be moving around this area during the period of the project and the impact of this on the community.   | <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_0092__024_151123         | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | Would be good to understand the impact - road network disturbance and for what period of time in more detail as the project develops.   | <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>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_0093_002_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | As a resident on REDACTED, REDACTED, my house is on the main road opposite the beach. I walk my dog on the beach and nature reserve multiple times per day or week and use the Clifton Drive cycle lane regularly instead of my car. I have been living here almost 8 years and chose this area specifically for the quiet, rural feel. I am extremely concerned about what this project will do to my quality of life, general health and cost of living if I have to sit in construction traffic jams and drive to be able to find somewhere remote to take a walk, especially if it takes years to complete. Many of my neighbours are retired or elderly  | <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>An assessment considering how the Transmission Assets affects different aspects of the environment that influence population health</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | and chose to live here for a better quality of life in their later years. This will have a huge impact on our wellbeing.  | 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 appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards.  |
| 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_004_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | I work from home on the seafront in a computer-based role. I can hear every car that goes past. I would be unable to work effectively and join in Teams calls if the main road had large scale development work being carried out for weeks or even months. My nearest office is 2 hours drive away, that is not viable for commuting instead of working from home.   | 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_0093_005_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.9                          | Linked to traffic question 3.7 above - As a resident on REDACTED, REDACTED my house is on the main road opposite the beach. 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 and resulting CO2 fumes in our gardens and houses. If the Wind Farm work lasted weeks or months I would be concerned about the damage to our health as a result.   | 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.<br><br>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.   |
| 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 REDACTED developments  | 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   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | 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 REDACTED 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. | 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).<br><br>Detailed assessments are 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_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).<br>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.<br>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_005_061123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | There are already traffic issues in the light of the only road through to Lytham and St Annes is via the Queensway. In addition, there is only one exit from Richmond Point Development and this will become an even greater problem  | 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).<br>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.<br><br>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_0095_001_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | 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.<br><br>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   | 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<br>- selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets<br>- refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received.<br><br>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      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p>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>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_0170_003_151023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | <p>As already advised<br/><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).</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>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:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)<br/>Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p> |
| TA_0097_007_171123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | <p>I image there's is going to be a lot of lorries if construction started people coming and going</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_0098_008_081123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | <p>Your traffic will make the use of local traffic extremely difficult.</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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | reference F1.3). Onshore maintenance would be limited to essential maintenance and/or emergency works.<br>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_0098_018_081123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 10                     |                              | 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.   | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_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).<br>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.<br>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_0252_003_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | I was informed by staff at the Kirkham open meeting that the farm occupation road off REDACTED would not be used by machinery to access the proposed cabling but access directly from REDACTED where the cabling crosses. The occupation road could become extremely soiled if heavy machinery accesses the project via this route and could cause extreme disruption to the REDACTED also relying on the same access route if works are carried out in adverse weather conditions. | 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).<br>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.<br>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_0100_001_241023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | 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.  | 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).<br>Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants’ response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <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>F3.2).<br/>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.<br/>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).<br/>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).<br/>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).<br/>Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2).<br/>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_0100_003_241023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | <p>Not in residential areas when there are other options but are costlier<br/><br/>Too much traffic and noise already here</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).<br/>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).<br/>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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).   |
| 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).<br>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.<br>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_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_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.<br>the noise would also impact the horses as they have much more sensitive hearing than us.<br>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.<br>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.<br>i cant imagine losing any land to pipes etc, the land we are on is marshy 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.<br>i could not more strongly oppose the development | This consultee is not 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).<br>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_008_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | the impact on traffic and congestion in the area of newton and blackpool road/ kirkham is a concern to locals, it is already a busy area  | 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).<br>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.   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | 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_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 REDACTED 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_0103_001_051123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      |                              | Impact on transit on my road is not clearly defined in the proposal. Are we talking days, weeks, months of road closures?  | <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>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_0103_003_051123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | Impact on transit on my road is not clearly defined in the proposal. Are we talking days, weeks, months of road closures?  | <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>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>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
| 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. Further St Annes only has two main exit/entry roads and the councils &amp; 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. 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_008_281023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | <p>Whereas it is almost possible to tell as the information is so vague, the proposed site would appear to be close to Blackpool Road playing fields that attract large number of visitors. Knowing that contractors are inept at traffic management, how can this square with supporting the continued recreational use of the fields.</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_0106_009_281023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | <p>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.</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> <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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | 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_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).<br>Detailed assessments are 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).<br>Detailed assessments are 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_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.<br>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.<br>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 | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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).<br>Detailed assessments are 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).<br>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.<br>Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method        | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                        |                        |                              | and welfare (people have struggled when needing to get to the hospital sited in Blackpool)   | 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). |
| TA_0107_003_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form   | 3                      | 3.7                          | Fylde Borough Council have now asked for a delay in the East West T5 road, is this due to these plans?   | The Applicants are not aware of any delay/have not requested any delay to other projects.  |
| TA_0111_008_131123          | S44     | Hardcopy feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | The traffic around Clifton Drive North in the area of the Nature Reserve and Sand Dunes will be increased on a very busy road during construction.   | 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_0112_005_231123          | S44     | Online feedback form   | 3                      | 3.7                          | What is the real impact going to be? The roads at Lytham St Annes are not designed to take heavy works traffic when it's mainly residential. The increase in noise alone would make it less enjoyable to live/work in, those who work from home will never be able to get away from it. I would urge you to consider not commencing works so close to residential property | 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.<br><br>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_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.  | 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   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | Detailed assessments are 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_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_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).</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> <p>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_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>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <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>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_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.</p> <p>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 Clifton Drive 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> <p>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.</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_0115_003_051123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | <p>See my general feedback at the beginning.</p> <p>Huge concern over traffic and road closures expected as there is only x2 main roads in/out of st annes. Between the x2 over the last few years it has been relentless because of roadworks on both, so the proposition to have further disruption having direct negative impact on the residents and the tourism industry is something I cannot support.</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>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| TA_0115_007_051123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 16                     |                              | <p>The only other thing I am concerned about is the impact to both the railway and airport.</p> <p>We already have a poor rail service, but does get used by both commuters and tourists alot. The proposed cable route means drilling underneath so presume the lines would have to be closed whilst work was being done, which is of course not supported.</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.</p> |



## E1.16.22.2 Traffic and Transport table of responses (via all other methods)

**Table E1.16.22.2: Traffic and transport table of responses (via all other methods)**

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| TA_0003_010_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | The indicated width of the construction corridor is 122m. Much of this is accounted for by the proposed linear storage of topsoil and subsoil during construction. The utilisation of a series of top and subsoil storage areas could reduce the width of the construction corridor by approximately 40% and reduce the adverse impact not only on agricultural holdings but on ecology, transport infrastructure and reduce the development footprint of the project as a whole.   | The project 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_0005_005_231123          | S42     | Email           | 3. The developer's documentation has currently failed to evidence that they have given weight to, or mitigation of the adverse impacts on the local: residents, communities, economies and environments on :- i. amenity (disruption & destruction of the rural character of the area, disruption due to construction & traffic), ii. health & well-being (including emissions giving rise to: respiratory impacts- in construction & restoration; aural impacts- throughout the 6 decade programme life cycle from activity, plant and equipments; and potentially, electro-magnetic impacts - in operation throughout the life of the programme.iii. highway safety (through inadequate specification & control of traffic. Plus proposed use of narrow rural lanes, also used for residential & leisure access with consequential severe impacts on all users).  | Once operational, the substations will not have any emissions to air. 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. 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.Noise and vibration impacts during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Transmission Assets are presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.2: Construction noise and Vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.2). This assessment includes an assessment of construction traffic noise, as well as an assessment of the noise and vibration impacts during each phase of construction required for the Transmission Assets. Impacts in relation to traffic and transport are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7). |
| 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_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).  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' 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_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).   |
| TA_0012_007_221123          | S42     | Email           | We also have concerns about the impact on the sand dunes where these cables come ashore and the eco systems that has been worked on over the years. We feel that there will need to be road closures as the building work is started in an area that has limited access in and out of St Anne's. The town has suffered over the years when roads have been closed, snarling up the town. These construction times will be over years not weeks or months and will have a negative economic impact on our town.  | 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). 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_0017_001_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | The proposal has the potential to cause significant disruption to residents throughout its construction phase, and it is imperative that this is minimised through the design and phasing of works, and mitigated through adequate controls on working practices to control noise and vibration. In particular any roadworks are likely to have significant knock on effects to the wider network resulting in congestion; this is especially the case in the area around Blackpool Airport. When laying the onshore cable, any road crossing should be undertaken with directional drilling unless the road is demonstrated to only carry minor volumes of traffic and that traffic can be easily diverted via alternative routes.   | An assessment of noise and vibration impacts during the construction phase of the Transmission Assets is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Construction noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.3) and section 8.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8). Details of controls and measures proposed are set out in section 8.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8). This includes control of working hours through the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP). An Outline CoCP is provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1). In addition, an Outline Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan has been prepared (document reference J1.3).  |
| 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_0019_026_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | It is forecast that heavy goods traffic will increase by 530% on the A583 and 581% on the A584 for a significant period of time. It would appear when reading the high-level timelines that construction will last two years, but the detail indicates, even if delivered in a timely manner, the project will take five years. Working hours are specified as weekdays 7am - 6pm and Saturday 7am -1pm with an hour at either side for vehicles to arrive or depart. It should be specified before commencement where the vehicles queue outside the specified timeframes and how the noise (particularly when they manoeuvre and reverse) will be monitored? These hours should be shortened significantly in both the morning and evening. Previous developments in the village caused major congestion/disruption and damage to | 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). Working hours would be controlled through a requirement of the development consent order.   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | footways and road surfaces. Highway resurfacing at the end of construction needs to be conditioned and mandated to be in place..   |  |
| TA_0019_027_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Electromagnetic radiation, light pollution, noise, and vibration levels for residents generated by the substations should be specified and set at best practice levels. The maximum levels for those residential receptors in close proximity to the substations should be specified with appropriate monitoring and enforcement in place to ensure these levels are not breached. These levels should be identified both during construction and once construction is completed.  | A baseline sound survey has been undertaken to quantify the baseline sound environment at locations representative of the nearest and most exposed noise sensitive receptors. The survey data has been used to derive representative daytime and night-time background sound levels at these receptors against which the assessment of operational noise impacts has been undertaken. Details are provided in Volume 3, Annex 8.1: Baseline sound survey of the ES and section 8.6.2 of this Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8).The assessment of operational noise impacts is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3). 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. An operational noise limit will be secured as a requirement of the DCO resulting in significant adverse effects being avoided and adverse effects minimised at all times. 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_0021_002_211123          | S42     | Email           | A detailed review has been undertaken of the following: PEIR Volume 3 Chapter 7 Traffic and Transport this chapter considers the potential impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets on traffic and transport during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases, specifically relating to the onshore elements of the Transmission Assets landward of Mean High-Water Springs (MHWS). It sets out: existing and future environmental baseline conditions established from desk studies, surveys and consultation undertaken to date; the potential environmental impacts and effects on all aspects of traffic and transport arising from the Transmission Assets, based on the information gathered and the analysis and assessments undertaken to date; assumptions and limitations encountered in compiling the environmental information; and any necessary monitoring and/or mitigation measures that could prevent, minimise, reduce or offset the possible environmental effects identified in the EIA process. This chapter also contains an integrated and preliminary 'Transport Assessment' to consider the potential impacts and effects on the operation of the highway network arising from the Transmission Assets. | The Applicants note your response. Responses to detailed points are provided in turn.  |
| TA_0021_003_211123          | S42     | Email           | The following summarises key observations that have been made by National Highways with regard to PEIR Volume 3 Chapter 7 Traffic and Transport chapter; PEIR Vol 3 Ch7, para Table 7.7 Issues scoped out of assessment National Highways note PINS comments in paragraph 3.16 of the Scoping Opinion (December 2022) relating to the scoping out of assessments relating to the offshore elements of the Transmission Assets and the operation, maintenance and decommissioning of the onshore element of the Transmission Assets. National Highways request to be consulted on these aspects throughout the pre-application stage. National Highways also request further information on the separate DCO Applications for the Morgan and Morecambe Wind Farm Generation Assets, including dates for the consultation period for those applications.   | The Applicants note the comments from National Highways regarding the response from the Planning Inspectorate to scoping. It is understood that National Highways responded at the scoping stage. National Highways have been invited to form part of the Traffic and Transport Expert Working Group meetings for the Transmission Assets. National Highways have been consulted separately regarding the Morgan Offshore Wind Project and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm.  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
| TA_0021_004_211123          | S42     | Email           | 7.4.3, Figure 7.1 Study Area (SRN): M55, M6 Junction 29-32, M61 Junction 9 to M6 Junction 30, M65 Junction 1-2 National Highways note the proposed extent of the study area shown on Figure 7.1 (PEIR Volume 3, Chapter 7) and agree this is consistent with discussions from EWG meetings. However, given that the origins and routing of ALLs has not yet been finalised, National Highways consider it is possible that the study area may need to be extended once this information is confirmed.  | The Applicants note this response. Details regarding abnormal loads is provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7).  |
| TA_0021_005_211123          | S42     | Email           | Table 7.9 Site Specific Surveys Undertaken by Nationwide Data Collection 08/06/22 to 14/06/22 National Highways note that the Applicant commissioned traffic surveys in June 2022 (Table 9 of PEIR Volume 3 Chapter 7). National Highways request further detail be provided, including confirmation of whether these surveys covered the Strategic Road Network?  | Details on traffic surveys, growth factors, committed road schemes, other committed developments and base traffic flows are set out in sections 7.5 and 7.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7). This includes details of additional traffic surveys undertaken during 2024.  |
| TA_0021_006_211123          | S42     | Email           | Table 7.12 Source of base traffic data for links in study area Table 7.12 (PEIR Volume 3, Chapter 7) sets out the base traffic flows. National Highways note these have been derived from a number of sources and include some pre-COVID data. National Highways request further information relating to the base flows and growth factors applied.  | Details on traffic surveys, growth factors, committed road schemes, other committed developments and base traffic flows are set out in sections 7.5 and 7.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7). This includes details of additional traffic surveys undertaken during 2024.  |
| TA_0021_007_211123          | S42     | Email           | 7.5.4.4 Source documents for base flow<br>National Highways request to be provided with copies of reports relating to recent road schemes in Lancashire:<br>Appendix E. Forecast Metrics of the Preston Western Distributor Full Business Case Monitoring and Evaluation Plan;<br>Traffic Modelling and Economic Appraisal Report for the M55 Heyhouses Link Road;<br>and A582 Dualling Environmental Statement Volume 2 Main Statement Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport.   | Details on traffic surveys, growth factors, committed road schemes, other committed developments and base traffic flows are set out in sections 7.5 and 7.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7). This includes details of additional traffic surveys undertaken during 2024.<br>Section 7.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7) provides an analysis of the impacts on traffic and transport during construction of the onshore elements of the Transmission Assets and assesses the impact of construction traffic in terms of driver delay and road safety at the triangle of the M6, M61 and M65 and the M6-M55 link at junction 32 with both as high sensitivities |
| TA_0021_008_211123          | S42     | Email           | Table 7.14 Key Receptors to be taken forward to assessment, with level of sensitivity National Highways note that in Table 7.14 (PEIR Volume 3, Chapter 7) all SRN links are noted to be negligible sensitivity. In paragraph 7.9.3.2 (PEIR Volume 3, Chapter 7), it is stated that the following areas of the network are of high sensitivity: the triangle of the M6, M61 and M65; and the M6-M55 link at junction 32. National Highways request the Applicant confirms that paragraph 7.9.3.2 supersedes the information in Table 7.14 and that the links identified by National Highways will be regarded as high sensitivity for the purposes of environmental appraisal. | Section 7.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7) provides an analysis of the impacts on traffic and transport during construction of the onshore elements of the Transmission Assets and assesses the impact of construction traffic in terms of driver delay and road safety at the triangle of the M6, M61 and M65 and the M6-M55 link at junction 32 with both as high sensitivities. There are no proposed changes to any infrastructure along the Strategic Road Network as a result of the onshore elements of the Transmission Assets.   |
| TA_0021_009_211123          | S42     | Email           | Table 7.21 Assignment of construction traffic<br>National Highways note the worst-case construction flows shown in Table 7.21 (PEIR Volume 3, Chapter 7) and request further information to understand how these figures have been derived.  | Details of traffic surveys, growth factors, committed road schemes, other committed developments and base traffic flows are set out in sections 7.5 and 7.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7). This includes details of additional traffic surveys undertaken during 2024. Section 7.9 of that chapter of the ES provides details on the derivation of construction traffic flows.<br>National Highways have been invited to form part of the Traffic and Transport Expert Working Group (EWG) meetings for the Transmission Assets. The construction traffic flows and routes presented within EWG Meeting 2 were issued separately to the highway authorities for comments.                                       |
| TA_0021_010_211123          | S42     | Email           | Para 7.9.22 Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) National Highways request to be consulted upon the development of the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) during the pre-application stage.  | National Highways have been invited to form part of the Traffic and Transport Expert Working Group (EWG) meetings for the Transmission Assets. The construction traffic flows and routes presented within EWG Meeting 2 were issued separately to the highway authorities for comments. The Construction Traffic Management Plan is provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J5).  |
| TA_0021_011_211123          | S42     | Email           | Table 7.2.2 Highway Links screened into environmental assessment.<br>National Highways note that none of the SRN links meet the IEMA screening test Rule 1 or Rule 2 (Table 7.22 PEIR Volume 3, Chapter 7). However, given the uncertainty around the derivation of baseline flows and current lack of detail in terms   | Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7) has been updated to take into account the current Transmission Assets Order Limits and project design. All road links have been screened using the Rule 1 and Rule 2 criteria.   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | of construction traffic routes and volumes, can the Applicant confirm the process for links to be scoped back in if they exceed Rule 1 or Rule 2 in future?   |   |
| TA_0021_012_211123          | S42     | Email           | 7.9.4/7.9.5 Pedestrian Delay and Amenity National Highways note that none of the SRN links are scoped in for assessment of pedestrian delay and amenity, which is agreed. However, National Highways request that the Applicant gives due consideration to the impact on WCHARS within the Transport Assessment, for example at junctions on the M55 which have cycle lanes and pedestrian routes within them. Linked to this point, National Highways request clarification on whether Equality Impact Assessments will be carried out as part of this process.  | Section 7.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7) provides an analysis of the impacts on traffic and transport during construction of the onshore elements of the Transmission Assets and considers WCHARs. There are no proposed changes to any infrastructure along the SRN as a result of the onshore elements of the Transmission Assets and therefore Equality Impact Assessments are not necessary.  |
| TA_0021_013_211123          | S42     | Email           | 7.10 Cumulative effects assessment<br>It is noted in paragraph 7.10 (PEIR Volume 3, Chapter 7) that a cumulative effects assessment will form part of the DCO application. National Highways request to be consulted on the development of the CEA through the pre-application process.   | Cumulative effects are set out in section 7.13 of Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7). Other proposed road schemes were discussed at the first Expert Working Group (EWG) Meeting. Traffic modelling from Lancashire County Council was not received. Therefore, a Technical Note was prepared and issued to the highway authorities setting out a proposed methodology to calculate forecast baseline traffic flows. The methods set out in the note are recognised methods within the transport industry on which to determine base traffic flows for such road schemes. |
| TA_0021_014_211123          | S42     | Email           | Review of Minutes of Meeting 1: Morgan & Morecambe Transmission Assets Traffic & Transport Expert Working Group (EWG) It is noted that this will form a separate report and be subject to separate meetings. However, this is currently integrated within the PEIR Scoping Report Item 10 Transport Assessment Scoping stated that the Transport Assessment Scoping Report would be produced as a standalone document and discussed at separate meetings to the PEIR/EIA. National Highways request that the Applicant confirm when a first draft of the TA Scoping Note will be produced.  | The construction traffic flows and routes presented within Expert Working Group Meeting 2 were issued separately to the highway authorities for comments, however, no response was received and the Transport Assessment has been prepared in accordance with the comments received from the EWG meetings and the scoping and consultation comments received from all of the highway authorities during the pre-application, and consultation processes   |
| TA_0021_015_211123          | S42     | Email           | Item 11 Port Access and Transport Plan (PAPT)<br>National Highways request to be consulted upon the development of PAPT for the Generation Assets DCO applications.<br>These points are the comments National Highways wishes to provide as part of the current consultation.   | A PATP will be produced post consent as a requirement of the DCO and National Highways will be consulted on its preparation accordingly.  |
| TA_0029_017_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Construction Traffic At this stage no details of haul roads or construction routes have yet been provided. These may have implications for our bridge assets. Regardless of whether such bridges are owned by the Trust, many are heritage assets and may not be suitable for construction traffic. We would wish to comment further on this matter.  | Construction traffic effects are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7). 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_0035_050_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 1.1.3.1 Issue<br>The OCoCP states that it will cover the monitoring procedures that will be required, but there is no clarity on how monitoring procedures will be incorporated, either in to the Outline document, or the detailed CoCP(s).<br>Impact<br>There is a real risk that the project team could lose oversight of its Principal Contractors, who in turn may lose oversight of their sub-contractors. This could result in management plans and systems not being followed resulting in increased pollution risk to protected sites.<br>Solution<br>Ensure the OCoCP set the principles of monitoring and each detailed CoCP provides further detail as to how monitoring will be carried out. | The Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) submitted as part of the application for development consent sets out how the measures will be implemented, including the responsibilities of the Contractors and the Applicants.   |
| TA_0035_057_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Contents section Issue Doesn't list the actual contents of the document. For example, no section 1.6 in contents but is present in document. Impact Potentially misleading for reader and not helpful in document usage.<br>Solution<br>Update Contents to match document.  | The Applicants note your response. The contents pages have been checked and updated for ES documents.   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
| TA_0035_077_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT33 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. The CoCP will include best practice measures in relation to air quality that will be applied where human receptors reside within 350 m of works, where required, or where sensitive ecological receptors are present within 50 m, as described in Institute of Air Quality guidance Management (IAQM, 2014) as appropriate.</p> <p>Issue<br/>Measures required to manage dust and air quality have yet to be fully addressed.</p> <p>Impact<br/>Risk to sensitive ecological receptors from poor air quality.</p> <p>Solution<br/>Outline Dust Management Plan setting out dust and air quality control measures to be appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission.</p>  | An Outline Dust Management Plan is provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1.2).  |
| TA_0035_078_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT35, 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. The CoCP will include measures to maintain and address:- 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.</p> <p>Issue<br/>Measures required to manage environmental risks have yet to be fully addressed.</p> <p>Impact<br/>Risk to the environment</p> <p>Solution<br/>Outline versions of various Plans to manage environmental risks to be appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission. See also CoT04 - Onshore pollution prevention plan CoT09 - Drainage Management Plan CoT11 - Operational Onshore Substation Drainage Management plan CoT20 – Construction Fencing Plan CoT26 – Site Waste Management Plan CoT30 – Contaminated Land and Groundwater Discovery Strategy CoT33 – Air Quality CoT73 – Biosecurity Protocol CoT76 – Outline Ecological Management Plan CoT77 – Bentonite Breakout Plan CoT78 – Biosecurity Protocol CoT81 – Soil Management Plan CoT86 – Measures to protect minor watercourses</p> | See the Outline CoCP (document reference J1) and the following plans submitted as part of the application for development consent:•Outline Communications Plan (document reference J1.1)•Outline Dust Management Plan (document reference J1.2)•Outline Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (document reference J1.3)•Outline Pollution Prevention Plan (document reference J1.4)•Outline Public Rights of Way (PRoW) Management Plan (document reference J1.5)•Outline Site Waste Management Plan (document reference J1.6)•Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7)•Outline Spillage and Emergency Response Plan (document reference J1.8)•Outline Surface Water and Groundwater Management Plan (document reference J1.9)•Outline Construction Fencing Plan (document reference J1.10)•Outline Construction Artificial Light Emissions Management Plan (document reference J1.11)•Outline Biosecurity Protocol (document reference J1.12)•Outline Bentonite Breakout Plan (document reference J1.13)•Outline Contaminated Land and Groundwater Discovery Strategy (document reference J1.14) |
| TA_0036_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | We have no comments on the project save its possible impact on our Railways and its operations   | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0036_002_231123          | S44     | Email           | Our concern is to the railway we operate at Preston docks.   | The Applicants note your response. This lies outside of the Transmission Assets Order Limits and no impacts are anticipated.   |
| TA_0036_003_231123          | S44     | Email           | Our concerns relate to its possible impact on our railway both in terms of any physical works and interference to our train services both freight and passenger.   | The Applicants note your response. This lies outside of the Transmission Assets Order Limits and no impacts are anticipated.   |
| TA_0036_004_231123          | S44     | Email           | We are a stationary railway catering passenger and freight traffic   | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0036_005_231123          | S44     | Email           | As elsewhere on this form our concerns are the impact on our railway and its traffic being disrupted by works  | The Applicants note your response. This lies outside of the Transmission Assets Order Limits and no impacts are anticipated.   |
| TA_0036_006_231123          | S44     | Email           | As above all our concerns relate to the route to Penwortham and its impact on our railway if the route chosen crosses it   | The Applicants note your response. This lies outside of the Transmission Assets Order Limits and no impacts are anticipated.   |
| TA_0036_007_231123          | S44     | Email           | As above our railway is open to freight traffic 12 months a year as well as carrying seasonal heritage passenger trains  | The Applicants note your response.   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
| TA_0036_008_231123          | S44     | Email           | We are a statutory railway operating upon a transport and works act order made by the secretary of stae in 2004  | The Applicants note your response.  |
| TA_0036_009_231123          | S44     | Email           | As above and as per the covering letter attached to this form  | The Applicants note your 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_0017_001_161123          | S42/S44 | Email           | I am writing to you as the REDACTED for REDACTED on the Fylde coast. I would like to formally express my objection to any proposal to dig up any roads or pavements in my division - particularly those highlighted in the attached copy of drawing BP-GBR-MORG-REG-0053, namely Leach Lane, Kilnhouse Lane, Blackpool Road North and any adjacent roads. I would also like to object to any disturbance to Blackpool Road Playing Fields since this is regularly used by St Annes Junior Football Club and a great deal of work has been undertaken to try and improve and maintain the football pitches. Finally I would ask that any work crossing Clifton Drive North, Queensway and the new M55 Heyhouses Link Road is actioned by drilling under the road surface without disrupting traffic flow or damaging the condition of the road and pavement surfaces. Please will you acknowledge receipt of my objections. | The ongoing process of site selection has identified that this option (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_0038_008_181123          | S44     | Email           | 8. Working hours weekdays 7am - 6pm and Saturday 7am – 1pm with an hour at either side for vehicles to arrive or depart. Residents surrounding the developments on Acorn Avenue and Woodlands Close and the access routes to them experienced great disruption with the noise and queueing of vehicles from outside the specified timeframes. Where will the vehicles queue outside the specified time-fames and how will the noise (particularly when they manoeuvre and reverse) be monitored? These hours should be shortened significantly in both the morning and evening.  | 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). Working hours would be controlled through a requirement of the development consent order.             |
| TA_0038_030_181123          | S44     | Email           | 8. Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport The PEIR table for vehicle movements has no duration; are the number per day? 'construction vehicle movements through the access, including total movements (comprising arrivals and departures)'  | Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES sets out details of predicted traffic generation - each table sets out whether numbers are daily or hourly.  |
| 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  | 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) |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | 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. | 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_0043_017_211123          | S44     | Email           | 17 All our access tracks are used 365 days a year and we need flexibility to use these tracks – easement contractors cannot simply adopt their use.  | 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 accesses, and 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_0043_022_211123          | S44     | Email           | 22 Our farm is based on REDACTED which will be crossed by the project. This derestricted lane is dangerous at the best of times and is inevitably going to become subject to large amount of construction traffic when it is already overloaded. There are additionally diversified local business on the Lane including our aunt's florist with approximately 10 staff. The additional traffic and disruption pose a risk to this business with potential job losses for her local based staff.   | Impacts and effects in relation to traffic and highways are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7).  |
| TA_0044_003_211123          | S44     | Email           | Our rural road network, many over moss land are already suffering without allowing access to over 500 lorries to manage this project   | 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_0044_005_211123          | S44     | Email           | 4. We think that we will have severe access problems, crossing the cable route, with cattle and machinery and uneconomical bits of field5. Rural roads damaged, Pegs lane is single track with passing places, with ditches on both sides, and they want to put a compound there, with large and heavy vehicles  | 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)..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. As part of these discussions it is the Applicants intentions to agree accommodation works the minimise the impact of farming activities. Working practices will be captured in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) |
| TA_0045_004_211123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Increase in traffic especially industrial traffic such as lorries and wagons.  | The impacts and effects of the Transmission Assets in terms of traffic and transport are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7).   |
| TA_0117_002_271023          | S44     | Email           | Eker Lane is a small track that serves the farmers, horses as a bridleway and is the only peaceful walk on the north side of the A584. It is regularly used by the aforementioned and option B of the Morecambe substation would destroy the little Countryside we can walk in. Also, from a planning point of view, the highway along Lower Lane is extremely narrow and could not handle the extra HGVs et cetera alongside the present flow of vehicles. Eker Lane is unadopted.  | 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).   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
| TA_0118_009_171123          | S44     | Email           | 11) How safe will our already poorly maintained crumbling roads be with huge cables being burrowed underneath them and heavy vehicles driving over them?  | 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).<br>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_0124_005_171123          | S44     | Email           | 5.The noise 24/7 will be unbearable. This is a quiet village with just the gentle hum of traffic. The planned substation will create horrendous noise.6.The building work will create huge disruption constantly and we dont know how long for.   | 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).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_0125_008_181123          | S44     | Email           | 12.How safe will our already poorly maintained crumbling roads be with huge cables being burrowed underneath them and heavy vehicles driving over them?   | 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).<br>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_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 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 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_0130_004_191123          | S44     | Email           | Not to mention the impact and disruption to roads and traffic, something else that was a nightmare this year when Blackpool Council made road alterations to the leisure village entrance at the top of Division Lane. Note Queensway is 1 of only 2 entrances to St Annes from Blackpool. This impact disrupted Blackpool and St Annes residents daily for months and not just those of living locally. It also impacted business in the area, some lost a significant amount of trade and need closed down!   | 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).  |
| 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  | 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | suffering for residents within the Fylde coast for years to come via flooding and disruption i.e. traffic.   | 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_0131_001_191123          | S44     | Email           | I write to reject your proposal for the offshore windfarm at Morecambe. The reasons are as follows, and are mainly based on the cable route: 1) Impact on the land and local farms. 2) The endless disruption on roads and transport in the area of Squires Gate Lane / Clifton Drive North / Queensway which has had constant road works and delays in recent times. I am not prepared to put up with having 1 of only 2 available routes to my house with a long term traffic issue. It is absolutely unbearable. The queues are horrific.   | 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). 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).   |
| 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted 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_0132_001_191123          | S44     | Email           | I wish to register my utter disagreement with the planned wind farm, very close to my property.I believe I am the longest standing resident on REDACTED, having moved to this bungalow in September 1972, fifty one years ago.Many changes, not all for the better, have been made since then, but the thought of the absolute desecration of this rural area that this plan would bring, is devastating.The noise, disruption of traffic (already dreadful in this location), the years it will take to complete, is beyond comprehension.This country area was beautiful and has been encroached upon enough, in recent years.It also has huge drainage problems; properties and dykes are regularly waterlogged, through both Fylde (my council) and Blackpool Council inactivity. Inevitably the situation would be exacerbated should this project go ahead.Kindly register my complete disapproval. | 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).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_0133_002_191123          | S44     | Email           | (iii) The Compound would increase the danger of an already dangerous Road Junction The junction between Bryning Lane and Bryning Hall Lane is already a dangerous road junctionAdditional link roads to the Compound and the additional traffic to and from the Compound would only increase the danger   | 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).  |
| 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  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted 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_0135_002_191123          | S44     | Email           | <p>The proposed route will have a severe impact on the local communities with transport disruption, impact on businesses and the well-being of the local residents.</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) 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). 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_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_0136_002_201123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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 bearable, nor acceptable for a long period of time. There are better routes and options surely.</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) 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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | 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_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 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. <a href="https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Fylde-Biodiversity-SPD-Adopted-11-September-2019-FINAL.pdf">https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Fylde-Biodiversity-SPD-Adopted-11-September-2019-FINAL.pdf</a> <a href="http://www.stannesonthesea-tc.gov.uk/documents/(12)%20150612-St.%20Anne%27s%20NDP%20Main%20Document%20Pre%20Submission%20Final.1.pdf">http://www.stannesonthesea-tc.gov.uk/documents/(12)%20150612-St.%20Anne%27s%20NDP%20Main%20Document%20Pre%20Submission%20Final.1.pdf</a> <a href="https://www.birdguides.com/sites/europe/britain-ireland/britain/england/lancashire/lytham-moss/">https://www.birdguides.com/sites/europe/britain-ireland/britain/england/lancashire/lytham-moss/</a> <a href="https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/EL6.020b-vi-Matter-6-Appendix-CA4-part-1-Oyston-Estates-050-.pdf">https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/EL6.020b-vi-Matter-6-Appendix-CA4-part-1-Oyston-Estates-050-.pdf</a> We as residents look forward to your response in writing to these questions and look forward to your site visit. | 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). |
| TA_0139_003_201123          | S44     | Email           | 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?   | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_0139_004_201123          | S44     | Email           | 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   | 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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 <a href="https://blackpoolez.com">https://blackpoolez.com</a>), 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 (<a href="https://pa.fylde.gov.uk/Planning/Display/23/0758">https://pa.fylde.gov.uk/Planning/Display/23/0758</a>).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>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_002_201123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Our infrastructure will not support prolonged road closures or works of this magnitude.A construction period of several years was stated and as St Anne's only has two roads in/out it would cause traffic chaos.</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) 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_0143_001_201123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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</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</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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.</p>  | <p>(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_0144_001_201123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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 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). 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_0146_001_201123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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_0147_001_201123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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 hazard- Traffic congestion in the areas surrounding the potential siteI am sure there</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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | must be other places this substation could be built within Fylde that would have considerably less impact on people's livelihoods.   | 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_0150_009_201123          | 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 control construction impacts on the environment and the local community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1). |
| 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_0153_001_201123          | S44     | Email           | I am emailing to strongly object to the proposed substation to be placed on the outskirts of Freckleton.This will cause significant road and rail disruption within the Fylde area, seriously affecting peoples lives and ability to get to work for a long period. It will also take the livelihood of a number of farmers and severally effect the economy of the Fylde.   | 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).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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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.  |
| 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 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.   | 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_006_211123          | S44     | Email           | Construction traffic / and running the facilities traffic. There are no temporary or permanent roads shown, and looking at the proposed sites can only be opposite Carr Hill High School (option 1), near Strike Lane primary school (option 2) or in both cases close to Lower Lane residential areas which both create problems.   | 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). 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_0161_015_211123          | S44     | Email           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•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.</li> <li>•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.</li> <li>•Removal of our hedgerows and construction in our fields totally destroys our traditional landscape character.</li> </ul> | 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. |
| TA_0161_016_211123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Mitigation •No information has been made available relating to how the project will mitigate :-the construction activity; the visual impact of the substations; the noise and vibration levels both post and during construction; light pollution from the sites; electro-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 etc Who 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. Conclusion I object to the proposals which have</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).   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | been presented (not consulted) for the Morecambe and Morgan Wind Farm Transmission Assets. I hope that you will take my comments into account.   |  |
| TA_0162_001_211123          | S44     | Email           | 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.  | 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. 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_0165_006_211123          | S44     | Email           | In addition, I would like to draw attention to the disruption that will occur during the creation of a channel for cables running from St Annes to the proposed transformer location. This construction activity is likely to cause inconvenience and disturbances to the daily lives of the residents. It is essential that the developers provide detailed information on how they plan to minimise the impact of this channel construction on the community.  | 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_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_0168_003_171123          | S44     | Email           | 3) Disruption on roads on St Annes   | 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_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   | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, 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.</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:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (<a href="http://www.gov.uk">www.gov.uk</a>) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>  |
| TA_0183_003_221123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Furthermore, roads will face disruption while the work goes ahead. Both Lytham and Blackpool rely on tourism for their economies, with events such as Lytham Festival proving a huge draw for tourists and those from further afield. With roads in chaos, tourism to local towns will fall, and staff who work at local employers, such as REDACTED, will face major disruptions getting to work.</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) 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). 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>  |
| TA_0183_005_221123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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). 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).</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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_0184_001_221123          | S44     | Email           | We totally object to the proposed landfall area for this scheme. We totally object to the disruption this work will cause. The ground that the coastal dunes housing is built on will be badly affected as this land is not stable. Dunes are not stable. We believe this scheme puts the fabric of our house in danger. The area of coastal dunes housing does not have suitable roads for heavy plant either in structure or capacity. | 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). 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: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions (document reference F3.1) of the ES. 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_0185_003_221123          | S44     | Email           | In addition to the extremely poor communications, I also site these objections / observations:• The access roads and easements have not been declared and therefore the full extent of the land impact is not fully declared.• Parcels of land that will remain based on the information provided so far, will not be accessible for farming.  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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 including any severance and injurious affection.   |
| TA_0186_004_221123          | S44     | Email           | Access roads for the construction site both permanent and temporary road access and the easement, have not been declared and therefore we do not know the full impact but on the little information that has been shared that is sufficient to say we will not have a economically viable business.  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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 continue discussions  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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.   |
| TA_0188_004_221123          | S44     | Email           | Access to the site and dangerous traffic operations I am particularly concerned about the access which will be required to the sites, as these routes are not detailed in the plans as yet, and so I expect that additional land will need to be taken from us for the construction of access roads. Our farm is down a single-track road, which is also a busy public footpath and bridleway. It is absolutely unacceptable that this lane can even be considered for access to the sites as it simply is not suitable for large construction vehicles and increased traffic. There are young children living here and the thought that we could have an increased volume of traffic coming through our yard is very worrying from a safety perspective. The yard is also a working farmyard and any additional traffic will affect farming operations and disrupt the running of our business. REDACTED is a small country road which is already in a very poor state of repair and regularly floods. If this is used to access the sites this will cause further damage and increased traffic which is dangerous and inconvenient. | 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_0189_004_221123          | S44     | Email           | 3. REDACTED is a small country lane which is not suitable for a lot of heavy traffic.   | 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 proposed works would not restrict access and measures to control impacts are set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8). |
| TA_0189_011_221123          | S44     | Email           | 8. We are very concerned that developers may try to use the farm lane for their access to the site. That would be completely unacceptable for health and safety reasons as there are often small children and livestock in the yard. The lane is too narrow and not passable for large vehicles.  | 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_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_003_221123          | S44     | Email           | The drawings also indicate an access off [REDACTED] which is immediately adjacent to the farm buildings therefore it creates a highways and security risk to the farm buildings which are agricultural and semi-commercial which is occupied by REDACTED for her well established flower business. This access is incidental and not required and any access that is needed can easily be obtained from REDACTED when the cable crosses.  | Operational accesses have where possible utilised existing access routes and tracks to limited the impact on a holding. 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. 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
| 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>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).</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_0197_008_221123          | 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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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_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 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_009_221123          | S44     | Email           | More transparency regarding access points to construction sites   | 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).  |
| TA_0201_004_221123          | S44     | Email           | 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  | The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. 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).   |
| TA_0202_006_221123          | S44     | Email           | Transport and Road Use The roads in this area are Moss Roads and have not been maintained by Lancs County Council. It looks kike from the map we have 3 potential compounds. The road infrastructure from Lytham, A583 Peel or from Wrea Green  | 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   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>are not fit for purpose. Peel Road was shut from 25/09/2023 for a month and all the HGV's had to transport their cargo along Ballam Road. HGVs could not pass each other which has left the road verges crumbling more so than before. The road is so uneven that even a car cannot drive more than 15-20 MPH. The camber of the road throws you onto oncoming traffic and to be honest it is only time before there is a bad accident or a fatality. There are 4-foot drops from the edge of the road and during the first week of the road closure we had 4 wagons come off the road and into the hedge/field. The whole area is a disaster waiting to happen. Are you going to make the road system right and resurface and stabilise all roads and accesses to be of benefit to the residents of the Fylde?</p> | <p>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_0203_009_231123          | 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_0204_009_231123          | 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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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_0208_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | 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.   | 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. |
| TA_0211_002_231123          | S44     | Email           | 7 I believe that this project is anticipated to be implemented without road closures. I assume the planners are unaware of the fact that REDACTED has become a busy derestricted 'rat run', It is difficult enough to cross our dairy herd twice a day amongst the current traffic, I would imagine that increased construction traffic will add further chaos to this busy country Lane. I hope the project organisers are aware that our dairy contract stipulates that access to our farmyard for the daily collection of milk is to be maintained 24/7 365. Timing of collection is at variable hours with different drivers.   | 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_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_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 | 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                       |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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>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 offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted 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_002_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>2, Rural Roads These will be severely affected by construction, many already suffering subsidence from heavy traffic, over 500 more lorries passing through local villages , past primary schools, churches, holiday parks and open recreational spaces. Haul roads with in the project boundary! how many thousands of tons will be need to be brought in to construct this, and then taken away again before the land can be returned to agricultural production.?how many locals will suffer delays at peak traffic times, trying to get to work, local shops, schools and amenities.?</p>  | <p>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. 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</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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_004_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Questions 3.7</p> <p>The potential impact of the scheme on the road network surrounding our clients' property is not clear or yet defined. As such, they have significant concerns regarding this, and the potential impact on their farming businesses.</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 including any severance and injurious affection. The issues matters in feedback will be included within those negotiations and discussions to progress the land agreements.</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_0222_018_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Question 3.7 Our clients have significant concerns regarding the impact of the Morecambe &amp; 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 &amp; Morgan to date.</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. 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_0230_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> <p>It is wholly unacceptable to consider the Morgan substation site in this location given it's close proximity to my client's family home and other dwelling houses at [REDACTED].</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The 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>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.</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>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>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.</p> |
| TA_0230_019_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>The 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>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. 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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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).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_0232_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | I am totally opposed to the plans, there are no details of any buildings to be on site, and no shown access roads therefore I cannot make 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_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | REDACTED My client owns two dwelling houses next to each other together with circa 35 acres of land at REDACTED which is immediately north of REDACTED where the proposed Morgan substation is proposed and due east is the proposed Morecambe substation Option 1 site. My client's properties will be significantly affected by the proposed schemes both during construction and the permanent substation sites thereafter. The substation sites are far too close to dwelling houses with health, visual and noise in mind. The 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 Morgan substation would be 400m from REDACTED, approx. 140m to REDACTED, 120m from REDACTED, similar distance to dwellings at the end of REDACTED track and approx. 100m from a housing estate immediately on the west side of REDACTED. It is wholly unacceptable to consider the Morgan substation site in this location given its close proximity to dwelling houses. | 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). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_0235_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | This consultation feedback is made on behalf of REDACTED who own freehold land at REDACTED as owner occupier. My client's properties will be significantly affected by the proposed schemes both during construction and the permanent substation sites thereafter. The substation sites are far too close to dwelling houses with health, visual and noise in mind. The 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.   | 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | 2 of the ES (document reference F4.2).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. 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_0236_004_231123          | S44     | Email           | I believe that the rural road network will be massively affected by this project with it crossing the path of every single road accessing the area of lytham, st Anne's and watron. The roads are not suitable for such heavy construction vehicles for pass each other safely.  | 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).  |
| TA_0237_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | 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.   | 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). |
| TA_0239_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | 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 | 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.  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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>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_0243_010_231123          | 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_0244_010_231123          | 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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>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_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> |
| 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</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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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>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_002_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>REDACTED is a main through route to St Annes, it is in the middle of a residential area which has in the past been subject to subsidence. Even considering putting cables under this road is completely unacceptable and would cause major inconvenience and problems for residents who have no off road parking and have already endured their fill of road closures in the area adding additional hours to travel out of St Annes.</p>   | <p>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).</p>   |
| TA_0249_002_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>REDACTED is a main through route to St Annes, it is in the middle of a residential area which has in the past been subject to subsidence. Even considering putting cables under this road is completely unacceptable and would cause major inconvenience and problems for residents who have no off road parking and have already endured their fill of road closures in the area adding additional hours to travel out of St Annes.</p>   | <p>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).</p>   |



## E1.16.23 Noise and vibration table of responses

## E1.16.23.1 Noise and vibration table of responses (via feedback form)

**Table E1.16.23.1: Noise and Vibration 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 (3.8; Noise and vibration) 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_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_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_0051_008_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form   | 3                      | 3.8                          | See 3. above<br><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_0052_001_131123          | S44     | Hardcopy feedback form | 1                      |                              | 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?<br>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   | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p>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 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_0053_008_171123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | Great concerns due to proximity  | <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).</p> <p>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_0056_020_141123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | <p>As previously stated</p> <p><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.</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 Statement of Community Consultation).</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>What are their noise levels?</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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | 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>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_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_0060_014_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 6                      |                              | Many vehicles in such a small space pollution from vehicles exhaust and dripping oil from their engines will cause massive damage to the area.                                  | <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_251_003_231123           | S44     | Consult Online       | NULL                   |                              | What impact will the cabling have on the beach between the sea and the sand dunes. This area again I imagine will be used as as a jointing pit area. How will this be serviced? | <p>Cables will be installed in the intertidal area, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). These works would be temporary.</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 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 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.</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>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  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
| TA_0062_004_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | We have grave concerns about noise generated from construction and when going into service.   | 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).<br>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_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).<br>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.<br>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.<br>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_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) 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).<br>Further details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7),  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method         | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants’ response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                         |                        |                              |   | with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8).  |
| TA_0066_007_171023          | S44     | Online feedback form    | 3                      | 3.8                          | Local residents should be compensated for the effect of dust and noise. Perhaps this could be in the form of discounted energy bills.   | 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).<br>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).<br>An assessment of dust generated during the construction phase has been undertaken in the Environmental Statement (ES) and mitigation measures recommended to ensure the effects are not significant (Volume 3, Chapter 9 of the ES, document reference F3.9). The mitigation measures have been included in the dust management plan (document reference J25). |
| 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 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 | 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).<br>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_0068_005_231123          | S44     | Hard copy feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | Will this have an impact on the foundations of the houses? What checks will you put in place to reassure residents that their properties will be safe from damage? Dust and grit getting into people’s houses.  | The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.<br>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.<br>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_0073_003_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form    | 3                      | 3.8                          | The vibration is a concern as is noise should it be close to the rear of our properties along REDACTED  | The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. 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.<br>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.   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
| TA_0074_009_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | Totally unacceptable in this area where ground is so unstable I recently had to have deep piling for a small extension  | 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_0075_005_071123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | Noise and vibration is a concern. I hope you'll be able to allay these concerns.  | 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_0075_007_071123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 8                      |                              | How much noise will be created by the onshore substations?  | 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). 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. 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. 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). An operational noise limit will be secured as a requirement of the DCO resulting in significant adverse effects being avoided and adverse impacts minimised at all times. |
| 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.<br><br>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_0080_001_201123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | Concern about noise from the wind farm should the distance to the shore be too close.<br><br>Concern about contamination of bathing water during the development of | In regards to noise, 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. Increased suspended sediment concentrations and associated   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | the project . This is an area of tourism with swimming, windsurfing and families enjoying the beach .  | deposition affecting recreational diving sites and designated bathing water site is assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 9: Other sea users of the ES (document reference F2.9). This assessment concludes a negligible significance.<br>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 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_0082_003_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | My home is within 50 meters of Queensway. I have concerns about noise during the cable laying phase in addition to vibration and possible damage to my property.   | 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.<br>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_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. Please do all you can to run these cables directly out of the airport and into the countryside. | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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).<br>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 |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants’ response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | 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_014_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | I do not agree to planning permission  | The Applicants note your response.  |
| 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_0085_001_191123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      |                              | <p>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:</p> <p>Concerns about the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The impact of the wide corridor immediately next to our properties, but also will it go under our land?<br/>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!</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>4) Vermin - we know from other local digging, drilling that this has driven vermin into our homes!</li> <li>5) Noise from the amount of electricity being transmitted right by our homes.</li> <li>6) Impact on the local wildlife in the area</li> <li>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</li> <li>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 specific 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.</li> <li>9) What access will be required to land involving access down REDACTED - this question has not been adequately answered at consultation meetings.</li> <li>10) Disruptive lighting at the bottom of our gardens/land during works</li> <li>11) Major concerns re traffic disruption to the local area during construction as follows:<br/>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</li> </ol> | <p>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.</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | 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.<br>11.2 - Traffic and works disruption impact to neighbouring roads in St Annes using these routes to join up with land by REDACTED  |   |
| TA_0085_007_191123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | 1) 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 specific 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.<br><br>2) I also have concerns about vibration - other local drilling could be felt in our homes and caused cracks in the walls and impact to foundations<br><br>3) When the work is complete noise and vibrations from the amount of electricity being transmitted right by our homes.   | The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. 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.<br>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_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.<br>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<br>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. 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.<br>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<br>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.<br>We don't want any interruption to farmlands either, we need them.<br>So I strongly object to these proposals | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| 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"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- It feels like someone has just looked at a map and decided these are the easiest places, with little other consideration.</li> <li>- Your website is hard to navigate and does not provide large scale detailed maps. It is difficult to determine exact proposed areas.</li> <li>- There has been little consideration of potential flood risks and lack of information to local residents about how this would be managed.</li> <li>- There is no information about why any Fylde or Blackpool Council enterprise zones or brown field sites have not been considered.</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- There is no information about how any access to the sites would be obtained, and no assessment about impact on local traffic and roads.</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- This is an area of quite countryside and would involve significant loss of a local amenity and change to the local environment.</li> <li>- Potential loss of value to local property.</li> <li>- Two large sub stations are proposed quite near to each other, making a significant impact on the local amenity.</li> <li>- 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</li> <li>- I have attended public consultation meetings which have been poorly presented with representatives being poorly prepared and unable to answer most questions</li> </ul> | <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). Detailed assessments are 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_0088_001_301023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | <p>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.</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).</p> <p>These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the Outline Code of</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | 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_0092_025_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | As previous comment - need to understand noise and vibration levels in relation to teaching provision and impact at the COLlege (based near landfall area)   | 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.<br><br>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_0093_004_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | I work from home on the seafront in a computer-based role. I can hear every car that goes past. I would be unable to work effectively and join in Teams calls if the main road had large scale development work being carried out for weeks or even months. My nearest office is 2 hours drive away, that is not viable for commuting instead of working from home.  | 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_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 REDACTED 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 REDACTED 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 | 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).<br><br>Detailed assessments are 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | choose an alternative. Whilst you say the Lytham St Annes Zone has 'less coastal residential density' you will still have 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.  | Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).  |
| TA_0093_007_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 12                     |                              | When the Cuadrilla fracking was in operation (before protestors successfully lobbied for work to be ceased) we felt small earth tremors in our houses even though we are a few miles away. Any activity involving major drilling under our houses will be met with huge opposition unless you can guarantee there will be no noise pollution or vibration and no damage to houses which already shake when lorries drive past.                                       | <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 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.</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).</p> <p>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_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_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   | <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).</p> <p>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> <p>The typical maximum depth of cable installation using trenching methodology is approximately 1.8m. Trenchless, drilling</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | 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_0170_004_151023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | <p>As already advised<br/><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. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)<br/>Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p> |
| TA_0096_001_131123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | <p>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</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). Visualisations have been presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants’ response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | <p>Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 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>  |
| TA_0096_002_131123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      |                              | <p>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</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). 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).</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> |

| 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_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 and experience as residents situated closest to the monstrous constructions being proposed | <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). 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).</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_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 | <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). Visualisations have been presented as part of the landscape and visual assessment within</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | <p>Volume 3, Figure 10.5 (Parts 1-5) (document reference F3.12, Part 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>  |
| TA_0096_005_131123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 9                      |                              | <p>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</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). 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).</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> |

| 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_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"> <li>- Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2).</li> <li>- Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3).</li> <li>- Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4).</li> <li>- Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5).</li> </ul> <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_008_171123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | <p>This is very worrying and can cause so many ill effects on humans I don't want this in close proximity.</p> <p>Wind turbine syndrome<br/>Shadow flicker<br/>Sleep disbursements<br/>Infrared</p> <p>These need to be built far away not to impact on people's lives and depreciation of the value of our lives and house prices</p>  | <p>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.</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:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)<br/>Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>   |
| TA_0097_009_171123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      |                              | I do not want this project to go a head. I do not want electromagnetic radiation on my door step or construction or ill effects caused by all this will bring I want peace and quiet this is why I moved to this area   | <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.</p> <p>See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4).</p> |
| TA_0098_004_081123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.3                          | It will obviously all be disturbed by the noise and the disturbance of the area they inhabit.   | 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 Transmission Assets Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference: J11), Marine Enhancement Statement (document reference: J12)   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | 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_0098_009_081123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | This is just going to be horrendous .  | <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>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. 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. 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). An operational noise limit will be secured as a requirement of the DCO resulting in significant adverse effects being avoided and adverse impacts minimised at all times.</p>  |
| TA_0098_016_081123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 8                      |                              | <p>This area is vast and situated between Kirkham, Newton and Freckleton, and far too close to all three.</p> <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>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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 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_0100_004_241023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | <p>As above<br/>(Not in residential areas when there are other options but are costlier<br/>Too much traffic and noise already here)</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</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants’ response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | (document reference J3).<br>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).<br>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_0101_005_121123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | This will have a huge impact on myself and husband as we work shifts so will be kept awake with drilling etc.<br><br>Vibration could be detrimental to our house.   | 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).<br>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_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.<br>the noise would also impact the horses as they have much more sensitive hearing than us.<br>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.<br>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.<br>i cant imagine losing any land to pipes etc, the land we are on is marshy 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.<br>i could not more strongly oppose the development | This consultee is not 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).<br>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_004_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      |                              | 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.<br>the noise would also impact the horses as they have much more sensitive hearing than us.<br>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.<br>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.  | 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).<br>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.  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants’ response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p>i cant imagine losing any land to pipes etc, the land we are on is marshy 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> |  |
| TA_0102_009_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | <p>big concern about this aspect, it would make spending time at the stables unpleasant and could make the horses restless and dangerous to handle if they are spooked by it,</p> <p>not to mention long term health implications</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).</p> <p>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> <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).</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 REDACTED 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_0106_010_281023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | <p>Clearly building a 70 metres wide trench up to 25 km is length next to residential property will create unacceptable noise and vibration.</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>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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | (document reference F3.8.3).<br>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_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).<br>Detailed assessments are 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).<br>Detailed assessments are 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_0110_002_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | What are the protection measures for Human Health relating to the extensive onshore cabling and substations. The PEIR seems to conclude that no mitigation is required and does not specify how exposures to EMFs will be assured to be within regulations.<br><br>In particular, burying underground cables does not, per se, limit magnetic fields into the surface environments. The Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report of October 2022. In Part 2: Transmission Assets, section 10.2.1 provides only a short description of the positioning with regards to Human Health and, regarding the onshore transmission cables, paragraph 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". This might be considered misleading as it only refers to the electric field and is silent on the magnetic fields. | 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_0110_003_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | See above. Magnetic fields (sic) above and around the cables are threat to Human Health.<br><i>("What are the protection measures for Human Health relating to the extensive onshore cabling and substations. The PEIR seems to conclude that no mitigation is required and does not specify how exposures to</i>  | 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.  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method        | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                        |                        |                              | <p><i>EMFs will be assured to be within regulations.</i></p> <p><i>In particular, burying underground cables does not, per se, limit magnetic fields into the surface environments. The Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report of October 2022. In Part 2: Transmission Assets, section 10.2.1 provides only a short description of the positioning with regards to Human Health and, regarding the onshore transmission cables, paragraph 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". This might be considered misleading as it only refers to the electric field and is silent on the magnetic fields."</i></p> | 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_0111_009_131123          | S44     | Hardcopy feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | The noise and vibrations will be greatly increased for those of us living in the area of the Nature Reserve and along the Railway line at the back of REDACTED.   | 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_0112_006_231123          | S44     | Online feedback form   | 3                      | 3.8                          | See above, I am concerned about the level of noise/vibration especially with a disabled person at home. Working from home means any action also impacts on residents jobs. Houses in this area are old and may suffer disproportionately due to their age.  | 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_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> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants’ response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | 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_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).</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> <p>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_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. 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</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).<br><br>Detailed assessments are 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_0115_004_051123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | Please see my general feedback. We have had to live with construction noise and vibrations for the last 6 years, with bulldozers working at unsociable hours, mess and general noise so I do not want to have to go through it all again whilst the cables are laid right outside my house. | 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).<br>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).<br><br>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). |



## E1.16.23.2 Noise and vibration table of responses (via all other methods)

**Table E1.16.23.2: Noise and vibration table of responses (via all other methods)**

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
| TA_0001_246_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.31 1.11.3.127<br>Natural England do not agree with the conclusion of no adverse impacts for the Ribble & Alt Estuaries. Whilst assessment has discussed loss of habitat, and recorded bird distance from habitat it has not assessed noise and visual impacts, these impact pathways can have impacts on species that are not in immediate area but are present in the surrounding areas. No detailed information, such as predicted noise levels, has been provided so at this stage adverse impacts cannot be ruled out<br>See above.  | 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).<br><br>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_247_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.32 1.11.3.146 See comments above. It is a similar issue with noise and visual impacts not being fully considered for Morecambe Bay and Duddon Estuaries SPA. This should include assessment for qualifying species utilising area outside and surrounding the corridor such as Golden Plover. For example, section 1.11.3.134 states there will be no impacts from presence of people/machinery on lapwing as the closest significant number was recorded 100m away from proposed corridor. Natural England would advise these still have the potential to be impacted through noise and visual disturbance. Natural England consider any FLL within 200m to be potentially impacted and therefore further evidence is required to demonstrate if certain bird features will be impacted or not. | 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_248_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.33 1.11.3.149<br>See comments above – same advice applies to Morecambe Bay Ramsar as it does for Morecambe Bay and Duddon Estuaries<br>See above.  | 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).<br><br>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_0002_013_171123          | S42     | Email           | No information has been provided regarding the possible acoustic issues that can surround substation equipment, which may produce a low frequency 50hz background hum which can be extremely annoying. This specific concern relates to those substations close to the residential areas, especially those close to Kirkham Rd. What information is available suggests that a noise level in excess of 35dB above ambient is to be expected. This is intolerable to anyone living close to the development and experience suggests that in some weather conditions the noise footprint would be far wider than predicted.  | 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. 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. Acoustic character corrections have been applied to the predicted levels at receptors where the tonal components are deemed to be perceptible by the standards of BS 4142:2014+A1:2019. 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).  |
| 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). |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
| TA_0003_013_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Noise Impact The Council remains concerned that the impact of noise on local communities both during the construction phase and the long-term operation of the sub stations in particular. As the construction will largely take place in, and the substations will be located in, rural areas where the background noise levels are relatively low, there is clearly a greater potential for noise disturbance emanating from the development. It is essential that any impact of noise disturbance has regard to the impact on residential amenity rather than using higher WHO thresholds that are based on potential impact on Human Health. As details of the technology that will be utilised in the substations are clarified, the council would wish to be involved in further discussions in regard to potential noise impacts.                           | The assessment of noise impacts during the operational phase of the Transmission Assets is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3). This assessment has been undertaken using the night-time background sound levels at the most-exposed receptors to operational noise which is a more robust assessment than one undertaken on the basis of WHO thresholds.  |
| TA_0005_005_231123          | S42     | Email           | 3. The developer's documentation has currently failed to evidence that they have given weight to, or mitigation of the adverse impacts on the local: residents, communities, economies and environments on :- i. amenity (disruption & destruction of the rural character of the area, disruption due to construction & traffic), ii. health & well-being (including emissions giving rise to: respiratory impacts- in construction & restoration; aural impacts- throughout the 6 decade programme life cycle from activity, plant and equipments; and potentially, electro-magnetic impacts - in operation throughout the life of the programme.iii. highway safety (through inadequate specification & control of traffic. Plus proposed use of narrow rural lanes, also used for residential & leisure access with consequential severe impacts on all users). | Once operational, the substations will not have any emissions to air. 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. 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.Noise and vibration impacts during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Transmission Assets are presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.2: Construction noise and Vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.2). This assessment includes an assessment of construction traffic noise, as well as an assessment of the noise and vibration impacts during each phase of construction required for the Transmission Assets. Impacts in relation to traffic and transport are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7). |
| TA_0005_009_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7. There appears to be a failure to detail any meaningful mitigations of harmful impacts e.g. i. Converter station 24x7 humming noise at a volume that would require ear protectors in a workplace. In a low lying, flat area with only low clipped hedges, the industrial noise will be noticeable and will travel, no mitigations mentioned. Noise pollution in particular is known to be harmful to health and well-being, it can create physical and psychological stress, cause high blood pressure, headaches etc.   | 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. 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. Acoustic character corrections have been applied to the predicted levels at receptors where the tonal components are deemed to be perceptible by the standards of BS 4142:2014+A1:2019. 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).   |
| TA_0017_001_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | The proposal has the potential to cause significant disruption to residents throughout its construction phase, and it is imperative that this is minimised through the design and phasing of works, and mitigated through adequate controls on working practices to control noise and vibration. In particular any roadworks are likely to have significant knock on effects to the wider network resulting in congestion; this is especially the case in the area around Blackpool Airport. When laying the onshore cable, any road crossing should be undertaken with directional drilling unless the road is demonstrated to only carry minor volumes of traffic and that traffic can be easily diverted via alternative routes.  | An assessment of noise and vibration impacts during the construction phase of the Transmission Assets is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Construction noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.3) and section 8.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8). Details of controls and measures proposed are set out in section 8.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8). This includes control of working hours through the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP). An Outline CoCP is provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1). In addition, an   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | Outline Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan has been prepared (document reference J1.3).   |
| TA_0017_014_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Surveys Survey data submitted with the planning application should be current/up-to-date, in line with recognised guidelines (as summarised above). The survey area should include: • The intended location of the development footprint;• Potential working areas, compounds, storage areas and access routes;• Any land that may be used within the mitigation, compensation or biodiversity net gain proposals (on or off-site);• A suitable buffer distance, taking account of the likely zone of influence and relevant survey guidelines.  | The survey area is the area used for site-specific surveys and is generally defined as a 150 m buffer around the Onshore Order Limits. The 150 m buffer was included to take account of protected species that may occur adjacent or close to the Transmission Assets and to allow for evolution of the boundary during the site selection process. A separate survey area was used for GCN surveys. The GCN survey area is defined as a 250 m buffer around the Onshore Order Limits. Volume 3, Annex 3.8: Great crested newt survey and reptile survey technical report of the ES (document reference F3.3.8) provides further details regarding the GCN survey area. Owing to the iterative design process of the Transmission Assets, some surveys were undertaken further than 150 m from the Onshore Order Limits. Nevertheless, information from these surveys have been included in technical annexes because it provides context regarding the ecological sensitivity of the wider area. |
| 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_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_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_0019_027_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Electromagnetic radiation, light pollution, noise, and vibration levels for residents generated by the substations should be specified and set at best practice levels. The maximum levels for those residential receptors in close proximity to the substations should be specified with appropriate monitoring and enforcement in place to ensure these levels are not breached. These levels should be identified both during construction and once construction is completed.  | A baseline sound survey has been undertaken to quantify the baseline sound environment at locations representative of the nearest and most exposed noise sensitive receptors. The survey data has been used to derive representative daytime and night-time background sound levels at these receptors against which the assessment of operational noise impacts has been undertaken. Details are provided in Volume 3, Annex 8.1: Baseline sound survey of the ES and section 8.6.2 of this Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8).The assessment of operational noise impacts is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3). 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. An operational noise limit will            |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | be secured as a requirement of the DCO resulting in significant adverse effects being avoided and adverse effects minimised at all times. 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_0035_077_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | CoT33 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. The CoCP will include best practice measures in relation to air quality that will be applied where human receptors reside within 350 m of works, where required, or where sensitive ecological receptors are present within 50 m, as described in Institute of Air Quality guidance Management (IAQM,2014) as appropriate. Issue Measures required to manage dust and air quality have yet to be fully addressed. Impact Risk to sensitive ecological receptors from poor air quality. Solution Outline Dust Management Plan setting out dust and air quality control measures to be appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission.   | An Outline Dust Management Plan is provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1.2).   |
| TA_0035_078_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | CoT35, 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. The CoCP will include measures to maintain and address:- 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. Issue Measures required to manage environmental risks have yet to be fully addressed. Impact Risk to the environment Solution Outline versions of various Plans to manage environmental risks to be appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission. See also CoT04 - Onshore pollution prevention plan CoT09 - Drainage Management Plan CoT11 - Operational Onshore Substation Drainage Management plan CoT20 - Construction Fencing Plan CoT26 - Site Waste Management Plan CoT30 - Contaminated Land and Groundwater Discovery Strategy CoT33 - Air Quality CoT73 - Biosecurity Protocol CoT76 - Outline Ecological Management Plan CoT77 - Bentonite Breakout Plan CoT78 - Biosecurity Protocol CoT81 - Soil Management Plan CoT86 - Measures to protect minor watercourses | See the Outline CoCP (document reference J1) and the following plans submitted as part of the application for development consent:•Outline Communications Plan (document reference J1.1)•Outline Dust Management Plan (document reference J1.2)•Outline Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (document reference J1.3)•Outline Pollution Prevention Plan (document reference J1.4)•Outline Public Rights of Way (PRoW) Management Plan (document reference J1.5)•Outline Site Waste Management Plan (document reference J1.6)•Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7)•Outline Spillage and Emergency Response Plan (document reference J1.8)•Outline Surface Water and Groundwater Management Plan (document reference J1.9)•Outline Construction Fencing Plan (document reference J1.10)•Outline Construction Artificial Light Emissions Management Plan (document reference J1.11)•Outline Biosecurity Protocol (document reference J1.12)•Outline Bentonite Breakout Plan (document reference J1.13)•Outline Contaminated Land and Groundwater Discovery Strategy (document reference J1.14)  |
| TA_0038_008_181123          | S44     | Email           | 8. Working hours weekdays 7am - 6pm and Saturday 7am – 1pm with an hour at either side for vehicles to arrive or depart. Residents surrounding the developments on Acorn Avenue and Woodlands Close and the access routes to them experienced great disruption with the noise and queuing of vehicles from outside the specified timeframes. Where will the vehicles queue outside the specified time-fames and how will the noise (particularly when they manoeuvre and reverse) be monitored? These hours should be shortened significantly in both the morning and evening.   | 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). Working hours would be controlled through a requirement of the development consent order.   |
| TA_0038_027_181123          | S44     | Email           | 5. There is no identification of permissible noise, light, vibration or EMR emission upper limits from the substations. The approach to visual and noise mitigation not defined.   | A baseline sound survey has been undertaken to quantify the baseline sound environment at locations representative of the nearest and most exposed noise sensitive receptors. The survey data has been used to derive representative daytime and night-time background sound levels at these receptors against which the assessment of operational noise impacts has been undertaken. Details are provided in Volume 3, Annex 8.1: Baseline   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>sound survey of the ES and section 8.6.2 of this Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8).The assessment of operational noise impacts is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3). 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.An operational noise limit will be secured as a requirement of the DCO resulting in significant adverse effects being avoided and adverse effects minimised at all times.The Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3) sets out details of the substation design, including lighting.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_0038_028_181123          | S44     | Email           | <p>6. There appeared to be no answers to the following questions raised: how much noise does each substation produce? Is the noise production 24/7? What will be the noise and vibration levels for residents generated by the substations? What would the maximum levels be for residential receptors closest to the substations? What mitigation will be put in place? What will the levels be during construction and once construction is completed?</p> | <p>A baseline sound survey has been undertaken to quantify the baseline sound environment at locations representative of the nearest and most exposed noise sensitive receptors. The survey data has been used to derive representative daytime and night-time background sound levels at these receptors against which the assessment of operational noise impacts has been undertaken. Details are provided in Volume 3, Annex 8.1: Baseline sound survey of the ES and section 8.6.2 of this Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8).The assessment of operational noise impacts is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3). 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.An operational noise limit will be secured as a requirement of the DCO resulting in significant adverse effects being avoided and adverse effects minimised at all times.An assessment of noise and vibration impacts during the construction phase of the Transmission Assets is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Construction noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.3) and section 8.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8). Details of controls and measures proposed are set out in section 8.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8). This includes control of working hours through the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP). An Outline CoCP is provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1). In addition, an Outline Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan has been prepared (document reference J1.3).</p> |
| TA_0038_029_181123          | S44     | Email           | <p>7. Noise limits must be monitored and enforced; however, the approach to this not specified.</p>  | <p>An operational noise limit will be secured as a requirement of the DCO resulting in significant adverse effects being avoided and adverse effects minimised at all times.</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
| TA_0038_031_181123          | S44     | Email           | 9. Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration How many buildings will there be on each site (and their size?). From the Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration - The footprint of the onshore substations will be approximately 185,000 m2, including up to ten main buildings of approximately 80 x 140 m and a height of up to 20 m.   | Details are provided in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES. Some optionality for the final design is retained, including the overall number of buildings. The height of the substations has been reduced since PEIR.  |
| TA_0042_001_191123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</p> <p>If the route chosen includes my land on REDACTED, it would have a catastrophic and ruinous effect on my business.</p> <p>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.</p> | <p>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.</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 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.</p>  |
| TA_0043_020_211123          | S44     | Email           | 20 Noise pollution: During construction the normally quiet rural area around our farm will be impacted by noise from construction machines and additional associated traffic. Later will there be any noise from the cables underground? Why have we not been supplied with any information? Will this cause animal welfare issues for our cattle or wildlife? What are the health issues associated with these cables for the human population considering the land is used for food production? Is there a risk to human health from these cables?   | Impacts and effects in terms of noise and vibration are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8). This includes consideration of noise from traffic in section 8.11 of that chapter. Once installed, noise is not anticipated to be detectable from the presence of the cables. Impacts on human health are considered in Volume 1, Annex 5.1: Human health of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). 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_0045_001_211123          | S42/S44 | Email           | I object to the transformer being built for the following reasons.<br>Noise - constant humming.  | 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. 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. Acoustic character corrections have been applied to the predicted levels at receptors where the tonal components are deemed to be perceptible by the standards of BS 4142:2014+A1:2019. Mitigation measures have been specified where required.   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
| TA_0048_002_231123          | S44     | Email           | The cable corridor defies the whole concept of green energy, the environmental impacts are too severe on a small community that already has to live with excessive noise, base systems, Grange 1,2 and 3 land fill sites, Clifton marsh sewage, water treatment works Nuclear fuels springfields works, Kirkham prison, one would wonder how much this community has to live with   | A baseline sound survey has been undertaken to quantify the baseline sound environment at locations representative of the nearest and most exposed noise sensitive receptors. The survey data has been used to derive representative daytime and night-time background sound levels at these receptors against which the assessment of operational noise impacts has been undertaken. Details are provided in Volume 3, Annex 8.1: Baseline sound survey of the ES and section 8.6.2 of this Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8). The assessment of operational noise impacts is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3). 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. An operational noise limit will be secured as a requirement of the DCO resulting in significant adverse effects being avoided and adverse effects minimised at all times. 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). |
| 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_0122_001_171123          | S44     | Email           | I wish to object against the proposals to build two high (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 being done in a safe proximity and 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | 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.   | 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 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_005_171123          | S44     | Email           | 5.The noise 24/7 will be unbearable. This is a quiet village with just the gentle hum of traffic. The planned substation will create horrendous noise.<br>6.The building work will create huge disruption constantly and we dont know how long for.  | 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). 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_0125_002_181123          | S44     | Email           | I also strongly object to your proposals for the substations on the grounds of:- 3.My wife and I chose to retire here 5.5 years ago after moving from the village, to enjoy a beautiful, large back garden, peacefulness of the area and beautiful front views across open fields with livestock grazing in them. Had we known your intentions to construct 2 substations so close, then we would never have bought the property. 4.This will also impact people's general health my wife is asthmatic and requires to have windows open 24/7. However, this will be impossible due to the constant noise pollution (humming) again 24/7. My wife also suffers from hypothyroidism and needs access to Vitamin D via sunlight each day. Currently this is obtained by my wife tending to our garden, fish pond and the wildlife that frequents our garden daily, however, with the constant humming it will be impossible for her to do so comfortably. 5.I understand that the noise levels will be 38db above ambient, approaching to 70db, with ear protection required at 80db. Therefore, the constant noise level will be unbearable to say the least. | 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_0126_004_181123          | S44     | Email           | 5. The proximity of the development to the current residential area shows no sign of consideration. The area would be changed from its current agricultural outlook to an industrial development ruining the character of the area. The loss of the agricultural land in zone 1 will have a negative socio-economic impact to the area. There is no indication of noise, light and EMF emission levels resulting from the development which will affect the immediate area and therefore residents.  | The Planning Statement (document reference J28) sets out an assessment on the impact on the countryside and location of the substations. 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). 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   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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_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_0130_003_191123          | S44     | Email           | We also know from past experience disruption to land, digging drilling etc in the area, has driven vermin into our homes! It has also caused flooding and water tables to rise. The question of noise from transmitting that amount of electricity through the corridors is also unclear. A local electrical expert that installs commercially on a large scale doubts it will be silent.  | 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_0132_001_191123          | S44     | Email           | I wish to register my utter disagreement with the planned wind farm, very close to my property. I believe I am the longest standing resident on REDACTED, having moved to this bungalow in REDACTED, fifty one years ago. Many changes, not all for the better, have been made since then, but the thought of the absolute desecration of this rural area that this plan would bring, is devastating. The noise, disruption of traffic (already dreadful in this location), the years it will take to complete, is beyond comprehension. This country area was beautiful and has been encroached upon enough, in recent years. It also has huge drainage problems; properties and dykes are regularly waterlogged, through both Fylde (my council) and Blackpool Council inactivity. Inevitably the situation would be exacerbated should this project go ahead. Kindly register my complete disapproval.  | 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). 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_0133_001_191123          | S44     | Email           | We oppose the following: 1. THE ONSHORE TEMPORARY COMPOUND - AT BRYNING 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   | 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | 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 Wrea Green Equitation Centre - 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 FarmsThe Compound would affect the day to day operationThe Compound would affect the financial viability   | 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_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). |
| TA_0135_005_191123          | S44     | Email           | The suggestion that a noise level projection of 70 decibels is expected, when ear protection is required at 80, should be a large red flag for anyone involved in the planning process, as it will have the most horrendous impact on the local residents, schools , businesses etc.  | 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_0139_003_201123          | S44     | Email           | 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? | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_0139_004_201123          | S44     | Email           | 10th November 2023 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 Whopper Swans.18.)   | 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | <p>Why have you asked some residents on the same street of REDACTED 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 <a href="https://blackpoolez.com">https://blackpoolez.com</a>), 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 (<a href="https://pa.fylde.gov.uk/Planning/Display/23/0758">https://pa.fylde.gov.uk/Planning/Display/23/0758</a>). 26.) The Lytham moss land is wet and very low lying. - could cause flooding to us on REDACTED how will this be combated.27.) What is the proximity of the cable corridor to properties on REDACTED. 28.) How will you stop settlement on properties adjacent to the projects, path? 29.) Fylde size of REDACTED 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. REDACTED REDACTED</p> | <p>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_004_201123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Also the structural impact on our properties caused by you laying huge cables close to us, subsidence has occurred on the road next to ours and was caused by an excavation.</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.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_0143_001_201123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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. 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 land Prime agricultural land, potentially rendering the land useless In an area of separation Way too close to two schools Way too close to residential properties Flooding Visual impact Noise, light, vibration Wildlife Congestion Decreasing the value of land and</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</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | property Safety hazard Surely there must be other options available with far less intrusion on the whole of the Fylde.   | developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted 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_004_201123          | S44     | Email           | The PEIR does not identify permissible noise, light, vibration or EMR emission upper limits from the substations and you have not defined the approach to noise mitigation.  | Detailed assessments are 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 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). 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_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 hazard- Traffic congestion in the areas surrounding the potential sitel am sure there must be other places this substation could be built within Fylde that would have considerably less impact on people's livelihoods. | 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_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 land Prime agricultural land, potentially rendering the land useless In an area of separation Far too close to two schools and residential properties Flooding Visual impact Noise, light, vibration Wildlife Congestion Decreasing the value of land and property Safety hazard Surely 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).  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
| TA_0151_005_201123          | S44     | Email           | Noise, light, vibration and EMR emissions, these limits have not been correctly identified by the PEIR report. The threat for our local children growing up with electromagnetic radiation all around them. We still don't understand the full health risks and long-term issues this will cause, but it will be adverse.  | 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_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_0154_004_201123          | S44     | Email           | Fourthly the health and safety analysis of the impact of the substation seems to be based on data from Fylde Council. This data covers the whole of Fylde not just the Kirkham/Freckleton/Newton area and as such this is flawed. The social, economic and health data for this area is significantly different to that of Lytham and St Annes which squares the information used for analysis. I note separate areas of Preston were taken into account. This needs reanalysis using specific local data to assess the social, economic and health effects on the 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 as well as economic losses, decreases in housing price. The substations at both Penwortham and Heysham are built at significant distances from housing and schools but the noise generation can be heard 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 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.  |
| 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_003_211123          | S44     | Email           | Since distance is obviously a significant attenuator for noise and radiation the proximity is a cause for concern and I would like to see noise and radiation raised to a higher level than cost. It is apparent that radiation is very quickly dismissed as an irrational concern not supported by science, nevertheless we should remember that we are talking mental health as well as physical well-being and irrational concerns tend to create the highest levels of anxiety.  | 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | <p>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_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_005_211123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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?</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 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</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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_0155_007_211123          | S44     | Email           | The current noise levels are very low and I believe these levels can be maintained with appropriate design and specification. I would be disappointed if the noise nuisance were to be exhibited and perfectly habitable properties become "blighted" with all the implications that that would entail.  | 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_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_003_211123          | S44     | Email           | Since distance is obviously a significant attenuator for noise and radiation the proximity is a cause for concern and I would like to see noise and radiation raised to a higher level than cost. It is apparent that radiation is very quickly dismissed as an irrational concern not supported by science, nevertheless we should remember that we are talking mental health as well as physical well-being and irrational concerns tend to create the highest levels of anxiety.  | 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). 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_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 Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | 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?   | 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_0157_007_211123          | S44     | Email           | The current noise levels are very low and I believe these levels can be maintained with appropriate design and specification. I would be disappointed if the noise nuisance were to be exhibited and perfectly habitable properties become “blighted” with all the implications that that would entail. | 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_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_004_211123          | S44     | Email           | Based on the indicated size of the Sub Stations which are proposed the noise pollution which will be emitted from such buildings in close proximity to residential properties will be unbearable for the residents and as a result I strongly object to this proposal.                                  | 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).   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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_0160_005_211123          | S44     | Email           | There is Carr Hill High School / Strike Lane Primary School and a couple of children's nurseries ( Blue Bear / Tree Tots) also in a very close proximity of the proposed locations. There is nothing in the documentation you have sent me regarding Noise and vibration (makes a reference to Vol 3 / Chapter 8) must not be included in pack. The existing Penwortham Substation runs at about 68 decibels. Hearing protection is advised at 80 decibels and mandatory above that. The local residential area will not be able to have windows open or sit outside due to the external noise.  | 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_0161_012_211123          | S44     | Email           | •The project has not provided meaningful information on noise levels, vibration, electro-magnetic radiation or light pollution during and post construction and the impact of these on humans and both domestic and farm animals. Will children attending local schools and nursery, particularly Strike Lane Primary School and Carr Hill High School be able to concentrate during lessons with construction and post-construction noise? Will any remaining dairy cows (after you have taken the farmland) be able to produce the same quantity and quality of milk? What is the impact on human beings of constant 24/7 exposure to noise when they have had a lifetime of peace and quiet?  | 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).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_0161_016_211123          | S44     | Email           | Mitigation•No information has been made available relating to how the project will mitigate :-the construction activity; the visual impact of the substations; the noise and vibration levels both post and during construction; light pollution from the sites;electro-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 etc Who 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. Conclusion I 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. | Detailed assessments are 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_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_0165_003_211123          | S44     | Email           | Furthermore, the potential consequences of noise and light pollution resulting from the operation of the transformer are deeply troubling. Such pollution can have severe implications for the health and well-being of the residents in Newton. I request that a comprehensive study be conducted to assess the potential noise and light disturbances, and appropriate measures be taken to mitigate these effects.  | 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_0165_007_211123          | S44     | Email           | 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  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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>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 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_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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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_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_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. | <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). 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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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_0185_006_221123          | S44     | Email           | • Noise and light pollution from the construction of the substations would be significant.   | 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_0189_003_221123          | S44     | Email           | 2. It is very close to Strike Lane Primary School and Carr Hill High School. How will it affect the children attending these schools in terms of EMR, noise, light and vibration?  | 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). 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_0189_009_221123          | S44     | Email           | 6. The noise, vibration and light that would come from the site during and after construction would cause massive animal welfare issues. Any sudden loud or unexpected noises would cause the cattle to bolt and the resulting stampede would lead to serious injuries.  | 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_0200_005_221123          | S44     | Email           | Noise & Vibration Levels   | 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). Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used.   |
| TA_0208_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>We have two sections of land that will potentially be affected by the cable installations.</p> <p>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;</p> <p>1/ They will disrupt our usage of the land.<br/>Downtime for our projects and general usage could be quite considerable - none of us will live for ever</p> <p>2/ Access will suffer due to work in progress.</p> <p>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</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> <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>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:</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>therefore make limitations on values of the land in the future.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>5/ Concerns over traffic flow - access routes are very limited to start with.</p> <p>6/ Although you say we wont be affected by cable noise / ems - would you want these cables passing through or under your house - I somewhat doubt it.</p>  | <p>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> <p>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_006_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>11 Noise pollution during the construction of the trenches will detrimentally impact welfare of our cattle, wildlife and humans living effectively on a construction site. Will there be any noise emanating from the cables once they are laid underground?</p>   | <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. 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.</p>  |
| TA_0222_005_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Question 3.8<br/>Again, given the lack of information, the potential impact of noise and vibration on our clients' property is as yet undefined. However, they have significant concerns regarding the potential impact of noise and vibration on their land, and livestock.</p>   | <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. 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.</p>  |
| TA_0222_019_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Question 3.8 Our client has significant concerns regarding the impact of noise and vibration created by the construction of the Morecambe &amp; 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 &amp; Morgan.</p>   | <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. 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.</p>  |
| TA_0230_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>This consultation feedback is made on behalf of [REDACTED], who own the freehold and is an owner occupier.<br/>[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.<br/>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.<br/>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<br/>It is wholly unacceptable to consider the Morgan substation site in this location given it's close proximity to my client's family home and other dwelling houses at [REDACTED].<br/>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.<br/>The 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.<br/>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</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). 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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | after deflection from the proposed building will hit landfall on my client's property creating turbulent destructive winds.  | required, as well as noise impacts due to construction traffic on the local highway network.<br>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_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 process, is set out in Volume 1, 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. |
| TA_0230_019_231123          | S44     | Email           | The 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..  | 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. 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). 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_0233_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | Statutory Consultation Feedback in respect of Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms: Transmission Assets Statutory Consultation from 12 October 2023 – 23 November 2023 REDACTED My client owns two dwelling houses next to each other together with circa 35 acres of land at REDACTED which is immediately north of REDACTED where the proposed Morgan substation is proposed and due east is the proposed Morecambe substation Option 1 site. My clients properties will be significantly affected by the proposed schemes both during construction and the permanent substation sites thereafter. The substation sites are far too close to dwelling houses with health, visual and noise in mind. The 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 Morgan substation would be 400m from REDACTED, approx. 140m to REDACTED, 120m from REDACTED, similar distance to dwellings at the end of REDACTED track and approx. | 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). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | 100m from a housing estate immediately on the west side of REDACTED. It is wholly unacceptable to consider the Morgan substation site in this location given its close proximity to dwelling houses.   | description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, 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_0235_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | This consultation feedback is made on behalf of REDACTED who own freehold land at REDACTED as owner occupier. My clients properties will be significantly affected by the proposed schemes both during construction and the permanent substation sites thereafter. The substation sites are far too close to dwelling houses with health, visual and noise in mind. The 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.   | 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). 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. 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_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 substation is intentional to deceive the public! 45acre 20meters tall this will be an 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 |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | (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_0248_006_231123          | S44     | Email           | I have horses. Horses, have extremely sensitive hearing (they can hear noise up to 3km away). The noise during construction of a substation and/or installation of cables would be disruptive enough. Should the substations be built in the proposed area the constant hum produced from these would be intolerable for them. | 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). |
| TA_0249_006_231123          | S44     | Email           | I have horses. Horses, have extremely sensitive hearing (they can hear noise up to 3km away). The noise during construction of a substation and/or installation of cables would be disruptive enough. Should the substations be built in the proposed area the constant hum produced from these would be intolerable for them. | 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). |

## E1.16.24 Air quality tables of responses

## E1.16.24.1 Air quality table of responses (via feedback form)



**Table E1.16.24.1: Air Quality 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 (3.9; Air Quality) 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_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_0051_009_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.9                          | See 3. above<br><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_0053_009_171123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.9                          | Great concerns for health risks to local residents and holiday makers on caravan site   | 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.<br>The assessment indicates that there would be no significant effects arising from air quality emissions from traffic during the construction or decommissioning phases.<br>Effects during the operational phases are not likely and have been scoped out in agreement with the Planning Inspectorate.  |

| 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 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.  |
| TA_0056_021_141123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.9                          | As previously stated<br><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_011_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.9                          | Pollution from work vehicles and machinery being used on this project.   | 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.<br>The assessment indicates that there would be no significant effects arising from air quality emissions from traffic during the construction or decommissioning phases.<br>Effects during the operational phases are not likely and have been scoped out in agreement with the Planning Inspectorate.  |
| TA_0060_014_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 6                      |                              | Many vehicles in such a small space pollution from vehicles exhaust and dripping oil from their engines will cause massive damage to the area.   | 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).<br>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_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.<br>The assessment indicates that there would be no significant effects arising from air quality emissions from traffic during the construction or decommissioning phases.<br>Effects during the operational phases are not likely and have been scoped out in agreement with the Planning Inspectorate.  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method         | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
| 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) 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_0066_007_171023          | S44     | Online feedback form    | 3                      | 3.8                          | Local residents should be compensated for the effect of dust and noise. Perhaps this could be in the form of discounted energy bills.   | 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 of dust generated during the construction phase has been undertaken in the Environmental Statement (ES) and mitigation measures recommended to ensure the effects are not significant (Volume 3, Chapter 9 of the ES, document reference F3.9). The mitigation measures have been included in the dust management plan (document reference J25).  |
| TA_0068_006_231123          | S44     | Hard copy feedback form | 3                      | 3.9                          | For people with breathing difficulties, how will the project effect the air quality.  | 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.  |
| 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<br>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. Not happy about the disruption to the sand dunes and traffic congestion | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p>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. So I strongly object to these proposals</p> |   |
| TA_0092_026_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.9                          | <p>Will there be regular reports on air quality throughout the project available? Is there an alert system in place in case of any deterioration of air quality.</p>   | <p>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.</p> <p>The assessment indicates that there would be no significant effects arising from air quality emissions from traffic during the construction or decommissioning phases.</p> <p>Effects during the operational phases are not likely and have been scoped out in agreement with the Planning Inspectorate.</p>   |
| TA_0093_005_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.9                          | <p>Linked to traffic question 3.7 above - As a resident on REDACTED, REDACTED my house is on the main road opposite the beach. 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 and resulting CO2 fumes in our gardens and houses. If the Wind Farm work lasted weeks or months I would be concerned about the damage to our health as a result.</p>   | <p>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.</p> <p>The assessment indicates that there would be no significant effects arising from air quality emissions from traffic during the construction or decommissioning phases.</p> <p>Effects during the operational phases are not likely and have been scoped out in agreement with the Planning Inspectorate.</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)). 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> |
| TA_0170_005_151023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.9                          | <p>As already advised<br/><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</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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p><i>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>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 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_010_081123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.9                          | We will all be affected by breathing in all the dust that you produce .  | <p>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.</p> <p>The assessment indicates that there would be no significant effects arising from air quality emissions from traffic during the construction or decommissioning phases.</p> <p>Effects during the operational phases are not likely and have been scoped out in agreement with the Planning Inspectorate.</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)). 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> |
| TA_0100_005_241023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.9                          | <p>As above<br/>(<i>Not in residential areas when there are other options but are costlier</i></p> <p><i>Too much traffic and noise already here)</i></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>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).</p>   |
| TA_0106_010_281023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | Clearly building a 70 metres wide trench up to 25 km is length next to residential property will create unacceptable noise and vibration.  | <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>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).</p> <p>The cumulative noise and vibration impacts with other proposed</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method        | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                        |                        |                              |   | developments is considered in section 8.13 of Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8).   |
| TA_0106_011_281023          | S44     | Online feedback form   | 3                      | 3.9                          | This relates to air that electro magnetic radiation at higher than existing levels adjacent to residential property. The cabling is akin to overhead pylons, the health impact of which are well known.   | 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_0110_002_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form   | 3                      | 3.8                          | <p>What are the protection measures for Human Health relating to the extensive onshore cabling and substations. The PEIR seems to conclude that no mitigation is required and does not specify how exposures to EMFs will be assured to be within regulations.</p> <p>In particular, burying underground cables does not, per se, limit magnetic fields into the surface environments. The Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report of October 2022. In Part 2: Transmission Assets, section 10.2.1 provides only a short description of the positioning with regards to Human Health and, regarding the onshore transmission cables, paragraph 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". This might be considered misleading as it only refers to the electric field and is silent on the magnetic fields.</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). |
| TA_0110_003_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form   | 3                      | 3.6                          | <p>See above. Magnetic fields (sic) above and around the cables are threat to Human Health.</p> <p><i>("What are the protection measures for Human Health relating to the extensive onshore cabling and substations. The PEIR seems to conclude that no mitigation is required and does not specify how exposures to EMFs will be assured to be within regulations.</i></p> <p><i>In particular, burying underground cables does not, per se, limit magnetic fields into the surface environments. The Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report of October 2022. In Part 2: Transmission Assets, section 10.2.1 provides only a short description of the positioning with regards to Human Health and, regarding the onshore transmission cables, paragraph 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"". This might be considered misleading as it only refers to the electric field and is silent on the magnetic fields.")</i></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). |
| TA_0111_010_131123          | S44     | Hardcopy feedback form | 3                      | 3.9                          | There will be a detrimental effect to the air quality.  | 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).   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received | Applicants’ response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              |  | <p>These include measures to control dust through a Dust Management Plan (DMP). IAQM guidance indicates that implementation of these measures is effective.</p> <p>The assessment indicates that there would be no significant effects arising from air quality emissions from traffic during the construction or decommissioning phases.</p> <p>Effects during the operational phases are not likely and have been scoped out in agreement with the Planning Inspectorate.</p> |

## E1.16.24.2 Air quality table of responses (via all other methods)

**Table E1.16.24.2: Air quality table of responses (via all other methods)**

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
| TA_0001_211_231123          | S42     | Email           | <p>Identified impacts.</p> <p>6.25</p> <p>There is a lack of consideration of other impacts to Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI, particularly with regards to changes to the water table. The SSSI citation highlights “the series of exceptionally large and extensive dune slacks on either side of Clifton Drive North support a wide range of species which vary according to the depth of water and degree of moisture retention in relation to the water table”. Depending on the depth of cable installation the impacts of HDD on the dune water table (i.e., the cable resulting in the dune slacks becoming drier changing the species composition) should be considered. Other impacts such as impacts of dust on the SSSIs (identified in the Air Quality chapter as being features sensitive to dust of medium sensitivity – although ruled out due to HDD methods being used and provided the dust control measures are successfully implemented, the resultant effects of the dust exposure will normally be ‘not significant’.).</p> <p>Note nitrogen deposition to SSSIs does not appear to be covered – sand dunes are particularly sensitive to nitrogen deposition which can lead to over stabilisation through the dominance of coarse grasses. An assessment using the Air Pollution Information System (<a href="https://www.apis.ac.uk/">https://www.apis.ac.uk/</a>) should be undertaken. The effects of surface water run-off should also be considered. Consider changes to the water table at Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI. When considering habitats, it would be good to list all the potential pressures/ impacts considered.</p> | <p>Section 3.11.3 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation (document reference F3.3) provides an assessment of impacts to the SSSI, including changes in relation to the water table, changes in air quality from emissions of nitrogen, and the impact of surface runoff and pollution.</p> <p>Volume 3, Annex 9.1: Air quality impacts on ecological receptors of the ES (document reference F3.9.1) which states that impacts are insignificant for all pollutants at designated sites</p>  |
| TA_0003_004_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>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.</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, 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).</p>   |
| TA_0005_005_231123          | S42     | Email           | <p>3. The developer’s documentation has currently failed to evidence that they have given weight to, or mitigation of the adverse impacts on the local: residents, communities, economies and environments on :- i. amenity (disruption &amp; destruction of the rural character of the area, disruption due to construction &amp; traffic), ii. health &amp; well-being (including emissions giving rise to: respiratory impacts- in construction &amp; restoration; aural impacts– throughout the 6 decade programme life cycle from activity, plant and equipments; and potentially, electro-magnetic impacts - in operation throughout the life of the programme.iii. highway safety (through inadequate specification &amp; control of traffic. Plus proposed use of narrow rural lanes, also used for residential &amp; leisure access with consequential severe impacts on all users).</p>   | <p>Once operational, the substations will not have any emissions to air. 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. 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.Noise and vibration impacts during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Transmission Assets are presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.2: Construction noise and Vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.2). This assessment includes an assessment of construction traffic noise, as well as an assessment of the noise and vibration impacts during each phase of construction required for the Transmission Assets. Impacts in relation to traffic and transport are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7).</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
| TA_0019_027_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Electromagnetic radiation, light pollution, noise, and vibration levels for residents generated by the substations should be specified and set at best practice levels. The maximum levels for those residential receptors in close proximity to the substations should be specified with appropriate monitoring and enforcement in place to ensure these levels are not breached. These levels should be identified both during construction and once construction is completed.   | A baseline sound survey has been undertaken to quantify the baseline sound environment at locations representative of the nearest and most exposed noise sensitive receptors. The survey data has been used to derive representative daytime and night-time background sound levels at these receptors against which the assessment of operational noise impacts has been undertaken. Details are provided in Volume 3, Annex 8.1: Baseline sound survey of the ES and section 8.6.2 of this Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8). The assessment of operational noise impacts is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3). 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. An operational noise limit will be secured as a requirement of the DCO resulting in significant adverse effects being avoided and adverse effects minimised at all times. 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_0035_077_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | CoT33 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. The CoCP will include best practice measures in relation to air quality that will be applied where human receptors reside within 350 m of works, where required, or where sensitive ecological receptors are present within 50 m, as described in Institute of Air Quality guidance Management (IAQM, 2014) as appropriate. Issue Measures required to manage dust and air quality have yet to be fully addressed. Impact Risk to sensitive ecological receptors from poor air quality. Solution Outline Dust Management Plan setting out dust and air quality control measures to be appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission.   | An Outline Dust Management Plan is provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1.2).   |
| TA_0035_078_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | CoT35, 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. The CoCP will include measures to maintain and address:- 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. Issue Measures required to manage environmental risks have yet to be fully addressed. Impact Risk to the environment Solution Outline versions of various Plans to manage environmental risks to be appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission. See also CoT04 - Onshore pollution prevention plan CoT09 - Drainage Management Plan CoT11 - Operational Onshore Substation Drainage Management plan CoT20 - Construction Fencing Plan CoT26 - Site Waste Management Plan CoT30 - Contaminated Land and Groundwater Discovery Strategy CoT33 - Air Quality CoT73 - Biosecurity Protocol CoT76 - Outline Ecological Management Plan CoT77 - Bentonite Breakout Plan CoT78 - Biosecurity Protocol CoT81 - Soil Management Plan CoT86 - Measures to protect minor watercourses | See the Outline CoCP (document reference J1) and the following plans submitted as part of the application for development consent:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outline Communications Plan (document reference J1.1)</li> <li>• Outline Dust Management Plan (document reference J1.2)</li> <li>• Outline Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (document reference J1.3)</li> <li>• Outline Pollution Prevention Plan (document reference J1.4)</li> <li>• Outline Public Rights of Way (PRoW) Management Plan (document reference J1.5)</li> <li>• Outline Site Waste Management Plan (document reference J1.6)</li> <li>• Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7)</li> <li>• Outline Spillage and Emergency Response Plan (document reference J1.8)</li> <li>• Outline Surface Water and Groundwater Management Plan (document reference J1.9)</li> <li>• Outline Construction Fencing Plan (document reference J1.10)</li> <li>• Outline Construction Artificial Light Emissions Management Plan (document reference J1.11)</li> <li>• Outline Biosecurity Protocol (document reference J1.12)</li> <li>• Outline Bentonite Breakout Plan (document reference J1.13)</li> </ul>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | •Outline Contaminated Land and Groundwater Discovery Strategy (document reference J1.14).  |
| TA_0038_008_181123          | S44     | Email           | 8. Working hours weekdays 7am - 6pm and Saturday 7am – 1pm with an hour at either side for vehicles to arrive or depart. Residents surrounding the developments on Acorn Avenue and Woodlands Close and the access routes to them experienced great disruption with the noise and queueing of vehicles from outside the specified timeframes. Where will the vehicles queue outside the specified time-fames and how will the noise (particularly when they manoeuvre and reverse) be monitored? These hours should be shortened significantly in both the morning and evening.  | 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). Working hours would be controlled through a requirement of the development consent order.  |
| 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 READCTED.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_0139_003_201123          | S44     | Email           | 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?  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_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  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | <p>(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.</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:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>  |
| TA_0222_020_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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 &amp; Morgan.</p>  | <p>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.</p>   |
| TA_0230_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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 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.</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). 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.</p> |
| TA_0230_019_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>The 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>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. 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</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | F3.8).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_0233_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | Statutory Consultation Feedback in respect of Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms: Transmission Assets Statutory Consultation from 12 October 2023 – 23 November 2023 REDACTED My client owns two dwelling houses next to each other together with circa 35 acres of land at REDACTED which is immediately north of REDACTED where the proposed Morgan substation is proposed and due east is the proposed Morecambe substation Option 1 site. My clients properties will be significantly affected by the proposed schemes both during construction and the permanent substation sites thereafter. The substation sites are far too close to dwelling houses with health, visual and noise in mind. The 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 Morgan substation would be 400m from REDACTED, approx. 140m to REDACTED, 120m from REDACTED, similar distance to dwellings at the end of REDACTED track and approx. 100m from a housing estate immediately on the west side of REDACTED. It is wholly unacceptable to consider the Morgan substation site in this location given its close proximity to dwelling houses. | 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). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_0235_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | This consultation feedback is made on behalf of REDACTED who own freehold land at REDACTED as owner occupier. My clients properties will be significantly affected by the proposed schemes both during construction and the permanent substation sites thereafter. The substation sites are far too close to dwelling houses with health, visual and noise in mind. The 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.  | 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). 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. 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). |

## E1.16.25 Seascape, landscape and visual resources table of responses

## **E1.16.25.1 Seascape, landscape and visual resources table of responses (via feedback form)**



**Table E1.16.25.1: Seascape, landscape and visual resources 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 (4.1; Seascape, landscape and visual) 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_001_171123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | Totally unacceptable for surrounding areas.<br><br>As a leisure business owner (caravan and camping field) this will mean the closure of a life long ambition and a very successful business.<br><br>Substations proposed position within 200 yards of camp site<br><br>Will lose views, sunlight and livelihood | The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.<br>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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). 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). 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). |
| TA_0053_004_171123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 2                      |                              | Totally unacceptable see Q1<br><br>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_011_171123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      | 4.1                          | Will be non existent views   | 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | (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_0056_023_141123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      | 4.1                          | As previously stated<br><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_251_003_231123           | S44     | Consult Online       | NULL                   |                              | What impact will the cabling have on the beach between the sea and the sand dunes. This area again I imagine will be used as as a jointing pit area. How will this be serviced?   | Cables will be installed in the intertidal area, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). These works would be temporary.   |
| TA_0062_002_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | 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.<br>Should option 2 go ahead this will totally devastate our lives.<br>I will, object and campaign to exhaustion against this development ruining our lives.<br>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.<br>I am too old to start all over again and all this is giving me mental health issues making me extremely ill.<br>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.<br>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.<br>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.<br>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.<br>The erection of these two substations would be even more instrumental to | The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.<br>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.<br>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.<br>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 |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p>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 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 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.</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>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> |
| 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_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_0067_008_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 8                      |                              | Unsightly, enormous and again detail hidden deep in the documentation. An environmental diaster.   | 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  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | <p>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).</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_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 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 | <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>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_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   | <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_0074_011_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      | 4.1                          | Local business relies on visitors who will not come if the area is a building site  | <p>A full impact assessment on socio-economics is presented in Volume 4 Chapter 2 of the ES (document reference F4.2). 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_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   | <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>  |
| 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   | <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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | community are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1).   |
| 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_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_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_0076_007_091123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      | 4.1                          | Will this affect the views from the house   | 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_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_0080_007_201123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      | 4.1                          | I have concerns about the effects on habitats in the nature conservation area on Clifton Drive North bordering our estate .   | 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).   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
| TA_0081_003_201123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      |                              | <p>As mentioned, local residents including my family are totally opposed to this project. The damage and disruption to a local community is unacceptable.</p> <p>Our property values will plummet. A beautiful area will be destroyed.</p> <p>Lay your cables in a region where people's lives are not affected.</p> <p>Will fight this to the hilt!</p>  | <p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.</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_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_0084_001_091123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | I'm concerned I will see them and they will ruin the beautiful sunset views from St Annes Beach   | 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_0085_001_191123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      |                              | <p>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:</p> <p>Concerns about the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The impact of the wide corridor immediately next to our properties, but also will it go under our land?<br/>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!</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>4) Vermin - we know from other local digging, drilling that this has driven vermin into our homes!</li> <li>5) Noise from the amount of electricity being transmitted right by our homes.</li> <li>6) Impact on the local wildlife in the area</li> <li>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</li> <li>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.</li> <li>9) What access will be required to land involving access down REDACTED - this question has not been adequately answered at consultation meetings.</li> <li>10) Disruptive lighting at the bottom of our gardens/land during works</li> <li>11) Major concerns re traffic disruption to the local area during construction as follows:</li> </ol> | <p>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).</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   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <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_008_191123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      |                              | See 4.1 below<br><i>(Visual impact out at sea could impact the local tourist economy which is a massive part of the economy for Blackpool and Lytham St Annes and the sheer high volume of wind structures is considerable.)</i>  | 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_0085_009_191123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      | 4.1                          | Visual impact out at sea could impact the local tourist economy which is a massive part of the economy for Blackpool and Lytham St Annes and the sheer high volume of wind structures is considerable.  | 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_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.<br>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<br><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.<br>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<br><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</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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <i>those living nearby. This region relies on tourists who will be severely put off by such eyesores on entering the Fylde area.)</i>   | 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.<br>A full impact assessment on socio-economics is presented in Volume 4 Chapter 2 of the ES (document reference F4.2).  |
| 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 , 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. 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. 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_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"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- It feels like someone has just looked at a map and decided these are the easiest places, with little other consideration.</li> <li>- Your website is hard to navigate and does not provide large scale detailed maps. It is difficult to determine exact proposed areas.</li> <li>- There has been little consideration of potential flood risks and lack of information to local residents about how this would be managed.</li> <li>- There is no information about why any Fylde or Blackpool Council enterprise zones or brown field sites have not been considered.</li> </ul>  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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.<br>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 |

| 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"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- There is no information about how any access to the sites would be obtained, and no assessment about impact on local traffic and roads.</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- This is an area of quite countryside and would involve significant loss of a local amenity and change to the local environment.</li> <li>- Potential loss of value to local property.</li> <li>- Two large sub stations are proposed quite near to each other, making a significant impact on the local amenity.</li> <li>- 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</li> <li>- I have attended public consultation meetings which have been poorly presented with representatives being poorly prepared and unable to answer most questions</li> </ul> | <p>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> |
| 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.  | <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 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> <p>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> <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>   |
| 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.   | <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>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | Detailed assessments are 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_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_0092__028_151123         | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      | 4.1                          | Need to ensure that once the project has been completed - other than the wind turbines, no infrastructure is visible on the landscape and that everything has been sympathetically restored accordingly. Opportunity to be involved in regular updates and provide feedback throughout the project period.   | 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_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"> <li>- selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets</li> <li>- refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received.</li> </ul> <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_0170_001_151023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | 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.  | 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,   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <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>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<br/><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. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)<br/>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<br/><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>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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <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>and have 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. The UK Government has also produced a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)<br/>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<br/><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. The UK Government has also produced a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)<br/>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<br/><i>(We are horrified at the prospect of the three Morecambe proposed onshore substation sites especially option2 (south), as this is the first time</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</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p><i>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>and have 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. The UK Government has also produced a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)<br/>Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p> |
| 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</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  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | 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<br/><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 Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_0096_001_131123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | <p>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</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). 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).</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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | <p>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_0096_002_131123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      |                              | <p>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</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). 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).</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_0096_003_131123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 7                      |                              | <p>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</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>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p>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</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). 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).</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_0096_004_131123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 8                      |                              | <p>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</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). 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).</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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | <p>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_0096_005_131123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 9                      |                              | <p>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</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). 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).</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_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"> <li>- Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2).</li> <li>- Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3).</li> <li>- Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4).</li> </ul>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | <p>- Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5).</p> <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_010_171123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      | 4.1                          | It's a eye sore   | <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_0098_012_081123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      | 4.1                          | <p>Landscapes will be ruined forever.</p> <p>What was once green fields with views for miles, will just become a noisy, cancer causing eyesore.</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>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).</p> <p>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> <p>For an assessment on human health, please refer to Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) of the ES.</p> |
| TA_0098_016_081123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 8                      |                              | <p>This area is vast and situated between Kirkham, Newton and Freckleton, and far too close to all three.</p> <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>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <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>the ES (document reference F1.5.3).<br/>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:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)<br/>Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</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>  |
| TA_0252_005_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 7                      |                              | <p>Extremely disruptive to the local farming community, the local environment and visual impact especially from the substations and other infrastructure.</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. Detailed assessments are 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 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)</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects.   |
| 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_010_241023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 15                     |                              | All or half profits goes to local councils so they can spend on local communities .<br><br>Profits should not go to faceless shareholders until the local area is fully compensated for the damage this project will do and the area should get free power . Alternatively only potentially a nominal charge for residents effected by this project should be charge for power after all it is us that have put up with this eyesore and the private firms do not own this land.   | 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.<br>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.<br>We welcome further input from the local community and encourage you to reach out to the project team in due course.  |
| 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.<br>we have worked hard to develop REDACTED and improve the grazing and natural habitats not only for horses but other wild life too.<br>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).<br>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_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_0104_003_101123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 5                      |                              | Passing through a number of green belt by lytham moss, visually damaging to the environment as well as physically damaging green belt 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method        | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                        |                        |                              |   | <p>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>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_0111_012_131123          | S44     | Hardcopy feedback form | 4                      | 4.1                          | The landfall site on the beach will obviously damage visually and for access, this part of the beach forever.   | <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>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 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.</p> |
| 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. 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. | <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>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).</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</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | <p>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).</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_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_002_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      |                              | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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!</p> <p>Considering you have a Communications team - isn't that their job !! Couldn't they have liaised with Fylde Parish Council to find a location?</p> <p>My list ( as requested ) is below<br/>           *There is Community Centre on Lower Lane opposite the proposed site of the huge Morgan sub station<br/>           *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</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>The Applicants attempted to hold an event in Freckleton during the statutory consultation period. However, this was not 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>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p>*There is the village library<br/>*Freckleton Sports and Social club<br/>*There are 3 pubs in the village<br/>*There is the Rawstone sports club<br/>*There is a health centre with a large reception area<br/>*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 !<br/>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).<br/>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> <p>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_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. 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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | <p>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_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 .</p> <p>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.</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>  |



## **E1.16.25.2 Seascape, landscape and visual resources table of responses (via all other methods)**

**Table E1.16.25.2: Seascape, landscape and visual resources table of responses (via all other methods)**

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| TA_0001_270_231123          | S42     | Email           | <p>Natural England's Position on Worst Case Scenario or Scenarios<br/>8.1 Vol 4, Ch 1 / General</p> <p>The maximum design scenarios (worst case scenarios) have been identified through the use of the Project Design Envelope (PDE) or "Rochdale Envelope" approach. Whilst there is flexibility within this approach, emphasis should be placed on firstly avoiding the impact of the development on the landscape. In clearly identifying these maximum design scenarios (such as visual detractors around the substations, or the disruption to or loss of the landscape / habitats during the laying of cables in the construction phase), the impacts of the proposal should be assessed in terms of real-life consequences for localised environs, wildlife and people. Once a maximum design scenario has been identified, it is necessary to consider location, magnitude and timing to bring all elements into the assessment of significance.</p> <p>Where avoidance of the impact is not possible, cascading down to reducing and then mitigating the impact should be the standard approach and these should be considered during the detailed design phase. The submitted ES should clearly present the impacts of the proposal without mitigation and then once mitigation has been applied.</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_0001_271_231123          | S42     | Email           | <p>Identified impacts 8.2 Vol 4, Ch 1 / General Unfortunately, Natural England cannot comment on the quality of the EIA as it is yet to be finalised beyond the scoping stage. Future pre-construction surveys are required to establish a full set of baseline data.</p>   | <p>Further baseline data on landscape and visual receptors has been gathered since publication of the PEIR, which has included site surveys and photography following stakeholder feedback. The LVIA for the ES has been undertaken on this basis (refer to Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES (document reference F3.10)).</p>  |
| TA_0001_272_231123          | S42     | Email           | <p>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.</p>   | <p>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).</p>  |
| TA_0001_308_231123          | S42     | Email           | <p>SLVIA The design, implementation and monitoring of landscape mitigation must be robust and appropriate. This is vitally important, not only around the buildings, but also along cable laying routes as the landscape can suffer in the long-term from this level of disruption. The land can settle to a level which is ununiform to the surrounding landform and so create rises and falls which are not organic to the surrounding landscape.</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_0001_309_231123          | S42     | Email           | <p>Around the buildings, new planting should be native and aim to replicate the surrounding species where possible. This is particularly applicable to screening tree planting and hedge-laying. Landscape design work should be carried out in conjunction with the BNG.</p>   | <p>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 Benefit 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.</p>   |
| TA_0001_310_231123          | S42     | Email           | <p>Appendix 1 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'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)).</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | <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: • 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.</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: • 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.</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. 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 and has no significant outstanding concerns. As above, we reserve the right to revise our opinion should new evidence be presented.</p> |  |
| TA_0002_006_221123          | S42     | Email           | <p>This embedded figure shows an extract from the Fylde Local Plan to 2032. This clearly shows the areas designated Green Belt and Countryside. Much of the proposed route of the underground cabling and the sites of the proposed sub-stations fall within the Green Belt situated between Freckleton and Kirkham. Development of the size and type proposed for the sub-stations is not appropriate in the locations proposed and will create permanent harm to the area, even following the completion of the projected build and restoration of land involved in the project.</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. 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 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</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)</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>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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>  |   |
| TA_0003_006_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>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.</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, 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.</p> |
| TA_0003_012_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Landscape Impact The design of the substations has not yet been finalised. However, from the information that is available, it is clear that the massing of the proposed structures required to house the equipment will be significant. Fylde has a flat, rolling, rural character interspersed with limited tree cover (the area of tree cover has been identified as falling within the lowest 10% of all English local authority administrative areas). The visual impact of such large structures in the wider landscape, particularly in the rural area will be significant. The structures will appear as dominant discordant features in the rural landscape. The nature of the landscape will mean that there is little in the way of topographical features that will help integrate the structures into the landscape. Due to the height of the structures, it will not be possible to provide any meaningful landscape screening, particular when viewed across the wider landscape. Further consideration needs to be given to the scale and location of the proposed substations.</p> | <p>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). 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). The evolution of mitigation measures, including tree retention and loss strategy and replacement planting opportunities has formed part of this process (refer to Volume 3, Annex 10.5: Tree survey and arboricultural impact assessment of the ES (document reference F3.10.5). In addition, an Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2) has been prepared as part of the application for development consent to include measures to mitigate effects on landscape and visual receptors during construction, operation and maintenance of the Transmission Assets.</p>  |
| TA_0003_015_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>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.</p>  | <p>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.</p>  |
| TA_0005_003_231123          | S42     | Email           | <p>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</p>  | <p>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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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 &amp; well-being of the local: residents; communities; economies; and environments.</p>   | <p>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)</p>   |
| TA_0005_005_231123          | S42     | Email           | <p>3. The developer's documentation has currently failed to evidence that they have given weight to, or mitigation of the adverse impacts on the local: residents, communities, economies and environments on :- i. amenity (disruption &amp; destruction of the rural character of the area, disruption due to construction &amp; traffic), ii. health &amp; well-being (including emissions giving rise to: respiratory impacts- in construction &amp; restoration; aural impacts- throughout the 6 decade programme life cycle from activity, plant and equipment; and potentially, electro-magnetic impacts - in operation throughout the life of the programme.iii. highway safety (through inadequate specification &amp; control of traffic. Plus proposed use of narrow rural lanes, also used for residential &amp; leisure access with consequential severe impacts on all users).</p> | <p>Once operational, the substations will not have any emissions to air. 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. 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.Noise and vibration impacts during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Transmission Assets are presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.2: Construction noise and Vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.2). This assessment includes an assessment of construction traffic noise, as well as an assessment of the noise and vibration impacts during each phase of construction required for the Transmission Assets. Impacts in relation to traffic and transport are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7).</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>                               |

| 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_006_221123          | S42     | Email           | The consultation meetings left many questions unanswered but losing Grade A farmland at the heart of our precious greenbelt, with the wider impact on homes and infrastructure will do real damage to Fylde and St Anne's in particular.  | The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets on agricultural land use 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). This includes the preparation of a Code of Construction Practice in general accordance with the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) submitted with the application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Code of Construction Practice seek to limit disruption to the community. 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. |
| TA_0017_014_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Surveys Survey data submitted with the planning application should be current/up-to-date, in line with recognised guidelines (as summarised above). The survey area should include: • The intended location of the development footprint; • Potential working areas, compounds, storage areas and access routes; • Any land that may be used within the mitigation, compensation or biodiversity net gain proposals (on or off-site); • A suitable buffer distance, taking account of the likely zone of influence and relevant survey guidelines.                                    | The survey area is the area used for site-specific surveys and is generally defined as a 150 m buffer around the Onshore Order Limits. The 150 m buffer was included to take account of protected species that may occur adjacent or close to the Transmission Assets and to allow for evolution of the boundary during the site selection process. A separate survey area was used for GCN surveys. The GCN survey area is defined as a 250 m buffer around the Onshore Order Limits. Volume 3, Annex 3.8: Great crested newt survey and reptile survey technical report of the ES (document reference F3.3.8) provides further details regarding the GCN survey area. Owing to the iterative design process of the Transmission Assets, some surveys were undertaken further than 150 m from the Onshore Order Limits. Nevertheless, information from these surveys have been included in technical annexes because it provides context regarding the ecological sensitivity of the wider area.  |
| TA_0017_036_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | It should be stated how the necessary maintenance and management will be secured for the lifetime of the anticipated planning obligations.  | An Outline Ecological Management Plan (document reference J6) is provided as part of the application for development consent.  |
| TA_0017_037_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Monitoring measures should be sufficient to measure the success of mitigation and compensation measures, to inform the need for remedial measures and to inform establishment maintenance and long-term management.   | Any relevant monitoring measures are set out in section 3.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).   |
| TA_0018_001_061123          | S42     | Email           | Advice<br>These proposed windfarms will not have a direct impact on any historic assets in Wales or in Welsh waters. The nearest any of the masts will be to the Welsh coast is over 50km away. As such it would be only in exceptional circumstances (if then) that the windfarms will be visible from Wales and therefore we do not envisage that the proposed wind farms will have any significant impact on the settings of any designated historic assets in Wales.  | 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_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 | The Applicants note your response. Detailed comments responded to in turn, see unique reference TA_0019.   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | 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.   |  |
| 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_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_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_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  | 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | 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  | 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_021_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Amenity. The consultation has not explained how existing bridleways and public rights of way and access tracks used by many residents will be impacted - is access to be permanently or temporarily denied or restricted? Many parishioners use Parrox Lane, Thames Street, Lund Way bridleway and other routes for their recreational exercise, dog walking etc. The increased type and volume of heavy goods vehicle will severely impact the existing recreational use.   | Impacts and effects on public rights of way are set out in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Details of the management of these routes during construction are set out in the Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (document reference J1.5).  |
| TA_0019_025_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Visual amenity - there is mention of some replacement of hedges and additional planting. There are trees and hedgerows that should be protected. The screening required will need to be effective. Heritage assets in the village will have their setting impacted which requires careful consideration in terms of the size and species of trees used for screening. Specified screening needs should be properly mandated with timeframes for installation. How will the large, tall permanent buildings be clad if gas cooled substations are selected?   | 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.   |
| TA_0023_084_221123          | S42     | Email           | Based on the nature of the proposals NRW (A) are satisfied with the study areas (Vol 4 Figure 1.1) used for the assessment of landscape and visual effects (Vol 4 Chapter 1). As these do not overlap with statutory designated landscapes in Wales, we don't have any comments.   | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0027_001_231123          | S42     | Email           | Blackpool Council declared a Climate Change Emergency in June 2019 and is committed to ensuring that approaches to planning decision-making are in line with a shift to zero carbon by 2030. The Council recognises the importance of renewable energy generation and is therefore supportive of the proposal in principle. It is understood that the development would be visible from the Blackpool Promenade which includes a number of heritage assets including the Grade I Listed Blackpool Tower Building. Appropriate account of this should be taken as part of a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. Otherwise it is understood that the development would not directly affect land within the Blackpool borough boundary with landfall being made within the borough of Fylde and cable routing being through that borough. It is accepted that the Blackpool highway network would be used for site access and potential impact on that area of the network should be properly assessed within a Transport Assessment. It is understood that a separate submission is being made on behalf of the Blackpool Airport Enterprise Zone and Blackpool Airport.   | The Applicants recognise that Blackpool Council has declared a climate change emergency. This is acknowledged in Volume 1, Chapter 2: Policy and legislation context of the ES (document reference F1.2). Landscape and visual effects are set out in section 10.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual receptors of the ES (document reference F3.10). It is noted that offshore substation platforms and the offshore booster station are no longer proposed as part of the application for development consent for the Transmission Assets, such that there would be no sea-piercing offshore infrastructure forming part of the project. 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_0029_014_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Visual Impacts Based on the details it would appear that the substations and above ground infrastructure will be set well away from our assets. As the cabling will be installed underground then the longer-term visual impacts would likely be limited. The main visual impact will therefore be during the construction phase in relation to our interests. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) needs to consider the impact on boaters/towpath users as sensitive receptors. The waterway users will pass the position of the crossings at a relative low speed so will be susceptible to changes to the local landscape which need to be considered. We would welcome the waterway crossing of Savick Brook to be assessed via the LVIA. Any construction compounds near the river corridor should consider views during the construction phase and efforts should be made to minimise any visual impact. We would ask that the design for the crossing of the waterway are shared with the Trust at an early stage so that we can review the design in principle and its appropriateness within the waterways setting. This should also include any landscape design work associated with the works that could have visual impacts upon setting or character, for example parcels of screening vegetation buffers. | The effects of the Transmission Assets on landscape and visual resources, including users of waterways, is considered in Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES (document reference F3.10), where appropriate.   |
| TA_0035_078_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | CoT35, 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. The CoCP will include measures to maintain and address:- 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;  | See the Outline CoCP (document reference J1) and the following plans submitted as part of the application for development consent:•Outline Communications Plan (document reference J1.1)•Outline Dust Management Plan (document reference J1.2)•Outline Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (document reference J1.3)•Outline Pollution Prevention Plan (document reference J1.4)•Outline Public Rights of Way (PRoW) Management Plan (document   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>and- bentonite breakout plan. Issue Measures required to manage environmental risks have yet to be fully addressed. Impact Risk to the environment Solution Outline versions of various Plans to manage environmental risks to be appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission. See also CoT04 - Onshore pollution prevention plan CoT09 - Drainage Management Plan CoT11 - Operational Onshore Substation Drainage Management plan CoT20 - Construction Fencing Plan CoT26 - Site Waste Management Plan CoT30 - Contaminated Land and Groundwater Discovery Strategy CoT33 - Air Quality CoT73 - Biosecurity Protocol CoT76 - Outline Ecological Management Plan CoT77 - Bentonite Breakout Plan CoT78 - Biosecurity Protocol CoT81 - Soil Management Plan CoT86 - Measures to protect minor watercourses</p>   | <p>reference J1.5) • Outline Site Waste Management Plan (document reference J1.6) • Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7) • Outline Spillage and Emergency Response Plan (document reference J1.8) • Outline Surface Water and Groundwater Management Plan (document reference J1.9) • Outline Construction Fencing Plan (document reference J1.10) • Outline Construction Artificial Light Emissions Management Plan (document reference J1.11) • Outline Biosecurity Protocol (document reference J1.12) • Outline Bentonite Breakout Plan (document reference J1.13) • Outline Contaminated Land and Groundwater Discovery Strategy (document reference J1.14)</p>   |
| TA_0037_001_271023          | S44     | Email           | <p>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 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</p> | <p>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).</p> |
| TA_0038_022_181123          | S44     | Email           | <p>The PEIR - despite its (unmanageable) size - has a number of shortcomings: 1. The visual impact of the two ESSs has been grossly understated - almost hidden? There were no drawings/artists impression to provide the public with a reasonable impression of substation appearance and scale. The visual receptor photographs are nowhere near effective on giving residents a perspective on what the visual impact of the substations will be</p>   | <p>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</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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).  |
| TA_0038_023_181123          | S44     | Email           | 1. The visual impact of the two ESSs has been grossly understated – almost hidden? There were no drawings/artists impression to provide the public with a reasonable impression of substation appearance and scale. The visual receptor photographs are nowhere near effective on giving residents a perspective on what the visual impact of the substations will be | 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).  |
| TA_0038_024_181123          | S44     | Email           | 2. No definitive statement on visual mitigation was provided.   | Measures proposed to avoid or reduce landscape and visual impacts are set out in section 10.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES (document reference F3.10).<br>Details of the substation design are set out in the Outline Design Principles document (document reference J2). Landscape mitigation is proposed within the permanent substation sites and these measures are set out in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (document reference J2).   |
| TA_0038_025_181123          | S44     | Email           | 3. The proposal of two very large substations in close proximity, resulting in over intensive development and industrialisation of Zone 1, will have a significant adverse impact on local amenities and a change in the local character from rural/agricultural to industrial.   | Details of the impacts and effects in relation to landscape character are set out in section 10.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES (document reference F3.10).   |
| TA_0038_027_181123          | S44     | Email           | 5. There is no identification of permissible noise, light, vibration or EMR emission upper limits from the substations. The approach to visual and noise mitigation not defined.  | A baseline sound survey has been undertaken to quantify the baseline sound environment at locations representative of the nearest and most exposed noise sensitive receptors. The survey data has been used to derive representative daytime and night-time background sound levels at these receptors against which the assessment of operational noise impacts has been undertaken. Details are provided in Volume 3, Annex 8.1: Baseline sound survey of the ES and section 8.6.2 of this Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8).<br>The assessment of operational noise impacts is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3). 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.<br>An operational noise limit will be secured as a requirement of the DCO resulting in significant adverse effects being avoided and adverse effects minimised at all times.<br>The Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3) sets out details of the substation design, including lighting.<br>Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or used.<br>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 |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>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_0040_001_191123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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 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.</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). 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.</p> |
| TA_0042_001_191123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</p>  | <p>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.</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 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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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_115_221123          | S42     | Email           | Volume 4 Chapter 1: Seascape, Landscape and Visual Resources<br>15.1. MMO defers to and supports the statutory advice provided by the Natural England, historic England and/or the Local Planning Authority regarding the potential impacts to the seascape that may occur because of the Projects.  | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0010_116_221123          | S42     | Email           | 15.2. 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_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:<br>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.<br>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.<br>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_003_171123          | S44     | Email           | Reason for Objection- Substations I am writing this email, all of which is my strong objection to your proposals to build 2 enormous substations on greenbelt land where there are many properties in very close proximity. The land you propose to use is good grade A agricultural land which is used by farmers to provide them with a living. I also strongly object to your proposals for the substations on the grounds of:-1) My husband and I chose to retire here 5.5 years ago for a beautiful, large back garden and the peacefulness of the area and beautiful front views across open fields with cattle or sheep grazing after moving from the village. Had we known your intentions then we would never have bought the property.   | 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_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_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 can't 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   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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_011_171123          | S44     | Email           | 12.The PIER proposes 2 very large substations in close proximity, resulting in overintense development and industrialisation  | 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_002_181123          | S44     | Email           | I also strongly object to your proposals for the substations on the grounds of:-<br>3.My wife and I chose to retire here 5.5 years ago after moving from the village, to enjoy a beautiful, large back garden, peacefulness of the area and beautiful front views across open fields with livestock grazing in them. Had we known your intentions to construct 2 substations so close, then we would never have bought the property.<br>4.This will also impact people's general health my wife is asthmatic and requires to have windows open 24/7. However, this will be impossible due to the constant noise pollution (humming) again 24/7. My wife also suffers from hypothyroidism and needs access to Vitamin D via sunlight each day. Currently this is obtained by my wife tending to our garden, fish pond and the wildlife that frequents our garden daily, however, with the constant humming it will be impossible for her to do so comfortably.<br>5.I understand that the noise levels will be 38db above ambient, approaching to 70db, with ear protection required at 80db. Therefore, the constant noise level will be unbearable to say the least. | 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_0126_002_181123          | S44     | Email           | 3. The visual impacts of the industrial complexes are not made clear to residents close to the sites. The size and scale of the complexes is not made clear. The proposal for two large industrial complexes in close proximity will result in changing the character of the 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.  |
| TA_0126_004_181123          | S44     | Email           | 5. The proximity of the development to the current residential area shows no sign of consideration. The area would be changed from its current agricultural outlook to an industrial development ruining the character of the area. The loss of the agricultural land in zone 1 will have a negative socio-economic impact to the area. There is no indication of noise, light and EMF emission levels resulting from the development which will affect the immediate area and therefore residents.   | The Planning Statement (document reference J28) sets out an assessment on the impact on the countryside and location of the substations. 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). 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.  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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_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_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 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.   | 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 |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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_0132_001_191123          | S44     | Email           | I wish to register my utter disagreement with the planned wind farm, very close to my property. I believe I am the longest standing resident on REDACTED, having moved to this bungalow in September 1972, fifty one years ago. Many changes, not all for the better, have been made since then, but the thought of the absolute desecration of this rural area that this plan would bring, is devastating. The noise, disruption of traffic (already dreadful in this location), the years it will take to complete, is beyond comprehension. This country area was beautiful and has been encroached upon enough, in recent years. It also has huge drainage problems; properties and dykes are regularly waterlogged, through both Fylde (my council) and Blackpool Council inactivity. Inevitably the situation would be exacerbated should this project go ahead. Kindly register my complete disapproval.  | 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). 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_0133_005_191123          | S44     | Email           | (ii) The Corridor would affect an area of the Countryside<br><br>This would impact the the local countryside and animals<br><br>We attended the Consultation Event at Newton.<br><br>We look forward to hearing from you.  | 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.<br>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)<br>The Planning Statement (document reference J28) sets out an assessment on the impact on the countryside and location of the substations.  |
| 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).   |
| 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   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>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).</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_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. <a href="https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Fylde-Biodiversity-SPD-Adopted-11-September-2019-FINAL.pdf">https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Fylde-Biodiversity-SPD-Adopted-11-September-2019-FINAL.pdf</a> <a href="http://www.stannesonthesea-tc.gov.uk/documents/(12)%20150612-St.%20Anne%27s%20NDP%20Main%20Document%20Pre%20Submission%20Final.1.pdf">http://www.stannesonthesea-tc.gov.uk/documents/(12)%20150612-St.%20Anne%27s%20NDP%20Main%20Document%20Pre%20Submission%20Final.1.pdf</a> <a href="https://www.birdguides.com/sites/europe/britain-ireland/britain/england/lancashire/lytham-moss/">https://www.birdguides.com/sites/europe/britain-ireland/britain/england/lancashire/lytham-moss/</a> <a href="https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/EL6.020b-vi-Matter-6-Appendix-CA4-part-1-Oyston-Estates-050-.pdf">https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/EL6.020b-vi-Matter-6-Appendix-CA4-part-1-Oyston-Estates-050-.pdf</a> 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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).   |
| TA_0141_001_201123          | S44     | Email           | 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. | 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_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_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: 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_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 hazard- Traffic congestion in the areas surrounding the potential sitel am sure there must be other places this substation could be built within Fylde that would have considerably less impact on people's livelihoods.   | 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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:-<br>Green Belt land<br>Prime agricultural land, potentially rendering the land useless<br>In an area of separation<br>Far too close to two schools and residential properties<br>Flooding<br>Visual impact<br>Noise, light, vibration<br>Wildlife<br>Congestion<br>Decreasing the value of land and property<br>Safety hazard<br>Surely 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_001_201123          | S44     | Email           | Please see below and in addition:<br><br>I object to the building of substations on what is currently agricultural land. This will be a substantial change in the character of this semi-rural area and likely have a detrimental effect on the views enjoyed by so many of the local area and beyond.   | 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_0150_004_201123          | S44     | Email           | Visual impacts are grossly understated; no renderings were provided to give the public a reasonable impression of substance and scale.   | 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. 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. |
| TA_0150_005_201123          | S44     | Email           | The development will significantly adversely impact local amenities, change of character from rural to industrial, and potential flooding due to massive displacement caused by the enormous industrial development, ruining farmland for decades and placing homes at risk.   | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>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).</p>   |
| TA_0151_002_201123          | S44     | Email           | <p>There are no pictures or drawings of the planned substations and when independently check they are enormous and horrendous eyesores of gargantuan proportion, disproportionately huge compared to the area of the village.<br/>No detailed maps made available to view.</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). 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).</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_0156_005_211123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Visual impacts are grossly understated; no renderings were provided to give the public a reasonable impression of substance and scale.</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. 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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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.  |
| TA_0156_006_211123          | S44     | Email           | The development will significantly adversely impact local amenities, change of character from rural to industrial, and potential flooding due to massive displacement caused by the enormous industrial development, ruining farmland for decades and placing homes at risk.  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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). |
| 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_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 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   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | the substation. 30 meters tall is the same height as Conwy Castle and is going to look ridiculous within the proposed site.  | 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_003_211123          | S44     | Email           | 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.  | 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). |
| TA_0161_001_211123          | S44     | Email           | Proposed Morecambe & Morgan Wind Farms – Transmission Assets<br>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_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?<br>•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?<br>•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   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | 1, 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_012_211123          | S44     | Email           | <p>•The project has not provided meaningful information on noise levels, vibration, electro-magnetic radiation or light pollution during and post construction and the impact of these on humans and both domestic and farm animals. Will children attending local schools and nursery, particularly Strike Lane Primary School and Carr Hill High School be able to concentrate during lessons with construction and post-construction noise? Will any remaining dairy cows (after you have taken the farmland) be able to produce the same quantity and quality of milk? What is the impact on human beings of constant 24/7 exposure to noise when they have had a lifetime of peace and quiet?</p>  | <p>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). 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_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_0161_016_211123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Mitigation•No information has been made available relating to how the project will mitigate :-the construction activity; the visual impact of the substations; the noise and vibration levels both post and during construction; light pollution from the sites; electro-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_0163_004_211123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Visual impacts are grossly understated; no renderings were provided to give the public a reasonable impression of substance and scale.</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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | (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. 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.  |
| TA_0163_005_211123          | S44     | Email           | The development will significantly adversely impact local amenities, change of character from rural to industrial, and potential flooding due to massive displacement caused by the enormous industrial development, ruining farmland for decades and placing homes at risk.  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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). |
| 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 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. Detailed assessments are 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | measures adopted 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_0168_005_171123          | S44     | Email           | 5) I require full artists detailed drawing of exactly how this will look  | 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_0185_006_221123          | S44     | Email           | • Noise and light pollution from the construction of the substations would be significant.  | 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_0189_003_221123          | S44     | Email           | 2. It is very close to Strike Lane Primary School and Carr Hill High School. How will it affect the children attending these schools in terms of EMR, noise, light and vibration?   | 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). 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_0189_009_221123          | S44     | Email           | 6. The noise, vibration and light that would come from the site during and after construction would cause massive animal welfare issues. Any sudden loud or unexpected noises would cause the cattle to bolt and the resulting stampede would lead to serious injuries.   | 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_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 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 |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | <p>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_0197_004_221123          | S44     | Email           | Visual impacts are grossly understated; no renderings were provided to give the public a reasonable impression of substance and scale.  | <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. 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.</p>   |
| TA_0197_005_221123          | S44     | Email           | The development will significantly adversely impact local amenities, change of character from rural to industrial, and potential flooding due to massive displacement caused by the enormous industrial development, ruining farmland for decades and placing homes at risk | <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 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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>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).</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 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 offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted 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_004_221123          | S44     | Email           | Visual Impact  | <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>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
| TA_0200_006_221123          | S44     | Email           | Light Pollution from Sites Electro Magnetic Radiation  | 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). 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_0203_004_231123          | S44     | Email           | Visual impacts are grossly understated; no renderings were provided to give the public a reasonable impression of substance and scale.   | 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. 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.   |
| TA_0203_005_231123          | S44     | Email           | The development will significantly adversely impact local amenities, change of character from rural to industrial, and potential flooding due to massive displacement caused by the enormous industrial development, ruining farmland for decades and placing homes at risk. | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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 |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | <p>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).</p>   |
| TA_0204_004_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Visual impacts are grossly understated; no renderings were provided to give the public a reasonable impression of substance and scale.</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. 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.</p>  |
| TA_0204_005_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>The development will significantly adversely impact local amenities, change of character from rural to industrial, and potential flooding due to massive displacement caused by the enormous industrial development, ruining farmland for decades and placing homes at risk.</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 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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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).  |
| TA_0214_002_231123          | s44     | Email           | .I would like to ensure that these objections are logged:I object to the building of substations on what is currently agricultural land. This will be a substantial change in the character of this semi-rural area and likely have a detrimental effect on the views enjoyed by so many of the local area and beyond.   | 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 (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.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_0214_004_231123          | s44     | Email           | I object to the use of land within residential areas as construction compounds including the two indicated on REDACTED. 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  | 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_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 |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | <p>Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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 offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted 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_0225_019_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</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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_0226_013_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_0227_002_231123          | S44     | Email           | In addition, the siting of the substation is directly in view of the farmhouse which has a predominant south facing view with the boundary of the substation being about 120m from the farmhouse. 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 dwelling houses at [REDACTED] which also includes a [REDACTED]   | 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_013_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_0229_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | [REDACTED] comprises a dwelling house which is the family home plus an annex let on an assured shorthold tenancy, a farm shop and plant nursery together with a [REDACTED] which has a planning application submitted to [REDACTED]. In addition, the client has a sheep fattening business. The siting of the proposed Morecambe substation Option 1 site is directly in view of the [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 dwelling and [REDACTED] | 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 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 |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | <p>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).</p>   |
| TA_0229_012_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 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.</p>  |
| TA_0230_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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 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.</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). 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.</p> |
| TA_0230_011_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 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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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_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 process, is set out in Volume 1, 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. |
| 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_0233_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | Statutory Consultation Feedback in respect of Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms: Transmission Assets Statutory Consultation from 12 October 2023 – 23 November 2023 REDACTED My client owns two dwelling houses next to each other together with circa 35 acres of land at REDACTED which is immediately north of REDACTED where the proposed Morgan substation is proposed and due east is the proposed Morecambe substation Option 1 site. My clients properties will be significantly affected by the proposed schemes both during construction and the permanent substation sites thereafter. The substation sites are far too close to dwelling houses with health, visual and noise in mind. The 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 Morgan substation would be 400m from REDACTED, approx. 140m to REDACTED, 120m from REDACTED, similar distance to dwellings at the end of REDACTED track and approx. 100m from a housing estate immediately on the west side of REDACTED. It is wholly unacceptable to consider the Morgan substation site in this location given its close proximity to dwelling houses. | 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). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted 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_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_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_0235_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | This consultation feedback is made on behalf of REDACTED who own freehold land at REDACTED as owner occupier. My clients properties will be significantly affected by the proposed schemes both during construction and the permanent substation sites thereafter. The substation sites are far too close to dwelling houses with health, visual and noise in mind. The 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. | 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). 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. 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_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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>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_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 substations is intentional to deceive the public! 45acre 20meters tall this will be an 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>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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.</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 (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>Justification for the location of the Transmission Assets, including a description of the design and/or environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, 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_005_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Visual impacts are grossly understated; no renderings were provided to give the public a reasonable impression of substance and scale.</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. 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.</p>  |
| TA_0243_006_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>The development will significantly adversely impact local amenities, change of character from rural to industrial, and potential flooding due to massive displacement caused by the enormous industrial development, ruining farmland for decades and placing homes at risk.</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 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</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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).  |
| TA_0244_005_231123          | S44     | Email           | Visual impacts are grossly understated; no renderings were provided to give the public a reasonable impression of substance and scale.   | 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. 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.  |
| TA_0244_006_231123          | S44     | Email           | The development will significantly adversely impact local amenities, change of character from rural to industrial, and potential flooding due to massive displacement caused by the enormous industrial development, ruining farmland for decades and placing homes at risk. | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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). |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
| 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> |
| 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 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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>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> |



## E1.16.26 Aviation and radar table of responses

## E1.16.26.1 Aviation and radar table of responses (via feedback form)

**Table E1.16.26.1: Aviation and radar 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 (4.2; Aviation and radar) 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_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>   | 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.  |
| TA_0055_004_051123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | <p>The promotional material generally lightly skirts over road management. This is a major issue for which contractors and the councils have a well-founded local reputation in the Lytham St Annes area for being inept. There are for example only two main routes from north St Anne's and there has been considerable interruption to traffic flows for the smallest of junction changes. This can seriously impact the local community, extending to business and health (for the latter when people have to visit the hospitals but are faced with delays of over an hour).</p> <p>I have for example viewed the approval steps for the traffic management arrangements associated with a small junction change at the Queensway road (one of the only two main roads from St Annes) - this was grossly optimistic in terms of the interruption to traffic flows and not borne out in reality.</p> <p>Note Lytham St Annes has a relatively aged population and the main hospital is in Blackpool. In addition there are a number of leisure facilities close to the Airport that are heavily patronised - already football days have parking issues that are barely containable.</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. 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_0055_006_051123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      | 4.2                          | The effect of the electromagnetic radiation of local airport and air travel - has this been considered and what is the risk to closure of the airport as a result of miscalculation of the effect.  | 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_0056_024_141123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      | 4.2                          | <p>As previously stated<br/> <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>   | 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_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).  |
| TA_0062_005_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      | 4.2                          | I would be surprised if BAE Systems have no objections to this project.  | 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.  |
| 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_012_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      | 4.2                          | You will need to liaise with Blackpool Airport to avoid this assuming you are seeking the more sensible northern airport plan. Don't worry not much goes through the airport flights wise its a bit of a loss making white elephant and I am sure they would snap your hand off for any cash offer to allow you to cable through the airport   | The Applicants have engaged with Blackpool Airport. The impacts on aviation have been considered at Volume 3, Chapter 11: Aviation and radar of the ES (document reference: F3.11).  |
| 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 |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | 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_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)<br><br>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_0080_008_201123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      | 4.2                          | The development could cause interference with radar operations at Blackpool airport.  | 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.<br>I am also concerned about the size and the location of the transition joint boxes. I would like more information please.<br>I'm also concerned about the impact on the habitats of the nature reserve bordering our estate .<br>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.<br>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).<br>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_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 environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted 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 | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | 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. Please do all you can to run these cables directly out of the airport and into the countryside. | 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 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_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_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).  |
| TA_0098_013_081123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      | 4.2                          | Blackpool Airport and BAE close by.<br><br>Hopefully they will object to this, but you have probably already checked this out anyway.  | 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). 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.  |
| 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  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | 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_0106_007_281023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.3                          | The proposed routing is directly through a nature reserve and a designated green zone. Has the planning considered all the ordinances surrounding the use of green zone land and airport land in general.  | 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. 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). 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_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 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_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).  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| 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> <p>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.</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_0115_007_051123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 16                     |                              | <p>The only other thing I am concerned about is the impact to both the railway and airport.</p> <p>We already have a poor rail service, but does get used by both commuters and tourists alot. The proposed cable route means drilling underneath so presume the lines would have to be closed whilst work was being done, which is of course not supported.</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.</p>   |

## E1.16.26.2 Aviation and radar table of responses (via all other methods)



**Table E1.16.26.2: Aviation and radar table of responses (via all other methods)**

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
| TA_0003_008_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p><b>Sterilisation of Allocated Development Sites</b><br/>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 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.</p>   | <p>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.<br/>The effects of EMF on navigation aids are assessed in Volume 3, Chapter 11: Aviation and radar of the ES (document reference F3.11)</p> |
| TA_0022_001_161023          | S42     | Email           | <p>We refer to the consultation below. NATS owns and operates the St. Annes radar station. This site, is part of the national critical infrastructure and supports the provision of Air Traffic Services to various users in the UK. NATS notes that the site has been scoped out of the DCO. Accordingly, other than raising awareness and advising due care in respect of the power connection to the site, NATS anticipates no impact from the proposal and has no comments on the DCO application.</p>  | <p>The Applicants note your response.</p>   |
| TA_0025_001_231123          | S42     | Email           | <p><b>Subject: Representations to the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms: Transmission Assets Consultation</b><br/>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<br/>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</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> |

|                    |         |       |  |   |
|--------------------|---------|-------|--|---|
|                    |         |       | development to ensure MOD safeguarding interests are appropriately recognised and taken into account.  |   |
| TA_0025_002_231123 | S42     | Email | Generally, both construction activity and operational development within a six-kilometre radius of the Aerodrome will need to be assessed so as to demonstrate the degree of impact on the assets at the Aerodrome (a safeguarding assessment). This will need to include all aspects of construction, including the use of high cranes. Aerodrome Safeguarding is in place to ensure the safety of aircraft manoeuvring on the ground, taking off, landing or flying in the vicinity of the Aerodrome. BAE Systems needs to be assured that no aspect of the project will affect the safe operation and development of Warton Aerodrome. This includes a demonstration that the substations will not affect the Aerodrome obstacle limitation surfaces or radar and transmitter/receiver aerial surfaces.   | 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. |
| TA_0025_003_231123 | S42     | Email | There is also a 13km radius wildlife zone. The Aerodrome at Warton needs to be consulted on any developments that have the potential to attract wildlife. Birds are the main concern, particularly large, over-wintering birds. In relation to this, BAE Systems have initial concerns about the proposal to develop an “ Onshore and Intertidal Net Gain Enhancement Plan....to identify areas where biodiversity net gain is proposed. This will include details of the measures proposed, including details of any enhancement measures proposed for waterbirds.” (Preliminary Environmental Information Report Non-Technical Summary, October 2023). BAE Systems is particularly concerned about any enhancement measures in the wildlife zone that will increase the attractiveness of the area for birds (including new areas of standing water) as this has significant potential to negatively affect air safety.  | The Applicants welcome BAE Systems’ engagement and proactive approach to the Transmission Assets planning and development. This comment was taken into consideration at the mitigation stage when the project was undertaking site selection activities to locate areas where mitigation could be provided. Due to BAE Systems concerns, any biodiversity benefit, mitigation and enhancement has been sited outside of the wildlife zone.  |
| 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 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, 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 | 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_0010_117_221123 | S42     | Email | Volume 4 Chapter 2: Aviation and Radar<br>16.1. MMO defers to and supports the Civil Aviation Authority and Ministry of Defence regarding the potential impacts on shipping and navigation that may occur because of the Projects.   | The Applicants welcome the MMO’s engagement and response.   |

|                    |     |       |  |  |
|--------------------|-----|-------|--|--|
| TA_0133_001_191123 | S44 | Email | <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Affect the Indoor Riding School</li> <li>- Affect the Outdoor Riding Paddock. The Compound would affect the financial viability of the Horse Riding Schools</li> <li>- Raising Insurance Premiums. The Compound would affect Riding for the Disabled Lessons at REDACTED</li> <li>- Any noise would severely disrupt these lessons in both the Indoor School and the Outdoor Paddock</li> <li>- The Compound would remove the landing site for the Air Ambulance - which is more acute in accidents involving Riding for the Disabled clients</li> <li>(ii) The Compound would affect 2 Farms. The Compound would affect the day to day operation. The Compound would affect the financial viability.</li> </ul> | <p>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.</p>   |
| TA_0140_006_201123 | S44 | Email | <p>There will surely be a negative impact on Blackpool Airport and also the St Anne's Nature Reserve.</p>  | <p>The Applicants have engaged with the airport operators. The impacts on aviation have been considered at Volume 3, Chapter 11: Aviation and radar of the ES (document reference: F3.11).</p>   |
| TA_0167_008_171023 | S44 | Email | <p>In your documents you point to mitigation for the effects of Electro Magnetic fields but there is no indication of how this will be carried out and how effective it will be. Apart from the possible effects on Navigation Aids for air traffic using Blackpool Airport I understand that Electromagnetic Hypersensitivity exists as a medical condition for some in the population and there is no apparent statement as to how this has been considered. These vague proposals have caused uncertainty and, for some I am sure, anxiety as all that has been presented for consultation is, in effect, a red line boundary showing the probable area in which the onshore transmission assets are to be located.</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).</p> |



## E1.16.27 Socio-economics table of responses

## E1.16.27.1 Socio-economics table of responses (via feedback form)

**Table E1.16.27.1: Socio-economics 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 (4.4; Socio-economics) 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_001_171123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | <p>Totally unacceptable for surrounding areas.</p> <p>As a leisure business owner (caravan and camping field) this will mean the closure of a life long ambition and a very successful business.</p> <p>Substations proposed position within 200 yards of camp site</p> <p>Will lose views, sunlight and livelihood</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, 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). 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). 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).</p> |
| TA_0053_012_171123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 5                      |                              | <p>There again will impact on only my own land and business but many others,lanes too narrow,too close to residential area</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_0053_016_171123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 9                      |                              | <p>As previously stated totally unsuitable and too great an impact on local businesses and residents</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</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | <p>measures adopted 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>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_0053_020_171123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 16                     |                              | <p>Should not be allowed at any of proposals.</p> <p>Will be the eventual closure of my business and greatly affect property values.</p>   | <p>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).</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:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</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:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p> |
| TA_0056_026_141123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      | 4.4                          | <p>As previously stated<br/><i>("This I feel is deliberately written in such language that the regular lay person cannot possibly understand what it means.<br/>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.</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 Statement of Community Consultation).</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| TA_0060_009_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | Clifton Drive north coastal road is a main road which leads to major traffic congestion throughout the Fyld area thus affecting businesses nationwide.   | 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).<br>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.<br>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_251_004_231123           | S44     | Consult Online       | NULL                   |                              | 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.<br>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.  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_0070_001_231123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 7                      |                              | Concern over destruction and availability of good agricultural land.<br><br>The planning for use and access to farmland.<br><br>Land will be divided and not usable. Also the economic impact of no crops.   | 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).<br>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_0072_001_231123          | S44     | Consult Online       | NULL                   |                              | Terrible map, secretive, and you are crossing our land in a zig 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 necessity 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).<br>Detailed assessments are 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_0074_011_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      | 4.1                          | Local business relies on visitors who will not come if the area is a building site   | A full impact assessment on socio-economics is presented in Volume 4 Chapter 2 of the ES (document reference F4.2). 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      | 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_0075_001_071123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | I think this Wind Farm Project is vital. The UK as a whole will benefit from low carbon energy, being less reliant on gas. The local area : businesses and residents will benefit. However as a local resident, I do have some concerns as mentioned below.  | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0075_011_071123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 15                     |                              | The local area and beyond will benefit in terms of highly skilled, well paid job opportunities. Local businesses and suppliers could also benefit.   | 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_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 environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted 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_002_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | <p>Access into Lytham &amp; St Annes from the M55 is limited to 2 routings currently, The most popular being the route along Queensway. This route is used by several groups which should be considered. Ambulance services, Ambulances travel along Queensway regularly attending emergencies in Lytham &amp; St Annes. delays caused by queueing traffic on this road put local lives at risk. Tourists visiting Lytham &amp; St Annes are also likely to be impacted possibly resulting in fewer visitors who choose not to visit due to work being carried out on the main route into the towns. Whilst another route is available along Clifton Drive, this became congested also during a recent period of temporary lights on Queensway. As a result of potentially fewer visitors during the installation phase, there would likely be an impact on businesses.</p> <p>I am a resident of REDACTED in St Annes, a development located directly off Queensway. We have one access point onto and off of the estate which would also be impacted by the use of Queensway making it even more difficult to access the estate.</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>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_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.   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| TA_0085_008_191123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      |                              | See 4.1 below<br><i>(Visual impact out at sea could impact the local tourist economy which is a massive part of the economy for Blackpool and Lytham St Annes and the sheer high volume of wind structures is considerable.)</i>   | 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_0085_009_191123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      | 4.1                          | Visual impact out at sea could impact the local tourist economy which is a massive part of the economy for Blackpool and Lytham St Annes and the sheer high volume of wind structures is considerable.   | 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_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.<br>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<br><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.<br>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<br><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.<br>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                      |                              | Feedback on Transmission Assets Project<br><br>I wish to object to the proposals for the following reasons<br><br>- 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.<br>- It feels like someone has just looked at a map and | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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. |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p>decided these are the easiest places, with little other consideration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Your website is hard to navigate and does not provide large scale detailed maps. It is difficult to determine exact proposed areas.</li> <li>- There has been little consideration of potential flood risks and lack of information to local residents about how this would be managed.</li> <li>- There is no information about why any Fylde or Blackpool Council enterprise zones or brown field sites have not been considered.</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- There is no information about how any access to the sites would be obtained, and no assessment about impact on local traffic and roads.</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- This is an area of quite countryside and would involve significant loss of a local amenity and change to the local environment.</li> <li>- Potential loss of value to local property.</li> <li>- Two large sub stations are proposed quite near to each other, making a significant impact on the local amenity.</li> <li>- 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</li> <li>- I have attended public consultation meetings which have been poorly presented with representatives being poorly prepared and unable to answer most questions</li> </ul> | <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> |
| TA_0092__002_151123         | S44     | Online feedback form | 7                      |                              | <p>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.</p>  | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>  |
| TA_0092__005_151123         | S44     | Online feedback form | 12                     |                              | <p>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</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>Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | in the most sympathetic way possible. Ongoing consultation is necessary to achieve this.  | 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).<br>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__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.<br>- Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2).<br>- Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3).<br>- Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4).<br>- Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5).<br><br>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__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_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.<br>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.<br>We welcome further input from the local community and encourage you to reach out to the project team in due course.  |
| TA_0092__031_151123         | S44     | Online feedback form | 5                      |                              | Refer to previous comments re any impacts, direct or indirect on our LEHQ (Energy) Campus based at the Enterprise Zone. This is a live teaching area - any interruptions to our ability to deliver specialised training courses would have both a negative financial and reputational impact on the College. The specialised nature of these courses and the equipment involved make it impossible to relocate these activities to another part of the College. | This area lies outside the Transmission Assets Order Limits and no impacts are predicted.  |
| 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.<br><br>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.<br>The UK Government has also produced a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful:  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.  |
| TA_0252_001_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | 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.  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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.  |
| TA_0252_003_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.7                          | I was informed by staff at the Kirkham open meeting that the farm occupation road off READCTED would not be used by machinery to access the proposed cabling but access directly from REDACTED where the cabling crosses. The occupation road could become extremely soiled if heavy machinery accesses the project via this route and could cause extreme disruption to the REDACTED also relying on the same access route if works are carried out in adverse weather conditions. | 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_0252_004_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 5                      |                              | 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.  | 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 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. |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
| 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). 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. 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). 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 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_0100_006_241023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      | 4.1                          | <p>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.</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_0100_007_241023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      | 4.4                          | <p>Put profits into local area not go to faceless shareholders after all they do not own the land/sea the residents should</p>  | <p>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      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
| TA_0100_010_241023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 15                     |                              | <p>All or half profits goes to local councils so they can spend on local communities .</p> <p>Profits should not go to faceless shareholders until the local area is fully compensated for the damage this project will do and the area should get free power . Alternatively only potentially a nominal charge for residents effected by this project should be charge for power after all it is us that have put up with this eyesore and the private firms do not own this land.</p>   | <p>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_0104_001_101123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      |                              | <p>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.</p>   | <p>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).</p>  |
| TA_0106_013_281023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 8                      |                              | <p>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)</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, 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_0106_016_281023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 16                     |                              | <p>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</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>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.</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</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p>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 &amp; 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>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 &amp; 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). 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> <p>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> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| TA_0112_004_231123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | The local dunes, pier, seafront is a tourist draw to the Lytham St Annes that has little else in the way of commerce. We rely on tourism and a pleasant environment to attract visitors, disrupting that I believe would have lasting effects. Also not knowing how long and what form works would take will disrupt access to facilities etc for residents and disrupt their right to quiet enjoyment of their environment. | <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).</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>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 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.</p> |

## E1.16.27.2 Socio-economics table of responses (via all other methods)



**Table E1.16.27.2: Socio-economics table of responses (via all other methods)**

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| TA_0002_001_171123          | S42     | Email           | <p>1. Summary</p> <p>Freckleton Parish Council and the local community has no inherent objections to the principles of establishment off-Shore Wind Farms as a means of meeting the Energy Targets from renewable sources. However, there are deep concerns regarding the Proposal that is currently being placed before us because of the potentially disastrous implications for the future of The Fylde as a farming community and as a place of amenity for the residents and the many visitors who enjoy the facilities and environment that the Fylde currently affords.</p> <p>This note attempts to summarise these views and provides the overall conclusion that we must object to the proposals as presented as the impact is too high when compared to both the Local and National Benefit to be accrued.</p> <p>The note provides details of the logic behind this conclusion, especially relating to the programme consultation process, maturity of definition and likely cost issues arising.</p>   | The Applicant notes your response. Responses to detailed comments provided in turn associated to each topic raised (see unique reference TA_0002).   |
| TA_0002_015_171123          | S42     | Email           | <p>9. Conclusions</p> <p>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:</p> <p>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> | The Applicant notes your response. Responses to detailed comments provided in turn associated to each topic raised (see unique reference TA_0002).   |
| TA_0003_016_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Community Benefit</p> <p>For the reasons set out above, Fylde Council has significant concerns about the nature of the proposed development, its potential adverse impact on the local area and the absence of detail in the consultation submission.</p>  | The Applicants note your response  |
| TA_0003_017_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>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.</p>  | 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_111_231123          | S42     | Email           | <p>8. The developers' documentation has so far failed to demonstrate how the south Fylde resident: individuals, communities and enterprises will each have a net benefit from this programme. This needs to be corrected.</p>   | Information on biodiversity benefit 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). Impacts and effects, including any beneficial effects, are set out in Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document references F1 to F4). 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_0012_007_221123          | S42     | Email           | <p>We also have concerns about the impact on the sand dunes where these cables come ashore and the eco systems that has been worked on over the years. We feel that there will need to be road closures as the building work is started in an area that has limited access in and out of St Anne's. The town has suffered over the years when roads have been closed, snarling up the town. These</p>   | 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | construction times will be over years not weeks or months and will have a negative economic impact on our town.   | provided in section 3.11 of Volume 3 Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3). 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_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_027_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Electromagnetic radiation, light pollution, noise, and vibration levels for residents generated by the substations should be specified and set at best practice levels. The maximum levels for those residential receptors in close proximity to the substations should be specified with appropriate monitoring and enforcement in place to ensure these levels are not breached. These levels should be identified both during construction and once construction is completed.   | A baseline sound survey has been undertaken to quantify the baseline sound environment at locations representative of the nearest and most exposed noise sensitive receptors. The survey data has been used to derive representative daytime and night-time background sound levels at these receptors against which the assessment of operational noise impacts has been undertaken. Details are provided in Volume 3, Annex 8.1: Baseline sound survey of the ES and section 8.6.2 of this Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8). The assessment of operational noise impacts is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3). 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. An operational noise limit will be secured as a requirement of the DCO resulting in significant adverse effects being avoided and adverse effects minimised at all times. 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 |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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_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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Relocation of critical Operational Airport Infrastructure – including control tower, apron, fire station, taxiway, fuel farm facilities and radar</li> </ul> <p>The 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Support 5,000 no. new jobs;</li> <li>•Attract £300m + of private sector investment;</li> <li>•Generate a cumulative Gross Value Added total over the first five years of £232m and £2.08bn over the Enterprise Zone's lifetime;</li> <li>•Assist in the diversification of the local economy, which relies heavily upon tourism and the public sector;</li> <li>•Seek a sustainable future for Blackpool Airport</li> </ul> | 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_003_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Planning Applications 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"> <li>•Full planning permission – 12 no. grassed pitches (refs. 20/0108 Blackpool and 20/0114 Fylde); and</li> <li>•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)</li> </ul> <p>An application for the land to the north of the Sports Village, named the Eastern Gateway, has subsequently been approved and planning permission granted for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•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).</li> </ul> <p>There are two current applications, which are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Hybrid planning application relating to Enterprise Zone development consisting of a full planning application for the construction</li> </ul>   | 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  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | 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)  |   |
| 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 WeshamPolicy 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> | 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_0038_025_181123          | S44     | Email           | 3. The proposal of two very large substations in close proximity, resulting in over intensive development and industrialisation of Zone 1, will have a significant adverse impact on local amenities and a change in the local character from rural/agricultural to industrial.   | Details of the impacts and effects in relation to landscape character are set out in section 10.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 10: Landscape and visual resources of the ES (document reference F3.10).  |
| TA_0038_032_181123          | S44     | Email           | 10. These two ESSs will result in significant loss of pasture land to dairy farms in Zone 1. This impacts our food-security and would render them commercially non-viable with consequently adverse socio-economic impact.  | The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets on agricultural land use 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). This includes consideration of the effects of all elements of the Transmission Assets, including onshore substations on the viability existing farming businesses. 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 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_0038_033_181123          | S44     | Email           | 11. If any of the farms that suffer adverse socio-economic impact are owned by the Hornbie Trust then this would reduce the financial support that can be provided to the local Newton Bluecoat Primary School. Was this considered by M&M during their assessment of 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  |

| 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).<br>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)   |
| TA_0043_001_211123          | S44     | Email           | Please note that my farming business REDACTED based at REDACTED will be severely negatively impacted by the proposed cable laying project from Morecambe and Morgan, I list my objections to the project below: 1a I own and run a dairy farming business and employ 3 full time workers and local contracting firms regularly are employed by our business. As such, I contribute to the local rural economy. These jobs are in danger from this project as I may be forced to exit the dairy industry and my labour requirements will dwindle. 1b My land is used to graze a large herd of dairy cows, other cattle and other livestock and grow feed/bedding. I produce high quality milk which I sell to a large dairy company who process liquid milk and manufacture multiple dairy products to feed our growing population. This contributes to UK food security and ensures minimal environmental impact as food is produced and consumed within the North of England, reducing environmental damage caused by importing food stuff. | 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.  |
| TA_0043_005_211123          | S44     | Email           | 5 My medium- and long-term plan upon my retirement was to seek a dairy farming tenant. I have begun the selection process. Your project has stymied my plans as no tenant is likely to take on a tenancy on a moribund dairy farm which will have limited access to grazing blocks between the farm buildings and the land. Any rental bids are likely to be much reduced.   | Following route refinement, Dalcour McLaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms to secure the rights for the cables and any compounds which will include provisions for compensation and impacts on the farming business.   |
| TA_0043_006_211123          | S44     | Email           | 6 I have several diversification projects which are jeopardised. I have already agreed an option for a solar park on some of my land which will be affected by your cable laying plans. What solar company will take the risk of applying for planning permission – my land has been effectively sterilised. Any potential planning permission for housing development of large or small scale is also impacted.   | Following route refinement, Dalcour McLaren 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_0043_007_211123          | S44     | Email           | 7 Much of the farm consists of small 5-to-10-acre fields. The wide proposed cable easement which runs diagonally will inevitably mean that far more land in addition to the cable easement will become unfeasible to farm. Small irregularly shaped plots of land are impossible to mow or plough and even grazing is impractical.   | Following route refinement, Dalcour McLaren 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_0043_008_211123          | S44     | Email           | 8 The proposed manhole inspection covers (potentially in large numbers), have to be ploughed around, cultivated and mown around with slurry/fertiliser/weed control all being made much more difficult and costly. Contractors often refuse to work in fields with many manhole covers as whilst in theory they can be marked and worked around, in practice any small error by a driver can cause thousands of pounds worth of damage to machinery.   | 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. Following route refinement, Dalcour McLaren 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_0043_010_211123          | S44     | Email           | 10 Some small income streams such as our farm shoot, fishing and dog training facilities are not only important to the farm but also contribute to the livelihoods of neighbours and mental and physical well being our local community.   | 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.<br>As part of the Heads of Terms negotiations, there will be provisions included for compensation for loss of income as a consequence of the scheme and impact on the farming business.                                   |
| TA_0043_011_211123          | S44     | Email           | 11 Some of the best cropping fields on the farm are on the cable route. This farm is largely self-sufficient for good financial and biosecurity reasons. The crop loss in the short term and reduction of  | Following route refinement, Dalcour McLaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms to secure the rights for the  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | crop yield in the long term negatively affect us financially and our biosecurity and environmental credentials.  | cables and compound which will include provisions for compensation of severed land and impact on farming operations.   |
| TA_0043_012_211123          | S44     | Email           | 12 Loss of grazing: the easement will significantly reduce the area of grazing available and also the area where farm manures can be spread. This will increase 'slurry loading' which is a significant threat to the environment.   | 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_0043_016_211123          | S44     | Email           | 16 Any compensation package for landowners doesn't benefit tenants or the farm staff/contractors who may lose their jobs/revenue. We have made considerable financial investments in our dairy farming facilities recently. The project hugely impacts our ability to sweat these assets. Would Morgan and Morecambe prefer to leave the Fylde with some robust businesses rather than the alternative and leave lame ducks which may struggle? This is a multi-billion-pound project which is about profit for BP amongst others. I note the Chief Executive of BP was paid 10 million salary last 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 cables and compound which will include provisions for compensation of severed land and impact on farming operations.   |
| TA_0043_021_211123          | S44     | Email           | 21 Construction timescale: the project involves a very extended timescale over many years. Potentially there will be two extended waves of construction as each project may be constructed at different times. This may mean that all local business will be damaged for up to a decade.   | 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).<br>Detailed assessments are 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_0043_023_211123          | S44     | Email           | 23 The emotional impact of seeing the land which has been worked by generations of our family dug up and mutilated will impact on our mental well being and affects our enjoyment of the land as it is more than 'just' our place of work -it is our lives. Family members walk or exercise their dogs multiple times a day across our farmland. Any restrictions on this will impact their mental wellbeing. Generations of our family have been born and brought up here including our own children. Their potential ability to enjoy, live and/or work the land will be affected.   | 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).  |
| TA_0044_001_211123          | S44     | Email           | Background to our farming businesses. We are a family run farming business based at REDACTED and REDCATED, also renting neighbouring land. We farm; 350 acres of intensive grassland and 40 acres of low input rough grazing in SSSI. With 240 Dairy cows and 430 young stock and beef cattle. Annual Production 2.25 million litres of milk, sold on supermarket contract with Co op via Muller, 200 finished beef cattle sold deadweight to Morrisons 50 Wagyu cattle finished for Warrendale wagyu on a premium contract. Both our milk and beef buyers are keen for us to have a low carbon footprint and farm in a animal welfare and sustainable manner. These are continually monitored and scored annually, with severe penalties if we do not score well. The BP cable is likely to reduce our acreage by about 75-80 acres and affect 9 fields, most of which are used for making high quality grass forage and later season young stock grazing, as they are fast working flat fields ideal for large silage making equipment. All land currently farmed is within 1 mile of silage clamps and slurry stores allowing for fast operations. All the acres we currently farm are required for slurry applications to keep us within 250kg/ha N that current regulations state for annual spreading. | The Applicants note your response. Responses to detailed points provided. See unique reference TA_0044.  |
| TA_0044_004_211123          | S44     | Email           | Problems we foresee;<br>1. We fear loss of contracts if we are unable to maintain output and if our sustainability score is affected, as purchased feeds are a lot less sustainable than home grown forage<br>2. We do not know how we will feed our cattle if we lose up to 25% of our farmland<br>3. We do not know what we will do with slurry if we have less acreage to spread.   | Following route refinement, Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss provisions for compensation of severed land and impact on farming operations.  |
| TA_0044_007_211123          | S44     | Email           | 7. We feel field operations eg silaging will be more costly and inefficient, as access and field size will be compromised  | 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 which will include provisions for compensation of severed land and impact on farming operations.  |
| TA_0046_001_171123          | S44     | Email           | I would like to express my concerns regarding the work that passes our farm on REDACTED. We have 25 horses here and the horses hack out daily around the area the hassle this work is going to cause our business could see us close.  | Impacts and effects on recreational users (including horse rides) and public rights of way are set out in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES (document reference F3.6). Details of the management of   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | I would like to know what efforts you're going to make not to affect the wellbeing of our customers and their horses. From the rare breed of Suffolk Punch and competition horses they need daily exercise, a great deal of care and access to the farm is required at all time.   | these routes during construction are set out in the Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (document reference J1.5).   |
| TA_0048_002_231123          | S44     | Email           | The cable corridor defies the whole concept of green energy, the environmental impacts are to severe on small community that already have to live with excessive noise ,bae systems, Grange 1,2and 3 land fill sites, Clifton marsh sewage, water treatment works Nuclear fuels springfields works, Kirkham prison ,one would wonder how much this community has to live with  | <p>A baseline sound survey has been undertaken to quantify the baseline sound environment at locations representative of the nearest and most exposed noise sensitive receptors. The survey data has been used to derive representative daytime and night-time background sound levels at these receptors against which the assessment of operational noise impacts has been undertaken. Details are provided in Volume 3, Annex 8.1: Baseline sound survey of the ES and section 8.6.2 of this Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8).The assessment of operational noise impacts is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3). 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.An operational noise limit will be secured as a requirement of the DCO resulting in significant adverse effects being avoided and adverse effects minimised at all times.</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 - 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).</p> |
| TA_0010_119_221123          | S42     | Email           | 18. Volume 4 Chapter 4: Socio-Economics<br>18.1. MMO defers to the Local Planning Authority regarding the potential impacts on socio-economics that may occur because of the Projects.   | The Applicants note your response.  |
| 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. NamelyThe two farms 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. | 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_0124_012_171123          | S44     | Email           | 13.The farmers are going to lose vast amounts of land rendering many of them without commercial income. This will have an adverse socio economic impact. Ive spoken with many angry residents over the past weeks and have just been at a meeting organised by Newton Residents Association with Mark Menzies, where the anger in the room was palpable. Im sure you will receive many emails like this one, showing extreme opposition to your plans ahead of the 23rd November.  | 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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_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 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.  | 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_0126_004_181123          | S44     | Email           | 5. The proximity of the development to the current residential area shows no sign of consideration. The area would be changed from its current agricultural outlook to an industrial development ruining the character of the area. The loss of the agricultural land in zone 1 will have a negative socio-economic impact to the area. There is no indication of noise, light and EMF emission levels resulting from the development which will affect the immediate area and therefore residents.   | The Planning Statement (document reference J28) sets out an assessment on the impact on the countryside and location of the substations. 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). 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_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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | <p>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).</p> |
| TA_0133_001_191123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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</p> | <p>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.</p>   |
| TA_0133_004_191123          | S44     | Email           | <p>2. THE ONSHORE EXPORT CABLE CORRIDOR – REDACTED. We join all our neighbours in opposing this corridor (i) The Corridor would affect 2 Farms The Corridor would affect the day to day operation The Corridor would affect the financial viability.</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). 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:</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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.  |
| 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).  |
| TA_0135_002_191123          | S44     | Email           | The proposed route will have a severe impact on the local communities with transport disruption, impact on businesses and the well-being of the local residents.   | 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). 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 |
| TA_0135_005_191123          | S44     | Email           | The suggestion that a noise level projection of 70 decibels is expected, when ear protection is required at 80, should be a large red flag for anyone involved in the planning process, as it will have the most horrendous impact on the local residents, schools , businesses etc.   | 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_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  | 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | concerned about the work devaluing my home, as well as significantly disrupting my family's life for a significant period of time.  | <p>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>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_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.</p> <p>- Accompanying documentation. <a href="https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Fylde-Biodiversity-SPD-Adopted-11-September-2019-FINAL.pdf">https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Fylde-Biodiversity-SPD-Adopted-11-September-2019-FINAL.pdf</a> <a href="http://www.stannesonthesea-tc.gov.uk/documents/(12)%20150612-St.%20Anne%27s%20NDP%20Main%20Document%20Pre%20Submission%20Final.1.pdf">http://www.stannesonthesea-tc.gov.uk/documents/(12)%20150612-St.%20Anne%27s%20NDP%20Main%20Document%20Pre%20Submission%20Final.1.pdf</a> <a href="https://www.birdguides.com/sites/europe/britain-ireland/britain/england/lancashire/lytham-moss/">https://www.birdguides.com/sites/europe/britain-ireland/britain/england/lancashire/lytham-moss/</a> <a href="https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/EL6.020b-vi-Matter-6-Appendix-CA4-part-1-Oyston-Estates-050-.pdf">https://new.fylde.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/EL6.020b-vi-Matter-6-Appendix-CA4-part-1-Oyston-Estates-050-.pdf</a> 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_0143_001_201123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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, REDACTED. 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</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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | 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.   | 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_0144_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. | 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 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). 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_005_201123          | S44     | Email           | There will also be a significant loss of pastureland to dairy farms in zone 1 that would make them commercially non-viable, ending their farming businesses.  | 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.  |
| 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  | Detailed assessments are 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   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | 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.  |  |
| 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 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. | 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_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 land,Prime agricultural land, potentially rendering the land useless.In an area of separation. Far too close to two schools and residential properties.Flooding,Visual impact,Noise, light, vibration,Wildlife,Congestion,Decreasing the value of land and property,Safety hazard.Surely 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_0150_005_201123          | S44     | Email           | The development will significantly adversely impact local amenities, change of character from rural to industrial, and potential flooding due to massive displacement caused by the enormous industrial development, ruining farmland for decades and placing homes at risk.  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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). |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
| TA_0150_009_201123          | 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 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). |
| TA_0151_007_201123          | S44     | Email           | 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.   | 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 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_0152_001_201123          | S44     | Email           | After attending a Consultation event at Newton Village Hall and the Newton Residents Association meetings I feel I need to voice my anger at what is being proposed to yourselves directly. Firstly the destruction of hundreds of acres of prime farming land especially around Newton & Freckleton is | 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | horrific. The farms will no longer be commercially viable which have probably been in their families for generations. No farms = no food .   | 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_0153_001_201123          | S44     | Email           | I am emailing to strongly object to the proposed substation to be placed on the outskirts of Freckleton. This will cause significant road and rail disruption within the Fylde area, seriously affecting peoples lives and ability to get to work for a long period. It will also take the livelihood of a number of farmers and severally effect the economy of the Fylde.  | 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). 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.   |
| 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 land to be built on represents demarcation land between local villages and parishes. Losing this and effectively placing industrial units between them will not only join these villages but cause the loss of "rural fylde" , again 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_0156_006_211123          | S44     | Email           | The development will significantly adversely impact local amenities, change of character from rural to industrial, and potential flooding due to massive displacement caused by the enormous industrial development, ruining farmland for decades and placing homes at risk.   | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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  |



| 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). Detailed assessments are 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). |
| TA_0158_017_211123          | S44     | Email           | 8. There will be a significant loss in pasture land to the dairy farms in Zone 1, which may render them commercially unviable with consequently adverse socio-economic impact.   | 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_0161_013_211123          | S44     | Email           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?</li> <li>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?</li> </ul> | 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.  |
| TA_0161_015_211123          | S44     | Email           | • 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   | 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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>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_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 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_0162_003_211123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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_0163_005_211123          | S44     | Email           | <p>The development will significantly adversely impact local amenities, change of character from rural to industrial, and potential flooding due to massive displacement caused by the enormous industrial development, ruining farmland for decades and placing homes at risk.</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 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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>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).</p>  |
| TA_0165_005_211123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Moreover, the proposed construction of the transformer will result in the loss of valuable farm land in the Newton area. This loss is concerning not only from an agricultural perspective but also in terms of the environmental impact on our community. I urge the developers to provide detailed information on how they plan to mitigate the loss of farm land and any plans for compensatory measures.</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_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 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</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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.  |
| TA_0167_006_171023          | S44     | Email           | How will you deal with closures of Clifton Drive North a key route to St Annes on the Sea and Lytham towns? What is the effect on tourism, which both towns depend on economically, if access to these is significantly disturbed? How will you cross the Preston to Blackpool South railway line if open excavation is necessary without closing this and severely impacting on its use by both locals and visitors? In 8.7.5.4 of the Non-Technical Summary you talk of some requirement to close the beach to public access during the construction phase. This is surely inevitable given the need to build transition joint bays, tunnel under the Sand Dunes, Clifton Road North and the Nature Reserve, Railway Line, Golf Club and or Blackpool Airport, lay and joint eighteen High Voltage cables, carry out remedial works etc. No timescale for the works in this area is given but it is inconceivable that the works will not be significant or lengthy. The attraction of visitors to St Annes on the Sea (you will hopefully appreciate that Lytham St Annes is a generic term covering the town of St Annes-on-the-Sea, Andsell, Fairhaven and the town of Lytham) lies in its traditional seaside appeal encompassing the town, the beach and significantly the extensive and unspoilt sand dunes. Closures of the beach and the intrusive nature of the proposed works will do nothing to help the economy of St Annes nor its essential visitors on whom local businesses depend for their seasonal spending. | 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 Management Plan has been appended to the Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (document reference B13), which includes measures to minimise potential impacts. 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_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 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. Detailed assessments are 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_001_221123          | S44     | Email           | We are sending this email as part of the public consultation period to strongly OBJECT to your proposals regarding the proposed offshore wind farm cable routing and substation locations across the Fylde area. The proposed route of cables involves the destruction of greenbelt Grade A agricultural land. The land is used by farmers for the growing of crops, the grazing of animals and the spreading of farmyard manure which gives nutrients to the soil. Local farmers, who have been in this area for generations, rely on this land for their livelihoods. The sheer scale of your proposal would rip through the land of numerous farmers; to go ahead with the project would both bankrupt the farmers themselves and have a knock-on effect for local businesses who rely on these farms for goods, sales, and services. It amazes us how you are perfectly willing to tunnel under the golf  | 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 (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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | course, but will not do similar to avoid impacting upon the livelihoods of farmers and the businesses for which they provide.   | 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_0183_003_221123          | S44     | Email           | Furthermore, roads will face disruption while the work goes ahead. Both Lytham and Blackpool rely on tourism for their economies, with events such as Lytham Festival proving a huge draw for tourists and those from further afield. With roads in chaos, tourism to local towns will fall, and staff who work at local employers, such as REDACTED, will face major disruptions getting to work.  | 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). 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_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_0185_001_221123          | S44     | Email           | I am writing to advise that I object to the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farm substation, easement and transmission asset proposals as these will have a direct impact on my dairy farm business and leave it unviable. The Farm is an award winning (both locally and nationally) dairy unit. We supply the Cooperative Arla and are part of the Arla Care brand. The farms that supply the Arla Care brand have been selected for the grazing system and have a requirement to produce them against enhanced standards. These enhanced standards include higher welfare and environmental standards and provide a lower carbon footprint. We operate a grassland grazing system, which requires the cows to have grazing access to all of the grazing land. Heavy investment has been made in a track system that allows efficient movement of cows to and from the grazing paddock with minimum labour. In addition, the track system allows the grass crop management (which is measured on a weekly basis) to provide optimum quantity and quality feed for the grazing herd. The proposal of the Morgan substation and temporary site takes a large area of land away from the unit and we await to understand the roads and easements for this substation for the full impact. Then if the Morecambe site is selected as Morecambe 2 this would take away the land and block the usage | 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).   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | of the remaining land and this would devastate the whole farm business. If Morecambe 1 is selected as the preferred site this would also impact on the farm as it would take a major amount of land for the access roads and return easements to Penwortham. Either option Morecambe or Morecambe would leave the farm unviable.   | Detailed assessments are 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_0185_003_221123          | S44     | Email           | In addition to the extremely poor communications, I also site these objections / observations:• The access roads and easements have not been declared and therefore the full extent of the land impact is not fully declared.• Parcels of land that will remain based on the information provided so far, will not be accessible for farming.  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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 including any severance and injurious affection.   |
| TA_0186_001_221123          | S44     | Email           | I am writing to advise that I object to the Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farm substation, easement and transmission asset proposals as these will have a direct impact on our dairy farm business and leave it unviable. We run the farm as an efficient business utilizing local labour, and local contractors returning the monies into the local economy.The Farm is an award winning (both locally and nationally) dairy unit. We supply the Co-operative Arla and are part of the Arla Care brand. The farms that supply the Arla Care brand have been selected for the grazing system and have a requirement to produce them against enhanced standards. These enhanced standards include higher welfare and environmental standards and provide a lower carbon footprint. We operate a grassland grazing system, which requires the cows to have grazing access to all of the grazing land. Heavy investment has been made in a track system that allows efficient movement of cows to and from the grazing paddock with minimum labour. In addition, the track system allows the grass crop management (which is measured on a weekly basis) to provide optimum quantity and quality feed for the grazing herd. The proposal of the Morgan substation and temporary site takes a large area of land away from the unit and we await to understand the roads and easements for this substation for the full impact. Then if the Morecambe site is selected as Morecambe 2 this would take away the land and block the usage of the remaining land and this would devastate the whole farm business. If Morecambe 1 is selected as the preferred site this would also impact on the farm as it would take a major amount of land for the access roads and return easements to Penwortham. Either option Morecambe 1 or Morecambe 2 would leave the farm unviable.There have been two meetings with the Dalcour McLaren representatives with my husband and at no point was there mention of a substation, the discussion was only as a cable corridor. | 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). |
| TA_0186_004_221123          | S44     | Email           | Access roads for the construction site both permanent and temporary road access and the easement, have not been declared and therefore we do know the full impact but on the little information that has been shared that is sufficient to say we will not have a economically viable business.  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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 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.  |
| 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_0188_001_221123          | S44     | Email           | 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 livelihoods! 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 the 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. | 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 received 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.  |
| TA_0188_003_221123          | S44     | Email           | Destruction of numerous farm businesses Our farming business is very closely linked to our neighbour, [REDACTED] at [REDACTED], as we rear all his replacement heifers for his dairy herd. If the proposals go ahead as planned it will mean that our neighbour's farm will no longer be viable, and as a result our business will also be devastated. To try and run your business each day with that level of uncertainty hanging over you, in addition to all the other variables affecting farming that we   | 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | have no control over, is very difficult and stressful. All the farms which will be affected by the proposed development are livestock farms, with many of the stock being moved twice daily for milking. The level of disruption that will be caused by having to negotiate fences, construction work and new access points to fields will be huge as cattle do not like change and are very easily upset by a change in routine, thus affecting their productivity. In addition to this, the loss of land that is currently used for growing crops for the livestock to eat cannot be replaced as there will be no spare land available locally, and so inevitably farmers will have to reduce their stock numbers which could render their business unviable.  | 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). |
| 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:<br>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_007_221123          | S44     | Email           | The substations will seriously affect myself and my family, as well as our farming business. As we work in close collaboration with my next door neighbour, [REDACTED] any loss of land from either business will have very serious implications for the other. 1. The land being taken for the project will make the business unviable in its present form. 2. No attempt has been made by the planners to keep to field boundaries – the proposals cut up a number of fields making them useless for agricultural operations. 3. Access has been completely cut off from two of our fields on the far side of the substation site meaning that we can't get our grazing livestock to them. 4. The water main and meter boxes that supply the farm would be buried under the proposed substation site. This is an asbestos main and would fracture very easily if heavy machinery was to pass over it, leaving the farm and all the livestock without any water.  | The Applicant has sought to reduce land take where possible from the land interest to reduce the long term impact on the holding. Access to fields and severed land will be maintained through the use of crossing points where possible as set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development consent which includes measures regarding private services. 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.   |
| TA_0193_001_221123          | S44     | Email           | Further to our meeting at my client's property a few weeks ago, thank you again for your time attending my client's property in order that they could discuss the potential impact of the transmission and the cable route through my client's holding. To aid, I have just attached a plan that identifies my client's land holding [REDACTED] showing that the cable route completely severs and disrupts the majority of that parcel of land. My client have an intensive dairy herd of approximately 250 Montbeliard dairy cows complete with over 400 head of youngstock, therefore the land to the north of the farm is vital to the dairy business as there is very little land holding to the south with the buildings therefore all of the dairy herd graze the land to the north and it is also the land that the majority of the silage provision is made. The route cuts through the landholding which could make it impractical for crossing for grazing, and the lack of forage, which then brings into the viability of the farming business going forward. The land taken out also creates a slurry disposal issue. My client does not have sufficient land then to spread slurry to meet with necessary guidelines and then would be forced to reduce their dairy herd, increasing the volatility and bringing into question the viability of the farming business. | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). 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_0193_004_221123          | S44     | Email           | My client objects to the route and the principles of the transmission cable in its strongest extent. The construction of the cable will materially affect my client's farming business, jeopardising the established dairy herd due to the lack of grazing, silage provisions, lack of land for spreading slurry and day to day inconvenience of severing the land holding and crossing points.  | 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. 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_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   | 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>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>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_0197_005_221123          | S44     | Email           | <p>The development will significantly adversely impact local amenities, change of character from rural to industrial, and potential flooding due to massive displacement caused by the enormous industrial development, ruining farmland for decades and placing homes at risk</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 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</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>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).</p>   |
| TA_0197_008_221123          | 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_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 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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | <p>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 farm0It 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 families/households. • 122 metres if approximately the length of our farm steading, 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>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 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_005_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>The development will significantly adversely impact local amenities, change of character from rural to industrial, and potential flooding due to massive displacement caused by the enormous industrial development, ruining farmland for decades and placing homes at risk.</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 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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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).   |
| TA_0203_009_231123          | 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 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). |
| TA_0204_005_231123          | S44     | Email           | The development will significantly adversely impact local amenities, change of character from rural to industrial, and potential flooding due to massive displacement caused by the enormous industrial development, ruining farmland for decades and placing homes at risk. | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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).   |
| TA_0204_009_231123          | 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 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). |
| TA_0205_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, 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 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 might not be possible to come by in the | 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 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>locality and will not serve the holding as thisland does, with it being adjacent to the farmyard. Alternative land will need to besourced.- 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 schemeprovides an extremely valuable outlet for slurry. The loss of this land will be 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.- Loss of vital mowing and grazing land – the remainder of the land within thebiodiversity 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 requiredto 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 theland. There is an existing Countryside Stewardship agreement, which incorporatescapital items such as fencing and hedging. The landowner has incurred costs ininstructing a land agent to prepare and submit the application. There are concerns inbeing able to manage the hedgerows as agreed with the Rural Payments Agency andtherefore likely to incur payment reductions. Potential loss 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.- How will this 'biodiverse' land be managed?- Impact on land value- How can the business plan / further investments be implemented with so muchuncertainty?- 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. Whatwill 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 offarm land 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 have catastrophic effects on the business andlivelihood – future farming generations will also suffer. We also wish to know further information in relation to on what basis the land will be acquiredfor the purposes of the scheme.</p> | <p>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 inrelation to the proposed offshore wind farm, which proposes to transport electricity to theNational 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 theREDACTED 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 bestand most versatile agricultural land. The landowners cattle and sheep graze/are fed from theland, every blade of grass matters. The land is designated as Grades 2 and 3 on the AgriculturalLand Classification Map for England.Additional land is rented and additional fodder is already purchased in as there is not sufficientacreage to meet feed requirements. This will lead to an even greater requirement at greaterexpense to the business.The total owned landholding extends to 52.42 hectares (129.52 acres) or thereabouts, the lossof 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 – 300-400As 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. Alternativeland nigh on impossible to come by in the locality and will not serve the holding as thisland does, with it being adjacent to the farmyard. Alternative land will need to besourced.- 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 schemeprovides an extremely valuable outlet for slurry. The loss of this land will be 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</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>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> |   |
| 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_004_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>REDACTED is the Landowner of REDACTED. The land in REDACTED ownership will only be affected if the northerly of the two routes under consideration adjacent to the radar station is chosen. We would comment as follows • There is a lack of details information available in terms of the proposals. REDACTED's family business is REDACTED which lies some 600m to 700m to the north of the land affected. The business comprises as the names suggests a riding school but coupled with livery for horses and includes facilities for Riding for the Disabled (RDA). • The livery for horses includes rotational grazing where horses are brought out onto the land which will be directly affected by walking down REDACTED and onto the land which lies just to the south east of the intersection between REDACTED and REDACTED. The livery grazing area would be severely curtailed if the scheme were to proceed to such an extent that we believe REDACTED would no longer be able to continue his livery business from the REDACTED site there being no other land available for horse grazing to which he could walk the horses. This would have a severe effect on the family business and fuller financial details can be provided if required on a confidential basis. • In addition to affecting the livery fields it will also affect fields where the grass is grown for haylage which serves both the riding school, the livery and with surplus being sold. The surplus is sold on a dedicated round which has already been established and we believe that somewhere in the region of a quarter to a third of the production of haylage for horses from the land in question would be lost if the scheme were to go ahead. This once again would have a severe effect particularly on the haylage sale round where the business would no longer have control over the making of the haylage and would have to seek to buy haylage in from elsewhere to provide for the round. This would have a severe financial impact with a loss of profit and a loss of quality control which would have a long term effect. • The land is used for the spreading of manure produced at the riding school and livery and the loss of a substantial area of land which we believe would be somewhere in the region of 32 to 35 acres (excluding any areas required for compounds, wider areas at road crossing, unfarmable severed areas etc.) and mean that there would be insufficient ground on which to spread manures produced without running the risk of breaching regulations.</p>  | <p>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). 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> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
| TA_0207_005_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>• The land is classified Grade 2 on the Agricultural Land Classification, is low lying and comparatively level and benefits from extensive land drainage systems. There is a delicate balance in the land drainage systems and the installation of a substantial cable route across the land could very well disrupt the balance and cause losses over an extended period of time far beyond the construction period. We believe alternative routes through lower quality agricultural land should be considered. We believe that any of the above issues would have a serious effect on the viability of the family business but when combined will almost certainly have a major effect on the viability of the family business going forward. This in turn could impact the available facilities for RDA especially during the construction period</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). 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. 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. 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_0211_008_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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>  |
| TA_0215_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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</p> |

| 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).</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 offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted 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_0219_003_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>The proposals will cause severe damage to the land within the agricultural holding. The land is classified Grade 2 on the agricultural land classification and we believe alternative routes crossing poorer agricultural land should be considered. The proposed schemes will also have a deleterious effect on the sporting on the property most especially during the construction period and bearing in mind that the proposals would appear to affect some 40 to 50 acres of land (excluding compounds, additional access points and wider working areas at road, rail and ditch crossing and the effect of areas lost due to being severed and unfarmable) this means that somewhere towards 25% of the total area of the farm possibly moving towards 30% or more when the additional areas are added in will be affected and lost to production. This will also have a severe effect on the sporting on the farm especially during the construction period. We also note that substantial areas have been identified for biodiversity net gain but have received no substantive commentary regarding what is required or where and we are therefore unable to comment on that at the present time. There has been no information given as to the proximity to dwelling houses which the cable route can take and whether there is any exclusion zone.</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. 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>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| TA_0219_009_231123          | S44     | Email           | Land at REDACTED We are extremely concerned regarding the routing of the cable just to the north of REDACTED as this will undoubtedly have a severe effect on the caravan site and any potential extension of the caravan site whether it be the footprint of the caravan site extension itself or areas where landscaping and other BNG works maybe required. The site is noted for its peace and tranquility which will be destroyed during any construction phase. Regular and other customers are likely to move away through what could well be an extended construction phase over several years and it is unlikely that they will return having once left. This will have a severe financial impact on the business.   | 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. 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_0221_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | 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?  | 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_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_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 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   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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 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>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_0225_002_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 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]</p>   | <p>The Applicants note your response.</p>  |
| TA_0225_003_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Investment [REDACTED] along with other farm property has provided REDACTED with vital income which provides significant financial support to Newton Bluecoat School and for children's education locally upon application.</p>  | <p>The Applicants note your response.</p>  |
| TA_0225_004_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>[REDACTED] m has an excellent tenant farmer who has recently been awarded with a grasslandfarm award at the British Farming Awards in October 2023. The Trust are committed to the future of the farm however these two projects will devastate the viability of [REDACTED] given the proposals as set out in the statutory consultation.</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.</p>   |
| TA_0225_007_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>[REDACTED] is occupied under the terms of an Agricultural Holdings Act 1986 tenancy to [REDACTED] . [REDACTED] is an intensive productive grassland dairy farm of approximately 140 acres of Grade 2 to Grade 3 land which has a predominantly level aspect which runs north/south over a linear distance of about 1.3 km from the farmstead which is situated at the most northerly end of the main farmland block to it's most southerly extent of farmland which adjoins the REDACTED.</p>   | <p>The Applicants note your response.</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | [REDACTED] has a current milking herd of 140 dairy cows plus followers. The tenant has invested significantly over recent years in constructing new farm buildings.  |   |
| 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_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>The Applicants note your response.</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
| TA_0226_010_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_0226_021_231123          | S44     | Email           | The proposal also completely disrupts the ease of moving livestock from the contract rearing unit 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.  |
| 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_010_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   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | <p>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).</p>  |
| TA_0228_005_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>The projects are not sustainable;-Given the extensive development impact within the Green Belt and Open Countryside on agricultural businesses which will impact Food Security.-Significant loss of the most productive grassland in the UK which in turn causes a significant loss in Carbon Sequestration (Carbon Capture).-Major impact on the diverse wildlife and ecology within Rural Fylde and Rural Preston areas for many years to come.-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.-35 year projects will not benefit the next generation. This is not sustainable 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. 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).</p> |
| TA_0210_005_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>The projects are not sustainable;-Given the extensive development impact within the Green Belt and Open Countryside on agricultural businesses which will impact Food Security.-Significant loss of the most productive grassland in the UK which in turn causes a significant loss in Carbon Sequestration (Carbon Capture).-Major impact on the diverse wildlife and ecology within Rural Fylde and Rural Preston areas for many years to come.-The large buildings proposed to house the substation</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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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. -35 year projects will not benefit the next generation. This is not sustainable development.</p>   | <p>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).</p>  |
| TA_0229_002_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Impact on the [REDACTED]The impact on the [REDACTED] will be immediate upon start of construction for the Morecambe substation Option 1 site as no visitors will book a pitch when construction traffic, noise, dust will be heard and seen on a daily basis. The [REDACTED] business will cease to trade. Impact on the Farm ShopThe farm shop takings are approximately 70% from visitors to the [REDACTED] therefore this business will not be profitable and will cease to trade. Impact on the Plant NurseryThe plant nursery takings are approximately 40% from visitors to the [REDACTED] therefore this business will not be profitable and will cease to trade.</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 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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
| TA_0229_009_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</p> | <p>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).</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). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_0230_008_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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 | 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, 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_0231_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | This consultation feedback is made on behalf of [REDACTED][REDACTED] is a productive grassland dairy farm of approximately 70 acres of Grade 3 land which has a predominantly level aspect. The farm is accessed along a private single track which is shared with an adjoining neighbour at [REDACTED]. The farming business at [REDACTED] dairy replacements which are contract reared on behalf of [REDACTED]. Batches of dairy followers as and when required to be sent to [REDACTED] are walked along a 1km cow track from [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] is significantly affected by the proposed Morgan substation site which is proposed to be situated in the middle of the holding, completely severing the farmstead from a block of land lying to the south of the proposed substation. In addition, the siting of the substation is directly in view of the farmhouse which has a predominant south facing view with the boundary of the substation being about 160m from the farmhouse. The substation would be 140m from [REDACTED], similar distance to dwellings at the end of the farm track and approx. 100m from a housing estate immediately on the [REDACTED]. The proposed Morgan Substation site would permanently take about 9.25 acres of land from the holding and in doing so severs a 28.5 acres field which will leave about 6 acres adjoining the farmstead and about 13 acres severed on the south side. This is of course less any additional land required for permanent access. During the construction phase [REDACTED] may lose additional land for cable corridor laying which would be out of production for a minimum of 3 years, plus additional land recovery years. It is wholly unacceptable to consider the Morgan substation site in this location given its close proximity to dwelling houses at [REDACTED]. | 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. The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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). |
| TA_0231_006_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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>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).</p>  |
| TA_0231_018_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>The proposal also completely disrupts the ease of moving livestock from the contract rearing unit at [REDACTED] whilst my client's are extremely concerned that the Morecambe substation Option 2 site will mean that [REDACTED] will not remain a viable dairy farm and would therefore close both farming businesses.</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 including any severance and injurious affection. The issues matters in feedback will be included within those negotiations and discussions to progress the land agreements.</p>  |
| TA_0233_007_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_0234_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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 &amp; 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 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 than 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>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.</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>  |
| TA_0234_011_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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</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</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>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.</p>  | <p>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).</p> |
| TA_0234_020_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>Newton Marsh SSSI Newton Marsh SSSI does not feature in pretty much any of the PEIR documentation and isn't listed in the table of SSSI Sites ! There is brief mention of breeding godwits but then completely disregarded in any determination in favour of Zone 1 ? Newton and Freckleton Marshes are both managed by RSPB. These wind farm projects highlight both marshes for potential Biodiversity Net Gain which is a ludicrous proposal given their current nature conservation status together with approximately 50% of this land mass being a SSSI.</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. 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.</p>   |
| TA_0235_006_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>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.</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). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | and have 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_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 am 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_005_231123          | S44     | Email           | The fylde coast is a productive dairy farming area these businesses are going to be massively affected when the cable is routed. Affecting the production of forage to feed cows and the return of cow slurry back to the land to fertilise the land. I believe the the viability of farming business Will be challenged and many farmer will go out of business as a direct result of this proposed operation.   | 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_0239_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | 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. | 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 |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | <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_0243_006_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>The development will significantly adversely impact local amenities, change of character from rural to industrial, and potential flooding due to massive displacement caused by the enormous industrial development, ruining farmland for decades and placing homes at risk.</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 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).</p> |
| TA_0243_010_231123          | 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</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | <p>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_0244_006_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>The development will significantly adversely impact local amenities, change of character from rural to industrial, and potential flooding due to massive displacement caused by the enormous industrial development, ruining farmland for decades and placing homes at risk.</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 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).</p> |
| TA_0244_010_231123          | 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, 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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>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_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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
| 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>environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted 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). 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_007_231123          | S44     | Email           | <p>I am completely opposed to the project as it is currently presented. You would be taking away good quality farm land, destroying the countryside and destroying a rural community. There must be more suitable sites available that would not cause the problems and disruption on the scale proposed in both Newton and St Annes.</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. 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>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
| TA_0249_007_231123          | S44     | Email           | I am completely opposed to the project as it is currently presented. You would be taking away good quality farm land, destroying the countryside and destroying a rural community. There must be more suitable sites available that would not cause the problems and disruption on the scale proposed in both Newton and St Annes.   | The Applicant notes your response. We are committed to working with local communities and landowners that may be impacted by the project.  |
| 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. |

## E1.16.28 Human health table of responses

## E1.16.28.1 Human health tables of responses (via feedback form)



**Table E1.16.28.1: Human health 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_0053_009_171123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.9                          | Great concerns for health risks to local residents and holiday makers on caravan site   | <p>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.</p> <p>The assessment indicates that there would be no significant effects arising from air quality emissions from traffic during the construction or decommissioning phases.</p> <p>Effects during the operational phases are not likely and have been scoped out in agreement with the Planning Inspectorate.</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)). 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>                   |
| 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. | <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.</p> <p>See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4).</p> |
| TA_0055_003_051123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | The proximity to children's and youth's football and cricket fields and the health effects of the magnitude of magnetic radiation emitted from this project. These are decisions which are made by adults, but how are the young being protected?   | <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.</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   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| 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 field full of cows who can wander away to a barn at night, but not</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  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | for adjacent to permanent human habitation.<br><br>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.  |   |
| TA_0055_010_051123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 16                     |                              | EMC Radiation and Health Concerns<br><br>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.<br><br>This cable corridor will be transmitting 400kV 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!)<br><br>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.<br><br>There are a high number of studies setting out the health impacts of high voltage transmission systems in terms of electromagnetic radiation, almost of which are negative. This may be suitable when the systems are located in the countryside but not when directly adjacent to human habitation.<br><br>There are two 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 mental wellbeing. | 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_0058_001_201123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      |                              | 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 against 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.<br><br>Overall there has to be an easier route in which you can connect to the national grid, have you explored other options?   | 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_0058_003_201123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 14                     |                              | Object on the basis of unknown health risks, foundation problems to residential properties on sand based land and total disruption to road traffic and associated delays that will be created.   | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, 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_0061_001_161123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      |                              | <p>I object strongly to option two being chosen on the basis that all residential properties are built on sand based foundations. Drilling horizontal tunnels or large trenches so close to residential properties on sand based foundations may create structures to subside, move or crack with various defects that could occur.</p> <p>Can you give an assurance that prior to any work being undertaken, if option two is chosen you will carry out a full structural survey of all properties on Blackpool road north and that if during or post any of your works that any defects are identified then you will pay full costs and compensation to all property owners.</p> <p>I further object on the basis of unknown health effects that may be caused by a permanent high voltage magnetic field so close to residential properties. Can you provide any evidence that no minor or major health effects have been identified on any similar type projects. Can you also confirm that if any subsequent health issues are observed or identified that you will pay full compensation to any and all those who have been exposed or subjected to such effects of long term high voltage magnetic fields.</p>  | <p>The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.</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).</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.</p> <p>See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4).</p> |
| TA_251_003_231123           | S44     | Consult Online       | NULL                   |                              | What impact will the cabling have on the beach between the sea and the sand dunes. This area again I imagine will be used as as a jointing pit area. How will this be serviced?  | <p>Cables will be installed in the intertidal area, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). These works would be temporary.</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.</p> <p>Should option 2 go ahead this will totally devastate our lives.</p> <p>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</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>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p>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 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 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.</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>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> |
| TA_0066_001_171023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      | 1.1                          | <p>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.</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). Table 3.4 presented within Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3) 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).</p> <p>Further details regarding construction traffic are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7),</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method         | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                         |                        |                              |  | with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8).   |
| 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:<br>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)<br>Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.   |
| TA_0068_006_231123          | S44     | Hard Copy Feedback Form | 3                      | 3.9                          | For people with breathing difficulties, how will the project effect the air quality.   | 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.  |
| 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.  | 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).<br>An assessment on human health is provided at Volume 1, Annex 5.1 (document reference F1.5.1) of the ES. |
| TA_0078_016_051123          | S44     | Online feedback form    | 16                     |                              | We are feeling very angry!<br>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.<br>We did not sign up for years of upset and disruption in our retirement.<br>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.<br>Perhaps you would like to compulsory purchase all our homes ?!!!<br>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.<br>See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4).  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | <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:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)<br/>Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>  |
| TA_0082_001_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | <p>Lytham Moss is an area used for recreation, I use the area for dog walking and running as do many others. I have also seen the area used by walkers and horse riders. The proposed secondary cable route through Lytham Moss would impact a recreation area for many residents. I would not choose to exercise or dog walk in the area during or after the installation of cables due to the health risks associated with exposure to EMF's.</p>   | <p>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.<br/>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.<br/>See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4).</p> |
| TA_0082_004_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 7                      |                              | <p>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</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).<br/>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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | possible health risks, noise, vibrations, and impact on traffic in this residential area and Queensway. Please do all you can to run these cables directly out of the airport and into the countryside.   | 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_0082_005_151123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 12                     |                              | Various bodies have set limits and published guidelines on exposure to EMF's. Will the EMF's omitted from the cable corridor fall within these guidelines? What can you do during the installation of cables to minimize EMF's?   | 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_0093_002_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | As a resident on REDACTED, REDACTED, my house is on the main road opposite the beach. I walk my dog on the beach and nature reserve multiple times per day or week and use the Clifton Drive cycle lane regularly instead of my car. I have been living here almost 8 years and chose this area specifically for the quiet, rural feel. I am extremely concerned about what this project will do to my quality of life, general health and cost of living if I have to sit in construction traffic jams and drive to be able to find somewhere remote to take a walk, especially if it takes years to complete. Many of my neighbours are retired or elderly and chose to live here for a better quality of life in their later years. This will have a huge impact on our wellbeing. | Detailed assessments are 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). 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 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 appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards. |
| 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   | Detailed assessments are 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,  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | 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.  | 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).<br>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_005_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.9                          | Linked to traffic question 3.7 above - As a resident on REDACTED, REDACTED my house is on the main road opposite the beach. 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 and resulting CO2 fumes in our gardens and houses. If the Wind Farm work lasted weeks or months I would be concerned about the damage to our health as a result.  | 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.<br>The assessment indicates that there would be no significant effects arising from air quality emissions from traffic during the construction or decommissioning phases.<br>Effects during the operational phases are not likely and have been scoped out in agreement with the Planning Inspectorate.<br><br>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.                             |
| 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_0095_001_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | 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.<br><br>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 | 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<br>- selection of a single site for the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets<br>- refinement of the siting and orientation of the onshore substation for the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm: Transmission Assets, to take into account consultation responses received.<br><br>The Applicants provided documents for the statutory consultation,  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p>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>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_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<br/><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>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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <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>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. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)<br/>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<br/><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. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)<br/>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<br/><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</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).</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p><i>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>Detailed assessments are 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. The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (<a href="http://www.gov.uk">www.gov.uk</a>)<br/>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<br/><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).</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>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:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (<a href="http://www.gov.uk">www.gov.uk</a>)<br/>Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p> |
| TA_0170_006_151023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 5                      |                              | <p>This will also affect us as the cables will have to come through our land and we are totally against this project</p>  | <p>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.</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>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <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>environmental constraints considered as part of the iterative design process, is set out in Volume 1, 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_008_151023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 10                     |                              | <p>As already advised<br/><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 Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_0096_001_131123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | <p>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</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  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p>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</p>  | <p>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).</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_0096_002_131123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      |                              | <p>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</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). 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).</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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | <p>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_0096_003_131123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 7                      |                              | <p>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</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). 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).</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_0096_004_131123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 8                      |                              | <p>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</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</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p>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</p>  | <p>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).</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_0096_005_131123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 9                      |                              | <p>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</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). 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).</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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | <p>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_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"> <li>- Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology of the ES (document reference F2.2).</li> <li>- Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology of the ES (document reference F2.3).</li> <li>- Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals of the ES (document reference F2.4).</li> <li>- Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5).</li> </ul> <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_008_171123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | <p>This is very worrying and can cause so many ill effects on humans I don't want this in close proximity.<br/>Wind turbine syndrome<br/>Shadow flicker<br/>Sleep disbursements<br/>Infrared<br/>These need to be built far away not to impact on people's lives and depreciation of the value of our lives and house prices</p>   | <p>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.</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:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)<br/>Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>   |
| TA_0097_009_171123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      |                              | <p>I do not want this project to go a head. I do not want electromagnetic radiation on my door step or construction or ill effects caused by all this will bring I want peace and quiet this is why I moved to this area</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.</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   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| TA_0098_015_081123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 4                      | 4.5                          | The whole area is become very angry and / or depressed about this project  | 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 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 appropriately addressed through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards   |
| TA_0098_016_081123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 8                      |                              | <p>This area is vast and situated between Kirkham, Newton and Freckleton, and far too close to all three.</p> <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>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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 or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)<br/>Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p> |
| TA_0102_003_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 2                      |                              | <p>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.</p> <p>the noise would also impact the horses as they have much more sensitive hearing than us.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>i cant imagine losing any land to pipes etc, the land we are on is marshy 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</p> | <p>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).</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>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | sickness if the land is re used for grazing. it would take years for that risk to diminish.<br>i could not more strongly oppose the development   |   |
| TA_0102_004_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      |                              | 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.<br>the noise would also impact the horses as they have much more sensitive hearing than us.<br>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.<br>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.<br>i cant imagine losing any land to pipes etc, the land we are on is marshy 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.<br>i could not more strongly oppose the development | 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).<br>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_009_211123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | big concern about this aspect, it would make spending time at the stables unpleasant and could make the horses restless and dangerous to handle if they are spooked by it,<br><br>not to mention long term health implications  | This consultee is no longer captured by the draft order limits. 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).<br>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).<br><br>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).<br>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). |
| TA_0106_001_281023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 1                      |                              | 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.<br>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   | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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).<br>Detailed assessments are 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,   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p>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 &amp; 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>then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted 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. 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_011_281023          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.9                          | This relates to air that electro magnetic radiation at higher than existing levels adjacent to residential property. The cabling is akin to overhead pylons, the health impact of which are well known.  | <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.</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_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)   | <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, 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_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  | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <p>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 &amp; 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>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>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.</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>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |   | 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_0109_001_221123          | S44     | Consult Online       | NULL                   |                              | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</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). 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.</p> |
| TA_0110_002_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.8                          | <p>What are the protection measures for Human Health relating to the extensive onshore cabling and substations. The PEIR seems to conclude that no mitigation is required and does not specify how exposures to EMFs will be assured to be within regulations.</p> <p>In particular, burying underground cables does not, per se, limit magnetic fields into the surface environments. The Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report of October 2022. In Part 2: Transmission Assets, section 10.2.1 provides only a short description of the positioning with regards to Human Health and, regarding the onshore transmission cables, paragraph 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". This might be considered misleading as it only refers to the electric field and is silent on the magnetic fields.</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).</p>   |
| TA_0110_003_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 3                      | 3.6                          | <p>See above. Magnetic fields (sic) above and around the cables are threat to Human Health.<br/> <i>("What are the protection measures for Human Health relating to the extensive onshore cabling and substations. The PEIR seems to conclude that no mitigation is required and does not specify how exposures to EMFs will be assured to be within regulations.</i></p> <p><i>In particular, burying underground cables does not, per se, limit magnetic fields into the surface environments. The Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report of October 2022. In Part 2: Transmission Assets, section 10.2.1 provides only a short description of the positioning with regards to Human Health and, regarding the onshore transmission</i></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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | <i>cables, paragraph 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". This might be considered misleading as it only refers to the electric field and is silent on the magnetic fields."</i>  | 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_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. See also the submitted EMF Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4). |
| TA_0110_005_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 5                      |                              | I understand that underground cables will be installed using HDD. This is aesthetically appropriate. However, the magnetic fields above and around this cables will be enormous so this presents risks to anyone in those areas and surrounding residential properties. How the EMF will be measured to ensure it is in line with regulations is not apparent to me.   | 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_0110_006_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 12                     |                              | Table 1.26 of the PEIR Volume 1, Annex 5.1: Human health describes all but one of the impacts from the relevant criteria as being Minor Adverse, with no mitigation proposed, nor any monitoring.<br><br>It is astonishing that the PEIR simply concludes that, effectively, everything will be fine with regard to Human Health, without further independent validation nor any assurance of compliance with the regulatory requirements. | Impacts and effects on the environment and the community are set out in Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document references F1 to F4). Health is considered in Volume 1, Annex 5.1: Human health of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). Socio-economic baseline conditions and the predicted impacts are considered in Volume 4, Chapter 2: Socio-economics of the ES (document reference F4.2).<br><br>As set out in every ES chapter, migration measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse effects. Mitigation measures adopted 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 ES has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the EIA Regulations.   |
| TA_0110_007_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 15                     |                              | The Project should engage properly with addressing concerns around the EMF issues of the power cables and substations and provide tangible assurance that regulatory standards will be adhered to, e.g. by measurements of independent regulatory authorities.   | 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method        | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                        |                        |                              |   | 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_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_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 (REDACTED) 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 a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method        | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                        |                        |                              |  | Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.  |
| 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. | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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).<br>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). |
| TA_0112_006_231123          | S44     | Online feedback form   | 3                      | 3.8                          | See above, I am concerned about the level of noise/vibration especially with a disabled person at home. Working from home means any action also impacts on residents jobs. Houses in this area are old and may suffer disproportionately due to their age.   | 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).<br>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).  |

## E1.16.28.2 Human health tables of responses (via all other methods)

**Table E1.16.28.2: Human Health table of responses (via all other methods)**

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| TA_0002_001_171123          | S42     | Email           | <p>1. Summary</p> <p>Freckleton Parish Council and the local community has no inherent objections to the principles of establishment off-Shore Wind Farms as a means of meeting the Energy Targets from renewable sources. However, there are deep concerns regarding the Proposal that is currently being placed before us because of the potentially disastrous implications for the future of The Fylde as a farming community and as a place of amenity for the residents and the many visitors who enjoy the facilities and environment that the Fylde currently affords.</p> <p>This note attempts to summarise these views and provides the overall conclusion that we must object to the proposals as presented as the impact is too high when compared to both the Local and National Benefit to be accrued.</p> <p>The note provides details of the logic behind this conclusion, especially relating to the programme consultation process, maturity of definition and likely cost issues arising.</p>   | The Applicant notes your response. Responses to detailed comments provided in turn associated to each topic raised (see unique reference TA_0002).   |
| TA_0002_014_171123          | S42     | Email           | <p>There have been concerns raised regarding possible electro-magnetic issues associated with the high-power transmissions and the possible impact of this and the need for screening that might result.</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).</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> | The Applicants note your response. Responses provided to each detailed comment above.  |
| TA_0003_004_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>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.</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, 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).</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| TA_0003_013_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Noise Impact The Council remains concerned that the impact of noise on local communities both during the construction phase and the long-term operation of the sub stations in particular. As the construction will largely take place in, and the substations will be located in, rural areas where the background noise levels are relatively low, there is clearly a greater potential for noise disturbance emanating from the development. It is essential that any impact of noise disturbance has regard to the impact on residential amenity rather than using higher WHO thresholds that are based on potential impact on Human Health. As details of the technology that will be utilised in the substations are clarified, the council would wish to be involved in further discussions in regard to potential noise impacts.                          | The assessment of noise impacts during the operational phase of the Transmission Assets is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3). This assessment has been undertaken using the night-time background sound levels at the most-exposed receptors to operational noise which is a more robust assessment than one undertaken on the basis of WHO thresholds.  |
| TA_0005_005_231123          | S42     | Email           | 3. The developer's documentation has currently failed to evidence that they have given weight to, or mitigation of the adverse impacts on the local: residents, communities, economies and environments on :- i. amenity (disruption & destruction of the rural character of the area, disruption due to construction & traffic), ii. health & well-being (including emissions giving rise to: respiratory impacts- in construction & restoration; aural impacts- throughout the 6 decade programme life cycle from activity, plant and equipment; and potentially, electro-magnetic impacts - in operation throughout the life of the programme.iii. highway safety (through inadequate specification & control of traffic. Plus proposed use of narrow rural lanes, also used for residential & leisure access with consequential severe impacts on all users). | Once operational, the substations will not have any emissions to air. 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. 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.Noise and vibration impacts during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Transmission Assets are presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.2: Construction noise and Vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.2). This assessment includes an assessment of construction traffic noise, as well as an assessment of the noise and vibration impacts during each phase of construction required for the Transmission Assets. Impacts in relation to traffic and transport are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7). |
| TA_0005_009_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7. There appears to be a failure to detail any meaningful mitigations of harmful impacts e.g. i. Converter station 24x7 humming noise at a volume that would require ear protectors in a workplace. In a low lying, flat area with only low clipped hedges, the industrial noise will be noticeable and will travel, no mitigations mentioned. Noise pollution in particular is known to be harmful to health and well-being, it can create physical and psychological stress, cause high blood pressure, headaches etc.  | 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. 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. Acoustic character corrections have been applied to the predicted levels at receptors where the tonal components are deemed to be perceptible by the standards of BS 4142:2014+A1:2019. 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).   |
| TA_0005_111_231123          | S42     | Email           | 8. The developers' documentation has so far failed to demonstrate how the south Fylde resident: individuals, communities and enterprises will each have a net benefit from this programme. This needs to be corrected.  | Information on biodiversity benefit 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).Impacts and effects, including any beneficial effects, are set out in Volumes 1 to 4 of the ES (document references F1 to F4). 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_0012_007_221123          | S42     | Email           | We also have concerns about the impact on the sand dunes where these cables come ashore and the eco systems that has been worked on over the years. We feel that there will need to be  | Direct pipe trenchless installation is proposed beneath the sand dunes. This technology will ensure there is no open trenching through the dunes. This will  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | road closures as the building work is started in an area that has limited access in and out of St Anne's. The town has suffered over the years when roads have been closed, snarling up the town. These construction times will be over years not weeks or months and will have a negative economic impact on our town.  | 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).<br>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_0017_001_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | The proposal has the potential to cause significant disruption to residents throughout its construction phase, and it is imperative that this is minimised through the design and phasing of works, and mitigated through adequate controls on working practices to control noise and vibration. In particular any roadworks are likely to have significant knock on effects to the wider network resulting in congestion; this is especially the case in the area around Blackpool Airport. When laying the onshore cable, any road crossing should be undertaken with directional drilling unless the road is demonstrated to only carry minor volumes of traffic and that traffic can be easily diverted via alternative routes.  | An assessment of noise and vibration impacts during the construction phase of the Transmission Assets is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Construction noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8.3) and section 8.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8). Details of controls and measures proposed are set out in section 8.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8). This includes control of working hours through the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP). An Outline CoCP is provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1). In addition, an Outline Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan has been prepared (document reference J1.3).  |
| 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_027_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Electromagnetic radiation, light pollution, noise, and vibration levels for residents generated by the substations should be specified and set at best practice levels. The maximum levels for those residential receptors in close proximity to the substations should be specified with appropriate monitoring and enforcement in place to ensure these levels are not breached. These levels should be identified both during construction and once construction is completed.  | A baseline sound survey has been undertaken to quantify the baseline sound environment at locations representative of the nearest and most exposed noise sensitive receptors. The survey data has been used to derive representative daytime and night-time background sound levels at these receptors against which the assessment of operational noise impacts has been undertaken. Details are provided in Volume 3, Annex 8.1: Baseline sound survey of the ES and section 8.6.2 of this Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8). The assessment of operational noise impacts is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3). 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. An operational noise limit will be secured as a requirement of the DCO resulting in significant adverse effects being avoided and adverse effects minimised at all times. 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). |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
| TA_0035_077_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | CoT33An 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. The CoCP will include best practice measures in relation to air quality that will be applied where human receptors reside within 350 m of works, where required, or where sensitive ecological receptors are present within 50 m, as described in Institute of Air Quality guidance Management (IAQM,2014) as appropriate.IssueMeasures required to manage dust and airquality have yet to be fully addressed.ImpactRisk to sensitive ecological receptors frompoor air quality.SolutionOutline Dust Management Plan setting out dust and air quality control measures to be appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission.   | An Outline Dust Management Plan is provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1.2).   |
| TA_0035_078_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | CoT35,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. The CoCP will include measures to maintain and address:- 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.IssueMeasures required to manage environmental risks have yet to be fully addressed.ImpactRisk to the environmentSolutionOutline versions of various Plans to manage environmental risks to be appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission.See alsoCoT04 - Onshore pollution prevention plan CoT09 - Drainage Management Plan CoT11 - Operational Onshore Substation Drainage Management planCoT20 – Construction Fencing Plan CoT26 – Site Waste Management Plan CoT30 – Contaminated Land and Groundwater Discovery Strategy CoT33 – Air QualityCoT73 – Biosecurity ProtocolCoT76 – Outline Ecological Management PlanCoT77 – Bentonite Breakout Plan CoT78 – Biosecurity Protocol CoT81 – Soil Management Plan CoT86 – Measures to protect minor watercourses   | See the Outline CoCP (document reference J1) and the following plans submitted as part of the application for development consent:•Outline Communications Plan (document reference J1.1)•Outline Dust Management Plan (document reference J1.2)•Outline Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (document reference J1.3)•Outline Pollution Prevention Plan (document reference J1.4)•Outline Public Rights of Way (PRoW) Management Plan (document reference J1.5)•Outline Site Waste Management Plan (document reference J1.6)•Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7)•Outline Spillage and Emergency Response Plan (document reference J1.8)•Outline Surface Water and Groundwater Management Plan (document reference J1.9)•Outline Construction Fencing Plan (document reference J1.10)•Outline Construction Artificial Light Emissions Management Plan (document reference J1.11)•Outline Biosecurity Protocol (document reference J1.12)•Outline Bentonite Breakout Plan (document reference J1.13)•Outline Contaminated Land and Groundwater Discovery Strategy (document reference J1.14)  |
| 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 | 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  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | 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  |   |
| TA_0038_008_181123          | S44     | Email           | 8. Working hours weekdays 7am - 6pm and Saturday 7am – 1pm with an hour at either side for vehicles to arrive or depart. Residents surrounding the developments on Acorn Avenue and Woodlands Close and the access routes to them experienced great disruption with the noise and queueing of vehicles from outside the specified timeframes. Where will the vehicles queue outside the specified time-fames and how will the noise (particularly when they manoeuvre and reverse) be monitored? These hours should be shortened significantly in both the morning and evening.  | 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). Working hours would be controlled through a requirement of the development consent order.   |
| TA_0038_027_181123          | S44     | Email           | 5. There is no identification of permissible noise, light, vibration or EMR emission upper limits from the substations. The approach to visual and noise mitigation not defined.   | A baseline sound survey has been undertaken to quantify the baseline sound environment at locations representative of the nearest and most exposed noise sensitive receptors. The survey data has been used to derive representative daytime and night-time background sound levels at these receptors against which the assessment of operational noise impacts has been undertaken. Details are provided in Volume 3, Annex 8.1: Baseline sound survey of the ES and section 8.6.2 of this Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8). The assessment of operational noise impacts is presented in Volume 3, Annex 8.3: Operational noise of the ES (document reference F3.8.3). 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. An operational noise limit will be secured as a requirement of the DCO resulting in significant adverse effects being avoided and adverse effects minimised at all times. The Outline Design Principles document (document reference J3) sets out details of the substation design, including lighting. 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_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 | 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | 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.   | promoted routes (e.g. NCRs, Long Distance Footpaths) during construction of the Transmission Assets.  |
| 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_020_211123          | S44     | Email           | 20 Noise pollution: During construction the normally quiet rural area around our farm will be impacted by noise from construction machines and additional associated traffic. Later will there be any noise from the cables underground? Why have we not been supplied with any information? Will this cause animal welfare issues for our cattle or wildlife? What are the health issues associated with these cables for the human population considering the land is used for food production? Is there a risk to human health from these cables?  | Impacts and effects in terms of noise and vibration are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8). This includes consideration of noise from traffic in section 8.11 of that chapter. Once installed, noise is not anticipated to be detectable from the presence of the cables. Impacts on human health are considered in Volume 1, Annex 5.1: Human health of the ES (document reference F1.5.1). 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_0045_002_211123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Close proximity to schools and nurseries.   | Impacts on sensitive receptors have been taken into account in relevant chapters, including Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7) and Volume 3, Chapter 8: Noise and vibration of the ES (document reference F3.8).  |
| TA_0118_004_171123          | S44     | Email           | 2) The substations will be far to 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_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;   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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 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_007_171123          | S44     | Email           | 8.The threat for our local children growing up with Electromagnetic Radiation all around them. We still dont understand the full health risks and long term issues that this will cause but we do have an idea and we know its bad.  | 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_0125_002_181123          | S44     | Email           | I also strongly object to your proposals for the substations on the grounds of:- 3.My wife and I chose to retire here 5.5 years ago after moving from the village, to enjoy a beautiful, large back garden, peacefulness of the area and beautiful front views across open fields with livestock grazing in them. Had we known your intentions to construct 2 substations so close, then we would never have bought the property. 4.This will also impact people's general health my wife is asthmatic and requires to have windows open 24/7. However, this will be impossible due to the constant noise pollution (humming) again 24/7. My wife also suffers from hypothyroidism and needs access to Vitamin D via sunlight each day. Currently this is obtained by my wife tending to our garden, fish pond and the wildlife that frequents our garden daily, however, with the constant humming it will be impossible for her to do so comfortably. 5.I understand that the noise levels | 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   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | will be 38db above ambient, approaching to 70db, with ear protection required at 80db. Therefore, the constant noise level will be unbearable to say the least.  |  |
| TA_0126_004_181123          | S44     | Email           | 5. The proximity of the development to the current residential area shows no sign of consideration. The area would be changed from its current agricultural outlook to an industrial development ruining the character of the area. The loss of the agricultural land in zone 1 will have a negative socio-economic impact to the area. There is no indication of noise, light and EMF emission levels resulting from the development which will affect the immediate area and therefore residents.  | The Planning Statement (document reference J28) sets out an assessment on the impact on the countryside and location of the substations. 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). 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_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).   |
| TA_0134_004_191123          | S44     | Email           | Radiation & EMR . Low frequency magnetic fields can circulate within the human body and could cause stimulation of nerves & muscles and effect other biological processes. Again a health risk to residents.   | 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_0134_006_191123          | S44     | Email           | Our house prices will plummet and our emotional, spiritual and physical health will be compromised.<br>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.<br>The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful:  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.  |
| TA_0135_002_191123          | S44     | Email           | The proposed route will have a severe impact on the local communities with transport disruption, impact on businesses and the well-being of the local residents.   | 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). 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 |
| TA_0135_005_191123          | S44     | Email           | The suggestion that a noise level projection of 70 decibels is expected, when ear protection is required at 80, should be a large red flag for anyone involved in the planning process, as it will have the most horrendous impact on the local residents, schools, businesses etc.  | 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_0140_003_201123          | S44     | Email           | I'm concerned as it seems that the road on which I live is going to be used to run massive cables, I'm concerned over the health effects caused by close proximity to these cables   | 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). 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).   |
| 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, | 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  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | 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.   | 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_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 hazard- Traffic congestion in the areas surrounding the potential sitel am sure there must be other places this substation could be built within Fylde that would have considerably less impact on people's livelihoods. | 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_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_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 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_009_201123          | 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  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |   | 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).   |
| TA_0151_005_201123          | S44     | Email           | Noise, light, vibration and EMR emissions, these limits have not been correctly identified by the PEIR report. The threat for our local children growing up with electromagnetic radiation all around them. We still don't understand the full health risks and long-term issues this will cause, but it will be adverse.   | 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_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 squees 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 on the 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 and 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_003_211123          | S44     | Email           | Since distance is obviously a significant attenuator for noise and radiation the proximity is a cause for concern and I would like to see noise and radiation raised to a higher level than cost. It is apparent that radiation is very quickly dismissed as an irrational concern not supported by science, nevertheless we should remember that we are talking mental health as well as physical well-being and irrational concerns tend to create the highest levels of anxiety.   | 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). This includes   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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_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_0156_007_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 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).   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
| TA_0157_003_211123          | S44     | Email           | Since distance is obviously a significant attenuator for noise and radiation the proximity is a cause for concern and I would like to see noise and radiation raised to a higher level than cost. It is apparent that radiation is very quickly dismissed as an irrational concern not supported by science, nevertheless we should remember that we are talking mental health as well as physical well-being and irrational concerns tend to create the highest levels of anxiety.  | 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). 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_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_0161_012_211123          | S44     | Email           | •The project has not provided meaningful information on noise levels, vibration, electro-magnetic radiation or light pollution during and post construction and the impact of these on humans and  | 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).   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | both domestic and farm animals. Will children attending local schools and nursery, particularly Strike Lane Primary School and Carr Hill High School be able to concentrate during lessons with construction and post-construction noise? Will any remaining dairy cows (after you have taken the farmland) be able to produce the same quantity and quality of milk? What is the impact on human beings of constant 24/7 exposure to noise when they have had a lifetime of peace and quiet?   | 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). 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_0161_016_211123          | S44     | Email           | Mitigation•No information has been made available relating to how the project will mitigate :- the construction activity; the visual impact of the substations; the noise and vibration levels both post and during construction; light pollution from the sites; electro-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. | Detailed assessments are 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_0162_001_211123          | S44     | Email           | 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.  | 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. 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_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_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  | 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | are alternative options laid out by the initial studies and FBCs plans, which should be reconsidered and different decisions made.  | 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_0165_003_211123          | S44     | Email           | Furthermore, the potential consequences of noise and light pollution resulting from the operation of the transformer are deeply troubling. Such pollution can have severe implications for the health and well-being of the residents in Newton. I request that a comprehensive study be conducted to assess the potential noise and light disturbances, and appropriate measures be taken to mitigate these effects.   | 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_0167_008_171023          | S44     | Email           | In your documents you point to mitigation for the effects of Electro Magnetic fields but there is no indication of how this will be carried out and how effective it will be. Apart from the possible effects on Navigation Aids for air traffic using Blackpool Airport I understand that Electromagnetic Hypersensitivity exists as a medical condition for some in the population and there is no apparent statement as to how this has been considered. These vague proposals have caused uncertainty and, for some I am sure, anxiety as all that has been presented for consultation is, in effect, a red line boundary showing the probable area in which the onshore transmission assets are to be located.   | 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_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 | 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. 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). |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| 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). |
| TA_0184_003_221123          | S44     | Email           | This scheme will adversely affect our physical and mental health and all of those affected.   | 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.  |
| TA_0185_007_221123          | S44     | Email           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>  | 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  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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_0186_005_221123          | S44     | Email           | My key issues are the impact on the mental health of my husband and myself and on the family as this decision is forced upon us with no choice and no other options have been put forward. At the meeting of the 26th October no other options were suggested, or alternatives, which leaves you as the individual with no business in a timeframe forced upon us.   | 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. 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. |
| TA_0187_002_221123          | S44     | Email           | 3. The health implications in this are also a matter of concern not to mention the mental health aspect on us due to the disruption and worry.   | The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. 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.  |
| TA_0188_005_221123          | S44     | Email           | Negative effects on human and animal health<br>The proposed substation site is located directly opposite our house and we have real concerns over the effects that this could potentially have both on our health and also the health of our livestock. I know that there are guidelines in place as to how far electricity substations need to be located away from schools and houses, but are there any studies which detail any negative effects there could be to grazing livestock which will be living on the adjacent land? Why is it deemed OK to subject livestock to any potential harm? Can we be categorically assured that there will be no negative effects on our health? The visual and auditory impact of the substation during construction, and also on completion, is a huge concern for us too. As well as being our livelihood and business, our farm is also our home and the place that we have chosen to bring up our daughter. We chose to come back to the farm after our daughter was born so that she could enjoy a safe upbringing in the country with space to play and have freedom. Having a substation directly opposite our house on land that we own was certainly not in the plan, and neither was the undue ongoing stress and upset that this has caused our family. I doubt whether anyone from bP or Flotation Energy would choose to live opposite a working substation, and yet you expect us to without any choice whatsoever in the matter. In addition to this the substation sites are very close to two schools and the potential effects on the health of the children in these schools must surely be considered. | 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.   |
| TA_0189_003_221123          | S44     | Email           | 2. It is very close to Strike Lane Primary School and Carr Hill High School. How will it affect the children attending these schools in terms of EMR, noise, light and vibration?  | 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). 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>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_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 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_008_221123          | 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> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| TA_0200_006_221123          | S44     | Email           | Light Pollution from Sites Electro Magnetic Radiation   | 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). 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_0200_008_221123          | S44     | Email           | Impact on Wildlife and Humans   | Detailed assessments are 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_0201_005_221123          | S44     | Email           | 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   | The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. 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.   |
| TA_0202_009_221123          | S44     | Email           | • Mental Health Issues- You will tip us and the rest of the Farming community over the top.   | 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.  |
| 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 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   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>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_009_231123          | 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_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 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 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_0204_009_231123          | 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 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). |
| TA_0208_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | 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. | 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.  |
| TA_0211_007_231123          | S44     | Email           | 12 Given that myself, my wife, my son, his wife and my only grandchildren will be living a few metres away from these cables and twenty or more staff working daily in the cables' vicinity please can you confirm that there are no health risks associated with these cables to humans or animals?  | 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | through sharing of non-technical information with the public and the project's adherence to health protection standards.  |
| TA_0225_020_231123          | S44     | Email           | 9. Substation sites and high voltage cables should be located sufficiently away from any dwelling or other building in occupancy to avoid higher than 0.4 microtesla level for magnetic field exposure. Public safety measures should follow the minimum recommendations of the National Institute of Public Health and the Environment ministry of health, welfare and sport National precautionary policies on magnetic fields from power lines in Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom publication. | 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_0226_014_231123          | S44     | Email           | 9. Substation sites and high voltage cables should be located sufficiently away from any dwelling or other building in occupancy to avoid higher than 0.4 microtesla level for magnetic field exposure. Public safety measures should follow the minimum recommendations of the National Institute of Public Health and the Environment ministry of health, welfare and sport National precautionary policies on magnetic fields from power lines in Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom publication. | 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_0227_014_231123          | S44     | Email           | 9. Substation sites and high voltage cables should be located sufficiently away from any dwelling or other building in occupancy to avoid higher than 0.4 microtesla level for magnetic field exposure. Public safety measures should follow the minimum recommendations of the National Institute of Public Health and the Environment ministry of health, welfare and sport National precautionary policies on magnetic fields from power lines in Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom publication. | 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_0228_007_231123          | S44     | Email           | Substation sites and high voltage cables should be located sufficiently away from any dwelling or other building in occupancy to avoid higher than 0.4 microtesla level for magnetic field exposure. Public safety measures should follow the minimum recommendations of the National Institute of Public Health and the Environment ministry of health, welfare and sport National precautionary policies on magnetic fields from power lines in Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom publication.    | 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). |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |  | Compliance Statement (Volume 1, Annex 3.4 of the ES, document reference E1.3.4).  |
| TA_0210_007_231123          | S44     | Email           | Substation sites and high voltage cables should be located sufficiently away from any dwelling or other building in occupancy to avoid higher than 0.4 microtesla level for magnetic field exposure. Public safety measures should follow the minimum recommendations of the National Institute of Public Health and the Environment ministry of health, welfare and sport National precautionary policies on magnetic fields from power lines in Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom publication.  | 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_0229_013_231123          | S44     | Email           | 9. Substation sites and high voltage cables should be located sufficiently away from any dwelling or other building in occupancy to avoid higher than 0.4 microtesla level for magnetic field exposure. Public safety measures should follow the minimum recommendations of the National Institute of Public Health and the Environment ministry of health, welfare and sport National precautionary policies on magnetic fields from power lines in Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom publication.   | The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. 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_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 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. | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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 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_012_231123          | S44     | Email           | 9. Substation sites and high voltage cables should be located sufficiently away from any dwelling or other building in occupancy to avoid higher than 0.4 microtesla level for magnetic field exposure. Public safety measures should follow the minimum recommendations of the National   | The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. Electro-magnetic fields (EMFs) are part of the natural world, and are also produced wherever electricity is generated, transmitted or  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | Institute of Public Health and the Environment ministry of health, welfare and sportNational precautionary policies on magnetic fields from power lines in Belgium, France,Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom publication.   | 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_0230_018_231123          | S44     | Email           | The substation site is far too close to dwelling houses and my client's dwelling in particular withhealth, 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 process, is set out in Volume 1, 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 healthhas 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_0231_010_231123          | S44     | Email           | 9. Substation sites and high voltage cables should be located sufficiently away from anydwelling or other building in occupancy to avoid higher than 0.4 microtesla level for magneticfield exposure. Public safety measures should follow the minimum recommendations of theNational Institute of Public Health and the Environment ministry of health, welfare and sportnational precautionary policies on magnetic fields from power lines in Belgium, France,Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom publication.   | 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_0233_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | Statutory Consultation Feedback in respect ofMorgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms: Transmission AssetsStatutory Consultation from 12 October 2023 – 23 November 2023REDACTEDMy client owns two dwelling houses next to each other together with circa 35 acres of land atREDACTED which is immediately north of REDACTED where the proposedMorgan substation is proposed and due east is the proposed Morecambe substation Option 1 site.My clients properties will be significantly affected by the proposed schemes both during constructionand the permanent substation sites thereafter.The substation sites are far too close to dwelling houses with health, visual and noise in mind.The construction traffic, noise, dust etc will be heard and seen on a daily basis for several years whichis totally unacceptable in a | 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). The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE). Further detail is presented in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | residential area immediately next to protected countryside. The Morgan substation would be 400m from REDACTED, approx. 140m to REDACTED, 120m from REDACTED, similar distance to dwellings at the end of REDACTED track and approx. 100m from a housing estate immediately on the west side of REDACTED. It is wholly unacceptable to consider the Morgan substation site in this location given its close proximity to dwelling houses.   | (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_0233_011_231123          | S44     | Email           | 9. Substation sites and high voltage cables should be located sufficiently away from any dwelling or other building in occupancy to avoid higher than 0.4 microtesla level for magnetic field exposure. Public safety measures should follow the minimum recommendations of the National Institute of Public Health and the Environment ministry of health, welfare and sport national precautionary policies on magnetic fields from power lines in Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom publication.                                     | The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. 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_0234_015_231123          | S44     | Email           | 9. Substation sites and high voltage cables should be located sufficiently away from any dwelling or other building in occupancy to avoid higher than 0.4 microtesla level for magnetic field exposure. Public safety measures should follow the minimum recommendations of the National Institute of Public Health and the Environment ministry of health, welfare and sport National precautionary policies on magnetic fields from power lines in Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom publication.                                     | 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_0235_001_231123          | S44     | Email           | This consultation feedback is made on behalf of REDACTED who own freehold land at REDACTED as owner occupier. My clients properties will be significantly affected by the proposed schemes both during construction and the permanent substation sites thereafter. The substation sites are far too close to dwelling houses with health, visual and noise in mind. The 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. | 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). 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. An assessment of the |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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_0235_010_231123          | S44     | Email           | 9. Substation sites and high voltage cables should be located sufficiently away from any dwelling or other building in occupancy to avoid higher than 0.4 microtesla level for magnetic field exposure. Public safety measures should follow the minimum recommendations of the National Institute of Public Health and the Environment ministry of health, welfare and sport national precautionary policies on magnetic fields from power lines in Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom publication.   | The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits. 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_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 am 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 substation is intentional to deceive the public! 45acre 20meters tall this will 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 |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| 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. | <p>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>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).</p>  |
| TA_0243_010_231123          | 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.   | <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_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. | <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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | <p>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_010_231123          | 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> |



## **E1.16.29 Draft Habitats Regulations Assessment table of responses (via all methods)**

**Table E1.16.29: Draft Habitats Regulations Assessment table of responses (via all methods)**

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
| TA_0001_047_231123          | S42     | Email           | Screening 1.46<br>HRA Screening Report<br>Natural England broadly agrees that the relevant sites have been screened in, correct features and pathways identified.<br>N/A   | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0001_048_231123          | S42     | Email           | Assessment 1.47<br>HRA ISAA<br>Broadly in agreement of the HRA methodology, appropriate SNCB guidance has been followed.<br>N/A  | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0001_049_231123          | S42     | Email           | In- combination 1.48<br>HRA ISAA<br>Please refer to comments A1.22 – A1.23 with regards to projects for inclusion<br>Refer to comments A1.22 – A1.23   | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0001_050_231123          | S42     | Email           | Screening 1.49<br>Broadly agree with the sites identified screened in for assessment<br>N/A  | The Applicant notes your response.   |
| TA_0001_053_231123          | S42     | Email           | Screening 1.52<br>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.<br>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).  |
| TA_0001_090_231123          | S42     | Email           | 2.36 HRA<br>Screening Report<br>Correct designated sites have been identified and scoped into the report<br>N/a  | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0001_091_231123          | S42     | Email           | 2.37 HRA<br>Screening report<br>Natural England broadly agrees that the relevant sites have been screened in, correct features and pathways identified.<br>N/a   | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0001_092_231123          | S42     | Email           | 2.38 Section 1.7<br>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.<br>Natural England have concerns about the volume of sand wave clearance required and the subsequent effects on Shell Flat and Lune Deep SAC.<br>Please refer to upfront comments in Table 1 for further advice on mitigating sandwave clearance.<br>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 extends circa 5 km in a principally east/west orientation, sop 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<br>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.   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
| TA_0001_012_231123          | S42     | Email           | Screening 1.16<br>Table 1.13 (HRA screening)<br>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.<br><a href="https://sac.jncc.gov.uk/species/S1103/">https://sac.jncc.gov.uk/species/S1103/</a>   | 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_170_231123          | S42     | Email           | Screening 4.55<br>General<br>We defer to the relevant SNCBs on the appropriate approach for assessing SACs outside English waters.   | The Applicants note your response.  |
| TA_0001_171_231123          | S42     | Email           | 4.56 Table 1.5<br>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<br>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:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pen Llŷn a'r Sarnau/Llŷn Peninsula and the Sarnau SAC</li> <li>• Lambay Island SAC</li> <li>• Cardigan Bay/Bae Ceredigion SAC</li> <li>• Pembrokeshire Marine/Sir Benfro Forol SAC</li> <li>• Saltee Islands SAC</li> </ul> As 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<br>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<br>Natural England agree with the conclusions in the LSE matrices. Agreement  | The Applicants note your response.  |
| TA_0001_219_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.4 A key part of the HRA assessment is correctly identifying SPA/Ramsar site features as breeding, non-breeding, and assemblage features. With SPA/ Ramsar sites, correctly identify features as breeding, non-breeding and assemblage features throughout the submitted ES.  | 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_220_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.5 Natural England do not consider that a 'whole project alone' assessment has been undertaken for the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA. For further detail, please see comment 7.46. The submitted ES should contain a 'whole project alone' assessment so the totality of potential impacts on the SPA (and other receptors where relevant) are properly quantified and appropriate mitigation put in place where needed. In particular, the assessment should fully consider how the construction pressures impact both the SPA itself and its functionally linked land. | 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) and in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Offshore ornithology of the ES (document reference F2.5). 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). Both the ES and the ISAA consider construction impacts, including impacts on functionally linked land.  |
| TA_0001_222_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.7 The developer has concluded no adverse effects for impacts via heavy machinery/people to disturbance of qualifying bird species for Liverpool Bay, Ribble & Alt and Morecambe Bay.   | The section of the Transmission Assets Order Limits adjacent to RSPB Fairhaven Lakes is proposed for ornithological mitigation (with no development   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | The assessment has not accounted for visual & noise disturbance for qualifying bird species utilising surrounding area which has potential to be disturbed. Natural England do not concur with these conclusions.<br>These impacts need to be included within the assessment in order to ensure the robustness of the HRA, and determine the scope of any required additional mitigation measures.   | to take place at this location). Refer to Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES for further details.<br>The findings of the HRA process are set out in the Information to Support Appropriate Assessment (ISAA) report (document reference E2.1, 2.2, 2.3).   |
| TA_0001_241_231123          | S42     | Email           | Screening 7.26 1.1.2152<br>As with other SPA/Ramsar sites, features need to be identified as breeding, non- breeding, and assemblage features. This is integral to the HRA assessment of the features. With SPA/ Ramsar sites, the submitted ES should identify features as breeding, non- breeding and assemblage features.   | An assessment of the potential impact on key receptors, including qualifying features of the 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 ES (document reference F3.4).<br>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). This includes identification of features of internationally and nationally designated sites in section 1.5 of Part 3 of the ISAA. |
| TA_0001_242_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.27 1.1.2.1 5.4, 1.1.2.1. 57 and 1.1.2.1. 127<br>Natural England do not agree with the conclusion of no AEoI for Ribble and Alt SPA based on information provided.<br>The submitted ES should provide further robust evidence to support this conclusion or apply the mitigation hierarchy to ensure adverse effects cannot arise.  | 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).<br>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_243_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.28 1.11.3.3 and 1.11.3.87<br>Natural England note the lengthy 77 month (6yr) risk period. This is noted as lengthy as it has implications for the duration of disturbance effects on SPA waterbirds.<br>n/a  | The Applicants note your response. Updated details regarding construction periods are provided in Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).  |
| TA_0001_250_231123          | S42     | Email           | 7.35 Table 1.374<br>Natural England notes that impacts from the cable installation will be for 66 months (5yr 6mths) but it is not quantified in the HRA where or when the risk will be, or the likely plant used to assess risks.<br>In the updated assessment, specify where and when the potential impacts risks (to ornithological features) will occur during the cable installation phase. The likely plant used in these assessments should also be outlined.   | The assessment of the effects due to disturbance and displacement from the presence of vehicles and/or heavy machinery associated with construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning activities is presented within section 4.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology of the ES (document reference F3.4).   |
| TA_0001_277_231123          | S42     | Email           | Impacts on the Natural Environment – Natural England's Key Concerns<br>Generic Comments<br>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_299_231123          | S42     | Email           | Onshore Ornithology<br>Natural England do not agree with the conclusion of No AEoI 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  | 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).   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | impacts to qualifying bird species of Liverpool Bay SPA, Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA, and Morecambe Bay and Duddon Estuary SPA.   | 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_300_231123          | S42     | Email           | The presented information within the PEIR is incomplete and there are further surveys to be reported. Currently, Natural England disagree that the survey effort is sufficient to rely on 1% rule of thumb as a screening tool. The survey areas presented here require further explanation as to why the core survey area was selected as a subset of the red line boundary. Without sufficient reasoning for this, further survey coverage is needed. It is also not clear why the core survey area was selected as a subset of the red line boundary. This is not appropriate unless the developer is committed to only causing impacts within this zone. | Additional surveys have been completed and reported within the ES. The 1% screening tool has not been used for ES purposes.<br>The survey coverage is reported within Volume 3, Annex 4.1: Breeding birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.1), Volume 3, Annex 4.2: Wintering and migratory birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.2) and Volume 3, Annex 4.3: Intertidal birds technical report of the ES (document reference F3.4.3) and is considered sufficiently robust to fully characterise the baseline used in this assessment.  |
| TA_0017_005_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | The Marine Management Organisation and Natural England should be consulted regarding potential ecological impacts of 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.<br>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_002_221123          | S42     | Email           | 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.   | The Applicants note your response.  |
| 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.   |
| TA_0023_004_221123          | S42     | Email           | Marine Ornithology: NRW (A) have some comments on changes needed to the shadow HRA methodology, though this may not change the overall conclusions.  | The Applicants note your response, specific responses provided for relevant comments below.   |
| TA_0023_008_221123          | S42     | Email           | 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 and Bala lake/ Afon Dyfrwy a Llyn Tegid SAC and Afon Gwyrfa a Llyn Cwellyn SAC. We do, however, provide some advice below that would improve the robustness of the shadow HRA.   | The Applicants note your response.  |
| 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  | 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | 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.   | 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_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.<br><br>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_076_221123          | S42     | Email           | NRW (A) does not agree with the use of SCOS [2018] for screening. We advise the use of Carter et al [2020].   | 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:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pen Llŷn a'r Sarnau/Llŷn Peninsula and the Sarnau SAC</li> <li>• Lambay Island SAC</li> <li>• Cardigan Bay/Bae Ceredigion SAC</li> <li>• Pembrokeshire Marine/Sir Benfro Forol SAC</li> <li>• Saltee Islands SAC</li> </ul> As agreed with Natural England via the Marine Mammals Expert Working Group (EWG) (EWG03) all SACs for harbour seal were screened out. |
| TA_0023_077_221123          | S42     | Email           | 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.<br>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.   | The Applicants note your response. Specific responses are provided for comments below.  |
| TA_0023_078_221123          | S42     | Email           | 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 | 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).  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | distributions 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:<br>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_0010_121_221123          | S42     | Email           | Habitat Regulations Assessment – Information to Support an Appropriate Assessment<br>20.1. MMO defers to the statutory advice provided by the relevant Statutory Nature Conservation Body's regarding the potential impacts to the protected features of the identified nature conservation areas that may occur because of the Projects including the in-combination assessment. Noting section XX and XX of this document include comments on the modelling and assessments for some features.   | The Applicants note your response.  |
| TA_0010_122_221123          | S42     | Email           | 20.2. 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.  |

## E1.16.30 Draft Development Consent Order table of responses

## **E1.16.30.1 Draft Development Consent Order table of responses (via feedback form)**



**Table E1.16.30.1: Draft Development Consent Order 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_011_231123          | S42     | Online feedback form | 14                     |                              | <p>What's the timescales?</p> <p>Is this consultation of any real benefit?</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). Table 3.4 presented within Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3) details the overall construction programme durations.</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>  |
| TA_0056_037_141123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 14                     |                              | <p>As previously stated<br/> <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_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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | <p>environmental effects. Mitigation measures adopted 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, 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_0058_003_201123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 14                     |                              | Object on the basis of unknown health risks, foundation problems to residential properties on sand based land and total disruption to road traffic and associated delays that will be created.   | <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_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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              |  | consultation requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and had regard to all the feedback submitted.  |
| TA_0064_016_221123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 14                     |                              | Please produce a representative onshore map  | 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_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_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_0081_007_201123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 14                     |                              | See previous comments.<br>("As mentioned, local residents including my family are totally opposed to this project. The damage and disruption to a local community is unacceptable.<br>Our property values will plummet. A beautiful area will be destroyed.<br>Lay your cables in a region where people's lives are not affected.<br>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_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_0085_014_191123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 14                     |                              | 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.<br>You also cannot answer questions to say whether you will or will not need to compulsory purchase and where. You say | 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).   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method      | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub – question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                      |                        |                              | decisions will be made after the consultation period has closed .<br>This is all totally unsatisfactory and grossly unreasonable to the residents that you are trying to get on side.   |   |
| 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).   |
| 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_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 in due course.   |
| TA_0105_010_231123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 14                     |                              | 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.<br><br>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).<br>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.<br>The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_0114_001_161123          | S44     | Online feedback form | 16                     |                              | Coordinated required MAHP pipeline within consultation zone   | The Applicants note this response, and has provided Protective Provisions for Sabic UK Petro-Chemicals in Schedule 10, Part 1 for the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1).  |

## **E1.16.30.2 Draft Development Consent Order table of responses (via all other methods)**

**Table E1.16.30.2: Draft Development Consent Order table of responses (via all other methods)**

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
| 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_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_198_231123          | S42     | Email           | Natural England's Position on Worst Case Scenario or Scenarios 6.12 Vol3; Chp 3 Table 3.11, Table 3:15 The developer recognises Lytham St. Anne's Dunes as a SSSI (Table 3.11) and it has been taken forward as an Important Ecological Feature (Table 3.15). However, as the proposed installation method is HDD it is felt the developer has not fully considered the MDS (Table 3.16) for this designated site. The current assessment for Lytham St. Anne's Dunes SSSI (para 3.9.2.8 - 3.9.2.11) notes "During construction the Transmission Assets will commit to avoiding impacts on the Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI, as the cables will be installed beneath this habitat via HDD (or other trenchless techniques) and open trenching techniques would not be used within this habitat.Accordingly, there will be no temporary or permanent loss of this habitat type. The magnitude of impact is therefore, considered to be no change." The developer goes on to note that while the sensitivity of the habitat is High, the significance of effect is no effect. However, from experience of similar projects Natural England know that on occasions HDD can fail, or the proposed development design changes and for example Transition Joint Bays need to be moved (which presumably currently will be situated on the beach)/ or additional vehicle access is required. In such scenarios by excluding any effect early in the assessment process there is a lack of detail later on if the installation methods change.Similarly full consideration of impacts should HDD not be undertaken in saltmarsh along the river Ribble (part of the Ribble Estuary SSSI). A full baseline assessment of Lytham St. Anne's Dunes SSSI should be undertaken so that should the worst-case scenario occur (i.e. HDD is not possible) sufficient ecological data is available to inform/ develop suitable mitigation measures. In addition, it could be used as a baseline for post-construction monitoring (and a means to determine recovery).Baseline surveys of Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI should include mapping to NVC level of the dune habitats present, with supporting quadrat sampling. Quadrat sampling should be sufficient in coverage to ensure all community types are sampled. The SSSI citation notes that the site support classic features of dune formation and ecological succession including the widest range of foredune, yellow dune, dune grassland, acid dune grassland, dune scrub and dune slack habitats found anywhere along the Fylde Coast. The site is botanically diverse with a number of rare or scarce plant species.Use of up-to-date aerial photography taken at the time of the NVC survey would be preferable. The developer should undertake a cable burial risk assessment for all the HDD work (including Lytham St. Anne's Dunes SSSI and the River Ribble (part of the Ribble Estuary SSSI) informed by geotechnical investigations. This should include an outline burial cable specification and installation plan which has a pollution* and contingency plan. This would help determine the likelihood (degree of confidence) of success of HDD at the given locations. *Note a Bentonite breakout plan is mentioned for the River Ribble but not for Lytham St. Annes Dunes | 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 likelihood of collapse that is associated with cable installation using horizontal directional drilling (HDD). The Works Plans submitted with the application for development consent (and accompanying description) allow only for direct pipe in this location. Therefore, the MDS that has been used is considered to be correct. Further data on the distribution and status of SSSI interest features that is necessary to inform the ES has been obtained from existing reports prepared on behalf of Lancashire Wildlife Trust and Our Future Coasts, and NVC surveys have been carried out to confirm or update the findings of these reports where necessary.CoT41 states that where the onshore export cable corridor or 400 kV grid connection cable corridor crosses sites of particular sensitivity, including Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI, a hydrogeological risk assessment will be undertaken to inform a site-specific crossing method statement which will also be agreed with the relevant authorities prior to construction.The risk of bentonite breakout at Lytham St Annes Dunes SSSI 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). |
| TA_0006_001_221123          | S42     | Email           | Standard navigation conditions for inclusion within Deemed Marine Licences (DML) for offshore renewable energy installations. Agreed by Marine Management Organisation (MMO), Trinity House, Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA) and UK Hydrographic Office (UKHO)Notifications and Inspections:1) The undertaker must inform the MMO Coastal Office in writing at least 5 days prior to the commencement of the authorised project or any part thereof, and within 5 days of completion of the authorised project.2) The Kingfisher Information Service of Seafish, must be informed of details of the vessel routes, timings and locations relating to the construction of the authorised project or any part thereof by email to REDACTED@seafish.co.uk :-a) at least 14 days prior to the commencement offshore activities, for inclusion in the Kingfisher Fortnightly Bulletin and offshore hazard awareness data, and;b) as soon as reasonably practicable and no later than 24 hours of completion of all offshore activities.Confirmation of   | The Applicants note your response. Appropriate drafting has been included in the DMLs at Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1).   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | <p>notification must be provided to the MMO within 5 days.3) The undertaker must ensure that a local notification to mariners is issued at least 14 days prior to the commencement of the authorised project or any part thereof advising of the start date of each Work No.&lt;insert&gt; and the expected vessel routes from the construction ports to the relevant location.Copies of all notices must be provided to the MMO, MCA and UKHO within 5 days.4) The undertaker must ensure that local notifications to mariners are updated and reissued at weekly intervals during construction activities and at least 5 days before any planned operations (or otherwise agreed) and maintenance works and supplemented with VHF radio broadcasts agreed with the MCA in accordance with the construction and monitoring programme approved under deemed marine licence condition &lt;insert&gt;.Copies of all notices must be provided to the MMO and UKHO within 5 days.5) The undertaker must notify the UKHO of the completion (within 14 days) of the authorised project or any part thereof in order that all necessary amendments are made to nautical charts.Copies of all notices must be provided to the MMO and MCA within 5 days.6) In case of damage to, or destruction or decay of, the authorised project seaward of MHWS or any part thereof, excluding the exposure of cables, the undertaker shall as soon as reasonably practicable and no later than 24 hours following the undertaker becoming aware of any such damage, destruction or decay, notify MMO, MCA, Trinity House, UKHO, the Kingfisher Information Service of Seafish and regional fisheries contacts.7) In case of buried cables becoming exposed on or above the seabed, the undertaker must within three days following identification of a cable exposure, notify mariners, regional fisheries contacts and the Kingfisher Information Service of Seafish of the location and extent of exposure. Copies of all notices must be provided to the MMO, MCA, Trinity House, and the UKHO within 5 days.</p> |   |
| TA_0006_002_221123          | S42     | Email           | <p>Pre-construction plans and documents:The authorised project shall not commence until the following have been submitted to and approved by the MMO. Each programme, statement, plan, protocol, scheme or other detail required to be approved under this condition must be submitted to the MMO for approval at least 6 months prior to the commencement of the authorised project except where otherwise stated.1) A plan to be agreed in writing with the MMO following appropriate consultation with Trinity House, the MCA and UKHO, setting out proposed details of the authorised project, including the:a) number, dimensions, specification, foundation type(s) and depth for each WTGs, offshore platforms, substations and meteorological masts;b) the grid coordinates of the centre point of the proposed location for each WTG, platform, substation and meteorological mast;c) proposed layout of all cables; andd) location and specification of all other aspects of the authorised project.</p>  | <p>The Applicants note your response. Appropriate drafting has been included in the DMLs at Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1).</p> |
| TA_0006_003_221123          | S42     | Email           | <p>2) An Aids to Navigation Management Plan to be agreed in writing by the MMO following appropriate consultation with Trinity House specifying how the undertaker will ensure compliance with conditions (1) to (4) of 'Aids to Navigation' from the commencement of construction of the authorised project to the completion of decommissioning.</p>  | <p>The Applicants note your response. Appropriate drafting has been included in the DMLs at Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1).</p> |
| TA_0006_004_221123          | S42     | Email           | <p>3) No part of the authorised project may commence until the MMO, in consultation with the MCA, has confirmed in writing that the undertaker has taken into account and, so far as is applicable to that stage of the project, adequately addressed all MCA recommendations as appropriate to the authorised project contained within MGN654 "Offshore Renewable Energy Installations (OREIs) – Guidance on UK Navigational Practice, Safety and Emergency Response Issues" and its annexes.</p>  | <p>The Applicants note your response. Appropriate drafting has been included in the DMLs at Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1).</p> |
| TA_0006_005_221123          | S42     | Email           | <p>4) A construction method statement in accordance with the construction methods assessed in the environmental statement and including details of –i) Cable specification, installation and monitoring, to include:a) technical specification offshore cables below MHWS;b) a detailed cable laying plan for the Order limits, incorporating a burial risk assessment encompassing the identification of any cable protection that exceeds 5% of navigable depth referenced to chart datum and, in the event that any area of cable protection exceeding 5% of navigable depth is identified, details of any steps (to be determined following consultation with the MCA and Trinity House) to be taken to ensure existing and future safe navigation is not compromised or such similar assessment to ascertain suitable burial depths and cable laying techniques, including cable protection; andc) proposals for monitoring offshore cables including cable protection during the operational lifetime of the authorised scheme which includes a risk based approach to the management of unburied or shallow buried cables.</p>   | <p>The Applicants note your response. Appropriate drafting has been included in the DMLs at Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1).</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| TA_0006_006_221123          | S42     | Email           | Pre-construction monitoring and surveys) A swath bathymetric survey to IHO Order 1a of the area within the Offshore Order Limits extending to an appropriate buffer around the site, must be undertaken. The survey shall include all proposed cable routes. This should fulfil the requirements of MGN654 and its supporting 'Hydrographic Guidelines for Offshore Renewable Energy Developers', which includes the requirement for the full density data and reports to be delivered to the MCA and the UKHO for the update of nautical charts and publications. This must be submitted as soon as possible, and no later than [three months] prior to construction. The Order Limit shapefiles must be submitted to MCA. The Report of Survey must also be sent to the MMO.  | The Applicants note your response. Appropriate drafting has been included in the DMLs at Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1).   |
| TA_0006_007_221123          | S42     | Email           | Aids to Navigation:1) The undertaker shall during the whole period from the commencement of construction of the authorised project to the completion of decommissioning exhibit such lights, marks, sounds, signals and other aids to navigation, and to take such other steps for the prevention of danger to navigation as Trinity House may from time to time direct2) The undertaker must during the whole period from the commencement of construction of the authorised project to the completion of decommissioning keep Trinity House and the MMO informed of progress of the authorised project including;a. notice of commencement of construction of the authorised project within 24 hours of commencement having occurred;b. notice within 24 hours of any aids to navigation being established by the undertaker; andc. notice within 5 days of completion of construction of the authorised project.3) The undertaker must provide reports to Trinity House on the availability of aids to navigation in accordance with the frequencies set out in the aids to navigation management plan agreed pursuant to condition <insert> using the reporting system provided by Trinity House.4)The undertaker must during the whole period from the commencement of construction of the authorised project to the completion of decommissioning notify Trinity House and the MMO of any failure of the aids to navigation and the timescales and plans for remedying such failures, as soon as possible and no later than 24 hours following the undertaker becoming aware of any such failure. | The Applicants note your response. Appropriate drafting has been included in the DMLs at Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1).   |
| TA_0006_008_221123          | S42     | Email           | Colouring of structures:<br>1) Except as otherwise required by Trinity House the undertaker must paint all structures forming part of the authorised project yellow (colour code RAL 1023) from at least HAT to a height as directed by Trinity House. Unless the MMO otherwise directs, the undertaker must paint the remainder of the structures grey (colour code RAL 7035).   | The Transmission Assets project has made design changes since the PEIR and have updated the Project Design Envelope (PDE) which no longer includes any surface piercing structures. Therefore colouring of structures is no longer applicable. |
| TA_0006_009_221123          | S42     | Email           | Construction Monitoring 1) Construction monitoring must include vessel traffic monitoring by automatic identification system for the duration of the construction period. An appropriate report must be submitted to the MMO, Trinity House and the MCA at the end of each year of the construction period. This should fulfil the requirements of MGN654 and its supporting 'Hydrographic Guidelines for Offshore Renewable Energy Developers', which includes the requirement for the full density data and reports to be delivered to the MCA and the UKHO for the update of nautical charts and publications. 3) Post construction monitoring must include vessel traffic monitoring by automatic identification system for a duration of three consecutive years following the completion of construction of authorised project, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the MMO. An appropriate report must be submitted to the MMO, Trinity House and the MCA at the end of each year of the three year period.  | The Applicants note your response. Appropriate drafting has been included in the DMLs at Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1).   |
| TA_0006_010_221123          | S42     | Email           | Post-construction plans and documents 1) The undertaker must conduct a swath bathymetric survey to IHO Order 1a of the installed export cable route and provide the data and survey report(s) to the MCA and UKHO. The MMO should be notified once this has been done, with a copy of the Report of Survey also sent to the MMO.2) On post decommissioning, the undertaker must conduct a swath bathymetric survey to IHO Order 1a of the cable route and the installed generating assets area and provide the data and survey report(s) to the MCA and UKHO. [Decommissioning is not consented at this stage so this can't be included in theDCO/DML]  | The Applicants note your response. Appropriate drafting has been included in the DMLs at Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1).   |
| TA_0006_011_221123          | S42     | Email           | Completion of Construction(1) The undertaker must submit a close out report to the MMO, MCA, UKHO and the relevant statutory nature conservation body within three months of the date of completion of construction. The close out report must confirm the date of completion of construction and must include the following details—(2) the final number of installed wind turbine generators;(3) as built plans; and(4) latitude and longitude coordinates of the centre point of the location for each wind turbine generator and offshore   | The Applicants note your response. Appropriate drafting has been included in the DMLs at Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1).   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | platform, substation, booster station and meteorological mast; provided as Geographical Information System data referenced to WGS84 datum.(5) latitude and longitude coordinates of the inter array and export cable routes; provided as Geographical Information System data referenced to WGS84 datum.  |  |
| TA_0006_012_221123          | S42     | Email           | NOTE: These are standard conditions to be applied to all DMLs, other maybe requested for site specific projects.  | The Applicants note your response. Appropriate drafting has been included in the DMLs at Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1).   |
| TA_0007_001_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | We understand that the proposals are evolving with a view to formally submitting an application for a Development Consent Order (DCO) in 2024. United Utilities wishes to make the following comments regarding the expectations for any future proposals and the scope for the Development Consent Order.SUMMARYAt this stage our advice is limited as the indicative plans are not detailed enough for us to carry out a comprehensive assessment. We would expect to see detailed plans showing the proposals in relation to any existing United Utilities' assets and infrastructure as part of the DCO applications/any future public consultation. Once the exact location of the substations, cable corridor and landfall area are known, we would be grateful if you can provide the proposed route of the onshore and offshore cables and location of the substation and any associated on shore development in a shapefile format, to allow us to undertake a high level review of the proposal.  | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of United Utilities Water Limited in Schedule 10, Part 6 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). Further discussions with United Utilities and landowners will be undertaken at the detailed design stage to confirm the location of water supply pipelines and sewer infrastructure. Prior to any construction activities, utility surveys will be undertaken to establish if any infrastructure is present prior to any intrusive work being undertaken and further discussion will take place with United Utilities. |
| TA_0007_002_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Following our review of the indicative Transmission Assets PEIR red line boundary and the indicative working plans showing the approximate location of landfall, the cable corridor options and the proposed onshore substation site options, we can confirm we have a number of large and critical assets and legal easements crossing the proposed onshore export cable corridor routes and proposed onshore substation sites. We also have large critical assets and land within our ownership in the area earmarked for potential biodiversity net gain, enhancement and mitigation areas.Our water mains include large diameter trunk mains, high pressure water supply mains and raw water mains. There are also a range of public sewers crossing the site including large diameter rising main sewers and gravity sewers and outfalls including major wastewater interconnector tunnels and tanks. Preston Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) also sits within the proposed site boundary. We would need to be afforded rights to access, repair and maintain these assets in accordance with our statutory powers. The review of assets will need to include any sea outfalls, including long sea outfalls, which may not be visible on the map of public water mains and sewers and may be affected by your development proposal.Please note that within our wider asset base there are a number of assets, which may not be visible on the public sewer and water main map. For example, various pumping stations and tanks as well as assets transferred under private sewers legislation and assets associated with our treatment works. All such assets need to be considered and protected in the delivery of your project.Further dialogue and agreement in respect of all these assets is required. | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of United Utilities Water Limited in Schedule 10, Part 6 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). Further discussions with United Utilities and landowners will be undertaken at the detailed design stage to confirm the location of water supply pipelines and sewer infrastructure. Prior to any construction activities, utility surveys will be undertaken to establish if any infrastructure is present prior to any intrusive work being undertaken and further discussion will take place with United Utilities. |
| TA_0007_003_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | It is the applicant's responsibility to demonstrate the exact relationship between any United Utilities' assets and the proposed development. You should investigate the existence and the precise location of water and wastewater pipelines as soon as possible as this could significantly impact the site selection process for the two new onshore substations, the on shore export cable corridors and landfall arrangements. Further information, including contact details for our Developer Services team, can be found in the 'Contact' section below.We request continued engagement to ensure any of our concerns are adequately addressed and to ensure appropriate protective provisions are agreed. In the interim, we wish to provide the following initial comments for your consideration.It is important to highlight that the costs for assessing the impact on our assets will be recoverable. We request that you engage with us as soon as possible so that we can discuss this process further.Our Assets and PropertyUnited Utilities will not allow building over or in close proximity to a water main and we will not normally allow building over or in close proximity to a public sewer.We would expect to see plans showing the proposals in relation to any existing United Utilities' assets and infrastructure as part of the DCO applications. We would be grateful if you can provide the proposed route of the onshore and offshore cables and location of the substation and any associated on shore development in a shapefile format, when available, to allow us to undertake a detailed assessment.  | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of United Utilities Water Limited in Schedule 10, Part 6 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). Further discussions with United Utilities and landowners will be undertaken at the detailed design stage to confirm the location of water supply pipelines and sewer infrastructure. Prior to any construction activities, utility surveys will be undertaken to establish if any infrastructure is present prior to any intrusive work being undertaken and further discussion will take place with United Utilities. |
| TA_0007_004_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Water and Wastewater Assets We would like to draw the applicant's attention to the various water and wastewater assets that lie within and near to the proposed application boundary. It is important to highlight that these assets include critical assets. These assets would need to be given careful consideration when  | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of United Utilities Water Limited in Schedule 10, Part 6 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). Further discussions with United Utilities and  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | designing any development proposal. Our water mains include large diameter trunk mains, high pressure water supply mains and raw water mains. There are also a range of public sewers crossing the site including large diameter rising main sewers and gravity sewers and outfalls including major wastewater interconnector tunnels and tanks. Preston Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) also sits within the proposed site boundary. We would need to be afforded rights to access, repair and maintain these assets in accordance with our statutory powers. The review of assets will need to include any sea outfalls, including long sea outfalls, which may not be visible on the map of public water mains and sewers and may be affected by your development proposal. Please note that within our wider asset base there are a number of assets, which may not be visible on the public sewer and water main map. For example, various pumping stations and tanks as well as assets transferred under private sewers legislation and assets associated with our treatment works. All such assets need to be considered and protected in the delivery of your project. Further dialogue and agreement in respect of all these assets is required. | landowners will be undertaken at the detailed design stage to confirm the location of water supply pipelines and sewer infrastructure. Prior to any construction activities, utility surveys will be undertaken to establish if any infrastructure is present prior to any intrusive work being undertaken and further discussion will take place with United Utilities.   |
| TA_0007_005_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | We require access as detailed in our 'Standard Conditions for Works Adjacent to Pipelines' (a copy is enclosed). You must comply with this document and it should be taken into account in the final proposals, or a diversion may be necessary.  | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of United Utilities Water Limited in Schedule 10, Part 6 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). Further discussions with United Utilities and landowners will be undertaken at the detailed design stage to confirm the location of water supply pipelines and sewer infrastructure. Prior to any construction activities, utility surveys will be undertaken to establish if any infrastructure is present prior to any intrusive work being undertaken and further discussion will take place with United Utilities to ensure suitable access.                       |
| TA_0007_006_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | It is the applicant's responsibility to demonstrate the exact relationship between any United Utilities' assets and the proposed development. You should investigate the existence and the precise location of water and wastewater pipelines as soon as possible as this could significantly impact the preferred site layout and/or diversion of the asset(s) may be required. Where United Utilities' assets cross the proposed site boundary, you must contact United Utilities prior to commencing any works on site, including trial holes, groundworks or demolition.  | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of United Utilities Water Limited in Schedule 10, Part 6 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). Further discussions with United Utilities and landowners will be undertaken at the detailed design stage to confirm the location of water supply pipelines and sewer infrastructure. Prior to any construction activities, utility surveys will be undertaken to establish if any infrastructure is present prior to any intrusive work being undertaken and further discussion will take place with United Utilities.   |
| TA_0007_007_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | If considering a diversion, the applicant should contact United Utilities at their earliest opportunity as they may find that a diversion is not possible. In some circumstances, usually related to the size and nature of the assets impacted by proposals, developers may discover that the cost of a diversion is prohibitive in the context of their development scheme. Unless there is specific provision within the title of the property or an associated easement, any necessary disconnection or diversion of assets to accommodate development, will be at the applicant's/developer's expense.   | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of United Utilities Water Limited in Schedule 10, Part 6 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). Further discussions with United Utilities and landowners will be undertaken at the detailed design stage to confirm the location of water supply pipelines and sewer infrastructure. Prior to any construction activities, utility surveys will be undertaken to establish if any infrastructure is present prior to any intrusive work being undertaken and further discussion will take place with United Utilities.   |
| TA_0007_008_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Where United Utilities' assets exist, the level of cover to our pipelines and apparatus must not be compromised either during or after construction and there should be no additional load bearing capacity on our assets without prior agreement with United Utilities. This would include earth movement and the transport and position of construction equipment and vehicles. The applicant should therefore give careful consideration to the implications of any changes in proposed land levels. Any such changes will need to be agreed with United Utilities.  | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of United Utilities Water Limited in Schedule 10, Part 6 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). Further discussions with United Utilities and landowners will be undertaken at the detailed design stage to confirm the location of water supply pipelines and sewer infrastructure. Prior to any construction activities, utility surveys will be undertaken to establish if any infrastructure is present prior to any intrusive work being undertaken and further discussion will take place with United Utilities to ensure the level of cover is not compromised. |
| TA_0007_009_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Our Standard Conditions document includes details of trees and shrubbery suitable for planting in the vicinity of our assets. Deep rooted shrubs and trees should not be planted near to our apparatus.   | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of United Utilities Water Limited in Schedule 10, Part 6 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). Further discussions with United Utilities and landowners will be undertaken at the detailed design stage to confirm the location of water supply pipelines and sewer infrastructure. Prior to any construction activities, utility surveys will be undertaken to establish if any infrastructure is present prior to any intrusive work  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |   | being undertaken and further discussion will take place with United Utilities to ensure the location of planting is suitable.  |
| TA_0007_010_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Consideration should also be applied to United Utilities' assets which may be located outside the site boundary. Any construction activities in the vicinity of our assets must comply with our 'Standard Conditions for Works Adjacent to Pipelines' and national building standards.  | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of United Utilities Water Limited in Schedule 10, Part 6 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). Further discussions with United Utilities and landowners will be undertaken at the detailed design stage to confirm the location of water supply pipelines and sewer infrastructure. Prior to any construction activities, utility surveys will be undertaken to establish if any infrastructure is present prior to any intrusive work being undertaken and further discussion will take place with United Utilities to ensure the standard conditions are met. |
| TA_0007_011_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | You must contact United Utilities for advice if your proposal is in the vicinity of water or wastewater pipelines and apparatus. It is your responsibility to ensure that United Utilities' required access is provided within your layout and that our infrastructure is appropriately protected. You would be liable for the cost of any damage to United Utilities' assets resulting from your activity. See 'Contacts' section below.   | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of United Utilities Water Limited in Schedule 10, Part 6 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). Further discussions with United Utilities and landowners will be undertaken at the detailed design stage to confirm the location of water supply pipelines and sewer infrastructure. Prior to any construction activities, utility surveys will be undertaken to establish if any infrastructure is present prior to any intrusive work being undertaken and further discussion will take place with United Utilities.   |
| TA_0007_012_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Vibration, Loading and Settlement<br>United Utilities requests that the impact of the proposed development includes an assessment of any potential settlement and vibration on United Utilities' assets. Similarly, any loading on United Utilities' assets during operation or during construction requires further consideration with United Utilities.   | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of United Utilities Water Limited in Schedule 10, Part 6 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). Further discussions with United Utilities and landowners will be undertaken at the detailed design stage to confirm the location of water supply pipelines and sewer infrastructure. Prior to any construction activities, utility surveys will be undertaken to establish if any infrastructure is present prior to any intrusive work being undertaken and to ensure that there would be no impacts from vibration, loading or settlement.                     |
| TA_0007_013_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Storage of Equipment and Materials within Easements / Offset Areas for Access and Maintenance<br>United Utilities has not undertaken a detailed assessment of where equipment and/or materials are proposed to be stored within a United Utilities' easement / area required for access and maintenance. As a general requirement, United Utilities does not usually allow the easement area, easement width or the necessary offset distance from our assets to be obstructed or impeded in any way. This is due to, but not limited to:<br>- loading implications of the asset and probability of asset failure;<br>- implications on access and maintenance of the asset, especially for critical assets;<br>- security of supply; and<br>- health and safety implications.<br>United Utilities reserves the right to instruct the removal of the equipment and materials located within the easement / access and maintenance offset area. United Utilities requires further consultation and supplementary information to discuss any affected assets. | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of United Utilities Water Limited in Schedule 10, Part 6 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). Further discussions with United Utilities and landowners will be undertaken at the detailed design stage to confirm the location of water supply pipelines and sewer infrastructure. Prior to any construction activities, utility surveys will be undertaken to establish if any infrastructure is present prior to any intrusive work being undertaken and to ensure that there would be no impacts from vibration, loading or settlement.                     |
| TA_0007_014_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Construction Compounds / Construction Traffic<br>Construction compounds should not be located on top of our apparatus. This is because we require unrestricted access for maintenance, repair and replacement to discharge our statutory duties. Similarly, detailed consideration will need to be given to any proposed construction traffic routes to assess the impact on our assets. It will be necessary to ensure that any approach to construction is the subject of a construction management plan to address a range of issues including the protection of our assets as well as any wider impact on our operations.   | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of United Utilities Water Limited in Schedule 10, Part 6 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). Further discussions with United Utilities and landowners will be undertaken at the detailed design stage to confirm the location of water supply pipelines and sewer infrastructure. Prior to any construction activities, utility surveys will be undertaken to establish if any infrastructure is present prior to any intrusive work being undertaken and to ensure that there would be no impacts from vibration, loading or settlement.                     |
| TA_0007_015_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Ecological Mitigation and Biodiversity Net Gain<br>Ecological mitigation and the delivery of areas for biodiversity net gain should not be located on top of our  | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of United Utilities Water Limited in Schedule 10, Part 6 of the draft Development   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | apparatus. This is because we require unrestricted access for maintenance, repair and replacement to discharge our statutory duties.   | Consent Order (document reference C1). Further discussions with United Utilities and landowners will be undertaken at the detailed design stage to confirm the location of water supply pipelines and sewer infrastructure. Prior to any construction activities, utility surveys will be undertaken to establish if any infrastructure is present prior to any intrusive work being undertaken and to ensure that there would be no impacts from vibration, loading or settlement.  |
| TA_0007_016_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Property Interests Within the application boundary, we have a range of property interests which include land in the ownership of United Utilities, easements, rights of way. We wish to discuss with you the implications for our land interests. Please note that the any easement associated with our apparatus is in addition to our statutory rights for inspection, maintenance and repair under the Water Industry Act 1991. The easements have restrictive covenants that must be adhered to. It is the responsibility of the developer to obtain a copy of the document, available from United Utilities Legal Services or Land Registry and to comply with the provisions stated within the document. Under no circumstances should anything be stored, planted or erected on the easement width. Nor should anything occur that may affect the integrity of the pipes or the legal right of United Utilities to 24 hour access. The applicant should contact our Property team to discuss how the proposals affect our land interests and to ensure no detrimental impact. United Utilities Property Services can be contacted at PropertyGeneralEnquiries@uuplc.co.uk. We also wish to note that within our wider asset base there are a number of assets, which although owned and operated by United Utilities, are not always in our land ownership. For example, assets transferred under private sewers legislation. | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of United Utilities Water Limited in Schedule 10, Part 6 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). Further discussions with United Utilities and landowners will be undertaken at the detailed design stage to confirm the location of water supply pipelines and sewer infrastructure. Prior to any construction activities, utility surveys will be undertaken to establish if any infrastructure is present prior to any intrusive work being undertaken and to ensure that there would be no impacts from vibration, loading or settlement. |
| 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 practise 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_037_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 5. Water Supply Requirements We request that you provide details of any water supply requirements for both construction and during operation as soon as possible. This should include details on rates of water supply required in litres per second and anticipated points of connection to the public water supply network. The details of water supply required should include details for any fire response purposes that may be necessary. For temporary related activities, such as construction compounds and workers accommodation, early consideration of any water supply requirements will also be required. If reinforcement of the water network is required to meet potential demand, this could be a significant project and the design and construction period should be accounted for. You will need to ensure that your Environmental Statement fully considers any environmental impact of your water supply requirements.  | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of United Utilities Water Limited in Schedule 10, Part 6 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). Further discussions with United Utilities and landowners will be undertaken at the detailed design stage to confirm the details of water supply requirements.  |
| TA_0008_003_221123          | S42     | Email           | We are content with the applied mitigations listed in Table 1.8 which are reflected in the draft Development Consent Order, subject to some amendments (see below). We are content that the Hazard Log in  | The Applicants note your response.   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | Appendix A provides a reasonable assessment of the hazards and we note there are no unacceptable risks identified.   |   |
| TA_0008_004_221123          | S42     | Email           | <p>We are content with regards to the process undertaken for complying with the guidance in MGN 654 and its annexes, and we welcome the work to be undertaken for addressing the guidance and recommendations in the future.</p> <p>Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) The draft DCO has been reviewed and I have provided comments on some necessary amendments in the draft DCO</p> <p>Conclusion<br/>The comments detailed above are considered appropriate and necessary for the safety of navigation and Search and Rescue purposes. We hope you find them useful at this stage and MCA is happy to discuss further as the project progresses.</p>   | The Applicants note your response.  |
| TA_0008_005_221123          | S42     | Email           | Comment left on DCO - Notifications and inspections 13.8.b - "within 24 hours - also applies to Schedule 15 Part 2"  | This is now condition 14(7)(b) of Schedules 14 and 15.and refers to 'within 24 hours'   |
| TA_0008_006_221123          | S42     | Email           | Comment left on DCO - Notifications and inspections 13.10 - "weekly- also applies to Schedule 15 Part 2"   | This is now condition 14(12) of Schedules 14 and 15 and includes the amendment.   |
| TA_0008_007_221123          | S42     | Email           | Comment left on DCO - Notifications and inspections 13.13- "Amend to: In case of buried cables becoming exposed on or above the seabed - also applies to Schedule 15 Part 2"   | This is now condition 14(12) of Schedules 14 and 15.and includes the amendment.   |
| TA_0008_008_221123          | S42     | Email           | Comment left on DCO - Pre-construction monitoring and surveys 21.4.b -"The full density data and reports must be delivered to MCA and UKHO for the update of nautical charts and publications. This must be submitted as soon as possible and no later than three months prior to construction. The Order Limit shapefiles must be submitted to MCA and the Report of Survey sent to the MMO. - also applies to Schedule 15 Part 22"   | Appropriate wording is included at condition 24(3) of Schedules 14 and 15.  |
| TA_0008_009_221123          | S42     | Email           | Comment left on DCO - Post-construction monitoring 23.3.b - "The full density data and report must be delivered to MCA and UKHO for update of nautical charts and publications- also applies to Schedule 15 Part 2"  | Appropriate wording is included at condition 26(3) of Schedules 14 and 15.  |
| 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_0010_003_221123          | S42     | Email           | Marine Licensing Works activities taking place below the mean high water mark may require a marine licence in accordance with the Marine and Coastal Access Act (MCAA) 2009. Such activities include the construction, alteration or improvement of any works, dredging, or a deposit or removal of a substance or object below the mean high water springs mark or in any tidal river to the extent of the tidal influence.Applicants should be directed to the MMO's online portal to register for an application for marine licence <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/make-a-marine-licence-application">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/make-a-marine-licence-application</a> You can also apply to the MMO for consent under the Electricity Act 1989 (as amended) for offshore generating stations between 1 and 100 megawatts in English waters.The MMO is also the authority responsible for processing and determining Harbour Orders in England, together with granting consent under various local Acts and orders regarding harbours.A wildlife licence is also required for activities that that would affect a UK or European protected marine species. | The Applicant notes your response. Deemed marine licences have been included in Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
| 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_025_231123          | S42     | Email           | 6.14 Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures and MonitoringMonitoringNoting 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_0016_002_211123          | S42     | Email           | Previous comments made by the Lead Local Flood Authority The Lead Local Flood Authority has been engaged with this project at various stage of development. Through our LLFA Planning Advice Service we have liaised with the project team in relation to onshore matters to provide advice aimed at managing and mitigating the impact on surface water flood risk and ordinary watercourses in Lancashire.  | The Applicants note your response. Lancashire County Council has been included in Expert Working Groups throughout the project. Standard protective provisions for the benefit of the Lead Local Flood Authority have been included in Schedule 10, Part 11 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1).   |
| TA_0016_003_211123          | S42     | Email           | Proposed works to ordinary watercoursesAny impact on ordinary watercourses should be identified, assessed, minimised and mitigated appropriately irrespective of whether the works impacting an ordinary watercourse are temporary or permanent and according to site-specific circumstances.Existing watercourses should be protected and, where appropriate, enhanced through the site layout, for example, naturalization, de-culverting, and the creation of riparian habitats. The culverting of any ordinary watercourses should be avoided. When designing a site layout, it is critical to consider the future ownership of and access to any on-site watercourses. The site layout must provide safe access to all on-site watercourses for maintenance purposes. No development should occur within 8 metres from the bank top of any ordinary watercourse to achieve this. This includes the construction of structures such as walls and fences and any activity during the construction phases of development. Failure to provide appropriate access and maintenance arrangements for ordinary watercourses can increase flood risk over the lifetime of the development, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework | Assessment of the impacts 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 presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are presented within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Volume 1, Annex 3.2: Onshore crossing schedule of the ES (document reference F1.3.2) presents crossing techniques of Ordinary Watercourses. An Outline CoCP (document reference J1) is submitted as part of the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP (document reference J1) includes measures to maintain and address:• 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.In addition, the Applicants are in discussion with the LLFA regarding protective provisions. |
| TA_0020_001_161123          | S42/S44 | Email           | NGT has feeder mains located within or in proximity to the Order limits. Details of this infrastructure is as follows:§Feeder 15 LUPTON TO BRETHERTON X:345989 Y:429428 X:346309 Y:426989§Associated cathodic protection apparatus§Ancillary apparatusPlease note that NGT has existing easements for these pipelines which provides rights for ongoing access and prevents the erection of permanent / temporary buildings/structures, change to existing ground levels or storage of materials etc within the easement strip.   | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of National Gas Transmission PLC in Schedule 10, Part 1 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1).  |
| TA_0020_002_161123          | S42/S44 | Email           | CATHODIC PROTECTION SYSTEMTo ensure a high level of safety and reliability in operation, National Gas Transmission's assets are protected by a cathodic protection system. It is essential that buried steel pipework associated with the transmission and distribution of natural gas is designed, installed, commissioned and maintained to withstand the potentially harmful effects of corrosion and that the corrosion control systems employed are monitored to ensure continued effectiveness. Installations in the vicinity of National Gas Transmission's assets which may potentially interfere with the cathodic protection  | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of National Gas Transmission PLC in Schedule 10, Part 1 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1).  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | system must be assessed and approved by National Gas Transmission, and appropriate control measures must be put in place where required.   |  |
| TA_0020_003_161123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Installations which have the potential to interfere with National Gas Transmission's Cathodic protection system include (but are not limited to):<br>1.High voltage cable crossings and parallelism<br>2.High voltage ac pylon parallelism<br>3.Battery Energy Storage Systems<br>4.Third party pipelines with cathodic protection systems<br>5.PV Solar arrays<br>Further information on A.C. interference can be found in UKOPA/GPG/027 UKOPA Good Practice Guide.<br>You should also be aware of NGT's guidance for working in proximity to its assets, further guidance and links are available as follows.                                    | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of National Gas Transmission PLC in Schedule 10, Part 1 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). |
| TA_0020_004_161123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Key considerations: NGT has a Deed of Grant of Easement for each pipeline, which prevents the erection of permanent / temporary buildings, or structures, change to existing ground levels, storage of materials etc.  | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of National Gas Transmission PLC in Schedule 10, Part 1 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). |
| TA_0020_005_161123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Please be aware that written permission is required before any works commence within the NGT easement strip. Furthermore a Deed of Consent will be required prior to commencement of works within NGT's easement strip subject to approval by NGT's plant protection team.   | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of National Gas Transmission PLC in Schedule 10, Part 1 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). |
| TA_0020_006_161123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Any large installations which may result in a large population increase in the vicinity of a high pressure gas pipeline must comply with the HSE's Land Use Planning methodology, and the HSE response should be submitted to National Gas Transmission for review   | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of National Gas Transmission PLC in Schedule 10, Part 1 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). |
| TA_0020_007_161123          | S42/S44 | Email           | The below guidance is not exhaustive and all works in the vicinity of NGT's asset shall be subject to review and approval from NGT's plant protection team in advance of commencement of works on site.  | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of National Gas Transmission PLC in Schedule 10, Part 1 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). |
| TA_0020_008_161123          | S42/S44 | Email           | You should be aware of the Health and Safety Executives guidance document HS(G) 47 "Avoiding Danger from Underground Services", and NGT's Dial Before You Dig Specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of NGT Assets. There will be additional requirements dictated by NGT's plant protection team.   | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of National Gas Transmission PLC in Schedule 10, Part 1 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). |
| TA_0020_009_161123          | S42/S44 | Email           | NGT will also need to ensure that its pipelines remain accessible during and after completion of the works.  | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of National Gas Transmission PLC in Schedule 10, Part 1 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). |
| TA_0020_010_161123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Our pipelines are normally buried to a depth cover of 1.1 metres, however actual depth and position must be confirmed on site by trial hole investigation under the supervision of a NGT representative. Ground cover above our pipelines should not be reduced or increased.  | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of National Gas Transmission PLC in Schedule 10, Part 1 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). |
| TA_0020_011_161123          | S42/S44 | Email           | If any excavations are planned within 3 metres of NGT High Pressure Pipeline or, within 10 metres of an AGI (Above Ground Installation), or if any embankment or dredging works are proposed then the actual position and depth of the pipeline must be established on site in the presence of a NGT representative. A safe working method agreed prior to any work taking place in order to minimise the risk of damage and ensure the final depth of cover does not affect the integrity of the pipeline.  | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of National Gas Transmission PLC in Schedule 10, Part 1 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). |
| TA_0020_012_161123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Below are some examples of work types that have specific restrictions when being undertaken in the vicinity of gas assets therefore consultation with NGT's Plant Protection team is essential:<br>§Demolition<br>§Blasting<br>§Piling and boring<br>§Deep mining<br>§Surface mineral extraction<br>§Landfilling<br>§Trenchless Techniques (e.g. HDD, pipe splitting, tunnelling etc.)<br>§Wind turbine installation - minimum separation distance of 1.5x the mast/hub height is required, and any auxiliary installations such as cable or track crossings will require a deed of consent.<br>§Solar farm installation<br>§Tree planting schemes | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of National Gas Transmission PLC in Schedule 10, Part 1 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
| TA_0020_013_161123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Traffic Crossings:•Where existing roads cannot be used, construction traffic should ONLY cross the pipeline at agreed locations.•Permanent road crossings will require a surface load calculation, and will require a deed of consent.•The pipeline shall be protected, at the crossing points, by temporary rafts constructed at ground level. The third party shall review ground conditions, vehicle types and crossing frequencies to determine the type and construction of the raft required.•The type of raft shall be agreed with NGT prior to installation.•No protective measures including the installation of concrete slab protection shall be installed over or near to the NGT pipeline without the prior permission of NGT•NGT will need to agree the material, the dimensions and method of installation of the proposed protective measure.•The method of installation shall be confirmed through the submission of a formal written method statement from the contractor to NGT.•An NGT representative shall monitor any works within close proximity to the pipeline to comply with NGT specification T/SP/SSW22   | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of National Gas Transmission PLC in Schedule 10, Part 1 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1).   |
| TA_0020_014_161123          | S42/S44 | Email           | New Asset Crossings: •New assets (cables/pipelines etc) may cross the pipeline at perpendicular angle to the pipeline i.e. 90 degrees.•The separation distance for a cable >33kV is 1000mm and pre and post energisation surveys may be required at National Gas Transmission's discretion. A risk assessment/method statement will need to be provided to, and accepted by National Gas Transmission prior to the deed of consent being agreed. Where a new asset is to cross over the pipeline a clearance distance of 0.6 metres between the crown of the pipeline and underside of the service should be maintained. If this cannot be achieved the service shall cross below the pipeline with a clearance distance of 0.6 metres.•A new service should not be laid parallel within an easement strip•Clearance must be at least 600mm above or below the pipeline•An NGT representative shall approve and supervise any cable crossing of a pipeline.•A Deed of Consent is required for any cable crossing the easement  | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of National Gas Transmission PLC in Schedule 10, Part 1 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1).   |
| TA_0020_015_161123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Where the promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with any of NGT apparatus, protective provisions will be required in a form acceptable to it to be included within the DCO. NGT requests to be consulted at the earliest stages to ensure that the most appropriate protective provisions are included within the DCO application to safeguard the integrity of our apparatus and to remove the requirement for objection.   | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of National Gas Transmission PLC in Schedule 10, Part 1 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1).   |
| TA_0020_016_161123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Adequate access to NGT pipelines must be maintained at all times during construction and post construction to ensure the safe operation of our network.  | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of National Gas Transmission PLC in Schedule 10, Part 1 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1).   |
| TA_0020_017_161123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Further Safety GuidanceTo download a copy of the HSE Guidance HS(G)47, please use the following link:<br><a href="https://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/books/hsg47.htm">https://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/books/hsg47.htm</a> Working Near National Gas Assets<br><a href="https://www.nationalgas.com/land-and-assets/working-near-our-assets">https://www.nationalgas.com/land-and-assets/working-near-our-assets</a> Specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of National Gas High Pressure Pipelines and Associated Installations<br><a href="https://www.nationalgas.com/document/82951/download">https://www.nationalgas.com/document/82951/download</a> Tree Planting Guidance<br><a href="https://www.nationalgas.com/document/82976/download">https://www.nationalgas.com/document/82976/download</a> Excavating Safely<br><a href="https://www.nationalgas.com/document/82971/download">https://www.nationalgas.com/document/82971/download</a> Dial Before You Dig Guidance<br><a href="https://www.nationalgas.com/document/128751/download">https://www.nationalgas.com/document/128751/download</a> Essential Guidance:<br><a href="https://www.nationalgas.com/gas-transmission/document/82931/download">https://www.nationalgas.com/gas-transmission/document/82931/download</a> Solar Farm Guidance<br><a href="https://www.nationalgas.com/document/82936/download">https://www.nationalgas.com/document/82936/download</a> | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of National Gas Transmission PLC in Schedule 10, Part 1 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1).   |
| 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 |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |  | 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_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_0028_001_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | PLANNING ACT 2008 STATUTORY CONSULTATION – SECTION 42 (1)(D) AND 44I refer to your letter dated 9th October 2023 regarding the above proposed DCO. Cadent has reviewed the project plans provided and wishes to make the following comments:In respect of existing Cadent infrastructure, Cadent will require appropriate protection for retained apparatus including compliance with relevant standards for works proposed within close proximity of its apparatus,Cadent Infrastructure within or in close proximity to the developmentCadent has identified the following apparatus within the vicinity of the proposed works:• High and Intermediate pressure (above 2 bar) Gas Pipelines and associated equipment• Low and Medium pressure (below 2 bar) gas pipes and associated equipment. (As a result it is highly likely that there are also gas services and associated apparatus in the vicinity, these are not shown on plans but their presence should be anticipated)Note: No liability of any kind whatsoever is accepted by Cadent Gas Limited or their agents, servants or contractors for any error or omission.PDFs of the Cadent gas assets works and locations within the area are available in the email titled CadentGas.msg   | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of Cadent Gas Limited, in Schedule 10, Part 4 of the draft Development Consent Order.             |
| TA_0028_002_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Diversion:Where diversions of apparatus are required to facilitate the scheme, Cadent will require adequate notice and discussions should be started at the earliest opportunity. Please be aware that diversions for high pressure apparatus can take in excess of two years to plan and procure materials.Cadent will require the party requesting the diversion works to obtain any necessary land rights, planning permissions and other consents to enable the diversion works to be carried out. Details of these consents should be agreed in writing with Cadent before any application is made. Cadent requires a minimum of C4/ Design study to have been carried out to establish an appropriate diversion route, temporary and permanent land take ahead of any application being made.Where diversions sit outside the highway boundary the party requesting the diversion will be responsible for obtaining at their cost and granting to Cadent the necessary land rights, on Cadent's standard terms, to allow the construction, maintenance and access of the diverted apparatus. As such adequate land rights must be granted to Cadent (e.g. following the exercise of compulsory powers to acquire such rights included within the DCO) to enable works to proceed, to Cadent's satisfaction. Cadent's approval to the land rights powers included in the DCO prior to submission is strongly recommended to avoid later substantive objection to the DCO. Land rights will be required to be obtained prior to construction and commissioning of any diverted apparatus, in order to avoid any delays to the project's timescales. A diversion agreement may be required addressing responsibility for works, timescales, expenses and indemnity. | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of Cadent Gas Limited, in Schedule 10, Part 4 of the draft Development Consent Order.             |
| TA_0028_003_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Protection/Protective Provisions:Where the Promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with any of Cadent's apparatus, Cadent will require appropriate protection for retained apparatus and further discussion on the impact to its apparatus and rights including adequate Protective Provisions. Operations within Cadent's existing easement strips are not permitted without approval and will necessitate a Deed of Consent or Crossing Agreement being put in place. Any proposals for work in the vicinity for Cadent's existing apparatus will require approval by Plant Protection under the Protective Provisions/Asset Protection Agreement and early discussions are advised.   | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of Cadent Gas Limited, in Schedule 10, Part 4 of the draft Development Consent Order.             |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
| TA_0028_004_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Cadent has a Deed of Grant of Easement for each pipeline, which prevents the erection of permanent / temporary buildings/structures, change to existing ground levels or storage of materials etc within the easement strip.   | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of Cadent Gas Limited, in Schedule 10, Part 4 of the draft Development Consent Order. |
| TA_0028_005_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Please be aware that written permission is required before any works commence within the Cadent easementstrip and a Crossing Agreement may be required if any apparatus needs to cross the Cadent easement strip   | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of Cadent Gas Limited, in Schedule 10, Part 4 of the draft Development Consent Order. |
| TA_0028_006_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | The below guidance is not exhaustive and all works in the vicinity of Cadent's asset shall be subject to review and approval from Cadent's plant protection team in advance of commencement of works on site.  | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of Cadent Gas Limited, in Schedule 10, Part 4 of the draft Development Consent Order. |
| TA_0028_007_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | You should be aware of the Health and Safety Executives guidance document HS(G) 47 "Avoiding Dangerfrom Underground Services", and Cadent's specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of Cadent HighPressure gas pipelines and associated installations - requirements for third parties GD/SP/SSW22. Digsafeleaflet Excavating Safely - Avoiding injury when working near gas pipes. There will be additional requirementsdictated by Cadent's plant protection team.  | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of Cadent Gas Limited, in Schedule 10, Part 4 of the draft Development Consent Order. |
| TA_0028_008_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Cadent will also need to ensure that our pipelines remain accessible throughout and after completion of the works .  | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of Cadent Gas Limited, in Schedule 10, Part 4 of the draft Development Consent Order. |
| TA_0028_009_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | The actual depth and position must be confirmed on site by trial hole investigation under the supervision of a Cadent representative. Ground cover above our pipelines should not be reduced or increased.   | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of Cadent Gas Limited, in Schedule 10, Part 4 of the draft Development Consent Order. |
| TA_0028_010_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | If any excavations are planned within 3 metres of Cadent High Pressure Pipeline or, within 10 metres of anAGI (Above Ground Installation), or if any embankment or dredging works are proposed then the actualposition and depth of the pipeline must be established on site in the presence of a Cadent representative. A safe working method agreed prior to any work taking place in order to minimise the risk of damage and ensurethe final depth of cover does not affect the integrity of the pipeline.   | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of Cadent Gas Limited, in Schedule 10, Part 4 of the draft Development Consent Order. |
| TA_0028_011_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Below are some examples of work types that have specific restrictions when being undertaken in the vicinityof gas assets therefore consultation with Cadent's Plant Protection team is essential:• Demolition• Blasting• Piling and boring• Deep mining• Surface mineral extraction• Landfilling• Trenchless Techniques (e.g. HDD, pipe splitting, tunnelling etc.)• Wind turbine installation• Solar farm installation• Tree planting schemes   | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of Cadent Gas Limited, in Schedule 10, Part 4 of the draft Development Consent Order. |
| TA_0028_012_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Pipeline Crossings:• Where existing roads cannot be used, construction traffic should ONLY cross the pipeline at agreed locations.• The pipeline shall be protected, at the crossing points, by temporary rafts constructed at ground level. Thethird party shall review ground conditions, vehicle types and crossing frequencies to determine the type andconstruction of the raft required.• The type of raft shall be agreed with Cadent prior to installation.• No protective measures including the installation of concrete slab protection shall be installed over or near tothe Cadent pipeline without the prior permission of Cadent.• Cadent will need to agree the material, the dimensions and method of installation of the proposed protectivemeasure.• The method of installation shall be confirmed through the submission of a formal written method statementfrom the contractor to Cadent.• A Cadent representative shall monitor any works within close proximity to the pipeline.New Service Crossing:• New services may cross the pipeline at perpendicular angle to the pipeline i.e. 90 degrees.• Where a new service is to cross over the pipeline a clearance distance of 0.6 metres between the crown ofthe pipeline and underside of the service should be maintained. If this cannot be achieved the service shallcross below the pipeline with a clearance distance of 0.6 metres.• A new service should not be laid parallel within an easement strip• A Cadent representative shall approve and supervise any new service crossing of a pipeline.• An exposed pipeline should be | The Applicants note this response, and has provided standard Protective Provisions for the benefit of Cadent Gas Limited, in Schedule 10, Part 4 of the draft Development Consent Order. |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | suitable supported and removed prior to backfilling• An exposed pipeline should be protected by matting and suitable timber cladding• For pipe construction involving deep excavation (<1.5m) in the vicinity of grey iron mains, the modelconsultative procedure will apply therefore an integrity assessment must be conducted to confirm if diversionis required  |   |
| 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 <a href="https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/business-and-trade/undertaking-works-on-our-property-and-our-code-ofpractice">https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/business-and-trade/undertaking-works-on-our-property-and-our-code-ofpractice</a> 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 generally 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_017_231123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Construction Traffic<br>At this stage no details of haul roads or construction routes have yet been provided. These may have implications for our bridge assets. Regardless of whether such bridges are owned by the Trust, many are heritage assets and may not be suitable for construction traffic. We would wish to comment further on this matter.  | Construction traffic effects are set out in Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and transport of the ES (document reference F3.7). 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 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 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.  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
| 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_016_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Protective Provisions: Any requests to disapply any permits or consents should be sent to us in writing as soon as possible to allow us sufficient time to consider them (minimum 6 months). Depending on the outcome this will have implications on the content of the DCO.   | The Applicants are continuing to engage with the Environment Agency in relation to their requirements and protective provisions for the benefit of the Environment Agency are included in Schedule 10, Part 9 of the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1).   |
| TA_0035_017_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Timescales – Sufficient time is required to ensure we can appropriately respond to discharge of requirements and protective provision consultations. Please ensure in your DCO a minimum of 21 days is stipulated as a response time for the discharge of requirements and a minimum of 61 days for protective provisions.   | The Applicants note your response and notes that the Applicant and the Environment Agency are continuing to engage on the EA's requested form of protective provisions.   |
| TA_0035_034_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 7.3.4.3 and 7.3.4.4 P.115 Issue Flood alerts cover large areas and the described approach to responding to flood alerts/ warnings does not allow for site specific considerations.<br><br>Impact<br>The site may be evacuated when flood risk is not going to impact the site itself. This could result in unnecessary and frequent disruption to site operations.<br><br>Solution<br>Flood Warning and Evacuation Plans (FWEP) and relevant actions need a considered approach on a site-by-site basis, commensurate with the likelihood and consequences of any flooding.  | As per CoT95 (refer to Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2.3)), the Applicants are committed to preparing flood warning and evacuation procedures as set out within the Outline CoCP (document reference J1).  |
| TA_0035_035_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | 7.3.4.5 P.115 Issue Information regarding fluvial and tidal watercourse standoff distances is incorrect.<br><br>Impact<br>Potential for works to be carried out without the necessary permissions.<br><br>Solution<br>Refer to and demonstrate an understanding of Schedule 25 of: -<br>The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 (legislation.gov.uk)   | Trenchless technique entry and exit points will be located at least 8 m from the banks of Ordinary Watercourses, Main Rivers and associated flood defences and 16 m from tidal Main Rivers and associated flood defences (CoT10 as set out in Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2)). |
| TA_0035_039_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Watercourse crossings CoT10 P.58 Issue Incorrect use of terminology regarding classification of watercourses. The wording in this commitment incorrectly refers to 'Environment Agency ordinary watercourses'. Watercourses are either designated statutory 'main rivers' under the regulatory control of the Environment Agency or 'ordinary watercourses' under the control and regulatory powers for the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA). Incorrect designation of a watercourse may affect the required stand-off distance, and it is unclear where the current stated stand-off distance of 10m is derived from. Impact<br>Confusion regarding watercourse classification may result in delays in securing relevant permissions for works from the correct authority<br><br>Solution<br>Reword the commitment to correct reflect to legal definitions and requirements. Ensure that stand-off distances and clearance depths are correctly justified. | This has been checked and updated accordingly.  |
| TA_0035_040_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | Watercourse crossings CoT10 P.58 Issue It is unclear how the choice of a minimum vertical clearance of 2m between the hard bed of watercourses and any flood defences has been derived and this may not be sufficient in some instances.<br><br>Impact   | It is noted within the Defra document Exempt flood risk activities: environmental permits (Section 3) (Defra, 2020) that service crossings are to be at least 1.5 m below the riverbed along its whole length. We have used the guidance to inform the trenchless technique depth below the hard bed of watercourses and any flood defences.    |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>Geomorphologically active rivers, together with the impact of increased peak river flows can result in erosion and bed incision and subsequent exposure of infrastructure</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Demonstrate an understanding of channel morphology &amp; bed material to inform HDD strategies.</p>  |  |
| TA_0035_042_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Table 2.7: Issues scoped out of the assessment. P.2 4Issue Flood risk arising from damage to existing flood defences and because of additional surface water runoff during operation and maintenance have been scoped out of the assessment. This is subject to the Environmental Statement (ES) detailing any operational controls in a management plan. We are satisfied with this approach. However details of such controls have not been considered in the Table of Commitments, CoT35 only considers the Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) Impact. There remains the potential for increased flood risk arising from damage to existing flood defences and because of additional surface water runoff during the operation and maintenance of this development.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Ensure measures are included in the ES.</p>                 | Operational controls are set out within the Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan (document reference J10).   |
| TA_0035_045_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Table 2.19: Measures</p> <p>CoT 10 P.49 See previous comments regarding the wording of CoT10</p>  | It is noted within the Defra document Exempt flood risk activities: environmental permits (Section 3) (Defra, 2020) that service crossings are to be at least 1.5 m below the riverbed along its whole length. We have used the guidance to inform the trenchless technique depth below the hard bed of watercourses and any flood defences.   |
| 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</p> <p>Ensure the use of trenchless techniques at vulnerable locations.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Open trench cable laying methods would cause increased environmental risk at these locations</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>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_066_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT04 An Outline Onshore Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) will form part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice, which will be prepared and submitted with the application for development consent. Onshore PPP(s) will be developed in accordance with the Outline Onshore PPP and will include details of emergency spill procedures. Good practice guidance detailed in the Environment Agency's Pollution Prevention Guidance notes (including Pollution Prevention Guidance notes 01, 05, 08 and 21) will be followed where appropriate, or the latest relevant available guidance. Issue Pollution prevention risks have yet to be fully addressed</p> <p>Impact.</p> <p>There remains a risk of detrimental impact on the aquatic environment</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Outline onshore pollution prevention plan to be secured in the DCO submission.</p> | An Outline Pollution Prevention Plan has been prepared and submitted as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1.4).   |
| TA_0035_067_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT05 During construction of piled foundations the following guidance will be used: Land Contamination Risk Management (LCRM) (July 2023) and Managing and reducing land contamination: guiding principles (GPLC), or latest relevant available guidance, where appropriate.</p> <p>Issue</p>   | Existing ground conditions are set out in section 1.6 of Volume 3, Chapter 1: Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions of the ES (document reference F3.1). The potential for mobilisation of any existing contamination is set out in section 1.11 of that chapter. Where suspected contamination is present and piling is proposed, a detailed piling risk assessment will be developed prior to the commencement of construction. Consultation |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>Risks associated with piled foundations have yet to be fully addressed</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Potential for contamination of ground or surface waters through the opening up of new contaminant pathways</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Piling methodology to be secured through DCO requirement. See also CoT103</p>  | with the Environment Agency will be sought. An Outline Code of Construction Practice is provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1).   |
| TA_0035_068_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT09 The Outline Code of Construction Practice will be submitted as part of the application for the development consent. CoCP(s) will be developed in accordance with the outline CoCP. The Outline CoCP will include information about drainage during construction.</p> <p>Issue</p> <p>Risks associated with drainage (water quality and flood risk) have yet to be fully addressed</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>There remains a risk of detrimental impact on the aquatic environment</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Outline Drainage Management Plan to be appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission.</p>   | Further information regarding construction drainage has been prepared as part of the Outline CoCP (document reference J1), which has been submitted as part of the application for development consent   |
| TA_0035_069_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT10 HDD (or other trenchless methodologies) entry and exit points will be located at least 10 m away from Environment Agency ordinary watercourses and 10 m from Environment Agency surface watercourses or the landward toe of the surface watercourse flood defences. Where a surface watercourse is to be crossed by HDD (or other trenchless methodologies), the onshore export cables and 400 kV grid connection cables will be installed at least 2 m beneath the hard bed of any watercourses and the optimal clearance depth beneath watercourses will be agreed with the relevant authorities prior to construction. Where Environment Agency flood defences are present, a minimum 2 m vertical clearance will be maintained between the hard bed of the watercourse and the landward toe of those flood defences.</p> <p>Issue</p> <p>Incorrect use of terminology regarding classification of watercourses. Watercourses are either designated statutory 'main rivers' under the regulatory control of the Environment Agency or 'ordinary watercourses' under the control and regulatory powers for the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA). Incorrect designation of a watercourse may affect the required stand-off distance, and it is unclear where the current stated stand-off distance of 10m is derived from.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Confusion regarding watercourse classification may result in delays in securing relevant permissions for works from the correct authority</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Reword the commitment to correct reflect the legal definitions and requirements. Ensure that stand-off distances and clearance depths are adequately justified.</p> | The Applicant notes your response. Wording and terminology has been updated for CoT10.   |
| TA_0035_081_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT44 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</p> <p>Ensure the use of trenchless techniques at vulnerable locations.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Open trench cable laying methods would cause significant long-term damage at these locations</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>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. |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| TA_0035_082_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>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</p> <p>Issue</p> <p>Measures to limit the impact of proposed works within the Fylde MCZ have yet to be fully developed.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Risk to the marine environment.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Outline Cable Specification and Installation Plan to be to be secured in the DCO submission.</p>  | 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           | <p>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.</p> <p>Issue</p> <p>Measures to manage environmental risk below MHWS have yet to be fully developed.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Risk to the marine environment</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Outline Offshore Construction Environmental Management Plan to be to be secured in the DCO submission which is enforceable with the Marine Management Organisation.</p>   | An Offshore Environmental Management Plan will be provided post-consent and will be secured through CoT65.   |
| TA_0035_084_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT73 &amp; CoT78A Biosecurity Protocol will be prepared as part of the Outline CoCP and submitted as part of the application for the development consent. CoCP(s) will be developed in accordance with the outline CoCP.</p> <p>Issue</p> <p>Measures to manage biosecurity have yet to be fully developed.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Risk to the environment</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Outline Biosecurity Protocol to be to be secured in the DCO submission.</p>   | An Outline Biosecurity Protocol has been provided as part of the application for development consent (document reference J1.12).                                   |
| TA_0035_085_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT76 Ecological Management Plan(s) (EMP) will be developed in accordance with the Outline Ecological Management Plan (OEMP). The Outline Ecological Management Plan will be submitted as part of the application for the development consent and will include but not be limited to pre-construction, construction and post-mitigation measures relating to habitats and protected or notable species, where relevant. The Outline Ecological Management Plan will also include a Breeding Bird Protection Plan which will set out mitigation measures such as vegetation clearance in winter (e.g., hedgerows), pre-construction breeding bird survey, appropriate protection zones upon confirmation of nest building/breeding taking place of key protected or sensitive species. The Ecological Management Plan will also include details of any long term mitigation and management measures relevant to onshore ecology and nature conservation and in relation to onshore and intertidal ornithology. This will include the management of ecological mitigation areas. The Ecological Management Plan will be developed in consultation with the relevant responsible authorities.</p> | This commitment remains in place and an Outline Ecological Management Plan (document reference J6) is provided as part of the application for development consent. |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>Issue</p> <p>Measures to manage ecological risk have yet to be fully developed</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Risk to habitats and species</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Outline Ecological Management Plan to be included in DCO submission</p>  |  |
| TA_0035_086_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT83 An Onshore and Intertidal Net Gain Enhancement Plan will be developed and submitted as part of the application to identify areas where biodiversity net gain and/or opportunities for any enhancement are proposed. This will include details of the measures proposed.</p> <p>Issue</p> <p>The identification of areas for mitigation, BNG or enhancement have yet to be fully developed. and may alter the red line boundary on the DCO submission.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>The clarification of BNG intentions may alter the red line boundary on the DCO submission.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>An Outline Net Gain Enhancement Plan to be included in DCO submission</p>   | CoT83 has been removed, as the Applicants' approach to undertaking enhancement opportunities is set out the Outline Ecological Management Plan (document reference J6), and the approach to biodiversity benefit is set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11).  |
| TA_0035_087_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT85 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. The outline CoCP will include that temporary haul road(s) will be installed using permeable gravel aggregate with a geotextile or othertype of protective matting, or plastic or metal plates or grating, where possible.</p> <p>Issue</p> <p>Measures to reduce surface water runoff have yet to be fully developed.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Risk of increased surface water runoff contributing to localised flood risk and risk to water quality.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Measures to be included in Outline Drainage Management Plan appended to Outline CoCP and secured in the DCO submission.</p> | An Outline CoCP (document reference J1) has been provided 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</p> <p>Measures to protect water quality and flow during trenched crossing of minor watercourses have yet to be fully developed.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Risk to the environment</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>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_089_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT90 HDD (or other trenchless methodologies) will be used to cross the River Ribble where the 400 kV grid connection cable is proposed.</p>   | CoT90 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   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | <p>Issue</p> <p>Project route requires crossing the River Ribble</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Crossing could have a detrimental environmental impact at this vulnerable location.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Intention to use HDD or other trenchless methodology to cross the Ribble should be included in DCO submission and their impacts assessed.</p>  | <p>including micro tunnelling and direct pipe 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.</p>  |
| TA_0035_090_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT94 The Outline Code of Construction practice (CoCP) will be submitted as part of the application for the development consent. CoCP(s) will be developed in accordance with the outline CoCP. The outline CoCP will include details of appropriate studies (e.g. Site Investigations) proposed to be undertaken where major HDDs (or other trenchless methodologies) are proposed, during the detailed design stage to confirm ground conditions.</p> <p>Issue</p> <p>Detailed understanding of localised ground conditions has yet to be completed.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Unknown ground conditions may impact on HDD activity resulting in detrimental impacts on the environment.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Secure through DCO requirement</p>  | <p>This is a standard approach to project development and for detailed site investigation work to be undertaken post-consent to inform the specific construction approach in any location.</p>   |
| TA_0035_091_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT95, CoT97 The Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) will be submitted as part of the application for the development consent. CoCP(s) will be developed in accordance with the outline CoCP. The Outline CoCP will include that during the construction phase the Principal Contractor(s) will sign up to the Flood Warning Service and will be alerted by a phone call or text when a Flood Warning becomes active. The flood warning will be applied to the entire Onshore Infrastructure Area located within Flood Zones 2 and 3 to enable site personnel to be evacuated from the site in a timely manner prior to a flood event occurring, if appropriate.</p> <p>Issue</p> <p>Flood Risk Management Plans have yet to be developed.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Increased risk to site and personnel from flooding.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Secure site-specific Flood Warning and Evacuation Plans (FWEP) through DCO requirement</p> | <p>As per CoT95, the Applicants are committed to preparing flood warning and evacuation procedures as set out within the Outline CoCP (document reference J1).</p>   |
| TA_0035_092_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT98 The Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) will be submitted as part of the application for the development consent. CoCP(s) will be developed in accordance with the outline CoCP. The Outline CoCP will include measures to minimise potential impacts to recreational users on the beach, where reasonably practicable</p> <p>Issue</p> <p>Impacts on amenity of the beach in the Landfall Area.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Potential restricted access or disruption to beach users.</p> <p>Solution</p>   | <p>CoT98 remains in place. The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to recreational resources, including the coastal area 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). This includes the commitment to retain access to coastal area during construction of the Transmission Assets.</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 | Secure as DCO requirement. There are a number of stakeholders who can support messaging around access etc. and advise on appropriate timings of work. Engage with beach managers and the Turning Tides Partnership to help anticipate the most pertinent issues and communicate with the public.   |   |
| TA_0035_093_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT103 Where suspected contamination is present and piling is proposed, where required a detailed piling risk assessment will be developed prior to the commencement of construction. Consultation with the Environment Agency will be sought.</p> <p>Issue</p> <p>Relevant locations, and measures required to prevent pollution of controlled waters have yet to be fully developed</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Potential for groundwaters pollution pathways to be created.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Secure through DCO requirement</p>   | This is a standard approach to project development and for detailed site investigation work to be undertaken post-consent to inform the specific construction approach in any location.   |
| TA_0035_094_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT104 Where the onshore export cable corridor and/or 400 kV grid connection corridor crosses sites of particular sensitivity, which cannot be avoided and has the potential to impact protected species populations, a mitigation strategy will be devised and agreed with relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>Issue</p> <p>Measures to protect water quality and flow during trenched crossing of minor watercourses have yet to be fully developed.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Risk of impact on sensitive species or habitats</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>An Outline Mitigation Strategy to be included in DCO submission.</p>   | Measures to protect water quality are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1). The potential impacts on habitats and species are set out in section 3.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 3: Onshore ecology and nature conservation of the ES (document reference F3.3).  |
| TA_0035_095_221123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>CoT103 Where suspected contamination is present and piling is proposed, where required a detailed piling risk assessment will be developed prior to the commencement of construction. Consultation with the Environment Agency will be sought.</p> <p>Issue</p> <p>Relevant locations, and measures required to prevent pollution of controlled waters have yet to be fully developed</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Potential for groundwaters pollution pathways to be created.</p> <p>Solution</p> <p>Secure through DCO requirement</p>   | CoT103 of the Commitments register states "Where suspected contamination is present and piling is proposed, where required detailed piling risk assessment(s) will be developed prior to the commencement of the relevant stage of works. Consultation with the Environment Agency will be sought."   |
| TA_0016_003_211123          | S42/S44 | Email           | <p>Ordinary Watercourse Crossings Open trench watercourse crossings should be avoided wherever possible, with trenchless construction methods such as horizontal directional drilling prioritised to minimise any unwanted effects on the bed and banks of the watercourse, and any disruption to existing flora, fauna and/or habitats. Where open trench watercourse crossings cannot be avoided, then effective construction method statements should be produced to detail, in chronological order, how the works will be undertaken from start to finish. Typically the Lead Local Flood Authority would expect this to consider, as a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How the works will be arranged to ensure there is no increase in flood risk to third parties. All reasonable precautions should be taken during the undertaking of the works so as not to obstruct or impede the flow of the watercourse. If over pumping is used, then this should only be undertaken in a manner that minimises bed disturbance, avoids movement of silt and minimises scour. A suitable screen/strainer should also be provided to prevent fish and other material being drawn in.</li> <li>• How any pollution risks will be managed and dealt with should they occur, i.e. the release of fine sediments and other pollutants into the watercourse</li> </ul> | Assessment of the impacts 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 presented within section 2.11.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are presented within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2). Volume 1, Annex 3.2: Onshore crossing schedule of the ES (document reference F1.3.2) presents crossing techniques of Ordinary Watercourses. An Outline CoCP (document reference J1) is submitted as part of the application for development consent. The Outline CoCP (document reference J1) includes measures to maintain and address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• flood protection and control measures;</li> <li>• drainage;</li> <li>• pollution prevention;</li> <li>• geology and ground conditions;</li> </ul> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | during the construction works. • How the bed and banks of the watercourse will be restored once the works are complete. Material used for backfilling must be inert and not contain any material that could potentially leach out into the watercourse. Any landscaping of banks must be restricted to native species only, and invasive species such as Japanese Knotweed, if encountered, must be managed and controlled on site.   | 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. In addition, the Applicants are in discussion with the LLFA regarding protective provisions.   |
| 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_002_251023          | S42     | Email           | The onshore project components of the proposed development also falls within the Consultation Zones of a number of major accident hazard pipelines This includes • HSE ref 6815 Cadent Gas Ltd, Lostock Hall Kirkham, which falls on the land associated with the proposed development near to Kirkham • HSE ref 6819 National Grid Gas PLC, 15 Feeder Carnforth Bretherton, which falls on the land associated with the proposed development near to Newton with Scales • HSE ref 7129 Essar Oil ( Ltd, NWEF Grangemouth Stanlow which falls on the land associated with the proposed development near to Newton with Scales • HSE ref 6710 Sabic UK Petrochemicals Ltd, Trans Pennine Ethylene Pipeline Wilton Runcorn, which falls on the land associated with the proposed development near to Newton with Scales • HSE ref 8345 National Grid Gas PLC, 21 Feeder Treales Mawdesley which falls on the land associated with the proposed development near to Ashton Bank The Applicant should make the necessary approaches to the relevant pipeline operators. There are three particular reasons for this i) the pipeline operator may have a legal interest in developments in the vicinity of the pipeline This may restrict developments within a certain proximity of the pipeline ii) the standards to which the pipeline is designed and operated may restrict major traffic routes within a certain proximity of the pipeline Consequently, there may be a need for the operator to modify the pipeline or its operation, if the development proceeds iii) to establish the necessary measures required to alter/upgrade the pipeline to appropriate standards | 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_0010_127_221123          | S42     | Email           | Draft Development Consent Order 22.1. MMO has reviewed the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) high-level initial observations in Table 1 below. The MMO considers that both DMLs (Schedule 14 and 15) are very similar in structure and therefore we have based our comments on Schedule 14, but at this stage these are equally applicable to Schedule 15. Schedule 14 should be called Deemed Marine Licence.  | The Applicants have taken into account the MMO's comments in the deemed marine licences included at Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft Development Consent Order (document C1).   |
| TA_0010_128_221123          | S42     | Email           | 22.2. In Table 3.14 (Vol.2, Chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology), it is indicated that the commitment (CoT48) to not carry out concurrently installation of piled foundations for the Morecambe OSPs, and for the Morgan OSPs and the Morgan offshore booster station, would be secured through a condition in the respective deemed Marine Licences (dMLs). This condition has not been drafted into the dML in its current form. MMO requests that this is included and the wording is shared prior to submission to PINS.  | 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. Piling has been removed from the design for the DCO application and therefore no condition is required or included in Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft Development Consent Order (document C1). |
| TA_0010_129_221123          | S42     | Email           | 22.3. MMO notes from Table 5 under Part 2 of Schedule 14 (Morgan TA), the values of several component parameters have not been stated. These include “Maximum diameter offshore substation platform monopile foundations (m)” and “Maximum diameter offshore substation platform jacket pin-pile foundations (m)”. Based on the information presented in the PEIR, it is the MMO's understanding that these parameters are known as they have been presented under the worst-case scenario to inform the preliminary EIA, and thus should be included within the dML.   | The deemed marine licences at Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft Development Consent Order (document C1) include the relevant offshore parameters.  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
| TA_0010_130_221123          | S42     | Email           | 22.4. MMO welcomes the references to the requirement for a fisheries liaison officer, coexistence plan and pre- and post-construction monitoring surveys to reduce impacts to fisheries and shellfisheries.   | The Applicants note your response.  |
| TA_0010_131_221123          | S42     | Email           | Determination dates 22.5. MMO strongly considers that it is inappropriate to put timeframes on complex technical decisions of this nature. The time it takes the MMO to make such determinations depends on the quality of the application made, and the complexity of the issues and the amount of consultation the MMO is required to undertake with other organisations to seek resolutions. MMO's position remains that it is inappropriate to apply a strict timeframe to the approvals the MMO is required to give under the conditions of the DML given this would create disparity between licences issued under the DCO process and those issued directly by the MMO, as marine licences issued by the MMO are not subject to set determination periods.22.6. Whilst the MMO acknowledges that the Applicant may wish to create some certainty around when it can expect the MMO to determine any applications for an approval required under the conditions of a licence, and whilst the MMO acknowledges that delays can be problematic for developers and that they can have financial implications, the MMO stresses that it does not delay determining whether to grant or refuse such approvals unnecessarily. The MMO makes these determinations in as timely manner as it is able to do so. The MMO's view is that it is for the developer to ensure that it applies for any such approval in sufficient time as to allow the MMO to properly determine whether to grant or refuse the approval application.22.7. MMO believes that if time scales are included within the DML for plans then these should be 6 months not 4 months. However, without prejudice to this position the MMO is open to discussions on which documents should be 6 months and which documents could be 4 months to take into account the concerns that the Applicant may have. | The Applicant will continue discussions with the MMO about timings for submission of documents for approval in terms of conditions in the deemed marine licence. Including timescales within the conditions of the deemed marine licence provide a degree of certainty to the Applicant when it is discharging conditions to allow works to commence. The timeous discharge of conditions is important to ensure that the Applicant can meet its construction programme. The Applicant notes that it is well precedented in offshore wind DCOs for such timescales to be included in conditions of a deemed marine licence.   |
| TA_0010_132_221123          | S42     | Email           | Additional Conditions<br>22.8. MMO has set out comments on the draft DCO/DML in Table 1 in addition to these the MMO requests the following conditions are added to the DML.  | The Applicants note you response and have responded to each accordingly, identifiable by unique reference number TA_0010.   |
| TA_0010_133_221123          | S42     | Email           | 22.9. Reporting of impact pile driving To comply with UK requirements on noise reporting the MMO requests this condition is added to both Schedule 14 and 15. The MMO may require updates prior to Application submission and will provide further comments in due course. "XX.—(1) Only when driven or part-driven pile foundations are proposed to be used as part of the foundation installation the undertaker must provide the following information to the Marine Noise Registry—(a) prior to the commencement of each stage of construction of the licensed activities, information on the expected location, start and end dates of impact pile driving to satisfy the Marine Noise Registry's Forward Look requirements;(b) at six month intervals following the commencement of pile driving, information on the locations and dates of impact pile driving to satisfy the Marine Noise Registry's Close Out requirements; and(c) within 12 weeks of completion of impact pile driving, information on the locations and dates of impact pile driving to satisfy the Marine Noise Registry's Close Out requirements.(2) The undertaker must notify the MMO in writing of the successful submission of Forward Look or Close Out data pursuant to paragraph (1) above within seven days of the submission.(3) For the purpose of this condition, "Forward Look" and "Close Out" mean the requirements as set out in the UK Marine Noise Registry Information Document Version 1 (July 2015) as amended, updated or superseded from time to time."  | 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. Piling has been removed from the design for the DCO application. As this removes for the need to assess the potential for injury and disturbance from underwater sound generated from piling, this has been further simplified within the marine mammals chapter. The relevant condition wording has been included in the deemed marine licences at Schedules 14 and 15 of the draft Development Consent Order (document C1) in relation to UXO clearance only as there will be no underwater sound generated from piling. |
| TA_0010_134_221123          | S42     | Email           | 22.10. Maintenance reporting To ensure the MMO is able to know the maintenance activities throughout the lifetime of the operation including understanding any impacts the MMO requests this condition is added to both Schedule 14 and 15. "XX.—(1) An annual maintenance report must be submitted to the MMO in writing within one month following the first anniversary of the date of commencement of operations, and every year thereafter until the permanent cessation of operation.(2) The report must provide a record of the licensed activities as set out in condition 3 during the preceding year, the timing of activities and methodologies used.(3) Every fifth year, the undertaker must submit to the MMO in writing, within one month of that date, a consolidated maintenance report, which will—(a) include a review of licensed activities undertaken during the preceding five years with reference to the reports submitted in accordance with condition XX(1) of this licence;(b) reconfirm the applicability of the methodologies and frequencies of the licensable activities permitted by this licence for the remaining duration of this licence."   | The deemed marine licences include appropriate drafting at condition 11 (maintenance of the authorised scheme), Part 2 of Schedules 14 and 15.  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| TA_0010_135_221123          | S42     | Email           | 22.11. Stages of construction To ensure the MMO has the full timetable for construction the MMO requests this condition is added to both Schedule 14 and 15. "XX.—(1) The licenced activities must not be commenced until a written scheme setting out the stages of construction of the authorised development seaward of MHWS has been submitted to and approved by the MMO in writing.(2) The stages of construction referred to in sub-paragraph (1) will not permit the authorised development to be constructed in more than one overall phase.(3) The scheme must be implemented as approved.(4) The written scheme referred to in sub-paragraph (1) must be submitted to the MMO in writing six months prior to the planned commencement of the licenced activities." | The deemed marine licences include this condition (see condition 12 , Part 2 of Schedules 14 and 15).  |
| TA_0010_136_221123          | S42     | Email           | 22.12. Schedule 16 – Documents to be Certified To ensure clarity across all areas the MMO recommends this Schedule being split into 3 Parts:Part 1 documents forming the environmental statement to be certifiedPart 2 examination documents forming part of the environmental Statement to be certifiedPart 3 other documents to be certified  | The Applicant notes your response. This is now Schedule 18 and clearly sets out the different document types.  |
| TA_0010_137_221123          | S42     | Email           | 22.13. Further detailed comments on the draft DCO and dML will be issued at a later date prior to submission to PINS.   | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0010_138_221123          | S42     | Email           | Draft DCO - Part 2 - Article (6) Benefit of the order - Schedule 14 and 15 should be disapplied from this Article. Section 72(7)(a) of the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 (MCAA 2009) already permits a licence holder to make an application for a marine licence to be transferred, and where such an application is approved for the MMO to then vary the licence accordingly (s. 72(7)(b)). This power should be retained and used in relation to the dML granted under the DCO.Further comments will be provided in due course.  | The Applicant acknowledges that Article 6 disapplies sections 72(7) and (8) of the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 in relation to a transfer or grant of the benefit of a deemed marine licence. For the reasons set out in detail in the Explanatory Memorandum, it is clear that there is no legal barrier to including these provisions in the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1), that it is entirely appropriate to provide for the transfer of a deemed marine licence alongside various overlapping powers/authorisations within a DCO and that there is therefore a clear advantage to doing so. This has been accepted by the Secretary of State repeatedly in relation to offshore wind farm DCOs, including most recently the Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon Extensions Offshore Wind Farm Order 2024, and is well precedented. |
| TA_0010_139_221123          | S42     | Email           | Schedule 14 – Deemed Marine Licence 1: Morgan Offshore Wind Farm Transmission Assets - - Part 1 Licensed marine activities<br>1 (2) Interpretation - - MMO recommends adding in a definition of a condition – for example ‘a condition in part 2 of this licence.’  | A definition of condition has been added to the deemed marine licences.  |
| TA_0010_140_221123          | S42     | Email           | 1 (2) Interpretation - - MMO recommends adding a definition of m3 to “m” means metres and “m2” means metres squared. To read “m” means metres, “m2” means metres squared and “m3” means metres cubed.   | The Applicants note your response. This is included in the definitions included within the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1).  |
| TA_0010_141_221123          | S42     | Email           | 1 (2) Interpretation - - MMO has been defined in Schedule 14 and 15, however the MMO has been referred to within the main DCO. MMO recommends that the MMO is defined in other Part 1’s of the DCO.   | The Applicants note your response. Definitions included within the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1) have since been updated.  |
| TA_0010_142_221123          | S42     | Email           | 1 (2) Interpretation - - MMO recommends adding [“the in-principle monitoring plan” means the document certified as the in-principle monitoring plan by the Secretary of State under article 40 for the purposes of this Order;]   | The draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1) now includes the relevant definition for in-principle monitoring plan.   |
| TA_0010_143_221123          | S42     | Email           | 1 (2) Interpretation - - suction bucket foundation” MMO advises that “ should be added to the beginning.  | The application no longer includes any offshore structures requiring foundations so this amendment is not necessary.   |
| TA_0010_144_221123          | S42     | Email           | 1 (2) Interpretation - - MSL is not a defined term at Part 1 1(1). MMO advises that this is defined.  | This definition is not used.   |
| TA_0010_145_221123          | S42     | Email           | 1 (5) - - MMO advises that these addresses are checked with the relevant bodies.  | The Applicants note your response.   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
| TA_0010_146_221123          | S42     | Email           | Details of licenced activities - - The coordinates are missing from this provision. MMO presumes that these will be included in a later draft.  | The Applicant confirms that the coordinates are now included in the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1).  |
| TA_0010_147_221123          | S42     | Email           | Details of licenced activities (2) (d) - - MMO advises that geophysical surveys would require notification.   | The Applicants note your response.  |
| TA_0010_148_221123          | S42     | Email           | Details of licenced activities (3)<br>Each paragraph should be labelled, MMO advises that this section should be ordered as 3 (1). Paragraph starting with 'In connection with the licenced activities' should be ordered as 3 (2). The activities here should match with the DCO activities and should include dredging. | The Applicants note your response.  |
| TA_0010_149_221123          | S42     | Email           | Details of licenced activities (4)<br>Further comments will be provided in due course.  | The Applicants note your response.  |
| TA_0010_150_221123          | S42     | Email           | Details of licenced activities (6)<br>Further comments will be provided in due course.  | The Applicants note your response.  |
| TA_0010_151_221123          | S42     | Email           | Details of licenced activities (7)<br>Further comments will be provided in due course.  | The Applicants note your response.  |
| TA_0010_152_221123          | S42     | Email           | Details of licenced activities (8) Further comments will be provided in due course.   | The Applicants note your response.  |
| TA_0010_153_221123          | S42     | Email           | Details of licenced activities (9)<br>Further comments will be provided in due course.  | The Applicants note your response.  |
| TA_0010_154_221123          | S42     | Email           | Part 2 - Conditions - - 10 Design Parameters Table 5 - - DML is a standalone document therefore the tables should be labelled as such. Part 2 Conditions should start at number 1 MMO requests that maximum total area and volume of cable and scour protection is included.  | The draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1) has been drafted in line with SI drafting principles. Maximum total areas and volumes of cable protection are included in the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1). Scour protection parameters are not required as there are no structures with foundations requiring scour protection included in the application. |
| TA_0010_155_221123          | S42     | Email           | 11 Maintenance of the authorised project<br>Further comments will be provided in due course.  | The Applicants note your response.  |
| TA_0010_156_221123          | S42     | Email           | 12 Extension of time periods<br>Further comments will be provided in due course.  | The Applicants note your response.  |
| TA_0010_157_221123          | S42     | Email           | 13 Notifications and inspections<br>Please check the numbering for this condition.  | The Applicant confirms this is now condition 14 and has been checked in the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1).  |
| TA_0010_158_221123          | S42     | Email           | 13 (7) 'The MMO' should be changed to 'MMO local office' and the wording is updated to 'at least 14 days prior to the commencement of the licensed activities or any part of them'.   | The Applicant confirms this is now condition 14(6) in the draft Development Consent Order (document reference C1) and now refers to MMO Local Office. The Applicant considers that 'at least five days prior to the commencement of the licensed activities or any part of them' is appropriate.  |
| TA_0010_159_221123          | S42     | Email           | 13 (11) The UKHO must also be notified at least 14 days prior to the commencement of activities.  | The Applicant confirms this is now condition 14(10). The Applicant notes that this condition relates to post completion notifications and not prior to commencement notifications.  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
| TA_0010_160_221123          | S42     | Email           | 13 (12) 'regional fisheries contacts' should be defined.   | The Applicant does not consider that this should be a defined term.  |
| TA_0010_161_221123          | S42     | Email           | 14 Aids to navigation<br>Further comments will be provided in due course.  | The Applicant confirms that this is now condition 18(2). The condition refers to details set out in the outline offshore written scheme of investigation (document reference J17) submitted with this application not the final version to be approved pursuant to condition 18(1)(c). |
| TA_0010_162_221123          | S42     | Email           | 15 Colouring of structures<br>Further comments will be provided in due course.   | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0010_163_221123          | S42     | Email           | 16 Chemicals, drilling and debris<br>Further comments will be provided in due course.  | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0010_164_221123          | S42     | Email           | 17 Force majeure<br>Further comments will be provided in due course.   | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0010_165_221123          | S42     | Email           | 18 UXO clearance<br>Further comments will be provided in due course.   | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0010_167_221123          | S42     | Email           | 19 Pre-construction plans and documentation<br>Further comments will be provided in due course. Please ensure all plans are referred to (e.g Operations and Maintenance Plan) and any outline or in principle plans are also referenced.   | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0010_168_221123          | S42     | Email           | 19 (1) (d) (iii) The MMO advise that there should be no full stop after 'if required'.   | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0010_169_221123          | S42     | Email           | 19 (3) The reference to the written scheme of investigation should be updated to state 'as approved under 19 (1) (g)'.   | The Applicant confirms that this is now condition 18(2). The condition refers to details set out in the outline offshore written scheme of investigation (document reference J17) submitted with this application not the final version to be approved pursuant to condition 18(1)(c). |
| TA_0010_170_221123          | S42     | Email           | 20 Reporting of engaged agents, contractors and vessels<br>Further comments will be provided in due course.  | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0010_171_221123          | S42     | Email           | 21 Pre-construction monitoring and surveys<br>Further comments will be provided in due course.   | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0010_172_221123          | S42     | Email           | 22 Construction monitoring<br>Further comments will be provided in due course.   | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0010_173_221123          | S42     | Email           | 22 (5) The MMO queries if the reference to paragraph 5 should in fact be a reference to paragraph 4.   | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0010_174_221123          | S42     | Email           | 23 Post-construction monitoring<br>Further comments will be provided in due course.  | The Applicants note your response.   |
| TA_0049_009_231123          | S42     | Email           | Section 8.7 (Commitments) – Table 8.18 summarises the following commitments:<br>- production of an Outline Marine Archaeology Written Scheme of Investigations (WSI) in consultation with Historic England;<br>- the spatial identification and application of Archaeological Exclusion Zones (AEZs) or temporary exclusion zones; and<br>- implementation of a reporting protocol system for archaeological discoveries to facilitate prompt action | Agreement of mitigation measures detailed in the draft DCO noted.  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 | and communication between key stakeholders.<br><br>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.   |  |
| 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_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).  |
| 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_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_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.<br>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_0222_012_231123          | S44     | Email           | Question 14 As has been stated, the site specific information which has been provided to landowners such as our clients by the Morecambe & Morgan schemes is extremely limited, beyond the information available  | 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 | to the general public. As such, it is difficult to make meaningful representations in respect of the draft DCO and the powers sought thereunder.  | 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.   |
| TA_0222_026_231123          | S44     | Email           | Question 14 The site specific information which has been provided by the Morecambe & Morgan projects is extremely limited, beyond that information available to the general public. As such, it is difficult to make meaningful representations in respect of the draft DCO and the powers sought thereunder.   | 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. |
| 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 RuralFylde and Rural Preston areas for many years, not a three year construction window asindicated in the statutory consultation documents, as each company will not commence andcomplete their respective projects transmission asset construction simultaneously.1.2 In the event that one project does not commence at all this will create significant uncertaintyas to if/when it will ever commence. For example, BP Morgan Project could be completed by2028 whilst Flotation Morecambe Project may stall or even cease to exist given that FlotationEnergy Limited is a new Co incorporated on 21 May 2018 with poor cashflow having reporteda loss in trading profit to 31 December 2022 and their accounts advise 'Principle risks anduncertainties' 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 FarmProject 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_0226_009_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 commoninterest 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 RuralFylde and Rural Preston areas for many years, not a three year construction window asindicated in the statutory consultation documents, as each company will not commence andcomplete their respective projects transmission asset construction simultaneously.1.2 In the event that one project does not commence at all this will create significant uncertaintyas to if/when it will ever commence. For example, BP Morgan Project could be completed by2028 whilst Flotation Morecambe Project may stall or even cease to exist given that FlotationEnergy Limited is a new Co incorporated on 21 May 2018 with poor cashflow having reporteda loss in trading profit to 31 December 2022 and their accounts advise 'Principle risks anduncertainties' 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 FarmProject 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 issues matters in feedback will be included within those negotiations and discussions to progress the land agreements.        |
| TA_0227_009_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 commoninterest 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 RuralFylde and Rural Preston areas for many years, not a three year construction window asindicated in the statutory consultation documents, as each company will not commence andcomplete their respective projects transmission asset construction simultaneously.1.2 In the event that one project does not commence at all this will create significant uncertaintyas to if/when it will ever commence. For example, BP Morgan Project could be completed by2028 whilst Flotation Morecambe Project may stall or even cease to exist given that FlotationEnergy Limited is a new Co incorporated on 21 May 2018 with poor cashflow having reporteda loss in trading profit to 31 December 2022 and their accounts advise 'Principle risks anduncertainties' 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 FarmProject 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 issues matters in feedback will be included within those negotiations and discussions to progress the land agreements.        |
| TA_0228_004_231123          | S44     | Email           | Morgan and Morecambe Projects are completely independent companies who's only commoninterest is to obtain a Development Consent Order (DCO) for their respective schemes;If a DCO is granted to both schemes this will cause major disturbance to the whole Rural Fylde andRural Preston areas for many   | 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 their   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 | years, not a three year construction window as indicated in the statutory consultation documents, as each company will not commence and complete their respective project transmission asset construction simultaneously.  | interest. The matters raised in feedback will be included within those negotiations and discussions to progress the land agreements.   |
| TA_0210_004_231123          | S44     | Email           | 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; 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 project transmission asset construction simultaneously.   | 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 their interest. The matters raised in feedback will be included within those negotiations and discussions to progress the land agreements.   |
| TA_0229_008_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 uncertainty 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. | The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.   |
| TA_0230_007_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 uncertainty 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. | The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.   |
| TA_0231_005_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 uncertainty 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 issues matters in feedback will be included within those negotiations and discussions to progress the land agreements. |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
| TA_0233_006_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 commoninterest 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 RuralFylde and Rural Preston areas for many years, not a three year construction window asindicated in the statutory consultation documents, as each company will not commence andcomplete their respective projects transmission asset construction simultaneously.1.2 In the event that one project does not commence at all this will create significant uncertaintyas to if/when it will ever commence. For example, BP Morgan Project could be completed by2028 whilst Flotation Morecambe Project may stall or even cease to exist given that FlotationEnergy Limited is a new Co incorporated on 21 May 2018 with poor cashflow having reporteda loss in trading profit to 31 December 2022 and their accounts advise 'Principle risks anduncertainties' 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 FarmProject is a major financial undertaking in construction of both offshore and onshore assets. | The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.   |
| TA_0234_010_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 commoninterest 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 RuralFylde and Rural Preston areas for many years, not a three year construction window asindicated in the statutory consultation documents, as each company will not commence andcomplete their respective projects transmission asset construction simultaneously.1.2 In the event that one project does not commence at all this will create significant uncertaintyas to if/when it will ever commence. For example, BP Morgan Project could be completed by2028 whilst Flotation Morecambe Project may stall or even cease to exist given that FlotationEnergy Limited is a new Co incorporated on 21 May 2018 with poor cashflow having reporteda loss in trading profit to 31 December 2022 and their accounts advise 'Principle risks anduncertainties' 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 FarmProject 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 feedback will be included within those negotiations and discussions to progress the land agreements. |
| TA_0235_005_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 commoninterest 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 RuralFylde and Rural Preston areas for many years, not a three year construction window asindicated in the statutory consultation documents, as each company will not commence andcomplete their respective projects transmission asset construction simultaneously.1.2 In the event that one project does not commence at all this will create significant uncertaintyas to if/when it will ever commence. For example, BP Morgan Project could be completed by2028 whilst Flotation Morecambe Project may stall or even cease to exist given that FlotationEnergy Limited is a new Co incorporated on 21 May 2018 with poor cashflow having reporteda loss in trading profit to 31 December 2022 and their accounts advise 'Principle risks anduncertainties' 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 FarmProject is a major financial undertaking in construction of both offshore and onshore assets. | The Applicants can confirm that following route refinement this interest is no longer within the draft order limits.   |

## E1.16.31 Targeted statutory consultation table of responses



**Table E1.16.31: Target Statutory Consultation Responses (Targeted statutory consultation – newly identified land interests 3 (21 March 2024 to 18 April 2024))**

**Consultation process/non-technical/not topic specific**

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| TA_0173_001_210324          | S44     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | <p>Further to your previous correspondence and the updated Statutory Consultation Period, I have taken the opportunity to download the plans and discuss the various changes with my client.</p> <p>I understand that the Morecambe offshore temporary compound construction is identified on my client's land REDACTED. Obviously, it still leaves an area to the north on the Morgan side of the cable route which is effectively severed. This provides useful access onto Hillock Lane and it would make sense for the Morgan compound to be located there.</p> <p>Other points to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The design and route of the cable route now has severed an area of land completely to the south of the cable route which would require access off Hillock Lane, or alternatively become severed and dealt with under usual compensation matters. Please provide for an access road off Hillock Lane within your design drawings.</li> </ul>   | <p>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.</p>   |
| TA_0179_012_160424          | S44     | Email           | 7                      |                              | <p>Agriculture Land</p> <p>The proposed alternative route appears to split into two at Great Carr Side Farm – surely only one route should be necessary/required, to have two routes is completely obliterating there being any useable land! This is a further example of how the consultation on this project appears to be premature as the necessary design details that would allow more effective consultation are simply not available. Furthermore, we have been advised that preliminary investigative works are due to start imminently, leading me to think that this further consultation is just a box ticking exercise, and your decision is already predetermined.</p>  | <p>The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3). Ongoing survey work is undertaken to assist in continued refinement of the design of the Transmission Assets.</p>  |
| TA_0180_013_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.4                          | <p>4.4 Socio-economics</p> <p>The project will have a variety of negative socio economic impacts, which are important to consider alongside the benefits of renewable energy production. Here are some potential negative impacts:</p> <p>Visual Impact and Aesthetics: the cable corridor, work and sub stations will have an impact on the visual landscape of rural areas, impacting the scenic beauty and potentially affecting tourism and property values. People will find large wind farms visually intrusive and disruptive to the natural environment.</p> <p>Property Values: There is evidence to suggest that the work will and can lower nearby property values. Concerns about noise, aesthetics, and perceived impacts on health can reduce the desirability of properties near wind farms, leading to potential economic losses for property owners.</p> <p>Tourism and Recreation: Our rural areas rely on tourism and outdoor recreation for economic activity. The presence of large wind farms might deter tourists who come to rural areas seeking untouched natural landscapes or peaceful surroundings, impacting local businesses like hotels, restaurants, and shops.</p> <p>Employment and Local Economy: While the Project can create jobs during the construction phase, the long-term employment impact might be limited. Maintenance and operations of wind farms often require specialized skills that might not benefit the local workforce. Additionally, if the wind farm is owned by external companies, much of the revenue generated might not circulate within the local economy.</p> <p>Community Disruption: The Project will lead to social tensions within local communities. Some residents might support the project due to potential economic benefits, while others might oppose it due to concerns about aesthetics, noise, or perceived impacts on health. This can lead to divisions within communities and strain social cohesion.</p> <p>Impact on Agriculture: The Project will occupy significant land area, potentially</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). Specifically, socio-economic impacts are set out in section 2.11 of Volume 4, Chapter 2: Socio-economics of the ES (document reference F4.2). 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 Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F1.5.1). 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> <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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | <p>displacing agricultural activities. This might affect local farmers and agriculture-related businesses. Moreover, construction and maintenance activities can disrupt farming operations and access to farmland.</p> <p>Infrastructure Costs: The Project to even be considered will impact remote rural areas that might require significant investment in new or upgraded infrastructure, such as roads, power lines, and substations. These costs might be borne by the local community or government, impacting public finances and resources.</p> <p>Cultural and Heritage Impact: Some wind farm developments might encroach upon culturally significant or protected areas, impacting local heritage and traditions. This can have intangible socioeconomic costs related to community identity and well-being.</p> <p>Addressing these potential negative impacts requires careful planning, community engagement, and consideration of broader socioeconomic factors. Strategies such as community consultation, fair compensation for affected parties, and investments in local infrastructure and skills development can help mitigate these impacts and maximize the benefits of renewable energy projects in rural areas.</p>  | <p>English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>   |
| TA_0180_014_170424          | S44     | Email           | 7                      |                              | <p><b>Agriculture Land</b><br/>Agricultural activity in Fylde is characterised by a relatively large number of small agricultural holdings, as is the case at REDACTED, their contribution to the rural economy of Fylde is significant.</p> <p>The proposed cable alternative route crosses agricultural units that would therefore inevitably be subdivided during the construction phase. The width of the construction corridor will have a relatively greater impact on these smaller agricultural holdings than would be the case on larger farms, as the land taken during construction would be a proportionally greater percentage.</p> <p>In the longer term, cable easements would mean that the availability of land to site agricultural buildings would be restricted and would have an impact on the sustainability of individual businesses, the rural economy as a whole and ultimately the character of the wider rural area. The siting of access points to the cable joints would also potentially impact the efficiency of agricultural holdings. It is considered that greater consideration needs to be given to the routing of cables across individual agricultural holdings to prevent subdivision and loss of productive land.</p> <p>The proposed alternative route appears to split into two at Great Carr Side Farm – surely only one route should be necessary/required, to have two routes is completely obliterating there being any useable land! This is a further example of how the consultation on this project appears to be premature as the necessary design details that would allow more effective consultation are simply not available.</p> <p>The indicated width of the construction corridor is 122m. Much of this is accounted for by the proposed linear storage of topsoil and subsoil during construction. The utilisation of a series of top and subsoil storage areas could reduce the width of the construction corridor by approximately 40% and reduce the adverse impact not only on agricultural holdings but on ecology, and transport infrastructure and reduce the development footprint of the project as a whole.</p> <p>Finally on this point, as the majority of the agricultural land that the project crosses is regarded as BMV, if the project goes ahead, it is essential that the land be reinstated to a high quality that does not impact upon the long-term viability and sustainability of the individual agricultural units.</p> | <p>The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found 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> <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 Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F3.6)</p> |
| TA_0180_020_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | Annex 1b Q1                  | <p>As per the above, the amendments are not acceptable, they will further add stress to the estate/community. All of the above will be compounded as the proposed amendments are closer to our properties, use our existing road infrastructure and take over our community footpath.</p> <p>The whole estate will be alongside a building site, affecting the views and prices of our properties.</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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              |   | 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_0181_013_170424          | S44     | Email           | 7                      |                              | <p>Agriculture Land</p> <p>Agricultural activity in Fylde is characterised by a relatively large number of small agricultural holdings, as is the case at REDACTED, their contribution to the rural economy of Fylde is significant.</p> <p>The proposed cable alternative route crosses agricultural units that would therefore inevitably be subdivided during the construction phase. The width of the construction corridor will have a relatively greater impact on these smaller agricultural holdings than would be the case on larger farms, as the land taken during construction would be a proportionally greater percentage.</p> <p>In the longer term, cable easements would mean that the availability of land to site agricultural buildings would be restricted and would have an impact on the sustainability of individual businesses, the rural economy as a whole and ultimately the character of the wider rural area. The siting of access points to the cable joints would also potentially impact the efficiency of agricultural holdings. It is considered that greater consideration needs to be given to the routing of cables across individual agricultural holdings to prevent subdivision and loss of productive land.</p> <p>The proposed alternative route appears to split into two at Great Carr Side Farm – surely only one route should be necessary/required, to have two routes is completely obliterating there being any useable land! This is a further example of how the consultation on this project appears to be premature as the necessary design details that would allow more effective consultation are simply not available.</p> <p>The indicated width of the construction corridor is 122m. Much of this is accounted for by the proposed linear storage of topsoil and subsoil during construction. The utilisation of a series of top and subsoil storage areas could reduce the width of the construction corridor by approximately 40% and reduce the adverse impact not only on agricultural holdings but on ecology, and transport infrastructure and reduce the development footprint of the project as a whole.</p> <p>Finally on this point, as the majority of the agricultural land that the project crosses is regarded as BMV, if the project goes ahead, it is essential that the land be reinstated to a high quality that does not impact upon the long-term viability and sustainability of the individual agricultural units.</p> | <p>The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found 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> <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 Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F3.6)</p> |
| TA_0182_013_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   | 7                      |                              | <p>The proposed cable route will subdivide a number of small agricultural holdings in the construction phase, and the impact on smaller holdings will be much greater than on larger farms. The cable easements are of greater concern to smaller holdings for the same reason.</p> <p>We would request further information as to why specific proposals around REDACTED have been made as we feel the proposed alternative route is entirely inappropriate.</p>  | <p>The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found 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).</p> <p>The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              |  | 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).   |
| TA_0182_017_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   | 16                     |                              | Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REDACTED, we strongly object to the proposed alternative route as the impact it will have is substantial and disproportionate given there are other alternatives which will have lesser impact. Clearly, the scheme was completely unaware of REDACTED as we were entirely missed off the initial consultation process – this is inexcusable in a scheme of this size which clearly has huge funding. | 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 interest of this PWIL was not known at the time of the November 2023 statutory consultation. Following further diligent inquiry and identification of access rights over land within the PEIR boundary, the PWIL was duly consulted as part of the targeted statutory consultations. |
| TA_0182_020_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   |                        | Annex 1b Q3                  | Yes – why weren't the 8 affected properties at REDACTED consulted in the original period from 12 October to 23 November 2023?  | The interest of this PWIL was not known at the time of the November 2023 statutory consultation. Following further diligent inquiry and identification of access rights over land within the PEIR boundary, the PWIL was duly consulted as part of the targeted statutory consultations.   |

## Project Description

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| TA_0177_014_110424          | S44     | Email           | 7                      |                              | <p>Agriculture Land</p> <p>Agricultural activity in Fylde is characterised by a relatively large number of small agricultural holdings, as is the case at REDACTED, their contribution to the rural economy of Fylde is significant.</p> <p>The proposed cable alternative route crosses agricultural units that would therefore inevitably be subdivided during the construction phase. The width of the construction corridor will have a relatively greater impact on these smaller agricultural holdings than would be the case on larger farms, as the land taken during construction would be a proportionally greater percentage.</p> <p>In the longer term, cable easements would mean that the availability of land to site agricultural buildings would be restricted and would have an impact on the sustainability of individual businesses, the rural economy as a whole and ultimately the character of the wider rural area. The siting of access points to the cable joints would also potentially impact the efficiency of agricultural holdings. It is considered that greater consideration needs to be given to the routing of cables across individual agricultural holdings to prevent subdivision and loss of productive land.</p> <p>The proposed alternative route appears to split into two at Great Carr Side Farm – surely only one route should be necessary/required, to have two routes is completely obliterating there being any useable land! This is a further example of how the consultation on this project appears to be premature as the</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. The final cable easement will restrict the ability to add additional buildings, but small nature of the holdings suggests the viability will naturally restrict the number of agricultural buildings per holding. 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> <p>The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found 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</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | <p>necessary design details that would allow more effective consultation are simply not available.</p> <p>The indicated width of the construction corridor is 122m. Much of this is accounted for by the proposed linear storage of topsoil and subsoil during construction. The utilisation of a series of top and subsoil storage areas could reduce the width of the construction corridor by approximately 40% and reduce the adverse impact not only on agricultural holdings but on ecology, and transport infrastructure and reduce the development footprint of the project as a whole.</p> <p>Finally on this point, as the majority of the agricultural land that the project crosses is regarded as BMV, if the project goes ahead, it is essential that the land be reinstated to a high quality that does not impact upon the long-term viability and sustainability of the individual agricultural units.</p>  | <p>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>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 Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F3.6)</p> <p>Soil storage and management is set out in the relevant plan along with the code of construction practice. It is not good practice to mix soils from different holdings, but rather replace in the location it was excavated so as not to create biosecurity and waste transfer issues. Transporting soil to a single storage location would also significantly increase the volume of traffic movements.</p> <p>All land will be reinstated to a minimum of the same condition post construction.</p>                                   |
| TA_0179_012_160424          | S44     | Email           | 7                      |                              | <p>Agriculture Land</p> <p>The proposed alternative route appears to split into two at Great Carr Side Farm – surely only one route should be necessary/required, to have two routes is completely obliterating there being any useable land! This is a further example of how the consultation on this project appears to be premature as the necessary design details that would allow more effective consultation are simply not available. Furthermore, we have been advised that preliminary investigative works are due to start imminently, leading me to think that this further consultation is just a box ticking exercise, and your decision is already predetermined.</p>  | <p>The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).</p> <p>Ongoing survey work is undertaken to assist in continued refinement of the design of the Transmission Assets.</p>  |
| TA_0180_014_170424          | S44     | Email           | 7                      |                              | <p>Agriculture Land</p> <p>Agricultural activity in Fylde is characterised by a relatively large number of small agricultural holdings, as is the case at REDACTED, their contribution to the rural economy of Fylde is significant.</p> <p>The proposed cable alternative route crosses agricultural units that would therefore inevitably be subdivided during the construction phase. The width of the construction corridor will have a relatively greater impact on these smaller agricultural holdings than would be the case on larger farms, as the land taken during construction would be a proportionally greater percentage.</p> <p>In the longer term, cable easements would mean that the availability of land to site agricultural buildings would be restricted and would have an impact on the sustainability of individual businesses, the rural economy as a whole and ultimately the character of the wider rural area. The siting of access points to the cable joints would also potentially impact the efficiency of agricultural holdings. It is considered that greater consideration needs to be given to the routing of cables across individual agricultural holdings to prevent subdivision and loss of productive land.</p> <p>The proposed alternative route appears to split into two at Great Carr Side Farm – surely only one route should be necessary/required, to have two routes is completely obliterating there being any useable land! This is a further example of how the consultation on this project appears to be premature as the necessary design details that would allow more effective consultation are simply not available.</p> <p>The indicated width of the construction corridor is 122m. Much of this is accounted for by the proposed linear storage of topsoil and subsoil during construction. The utilisation of a series of top and subsoil storage areas could reduce the width of the construction corridor by approximately 40% and reduce the adverse impact not only on agricultural holdings but on ecology, and transport infrastructure and reduce the development footprint of the project as a</p> | <p>The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found 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> <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 Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F3.6)</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | <p>whole.<br/>Finally on this point, as the majority of the agricultural land that the project crosses is regarded as BMV, if the project goes ahead, it is essential that the land be reinstated to a high quality that does not impact upon the long-term viability and sustainability of the individual agricultural units.</p>   |  |
| TA_0181_013_170424          | S44     | Email           | 7                      |                              | <p><b>Agriculture Land</b><br/>Agricultural activity in Fylde is characterised by a relatively large number of small agricultural holdings, as is the case at REDACTED, their contribution to the rural economy of Fylde is significant.<br/>The proposed cable alternative route crosses agricultural units that would therefore inevitably be subdivided during the construction phase. The width of the construction corridor will have a relatively greater impact on these smaller agricultural holdings than would be the case on larger farms, as the land taken during construction would be a proportionally greater percentage.<br/>In the longer term, cable easements would mean that the availability of land to site agricultural buildings would be restricted and would have an impact on the sustainability of individual businesses, the rural economy as a whole and ultimately the character of the wider rural area. The siting of access points to the cable joints would also potentially impact the efficiency of agricultural holdings. It is considered that greater consideration needs to be given to the routing of cables across individual agricultural holdings to prevent subdivision and loss of productive land.<br/>The proposed alternative route appears to split into two at Great Carr Side Farm – surely only one route should be necessary/required, to have two routes is completely obliterating there being any useable land! This is a further example of how the consultation on this project appears to be premature as the necessary design details that would allow more effective consultation are simply not available.<br/>The indicated width of the construction corridor is 122m. Much of this is accounted for by the proposed linear storage of topsoil and subsoil during construction. The utilisation of a series of top and subsoil storage areas could reduce the width of the construction corridor by approximately 40% and reduce the adverse impact not only on agricultural holdings but on ecology, and transport infrastructure and reduce the development footprint of the project as a whole.<br/>Finally on this point, as the majority of the agricultural land that the project crosses is regarded as BMV, if the project goes ahead, it is essential that the land be reinstated to a high quality that does not impact upon the long-term viability and sustainability of the individual agricultural units.</p> | <p>The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).<br/>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).<br/>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 Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F3.6)</p>  |
| TA_0182_013_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   | 7                      |                              | <p>The proposed cable route will subdivide a number of small agricultural holdings in the construction phase, and the impact on smaller holdings will be much greater than on larger farms. The cable easements are of greater concern to smaller holdings for the same reason.<br/>We would request further information as to why specific proposals around REDACTED have been made as we feel the proposed alternative route in entirely inappropriate.</p>  | <p>The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found 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).<br/>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).<br/>Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              |  | 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). |

**Site selection and consideration of alternatives**

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
| TA_0171_001_150324          | S44     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | <p>Further to your previous correspondence, I have reviewed the documentation on behalf of my client, REDACTED who has his agricultural property on REDACTED, as identified on the sheet 6 of 40 within the Section 42 Minor Changes Detailed Map Book.</p> <p>As you are more than aware, the cable route of both Morgan and Morecambe completely take out my client's land holding, he only owns 14 acres of land and your cable route takes out the majority of land. The only solace to my client was that his modern portal frame agricultural building and yard area was still operational and indeed my client has continued to improve and invest, most recently spending £150,000 in concrete yard and additional buildings. Yet, you have now highlighted a shared operation access to run through his yard, which effectively completely stops my client from farming and using the farm buildings for a health and safety, security and privacy issue.</p> <p>We strongly rebut the use of the access through my client's land. If you are accessing the cable route, then you can continue to use the access track that is already there established that is within the Ownership of REDACTED, not through my client's land. Please confirm receipt and confirmation that this access will be taken out and removed from your operational access requirements.</p> | As set out in the Project Description chapter of the ES (Volume 1, Chapter 3), no construction is proposed for operational accesses (i.e. only a permanent right of access is being sought) for the onshore export cable corridor and 400kV grid connection cable corridor, and where possible, operational accesses have been identified using existing access routes or gates/ gaps in the hedgerows. They have been designed to be approximately 3.5 m in width and follow existing paths, where practicable. The width of operational accesses may vary in places, for example, to ensure alignment with the boundaries of existing access tracks. Operational access will be taken to undertake low-level non-intrusive routine inspections (for example, inspections of joint bays via link boxes), and can be expected on an infrequent annual basis. |
| TA_0172_001_200324          | S44     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | <p>Further to your previous correspondence, I have spoken with my client, REDACTED, in relation to their land holding off REDACTED.</p> <p>I have attached a screenshot of the targeted consultation plan which identifies the slight movement/reduction of the working width for Morgan and Morecambe, but also the introduction of the Morecambe onshore ECC temporary construction compound to the land to the south-west.</p> <p>Given that my client is potentially burdened with the access road to the north of the land that has effectively got a small triangle of land to the north of the Morgan onshore ECC and Hillock Lane, this could be described as a redundant severed parcel of land if the cable comes through and therefore your client should consider taking this area as compound area which provides access directly off Hillock Lane. I believe that the post-consultation amended is identified as TCC.1.002.</p> <p>Maybe you will put forward this proposal to your clients. No other obvious matters arising other than below the proposed Morecambe temporary compound my client will be left with a small severed area to the south of which would not be able to be accessed and therefore all of my client's land holding REDACTED will be occupied by your clients causing major impacts on their farming operations going forward.</p>     | Following route refinement, Dalcour McLaren 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.   |
| TA_0173_001_210324          | S44     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | <p>Further to your previous correspondence and the updated Statutory Consultation Period, I have taken the opportunity to download the plans and discuss the various changes with my client.</p> <p>I understand that the Morecambe offshore temporary compound construction is identified on my client's land REDACTED. Obviously, it still leaves an area to the north on the Morgan side of the cable route which is effectively severed. This provides useful access onto Hillock Lane and it would make sense for the Morgan compound to be located there.</p> <p>Other points to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design and route of the cable route now has severed an area of land completely to the south of the cable route which would require access off Hillock Lane, or</li> </ul>  | 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.  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | alternatively become severed and dealt with under usual compensation matters. Please provide for an access road off Hillock Lane within your design drawings.   |   |
| TA_0174_001_210324          | S44     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | <p>Further to your previous correspondence, I have taken the opportunity to inspect the Targeted Statutory Consultation plans and discuss the contents of which with my clients.</p> <p>I am conscious that the Targeted Statutory Consultation period closes on the 24th which doesn't leave a lot of time for feedback however my observations and comments are contained on the attached plan, but also to reiterate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Targeted Consultation area in line with the original preliminary Environmental Information Report identified a small severed area to the south of Morecambe onshore temporary compound. This area would be completely severed and therefore IT would make more sense to use this within the compound area.</li> <li>• The shared occupational access to the south of Ballam Road is rejected. You have already identified a shared access road adjoining the southern tip of the Morgan onshore temporary compound and this provides sufficient access to the working width. It is unpalatable for my client to lose and disrupt yet another field for a temporary access. Please remove this from the drawings.</li> </ul>   | 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.   |
| TA_0175_001_210324          | S44     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | <p>Further to our previous email correspondence I can confirm that I met with my clients on Wednesday afternoon to discuss the latest Targeted Statutory Consultation areas identified on the detailed maps and more specifically my client's affected area which are identified between Pages 33 to 36 of the detailed booklet.</p> <p>Overall my clients are pleased with the amendments showing the route which effectively now sits south of the overhead pylons. This will hopefully reduce the impact of the scheme on my client's land holding notwithstanding the fact that it will still have a major detrimental effect on my client's farm and farming operations but I am pleased and grateful for the project's revision of the route.</p> <p>My clients still have concerns and observations in relation to the shared operational access as highlighted reference OAR.1.005F and OAR.1.005G which on the legend is identified as shared operational access and operational access routes. My clients request better detailed plans and information of the extent of these routes. In addition, my client requires better and more detailed plans of the Morgan onshore temporary construction access which leads off Bryning Lane. The design of such impacts considerably on the important grassland field close to the farm buildings. No doubt you will report the findings and be able to answer the questions in due course.</p>  | Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interest to show detail on the access routes and discuss Heads of Terms to secure the rights for the accesses.   |
| TA_0176_001_040424          | S44     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | <p>Please see below and attached from REDACTED, who is the agent acting for REDACTED. He has provided some feedback on the 400kv routing through his client's land and has suggested some amendments to the lessen the impact on them which have been annotated on the attached plans. I appreciate that this feedback comes at the eleventh hour, but I wanted to make sure it was sent across for your consideration. The requested changes are not enormous, and I have detailed REDACTED comments below.</p> <p>22003214_PLN_INFO_REDACTED – in respect of this plan, it is suggested by our client that the impact of this scheme could be significantly lessened by moving the route to the north of this land parcel, so that the works would not sever the fields in questions. This would lessen the impact on our client's farming operation, and avoid the costs and difficulties required in the scheme providing the necessary crossings, separate water supplies etc.</p> <p>22003214_PLN_INFO_REDCATED – it is suggested by our client that the compound area shown south of the corridor could be better sited in the severed area to the north of the cable corridor, between this and the caravan dealership. This would both lessen the impact of the scheme south of the corridor and make better use of an area to the north, which will otherwise be severed and serve little or no practical purpose during the works. It would also potentially provide better access to the compound from Blackpool Road.</p> <p>22003214_PLN_INFO_REDACTED – again, it has been suggested by our client that the route could be moved to the southern end of this land parcel, south of the pond,</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. 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  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | <p>which would lessen the impact of the scheme, avoid land being unnecessarily severed, and potentially remove the need for crossing points, additional water supplies etc, saving cost/complication for the scheme.</p> <p>22003214_PLN_INFO_REDACTED - in respect of this plan, it is suggested by our client that the impact of this scheme could be significantly lessened by moving the route to the north, to avoid severing the western field.. This would lessen the impact on our client's farming operation, and avoid the costs and difficulties required in the scheme providing the necessary crossings, separate water supplies etc.</p>  |   |
| TA_0177_014_110424          | S44     | Email           | 7                      |                              | <p><b>Agriculture Land</b><br/>Agricultural activity in Fylde is characterised by a relatively large number of small agricultural holdings, as is the case at REDACTED, their contribution to the rural economy of Fylde is significant.</p> <p>The proposed cable alternative route crosses agricultural units that would therefore inevitably be subdivided during the construction phase. The width of the construction corridor will have a relatively greater impact on these smaller agricultural holdings than would be the case on larger farms, as the land taken during construction would be a proportionally greater percentage.</p> <p>In the longer term, cable easements would mean that the availability of land to site agricultural buildings would be restricted and would have an impact on the sustainability of individual businesses, the rural economy as a whole and ultimately the character of the wider rural area. The siting of access points to the cable joints would also potentially impact the efficiency of agricultural holdings. It is considered that greater consideration needs to be given to the routing of cables across individual agricultural holdings to prevent subdivision and loss of productive land.</p> <p>The proposed alternative route appears to split into two at Great Carr Side Farm – surely only one route should be necessary/required, to have two routes is completely obliterating there being any useable land! This is a further example of how the consultation on this project appears to be premature as the necessary design details that would allow more effective consultation are simply not available.</p> <p>The indicated width of the construction corridor is 122m. Much of this is accounted for by the proposed linear storage of topsoil and subsoil during construction. The utilisation of a series of top and subsoil storage areas could reduce the width of the construction corridor by approximately 40% and reduce the adverse impact not only on agricultural holdings but on ecology, and transport infrastructure and reduce the development footprint of the project as a whole.</p> <p>Finally on this point, as the majority of the agricultural land that the project crosses is regarded as BMV, if the project goes ahead, it is essential that the land be reinstated to a high quality that does not impact upon the long-term viability and sustainability of the individual agricultural units.</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. The final cable easement will restrict the ability to add additional buildings, but small nature of the holdings suggests the viability will naturally restrict the number of agricultural buildings per holding. 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> <p>The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found 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> <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 Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F3.6)</p> <p>Soil storage and management is set out in the relevant plan along with the code of construction practice. It is not good practice to mix soils from different holdings, but rather replace in the location it was excavated so as not to create biosecurity and waste transfer issues. Transporting soil to a single storage location would also significantly increase the volume of traffic movements.</p> <p>All land will be reinstated to a minimum of the same condition post construction.</p> |
| TA_0177_018_110424          | S44     | Email           | 16                     |                              | <p>Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REG-REDACTED</p> <p>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great.</p> <p>The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered.</p> <p>The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected. Furthermore, the original</p>   | <p>The Applicants will work with agricultural landowners to mitigate impacts on farm holdings. Impacts on hedgerows will be minimised where possible.</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</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents.<br>Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will impact negatively wildlife and hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has.   | 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_0177_019_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | Annex 1b Q1                  | As per the above, the amendments are not acceptable, they will further add stress to the estate/community. All of the above will be compounded as the proposed amendments are closer to our properties, use our existing road infrastructure and take over our community footpath.<br>The whole estate will be alongside a building site, affecting the views and prices of our properties.   | Detailed assessments are 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_0177_021_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | Annex 1b Q3                  | Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REG-REDACTED<br>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great.<br>The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered, and at the worst to the original route.<br>The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected. Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents.<br>Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will impact negatively wildlife and hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has.<br>The tracks are in a poor state of disrepair and not suitable for heavy plant. The community struggles with the maintenance of the public roads and we cannot approve any projects that causes more damage.  | 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).<br>Detailed assessments are 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).<br>The access being discussed in this response is an operational access which will include light vehicular ad-hoc use through the operational phase of the Project. |
| TA_0178_001_140424          | S47     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | As a client of REDACTED I am writing to express my alarm at the unsuitability of the proposed siting of the compound adjacent to the riding school and to urge you to reconsider the location.<br>I understand that the consultation period has ended but I have only recently become aware of your proposals and their implications for the riding school.<br>I understand the need for wind power to meet our government's targets for clean energy, but the proposed location of the compound would have such a devastating effect on the riding school that it would force it to close completely. Horses are sensitive creatures and they would not be able to tolerate the noise and disruption which the compound would generate.<br>The riding school is a highly regarded establishment within the equine industry and for over 40 years has been supporting a huge local community of riders, volunteers, students and staff, serving hundreds of clients, providing training and opportunities for young people, disabled riders, colleges and young people with mental health and behavioural challenges.<br>For people like myself who have caring responsibilities for family members it provides | 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).<br>Daclour Maclaren on behalf of the applicant will work with the interest to discuss mitigation measures for the construction phase.   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | weekly wellbeing which I could not do without.<br>I urge you to take my points into consideration and find an alternative location.  |  |
| TA_0179_012_160424          | S44     | Email           | 7                      |                              | Agriculture Land<br>The proposed alternative route appears to split into two at Great Carr Side Farm – surely only one route should be necessary/required, to have two routes is completely obliterating there being any useable land! This is a further example of how the consultation on this project appears to be premature as the necessary design details that would allow more effective consultation are simply not available. Furthermore, we have been advised that preliminary investigative works are due to start imminently, leading me to think that this further consultation is just a box ticking exercise, and your decision is already predetermined.   | The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).<br>Ongoing survey work is undertaken to assist in continued refinement of the design of the Transmission Assets.  |
| TA_0179_016_160424          | S44     | Email           | 16                     |                              | Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REG-0077 - REDACTED<br>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great.<br>The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered.<br>The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected. Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents. Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will negatively impact wildlife and hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has.   | The Applicants will work with agricultural landowners to mitigate impacts on farm holdings. Impacts on hedgerows will be minimised where possible.<br>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).<br>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).<br>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_0180_014_170424          | S44     | Email           | 7                      |                              | Agriculture Land<br>Agricultural activity in Fylde is characterised by a relatively large number of small agricultural holdings, as is the case at REDACTED, their contribution to the rural economy of Fylde is significant.<br>The proposed cable alternative route crosses agricultural units that would therefore inevitably be subdivided during the construction phase. The width of the construction corridor will have a relatively greater impact on these smaller agricultural holdings than would be the case on larger farms, as the land taken during construction would be a proportionally greater percentage.<br>In the longer term, cable easements would mean that the availability of land to site agricultural buildings would be restricted and would have an impact on the sustainability of individual businesses, the rural economy as a whole and ultimately the character of the wider rural area. The siting of access points to the cable joints would also potentially impact the efficiency of agricultural holdings. It is considered that greater consideration needs to be given to the routing of cables across individual agricultural holdings to prevent subdivision and loss of productive land.<br>The proposed alternative route appears to split into two at Great Carr Side Farm – surely only one route should be necessary/required, to have two routes is completely obliterating there being any useable land! This is a further example of how the consultation on this project appears to be premature as the necessary design details that would allow more effective consultation are simply not available.<br>The indicated width of the construction corridor is 122m. Much of this is accounted for by the proposed linear storage of topsoil and subsoil during construction. The utilisation of a series of top and subsoil storage areas could reduce the width of the construction corridor by approximately 40% and reduce the adverse impact not only on agricultural holdings but on ecology, and transport infrastructure and reduce the development footprint of the project as a whole.<br>Finally on this point, as the majority of the agricultural land that the project crosses is regarded as BMV, if the project goes ahead, it is essential that the land be reinstated to | The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).<br>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).<br>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 Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F3.6) |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | a high quality that does not impact upon the long-term viability and sustainability of the individual agricultural units.   |  |
| TA_0180_018_170424          | S44     | Email           | 16                     |                              | <p>Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REDACTED</p> <p>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great.</p> <p>The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered.</p> <p>The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected. Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents.</p> <p>Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will impact negatively wildlife and hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has.</p>   | <p>The Applicants will work with agricultural landowners to mitigate impacts on farm holdings. Impacts on hedgerows will be minimised where possible.</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).</p> <p>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_0180_020_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | Annex 1b Q1                  | <p>As per the above, the amendments are not acceptable, they will further add stress to the estate/community. All of the above will be compounded as the proposed amendments are closer to our properties, use our existing road infrastructure and take over our community footpath.</p> <p>The whole estate will be alongside a building site, affecting the views and prices of our properties.</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_0180_020_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | Annex 1b Q3                  | <p>Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REG-REDACTED</p> <p>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great.</p> <p>The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered, and at the worst to the original route.</p> <p>The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected. Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents.</p> <p>Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will impact negatively wildlife and hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has.</p> <p>The tracks are in a poor state of disrepair and not suitable for heavy plant. The community struggles with the maintenance of the public roads and we cannot approve any projects that causes more damage.</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, 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).</p> <p>The access being discussed in this response is an operational</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              |   | access which will include light vehicular ad-hoc use through the operational phase of the Project.  |
| TA_0181_013_170424          | S44     | Email           | 7                      |                              | <p>Agriculture Land</p> <p>Agricultural activity in Fylde is characterised by a relatively large number of small agricultural holdings, as is the case at REDACTED, their contribution to the rural economy of Fylde is significant.</p> <p>The proposed cable alternative route crosses agricultural units that would therefore inevitably be subdivided during the construction phase. The width of the construction corridor will have a relatively greater impact on these smaller agricultural holdings than would be the case on larger farms, as the land taken during construction would be a proportionally greater percentage.</p> <p>In the longer term, cable easements would mean that the availability of land to site agricultural buildings would be restricted and would have an impact on the sustainability of individual businesses, the rural economy as a whole and ultimately the character of the wider rural area. The siting of access points to the cable joints would also potentially impact the efficiency of agricultural holdings. It is considered that greater consideration needs to be given to the routing of cables across individual agricultural holdings to prevent subdivision and loss of productive land.</p> <p>The proposed alternative route appears to split into two at Great Carr Side Farm – surely only one route should be necessary/required, to have two routes is completely obliterating there being any useable land! This is a further example of how the consultation on this project appears to be premature as the necessary design details that would allow more effective consultation are simply not available.</p> <p>The indicated width of the construction corridor is 122m. Much of this is accounted for by the proposed linear storage of topsoil and subsoil during construction. The utilisation of a series of top and subsoil storage areas could reduce the width of the construction corridor by approximately 40% and reduce the adverse impact not only on agricultural holdings but on ecology, and transport infrastructure and reduce the development footprint of the project as a whole.</p> <p>Finally on this point, as the majority of the agricultural land that the project crosses is regarded as BMV, if the project goes ahead, it is essential that the land be reinstated to a high quality that does not impact upon the long-term viability and sustainability of the individual agricultural units.</p> | <p>The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found 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> <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 Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F3.6)</p> |
| TA_0181_014_170427          | S44     | Email           | 16                     |                              | <p>Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REDACTED</p> <p>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great.</p> <p>The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered.</p> <p>The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected. Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents.</p> <p>Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will impact negatively wildlife and hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has.</p>   | <p>The Applicants will work with agricultural landowners to mitigate impacts on farm holdings. Impacts on hedgerows will be minimised where possible.</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 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> <p>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_0182_013_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   | 7                      |                              | <p>The proposed cable route will subdivide a number of small agricultural holdings in the construction phase, and the impact on smaller holdings will be much greater than on larger farms. The cable easements are of greater concern to smaller holdings for the same reason.</p> <p>We would request further information as to why specific proposals around REDACTED have been made as we feel the proposed alternative route is entirely inappropriate.</p>  | <p>The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found 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</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 (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).<br>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).<br>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_0182_017_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   | 16                     |                              | Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REDACTED, we strongly object to the proposed alternative route as the impact it will have is substantial and disproportionate given there are other alternatives which will have lesser impact.<br>Clearly, the scheme was completely unaware of REDACTED as we were entirely missed off the initial consultation process – this is inexcusable in a scheme of this size which clearly has huge funding. | 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).<br>The interest of this PWIL was not known at the time of the November 2023 statutory consultation. Following further diligent inquiry and identification of access rights over land within the PEIR boundary, the PWIL was duly consulted as part of the targeted statutory consultations.   |
| TA_0182_018_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   |                        | Annex 1b Q1                  | ECC.1.001 and TAT.1.002, TAT.1.003 and OAR.1.005<br>There are 8 properties directly affected by the proposed changes around REDACTED. The impact on these properties and the surrounding farmland is significant and we feel the changes are NOT warranted; the original proposed route is a better option.   | The Applicant notes your response. We are committed to working with local communities and landowners that may be impacted by the project<br>The access being discussed in this response is an operational access which will include light vehicular ad-hoc use through the operational phase of the Project.  |

### Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| TA_0177_001_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.1                          | The cable routing crosses active agricultural production land. This route is classified as Grade 2 and so regarded as the Best and Most Versatile land (BMV).<br>The proposed alternative routing appears to exacerbate the detrimental effect further as a greater extent of priority habitat and grade 2 classified land is encompassed in the cable corridor. | 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.<br>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).<br>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 |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              |   | in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1). These measures seek to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.   |
| TA_0177_008_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.8                          | Given that the construction will predominantly occur in rural areas characterised by comparatively low background noise levels, there is an increased likelihood of noise disruption originating from the development. Any assessment of noise disturbance should prioritise its effect on residential amenities, rather than relying on higher WHO thresholds primarily designed to gauge the potential impact on human health. Vibration from the drills and plants will cause distress to animals and birds. There are a significant number of residents who work from home, and as such require an element of peace to undertake their everyday tasks. Severe vibration will potentially create damage to the foundations of properties across the REDACTED | 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_0179_001_160424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.1                          | The cable routing crosses active agricultural production land. This route is classified as Grade 2 and so regarded as the Best and Most Versatile land (BMV). The proposed alternative routing set out in the Targeted Consultation at ECC.1.001 appears to exacerbate the detrimental effect further as a greater extent of priority habitat and grade 2 classified land is encompassed in the cable corridor. The amendment requires two cable corridors rather than one! Surely this is not in the best interest of the environment!   | 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). 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. |
| TA_0179_007_160424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.8                          | Vibration from the drills and plant machinery will cause distress to animals and birds. There are a significant number of residents who work from home, and as such require an element of peace to undertake their everyday tasks. Severe vibration and the proposed proximity of the re-routed cable corridor will potentially create damage to the foundations of properties across the REDACTED.   | 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_0180_001_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.1                          | The cable routing crosses active agricultural production land. This route is classified as Grade 2 and so regarded as the Best and Most Versatile land (BMV). The proposed alternative routing appears to exacerbate the detrimental effect further as a greater extent of priority habitat and grade 2 classified land is encompassed in the cable corridor.   | 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). 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. |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
| TA_0180_008_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.8                          | Given that the construction will predominantly occur in rural areas characterised by comparatively low background noise levels, there is an increased likelihood of noise disruption originating from the development. Any assessment of noise disturbance should prioritise its effect on residential amenities, rather than relying on higher WHO thresholds primarily designed to gauge the potential impact on human health. Vibration from the drills and plants will cause distress to animals and birds. There are a significant number of residents who work from home, and as such require an element of peace to undertake their everyday tasks. Severe vibration will potentially create damage to the foundations of properties across REDACTED     | 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_0181_001_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.1                          | The cable routing crosses active agricultural production land. This route is classified as Grade 2 and so regarded as the Best and Most Versatile land (BMV). The proposed alternative routing appears to exacerbate the detrimental effect further as a greater extent of priority habitat and grade 2 classified land is encompassed in the cable corridor.   | 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). 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. |
| TA_0181_008_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.8                          | Given that the construction will predominantly occur in rural areas characterised by comparatively low background noise levels, there is an increased likelihood of noise disruption originating from the development. Any assessment of noise disturbance should prioritise its effect on residential amenities, rather than relying on higher WHO thresholds primarily designed to gauge the potential impact on human health. Vibration from the drills and plants will cause distress to animals and birds. There are a significant number of residents who work from home, and as such require an element of peace to undertake their everyday tasks. Severe vibration will potentially create damage to the foundations of properties across the REDACTED | 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_0182_001_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   |                        | 3.1                          | The cable routing crosses active agricultural production land. This route is clarified as Grade 2 and so regarded as the Best and Most Versatile land (BMV). The proposed alternative routing appears to exacerbate the detrimental effect further as a greater extent of priority habitat and grade 2 classified land is encompassed in the cable corridor.<br>3.1 Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions (see volume 3, chapter 1 of our PEIR)<br>See paragraph under Q3   | 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). 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. |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| TA_0182_008_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   |                        | 3.8                          | The area around REDACTED is extremely quiet and any works to the degree suggested by this proposal will have a significant impact and potentially cause damage to 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).<br>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). |

### Hydrology and flood risk

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
| TA_0177_002_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.2                          | There are already substantial amounts of flooding in the fields, this concerns residents greatly that any construction work will have adverse effects. Wrea Brook is frequently at full capacity, with the feeder ditches then taking the strain of water. This affects all properties in our community but has a direct impact on REDACTED.<br>The fields that are targeted for construction also double up as floodplains and are underwater for approximately one hundred days per year. Many times during the year the land is too wet to access with farm vehicles, therefore heavy plant and construction traffic will struggle. Any traffic entering the highway after being in the fields will leave dangerous amounts of mud and soil on the public highway, causing danger to drivers and cyclists. | 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).<br>Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2).<br>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_0177_012_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.3                          | Biodiversity net gain is seen as legitimising the carving up of the landscape, however, surely this should not be seen as justifiable.<br>The area in question is farmland, we cannot afford to diminish the use of farmland for crops, once the land has been disturbed it will take years to regain the biodiversity to enable a farmer to continue successfully growing crops. As a nation, we need to do more to support growers of arable crops to continue to feed our nation.<br>The proposed route will affect other aspects of concern caused by climate change, including flooding.   | 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.<br>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.<br>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).<br>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).<br>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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction. |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| TA_0179_002_160424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.2                          | <p>There are already substantial amounts of flooding in the fields, this concerns residents greatly that any construction work will have adverse effects. Wrea Brook is frequently at full capacity, with the feeder ditches then taking the strain of water. This affects all properties in our community but has a direct impact on REDACTED</p> <p>The fields that are targeted for construction also double up as floodplains and are underwater for approximately one hundred days per year. Many times during the year the land is too wet to access with farm vehicles, therefore heavy plant and construction traffic will struggle. Any traffic entering the highway after being in the fields will leave dangerous amounts of mud and soil on the public highway, causing danger to drivers and cyclists.</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 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_0179_011_160424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.3                          | <p>Biodiversity net gain is seen as legitimising the carving up of the landscape, however, surely this should not be seen as justifiable. The area in question is farmland, we cannot afford to diminish the use of farmland for crops, once the land has been disturbed it will take years to regain the biodiversity to enable a farmer to continue successfully growing crops. As a nation, we need to do more to support growers of arable crops to continue to feed our nation.</p> <p>The proposed route will affect other aspects of concern caused by climate change, including flooding.</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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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> <p>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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction.</p> |
| TA_0180_002_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.2                          | <p>There are already substantial amounts of flooding in the fields, this concerns residents greatly that any construction work will have adverse effects. Wrea Brook is frequently at full capacity, with the feeder ditches then taking the strain of water. This affects all properties in our community but has a direct impact on REDACTED.</p> <p>The fields that are targeted for construction also double up as floodplains and are underwater for approximately one hundred days per year. Many times during the year the land is too wet to access with farm vehicles, therefore heavy plant and construction traffic will struggle. Any traffic entering the highway after being in the fields will leave dangerous amounts of mud and soil on the public highway, causing danger to drivers and cyclists.</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 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_0180_012_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.3                          | <p>Biodiversity net gain is seen as legitimising the carving up of the landscape, however, surely this should not be seen as justifiable.</p> <p>The area in question is farmland, we cannot afford to diminish the use of farmland for crops, once the land has been disturbed it will take years to</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,</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | regain the biodiversity to enable a farmer to continue successfully growing crops. As a nation, we need to do more to support growers of arable crops to continue to feed our nation.<br>The proposed route will affect other aspects of concern caused by climate change, including flooding.  | and to develop the design, to allow the maximum benefit to biodiversity within the parameters of the project.<br>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.<br>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).<br>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).<br>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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction. |
| TA_0181_002_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.2                          | There are already substantial amounts of flooding in the fields, this concerns residents greatly that any construction work will have adverse effects. Wrea Brook is frequently at full capacity, with the feeder ditches then taking the strain of water. This affects all properties in our community but has a direct impact on REDACTED.<br>The fields that are targeted for construction also double up as floodplains and are underwater for approximately one hundred days per year. Many times during the year the land is too wet to access with farm vehicles, therefore heavy plant and construction traffic will struggle. Any traffic entering the highway after being in the fields will leave dangerous amounts of mud and soil on the public highway, causing danger to drivers and cyclists. | 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).<br>Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2).<br>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_0181_012_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.3                          | Biodiversity net gain is seen as legitimising the carving up of the landscape, however, surely this should not be seen as justifiable.<br>The area in question is farmland, we cannot afford to diminish the use of farmland for crops, once the land has been disturbed it will take years to regain the biodiversity to enable a farmer to continue successfully growing crops. As a nation, we need to do more to support growers of arable crops to continue to feed our nation.<br>The proposed route will affect other aspects of concern caused by climate change, including flooding.   | 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.<br>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.<br>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).<br>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).<br>This includes the preparation of a Soil Management Plan in general  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              |  | accordance with the Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference: J1.7), which has been submitted with the application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction.  |
| TA_0182_002_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   |                        | 3.2                          | Grave concerns over flooding which already directly affects our property and the access roads. The targeted fields surrounding the properties currently act as flood plains and are underwater for a 100 days/year. Construction traffic is not suitable for the access roads. | 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_0182_012_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   |                        | 4.3                          | Disturbance to farmland for crops will have a huge impact on the biodiversity, and the already flooded areas will be further impacted.   | 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.<br>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.<br>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).<br>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 application for development consent.<br>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_0182_019_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   |                        | Annex 1b Q2                  | The proposed changes may be classed as "minor" but the environmental impacts on the farmlands surrounding, and dwellings at, REDACTED are major and our comments and feedback on the changes are extensive – as noted in the enclosed statutory consultation feedback form.    | Detailed assessments are 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  |

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

**Onshore ecology and nature conservation**

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
| TA_0177_001_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.1                          | The cable routing crosses active agricultural production land. This route is classified as Grade 2 and so regarded as the Best and Most Versatile land (BMV).<br>The proposed alternative routing appears to exacerbate the detrimental effect further as a greater extent of priority habitat and grade 2 classified land is encompassed in the cable corridor.  | 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.<br>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).<br>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. |
| TA_0177_003_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.3                          | The cable route will disturb many sensitive habitats such as the following.<br>Great numbers of these animals reside in the fields and hedgerows around REDACTED - photos are attached.<br>Deer<br>Hares<br>Rabbits<br>Bats<br>Hedgehogs<br>Voles<br>Dormouse<br>Lizards<br>Snakes<br>Newts<br>In addition to insects like beetles, ladybirds etc etc   | 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.<br>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)   |
| TA_0177_008_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.8                          | Given that the construction will predominantly occur in rural areas characterised by comparatively low background noise levels, there is an increased likelihood of noise disturbance originating from the development. Any assessment of noise disturbance should prioritise its effect on residential amenities, rather than relying on higher WHO thresholds primarily designed to gauge the potential impact on human health.<br>Vibration from the drills and plants will cause distress to animals and birds.<br>There are a significant number of residents who work from home, and as such require an element of peace to undertake their everyday tasks. Severe vibration will potentially create damage to the foundations of | 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).<br>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).  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | properties across the REDACTED   |   |
| TA_0177_010_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.1                          | Fylde has a flat, rolling, rural character interspersed with limited tree cover (the area of tree cover has been identified as falling within the lowest 10% of all English local authority administrative areas). The visual impact of the work will be significant.<br>Some of the properties have extensive views of the surrounding area, which is an area of outstanding beauty. Properties with these views command a higher price which all eight residents have paid. This disruption in views will significantly impact the everyday living of residents, their health and well-being, the wildlife and also the property prices. | 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_0177_012_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.3                          | Biodiversity net gain is seen as legitimising the carving up of the landscape, however, surely this should not be seen as justifiable.<br>The area in question is farmland, we cannot afford to diminish the use of farmland for crops, once the land has been disturbed it will take years to regain the biodiversity to enable a farmer to continue successfully growing crops. As a nation, we need to do more to support growers of arable crops to continue to feed our nation.<br>The proposed route will affect other aspects of concern caused by climate change, including flooding.  | 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.<br>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.<br>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).<br>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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction. |
| TA_0177_015_110424          | S44     | Email           | 13                     |                              | As already mentioned - biodiversity net gain is seen as legitimising the carving up of the landscape, however, surely this should not be seen as justifiable.<br>The area in question is farmland divided by hedgerows, we cannot afford to diminish the use of farmland for crops, once the land has been disturbed it will take years to regain the biodiversity to enable a farmer to continue successfully growing crops.  | 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.<br>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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              |   | <p>to existing plans and programmes, both within and outside the Onshore Order Limits.</p> <p>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> <p>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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction.</p> |
| TA_0177_018_110424          | S44     | Email           | 16                     |                              | <p>Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REG-REDACTED</p> <p>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great.</p> <p>The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered.</p> <p>The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected. Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents.</p> <p>Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will impact negatively wildlife and hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has.</p> | <p>The Applicants will work with agricultural landowners to mitigate impacts on farm holdings. Impacts on hedgerows will be minimised where possible.</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 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> <p>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_0177_020_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | Annex 1b Q2                  | <p>The impact on the environment is as above - it is not lessened with the new proposal.</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_0177_021_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | Annex 1b Q3                  | <p>Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REG-REDACTED</p> <p>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great.</p> <p>The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered, and at the worst to the original route.</p> <p>The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected. Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents.</p> <p>Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will impact negatively wildlife and</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, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects.</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has.<br>The tracks are in a poor state of disrepair and not suitable for heavy plant.<br>The community struggles with the maintenance of the public roads and we cannot approve any projects that causes more damage.   | Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets are provided in Volume 1, Annex 5.3: Commitments register of the ES (document reference F1.5.3).<br>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).<br>The access being discussed in this response is an operational access which will include light vehicular ad-hoc use through the operational phase of the Project.   |
| TA_0179_001_160424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.1                          | The cable routing crosses active agricultural production land. This route is classified as Grade 2 and so regarded as the Best and Most Versatile land (BMV).<br>The proposed alternative routing set out in the Targeted Consultation at ECC.1.001 appears to exacerbate the detrimental effect further as a greater extent of priority habitat and grade 2 classified land is encompassed in the cable corridor. The amendment requires two cable corridors rather than one!<br>Surely this is not in the best interest of the environment! | 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.<br>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).<br>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. |
| TA_0179_003_160424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.3                          | The cable route will disturb many sensitive habitats such as the following.<br>Great numbers of these animals reside in the fields and hedgerows around<br>REDACTED<br>Deer<br>Hares<br>Rabbits<br>Bats<br>Hedgehogs<br>Voles<br>Dormouse<br>In addition to insects like beetles, ladybirds,  | 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.<br>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)   |
| TA_0179_007_160424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.8                          | Vibration from the drills and plant machinery will cause distress to animals and birds.<br>There are a significant number of residents who work from home, and as such require an element of peace to undertake their everyday tasks.<br>Severe vibration and the proposed proximity of the re-routed cable corridor will potentially create damage to the foundations of properties across the REDACTED.   | 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).<br>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_0179_009_160424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.1                          | The visual impact of the work will be significant.<br>Some of the properties have extensive views of the surrounding area, which is an area of outstanding beauty. Properties with these views command a higher price which all eight residents have paid. This disruption in views will  | 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,  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | significantly impact the everyday living of residents, their health and well-being, the wildlife and also the property prices.   | 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_0179_011_160424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.3                          | Biodiversity net gain is seen as legitimising the carving up of the landscape, however, surely this should not be seen as justifiable. The area in question is farmland, we cannot afford to diminish the use of farmland for crops, once the land has been disturbed it will take years to regain the biodiversity to enable a farmer to continue successfully growing crops. As a nation, we need to do more to support growers of arable crops to continue to feed our nation.<br>The proposed route will affect other aspects of concern caused by climate change, including flooding. | 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.<br>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.<br>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).<br>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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction. |
| TA_0179_013_160424          | S44     | Email           | 13                     |                              | As already mentioned - biodiversity net gain is seen as legitimising the carving up of the landscape, however, surely this should not be seen as justifiable.<br>The area in question is farmland divided by hedgerows, we cannot afford to diminish the use of farmland for crops, once the land has been disturbed it will take years to regain the biodiversity to enable a farmer to continue successfully growing crops.  | 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.<br>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.<br>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).<br>Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are provided in section 6.8   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              |  | 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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction.   |
| TA_0179_016_160424          | S44     | Email           | 16                     |                              | Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REG-0077 - REDACTED<br>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great.<br>The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered.<br>The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected. Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents. Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will negatively impact wildlife and hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has. | The Applicants will work with agricultural landowners to mitigate impacts on farm holdings. Impacts on hedgerows will be minimised where possible.<br>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).<br>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).<br>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_0180_001_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.1                          | The cable routing crosses active agricultural production land. This route is classified as Grade 2 and so regarded as the Best and Most Versatile land (BMV).<br>The proposed alternative routing appears to exacerbate the detrimental effect further as a greater extent of priority habitat and grade 2 classified land is encompassed in the cable corridor.   | 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.<br>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).<br>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. |
| TA_0180_003_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.3                          | The cable route will disturb many sensitive habitats such as the following.<br>Great numbers of these animals reside in the fields and hedgerows around REDACTED - photos are attached.<br>Deer<br>Hares<br>Rabbits<br>Bats<br>Hedgehogs<br>Voles  | 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.<br>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)   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | Dormouse<br>Lizards<br>Snakes<br>Newts<br>In addition to insects like beetles, ladybirds etc etc   |  |
| TA_0180_008_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.8                          | Given that the construction will predominantly occur in rural areas characterised by comparatively low background noise levels, there is an increased likelihood of noise disruption originating from the development. Any assessment of noise disturbance should prioritise its effect on residential amenities, rather than relying on higher WHO thresholds primarily designed to gauge the potential impact on human health. Vibration from the drills and plants will cause distress to animals and birds.<br>There are a significant number of residents who work from home, and as such require an element of peace to undertake their everyday tasks. Severe vibration will potentially create damage to the foundations of properties across REDACTED | 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).<br>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_0180_010_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.1                          | Fylde has a flat, rolling, rural character interspersed with limited tree cover (the area of tree cover has been identified as falling within the lowest 10% of all English local authority administrative areas). The visual impact of the work will be significant.<br>Some of the properties have extensive views of the surrounding area, which is an area of outstanding beauty. Properties with these views command a higher price which all eight residents have paid. This disruption in views will significantly impact the everyday living of residents, their health and well-being, the wildlife and also the property prices.   | 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_0180_012_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.3                          | Biodiversity net gain is seen as legitimising the carving up of the landscape, however, surely this should not be seen as justifiable. The area in question is farmland, we cannot afford to diminish the use of farmland for crops, once the land has been disturbed it will take years to regain the biodiversity to enable a farmer to continue successfully growing crops. As a nation, we need to do more to support growers of arable crops to continue to feed our nation.<br>The proposed route will affect other aspects of concern caused by climate change, including flooding.   | 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.<br>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.<br>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).<br>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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              |  | Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction.  |
| TA_0180_015_170424          | S44     | Email           | 13                     |                              | As already mentioned - biodiversity net gain is seen as legitimising the carving up of the landscape, however, surely this should not be seen as justifiable.<br>The area in question is farmland divided by hedgerows, we cannot afford to diminish the use of farmland for crops, once the land has been disturbed it will take years to regain the biodiversity to enable a farmer to continue successfully growing crops.  | 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.<br>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.<br>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).<br>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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction. |
| TA_0180_018_170424          | S44     | Email           | 16                     |                              | Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REDACTED<br>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great.<br>The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered.<br>The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected. Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents.<br>Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will impact negatively wildlife and hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has. | The Applicants will work with agricultural landowners to mitigate impacts on farm holdings. Impacts on hedgerows will be minimised where possible.<br>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).<br>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).<br>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_0180_019_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | Annex 1b Q2                  | The impact on the environment is as above - it is not lessened with the new proposal.  | Detailed assessments are 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.  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              |   | Mitigation measures adopted 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_0180_020_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | Annex 1b Q3                  | <p>Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REG-REDACTED</p> <p>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great.</p> <p>The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered, and at the worst to the original route.</p> <p>The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected.</p> <p>Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents.</p> <p>Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will impact negatively wildlife and hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has.</p> <p>The tracks are in a poor state of disrepair and not suitable for heavy plant.</p> <p>The community struggles with the maintenance of the public roads and we cannot approve any projects that causes more damage.</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, mitigation measures have been developed to primarily avoid, then prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental effects.</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>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> <p>The access being discussed in this response is an operational access which will include light vehicular ad-hoc use through the operational phase of the Project.</p> |
| TA_0181_001_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.1                          | <p>The cable routing crosses active agricultural production land. This route is classified as Grade 2 and so regarded as the Best and Most Versatile land (BMV).</p> <p>The proposed alternative routing appears to exacerbate the detrimental effect further as a greater extent of priority habitat and grade 2 classified land is encompassed in the cable corridor.</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.</p> <p>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).</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). These measures seek to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.</p>  |
| TA_0181_003_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.3                          | <p>The cable route will disturb many sensitive habitats such as the following.</p> <p>Great numbers of these animals reside in the fields and hedgerows around REDACTED.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deer</li> <li>Hares</li> <li>Rabbits</li> <li>Bats</li> <li>Hedgehogs</li> <li>Voles</li> <li>Dormouse</li> <li>Grass Snakes</li> <li>Slow Worms</li> </ul>   | <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.</p> <p>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 | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | Lizards<br>In addition to insects like beetles, ladybirds,  |   |
| TA_0181_008_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.8                          | Given that the construction will predominantly occur in rural areas characterised by comparatively low background noise levels, there is an increased likelihood of noise disruption originating from the development. Any assessment of noise disturbance should prioritise its effect on residential amenities, rather than relying on higher WHO thresholds primarily designed to gauge the potential impact on human health. Vibration from the drills and plants will cause distress to animals and birds. There are a significant number of residents who work from home, and as such require an element of peace to undertake their everyday tasks. Severe vibration will potentially create damage to the foundations of properties across the REDACTED | 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_0181_010_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.1                          | Fylde has a flat, rolling, rural character interspersed with limited tree cover (the area of tree cover has been identified as falling within the lowest 10% of all English local authority administrative areas). The visual impact of the work will be significant.<br>Some of the properties have extensive views of the surrounding area, which is an area of outstanding beauty. Properties with these views command a higher price which all eight residents have paid. This disruption in views will significantly impact the everyday living of residents, their health and well-being, the wildlife and also the property prices.  | 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_0181_012_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.3                          | Biodiversity net gain is seen as legitimising the carving up of the landscape, however, surely this should not be seen as justifiable. The area in question is farmland, we cannot afford to diminish the use of farmland for crops, once the land has been disturbed it will take years to regain the biodiversity to enable a farmer to continue successfully growing crops. As a nation, we need to do more to support growers of arable crops to continue to feed our nation.<br>The proposed route will affect other aspects of concern caused by climate change, including flooding.  | 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.<br>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.<br>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).<br>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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction. |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
| TA_0181_014_170424          | S44     | Email           | 13                     |                              | <p>As already mentioned - biodiversity net gain is seen as legitimising the carving up of the landscape, however, surely this should not be seen as justifiable.</p> <p>The area in question is farmland divided by hedgerows, we cannot afford to diminish the use of farmland for crops, once the land has been disturbed it will take years to regain the biodiversity to enable a farmer to continue successfully growing crops.</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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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> <p>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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction.</p> |
| TA_0181_014_170427          | S44     | Email           | 16                     |                              | <p>Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REDACTED</p> <p>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great.</p> <p>The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered.</p> <p>The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected. Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents.</p> <p>Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will impact negatively wildlife and hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has.</p> | <p>The Applicants will work with agricultural landowners to mitigate impacts on farm holdings. Impacts on hedgerows will be minimised where possible.</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 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> <p>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_0182_001_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   |                        | 3.1                          | <p>The cable routing crosses active agricultural production land. This route is clarified as Grade 2 and so regarded as the Best and Most Versatile land (BMV).</p> <p>The proposed alternative routing appears to exacerbate the detrimental effect further as a greater extent of priority habitat and grade 2 classified land is encompassed in the cable corridor.</p> <p>3.1 Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions (see volume 3, chapter</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.</p> <p>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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | 1 of our PEIR)<br>See paragraph under Q3   | 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).<br>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.  |
| TA_0182_003_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   |                        | 3.3                          | 3.3 Onshore ecology and nature conservation (see volume 3, chapter 3 of our PEIR)<br>Disturbance of deer, hares, rabbits, bats, hedgehogs, voles, dormouse and multiple insects – beetles, ladybirds etc.          | 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.<br>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)   |
| TA_0182_012_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   |                        | 4.3                          | Disturbance to farmland for crops will have a huge impact on the biodiversity, and the already flooded areas will be further impacted.   | 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.<br>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.<br>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).<br>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 application for development consent.<br>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).<br>Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2).<br>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_0182_014_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   | 13                     |                              | We feel that the proposed Biodiversity Net gain is not justifiable due to the BMW farmland which is divided by hedgerows, and once disturbed will take many years to regain to enable successful growing of crops. | 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,  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              |  | <p>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>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.</p> <p>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> <p>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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction.</p> |

### Onshore and intertidal ornithology

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
| TA_0177_004_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.4                          | The proposed alternative route at REDACTED is widely acknowledged as having priority species on the land namely:<br>Shelducks<br>Lapwings<br>Corn Bunting<br>Linnets 900+<br>Migrating Geese<br>Collard Plover<br>Curlews<br>Oyster Catchers<br>Pheasants<br>Barn Owls<br>Little Owls | 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).<br>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).<br>Both the ES and the ISAA consider construction impacts, including impacts on functionally linked land. |
| TA_0179_004_160424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.4                          | The proposed alternative route at REDACTED is widely acknowledged as having priority species on the land namely:<br>Lapwings<br>Corn Bunting<br>Linnets 900+<br>Migrating Geese   | 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).<br>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).   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | Collard Plover<br>Curlews<br>Oyster Catchers<br>Pheasants<br>Barn Owls<br>Little Owls   | Both the ES and the ISAA consider construction impacts, including impacts on functionally linked land.   |
| TA_0180_004_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.4                          | 3.4 Onshore and intertidal ornithology<br>The proposed alternative route at REDACTED is widely acknowledged as having priority species on the land namely:<br>Shelducks<br>Lapwings<br>Corn Bunting<br>Linnets 900+<br>Migrating Geese<br>Collard Plover<br>Curlews<br>Oyster Catchers<br>Pheasants<br>Barn Owls<br>Little Owls | The ES includes an assessment of the Transmission Assets 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). Both the ES and the ISAA consider construction impacts, including impacts on functionally linked land. |
| TA_0181_004_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.4                          | 3.4 Onshore and intertidal ornithology<br>The proposed alternative route at REDACTED is widely acknowledged as having priority species on the land namely:<br>Lapwings<br>Corn Bunting<br>Linnets 900+<br>Migrating Geese<br>Collard Plover<br>Curlews<br>Oyster Catchers<br>Pheasants<br>Barn Owls<br>Little Owls              | The ES includes an assessment of the Transmission Assets 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). Both the ES and the ISAA consider construction impacts, including impacts on functionally linked land. |
| TA_0182_004_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   |                        | 3.4                          | 3.4 Onshore and intertidal ornithology (see volume 3, chapter 4 of our PEIR)<br>Disturbance of priority species; lapwing, corn bunting, linnets, geese, collard plover, curlews, oyster catchers, pheasants, barn owl, little owl.  | The ES includes an assessment of the Transmission Assets 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). Both the ES and the ISAA consider construction impacts, including impacts on functionally linked land. |

## Historic environment

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
| TA_0177_005_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.5                          | While this is not a typical historic area, the rolling hills around our community draw visitors in from across the UK and beyond. The devastating effect the cable corridor will have on visitor numbers will affect the local economy of Kirkham, Wrea Green, Freckleton, Lytham and Warton. There are significant numbers of businesses that rely on the tourism trade. | 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 ES (document reference F3.5). Potential indirect impacts on tourism associated with potential changes |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              |  | 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_0177_013_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.4                          | <p>The project will have a variety of negative socio economic impacts, which are important to consider alongside the benefits of renewable energy production. Here are some potential negative impacts:</p> <p>Visual Impact and Aesthetics: the cable corridor, work and sub stations will have an impact on the visual landscape of rural areas, impacting the scenic beauty and potentially affecting tourism and property values. People will find large wind farms visually intrusive and disruptive to the natural environment.</p> <p>Property Values: There is evidence to suggest that the work will and can lower nearby property values. Concerns about noise, aesthetics, and perceived impacts on health can reduce the desirability of properties near wind farms, leading to potential economic losses for property owners.</p> <p>Tourism and Recreation: Our rural areas rely on tourism and outdoor recreation for economic activity. The presence of large wind farms might deter tourists who come to rural areas seeking untouched natural landscapes or peaceful surroundings, impacting local businesses like hotels, restaurants, and shops.</p> <p>Employment and Local Economy: While the Project can create jobs during the construction phase, the long-term employment impact might be limited. Maintenance and operations of wind farms often require specialized skills that might not benefit the local workforce. Additionally, if the wind farm is owned by external companies, much of the revenue generated might not circulate within the local economy.</p> <p>Community Disruption: The Project will lead to social tensions within local communities. Some residents might support the project due to potential economic benefits, while others might oppose it due to concerns about aesthetics, noise, or perceived impacts on health. This can lead to divisions within communities and strain social cohesion.</p> <p>Impact on Agriculture: The Project will occupy significant land area, potentially displacing agricultural activities. This might affect local farmers and agriculture-related businesses. Moreover, construction and maintenance activities can disrupt farming operations and access to farmland.</p> <p>Infrastructure Costs: The Project to even be considered will impact remote rural areas that might require significant investment in new or upgraded infrastructure, such as roads, power lines, and substations. These costs might be borne by the local community or government, impacting public finances and resources.</p> <p>Cultural and Heritage Impact: Some wind farm developments might encroach upon culturally significant or protected areas, impacting local heritage and traditions. This can have intangible socioeconomic costs related to community identity and well-being.</p> <p>Addressing these potential negative impacts requires careful planning, community engagement, and consideration of broader socioeconomic factors. Strategies such as community consultation, fair compensation for affected parties, and investments in local infrastructure and skills</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). Specifically, socio-economic impacts are set out in section 2.11 of Volume 4, Chapter 2: Socio-economics of the ES (document reference F4.2). 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 Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F1.5.1). 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> <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:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (<a href="http://www.gov.uk">www.gov.uk</a>)<br/>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  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | development can help mitigate these impacts and maximize the benefits of renewable energy projects in rural areas.  |   |
| TA_0180_005_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.5                          | While this is not a typical historic area, the rolling hills around our community draw visitors in from across the UK and beyond. The devastating effect the cable corridor will have on visitor numbers will affect the local economy of Kirkham, Wrea Green, Freckleton, Lytham and Warton. There are significant numbers of businesses that rely on the tourism trade.   | 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 ES (document reference F3.5). 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_0180_013_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.4                          | <p><b>4.4 Socio-economics</b></p> <p>The project will have a variety of negative socio economic impacts, which are important to consider alongside the benefits of renewable energy production. Here are some potential negative impacts:</p> <p><b>Visual Impact and Aesthetics:</b> the cable corridor, work and sub stations will have an impact on the visual landscape of rural areas, impacting the scenic beauty and potentially affecting tourism and property values. People will find large wind farms visually intrusive and disruptive to the natural environment.</p> <p><b>Property Values:</b> There is evidence to suggest that the work will and can lower nearby property values. Concerns about noise, aesthetics, and perceived impacts on health can reduce the desirability of properties near wind farms, leading to potential economic losses for property owners.</p> <p><b>Tourism and Recreation:</b> Our rural areas rely on tourism and outdoor recreation for economic activity. The presence of large wind farms might deter tourists who come to rural areas seeking untouched natural landscapes or peaceful surroundings, impacting local businesses like hotels, restaurants, and shops.</p> <p><b>Employment and Local Economy:</b> While the Project can create jobs during the construction phase, the long-term employment impact might be limited. Maintenance and operations of wind farms often require specialized skills that might not benefit the local workforce. Additionally, if the wind farm is owned by external companies, much of the revenue generated might not circulate within the local economy.</p> <p><b>Community Disruption:</b> The Project will lead to social tensions within local communities. Some residents might support the project due to potential economic benefits, while others might oppose it due to concerns about aesthetics, noise, or perceived impacts on health. This can lead to divisions within communities and strain social cohesion.</p> <p><b>Impact on Agriculture:</b> The Project will occupy significant land area, potentially displacing agricultural activities. This might affect local farmers and agriculture-related businesses. Moreover, construction and maintenance activities can disrupt farming operations and access to farmland.</p> <p><b>Infrastructure Costs:</b> The Project to even be considered will impact remote rural areas that might require significant investment in new or upgraded infrastructure, such as roads, power lines, and substations.</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). Specifically, socio-economic impacts are set out in section 2.11 of Volume 4, Chapter 2: Socio-economics of the ES (document reference F4.2). 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 Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F1.5.1). 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. 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. |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | <p>These costs might be borne by the local community or government, impacting public finances and resources.</p> <p>Cultural and Heritage Impact: Some wind farm developments might encroach upon culturally significant or protected areas, impacting local heritage and traditions. This can have intangible socioeconomic costs related to community identity and well-being.</p> <p>Addressing these potential negative impacts requires careful planning, community engagement, and consideration of broader socioeconomic factors. Strategies such as community consultation, fair compensation for affected parties, and investments in local infrastructure and skills development can help mitigate these impacts and maximize the benefits of renewable energy projects in rural areas.</p> |   |
| TA_0181_005_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.5                          | <p>While this is not a typical historic area, the rolling hills around our community draw visitors in from across the UK and beyond. The devastating effect the cable corridor will have on visitor numbers will affect the local economy of Kirkham, Wrea Green, Freckleton, Lytham and Warton. There are significant numbers of businesses that rely on the tourism trade.</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 ES (document reference F3.5).</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> |
| TA_0182_005_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   |                        | 3.5                          | <p>Beautiful countryside will be disturbed; this may affect tourism and visitors bringing trade to the area.</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 ES (document reference F3.5).</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> |

### Land use and recreation

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
| TA_0172_001_200324          | S44     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | <p>Further to your previous correspondence, I have spoken with my client, REDACTED, in relation to their land holding off REDACTED.</p> | <p>Following route refinement, Dalcour McLaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms to</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | <p>I have attached a screenshot of the targeted consultation plan which identifies the slight movement/reduction of the working width for Morgan and Morecambe, but also the introduction of the Morecambe onshore ECC temporary construction compound to the land to the south-west. Given that my client is potentially burdened with the access road to the north of the land that has effectively got a small triangle of land to the north of the Morgan onshore ECC and Hillock Lane, this could be described as a redundant severed parcel of land if the cable comes through and therefore your client should consider taking this area as compound area which provides access directly off Hillock Lane. I believe that the post-consultation amended is identified as TCC.1.002.</p> <p>Maybe you will put forward this proposal to your clients. No other obvious matters arising other than below the proposed Morecambe temporary compound my client will be left with a small severed area to the south of which would not be able to be accessed and therefore all of my client's land holding REDACTED will be occupied by your clients causing major impacts on their farming operations going forward.</p>   | secure the rights for the compound which will include provisions for compensation of severed land and impact on farming operations.   |
| TA_0173_001_210324          | S44     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | <p>Further to your previous correspondence and the updated Statutory Consultation Period, I have taken the opportunity to download the plans and discuss the various changes with my client.</p> <p>I understand that the Morecambe offshore temporary compound construction is identified on my client's land REDACTED. Obviously, it still leaves an area to the north on the Morgan side of the cable route which is effectively severed. This provides useful access onto Hillock Lane and it would make sense for the Morgan compound to be located there.</p> <p>Other points to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design and route of the cable route now has severed an area of land completely to the south of the cable route which would require access off Hillock Lane, or alternatively become severed and dealt with under usual compensation matters. Please provide for an access road off Hillock Lane within your design drawings.</li> </ul>   | 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. |
| TA_0175_001_210324          | S44     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | <p>Further to our previous email correspondence I can confirm that I met with my clients on Wednesday afternoon to discuss the latest Targeted Statutory Consultation areas identified on the detailed maps and more specifically my client's affected area which are identified between Pages 33 to 36 of the detailed booklet.</p> <p>Overall my clients are pleased with the amendments showing the route which effectively now sits south of the overhead pylons. This will hopefully reduce the impact of the scheme on my client's land holding notwithstanding the fact that it will still have a major detrimental effect on my client's farm and farming operations but I am pleased and grateful for the project's revision of the route.</p> <p>My clients still have concerns and observations in relation to the shared operational access as highlighted reference OAR.1.005F and OAR.1.005G which on the legend is identified as shared operational access and operational access routes. My clients request better detailed plans and information of the extent of these routes. In addition, my client requires better and more detailed plans of the Morgan onshore temporary construction access which leads off Bryning Lane. The design of such impacts considerably on the important grassland field close to the farm buildings. No doubt you will report the findings and be able to answer the questions in due course.</p> | Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interest to show detail on the access routes and discuss Heads of Terms to secure the rights for the accesses.   |
| TA_0177_001_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.1                          | <p>The cable routing crosses active agricultural production land. This route is classified as Grade 2 and so regarded as the Best and Most Versatile land (BMV).</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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | The proposed alternative routing appears to exacerbate the detrimental effect further as a greater extent of priority habitat and grade 2 classified land is encompassed in the cable corridor.  | in section 6.6 and assessed in section 6.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Land use and recreation of the ES.<br>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.<br>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).<br>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.  |
| TA_0177_006_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.6                          | The public footpath that is used by residents of REDACTED is shown on the map within the proposed alternative route, showing that access to the site will be along this footpath from Huck Lane to Great Carrside Farm, this footpath is used by all residents and the project will create problems for families that use this for recreational walks into Lytham and surrounding areas.<br>Huck Lane is currently a Bridlepath used by walkers and horse riders, with an Equestrian Centre (Woodside Stables) at the end of Huck Lane. The proposed new alternative route will impact riders and their horses and create animal stress for such activities.<br>Wrea Brook Lane is used by residents for cycling, at present due to the heavy rain and mud, the lane is too dangerous to use for such activities. Any heavy plant will exacerbate this problem.  | 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_0177_013_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.4                          | The project will have a variety of negative socio economic impacts, which are important to consider alongside the benefits of renewable energy production. Here are some potential negative impacts:<br>Visual Impact and Aesthetics: the cable corridor, work and sub stations will have an impact on the visual landscape of rural areas, impacting the scenic beauty and potentially affecting tourism and property values. People will find large wind farms visually intrusive and disruptive to the natural environment.<br>Property Values: There is evidence to suggest that the work will and can lower nearby property values. Concerns about noise, aesthetics, and perceived impacts on health can reduce the desirability of properties near wind farms, leading to potential economic losses for property owners.<br>Tourism and Recreation: Our rural areas rely on tourism and outdoor recreation for economic activity. The presence of large wind farms might deter tourists who come to rural areas seeking untouched natural landscapes or peaceful surroundings, impacting local businesses like hotels, restaurants, and shops<br>Employment and Local Economy: While the Project can create jobs during the construction phase, the long-term employment impact might be limited. Maintenance and operations of wind farms often require specialized skills that might not benefit the local workforce. Additionally, if the wind farm is owned by external companies, much of the revenue generated might not circulate within the local economy.<br>Community Disruption: The Project will lead to social tensions within local communities. Some residents might support the project due to potential economic benefits, while others might oppose it due to concerns about aesthetics, noise, or perceived impacts on health. This can lead to divisions within communities and strain social cohesion. | Detailed assessments are 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, socio-economic impacts are set out in section 2.11 of Volume 4, Chapter 2: Socio-economics of the ES (document reference F4.2). 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 Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F1.5.1). 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.<br>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.<br>The UK Government has also produced or a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful: |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | <p>Impact on Agriculture: The Project will occupy significant land area, potentially displacing agricultural activities. This might affect local farmers and agriculture-related businesses. Moreover, construction and maintenance activities can disrupt farming operations and access to farmland.</p> <p>Infrastructure Costs: The Project to even be considered will impact remote rural areas that might require significant investment in new or upgraded infrastructure, such as roads, power lines, and substations. These costs might be borne by the local community or government, impacting public finances and resources.</p> <p>Cultural and Heritage Impact: Some wind farm developments might encroach upon culturally significant or protected areas, impacting local heritage and traditions. This can have intangible socioeconomic costs related to community identity and well-being.</p> <p>Addressing these potential negative impacts requires careful planning, community engagement, and consideration of broader socioeconomic factors. Strategies such as community consultation, fair compensation for affected parties, and investments in local infrastructure and skills development can help mitigate these impacts and maximize the benefits of renewable energy projects in rural areas.</p>   | <p>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>  |
| TA_0177_014_110424          | S44     | Email           | 7                      |                              | <p><b>Agriculture Land</b></p> <p>Agricultural activity in Fylde is characterised by a relatively large number of small agricultural holdings, as is the case at REDACTED, their contribution to the rural economy of Fylde is significant.</p> <p>The proposed cable alternative route crosses agricultural units that would therefore inevitably be subdivided during the construction phase. The width of the construction corridor will have a relatively greater impact on these smaller agricultural holdings than would be the case on larger farms, as the land taken during construction would be a proportionally greater percentage.</p> <p>In the longer term, cable easements would mean that the availability of land to site agricultural buildings would be restricted and would have an impact on the sustainability of individual businesses, the rural economy as a whole and ultimately the character of the wider rural area. The siting of access points to the cable joints would also potentially impact the efficiency of agricultural holdings. It is considered that greater consideration needs to be given to the routing of cables across individual agricultural holdings to prevent subdivision and loss of productive land.</p> <p>The proposed alternative route appears to split into two at Great Carr Side Farm – surely only one route should be necessary/required, to have two routes is completely obliterating there being any useable land! This is a further example of how the consultation on this project appears to be premature as the necessary design details that would allow more effective consultation are simply not available.</p> <p>The indicated width of the construction corridor is 122m. Much of this is accounted for by the proposed linear storage of topsoil and subsoil during construction. The utilisation of a series of top and subsoil storage areas could reduce the width of the construction corridor by approximately 40% and reduce the adverse impact not only on agricultural holdings but on ecology, and transport infrastructure and reduce the development footprint of the project as a whole.</p> <p>Finally on this point, as the majority of the agricultural land that the project crosses is regarded as BMV, if the project goes ahead, it is essential that the land be reinstated to a high quality that does not impact upon the long-term viability and sustainability of the individual agricultural units.</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. The final cable easement will restrict the ability to add additional buildings, but small nature of the holdings suggests the viability will naturally restrict the number of agricultural buildings per holding. 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> <p>The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found 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> <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 Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F3.6)</p> <p>Soil storage and management is set out in the relevant plan along with the code of construction practice. It is not good practice to mix soils from different holdings, but rather replace in the location it was excavated so as not to create biosecurity and waste transfer issues.</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              |  | Transporting soil to a single storage location would also significantly increase the volume of traffic movements.<br>All land will be reinstated to a minimum of the same condition post construction.  |
| TA_0177_018_110424          | S44     | Email           | 16                     |                              | <p>Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REG-REDACTED</p> <p>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great.</p> <p>The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered.</p> <p>The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected. Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents.</p> <p>Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will impact negatively wildlife and hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has.</p>  | <p>The Applicants will work with agricultural landowners to mitigate impacts on farm holdings. Impacts on hedgerows will be minimised where possible.</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_0178_001_140424          | S47     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | <p>As a client of REDACTED I am writing to express my alarm at the unsuitability of the proposed siting of the compound adjacent to the riding school and to urge you to reconsider the location</p> <p>I understand that the consultation period has ended but I have only recently become aware of your proposals and their implications for the riding school.</p> <p>I understand the need for wind power to meet our government's targets for clean energy, but the proposed location of the compound would have such a devastating effect on the riding school that it would force it to close completely. Horses are sensitive creatures and they would not be able to tolerate the noise and disruption which the compound would generate. The riding school is a highly regarded establishment within the equine industry and for over 40 years has been supporting a huge local community of riders, volunteers, students and staff, serving hundreds of clients, providing training and opportunities for young people, disabled riders, colleges and young people with mental health and behavioural challenges.</p> <p>For people like myself who have caring responsibilities for family members it provides weekly wellbeing which I could not do without.</p> <p>I urge you to take my points into consideration and find an alternative location.</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).</p> <p>Daclour Maclaren on behalf of the applicant will work with the interest to discuss mitigation measures for the construction phase.</p>   |
| TA_0179_001_160424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.1                          | <p>The cable routing crosses active agricultural production land. This route is classified as Grade 2 and so regarded as the Best and Most Versatile land (BMV).</p> <p>The proposed alternative routing set out in the Targeted Consultation at ECC.1.001 appears to exacerbate the detrimental effect further as a greater extent of priority habitat and grade 2 classified land is encompassed in the cable corridor. The amendment requires two cable corridors rather than one!</p> <p>Surely this is not in the best interest of the environment!</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.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>Details of the construction phase are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3:</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              |   | 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.   |
| TA_0179_005_160424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.6                          | The public footpath that is used by residents of the REDACTED is shown on the map within the proposed alternative route, showing that access to the site will be along this footpath from Huck Lane to Great Carrside Farm, this footpath is used by all residents and the project will create problems for families that use this for recreational walks into Lytham and surrounding areas. Huck Lane is currently a Bridlepath used by walkers and horse riders, with an Equestrian Centre (Woodside Stables) at the end of Huck Lane. The proposed new alternative route will impact riders and their horses and create animal stress for such activities.<br>Wrea Brook Lane is used by residents for cycling, at present due to the heavy rain and mud, the lane is too dangerous to use for such activities. Any heavy plant will exacerbate this problem. It cannot be stressed enough how unsuitable Wrea Brook Lane is for the proposed purpose you define as "Operational Access Route" . | 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_0179_012_160424          | S44     | Email           | 7                      |                              | Agriculture Land<br>The proposed alternative route appears to split into two at Great Carr Side Farm – surely only one route should be necessary/required, to have two routes is completely obliterating there being any useable land! This is a further example of how the consultation on this project appears to be premature as the necessary design details that would allow more effective consultation are simply not available. Furthermore, we have been advised that preliminary investigative works are due to start imminently, leading me to think that this further consultation is just a box ticking exercise, and your decision is already predetermined.  | The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).<br>Ongoing survey work is undertaken to assist in continued refinement of the design of the Transmission Assets.  |
| TA_0179_016_160424          | S44     | Email           | 16                     |                              | Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REG-0077 - REDACTED<br>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great.<br>The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered.<br>The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected. Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents. Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will negatively impact wildlife and hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has.  | The Applicants will work with agricultural landowners to mitigate impacts on farm holdings. Impacts on hedgerows will be minimised where possible.<br>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).<br>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).<br>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_0180_001_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.1                          | The cable routing crosses active agricultural production land. This route is classified as Grade 2 and so regarded as the Best and Most Versatile land (BMV).<br>The proposed alternative routing appears to exacerbate the detrimental effect further as a greater extent of priority habitat and grade 2 classified land is encompassed in the cable corridor.  | 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.<br>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.<br>Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              |   | 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).<br>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.   |
| TA_0180_006_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.6                          | The public footpath that is used by residents of REDACTED is shown on the map within the proposed alternative route, showing that access to the site will be along this footpath from Huck Lane to Great Carrside Farm, this footpath is used by all residents and the project will create problems for families that use this for recreational walks into Lytham and surrounding areas.<br>Huck Lane is currently a Bridlepath used by walkers and horse riders, with an Equestrian Centre (Woodside Stables) at the end of Huck Lane. The proposed new alternative route will impact riders and their horses and create animal stress for such activities.<br>Wrea Brook Lane is used by residents for cycling, at present due to the heavy rain and mud, the lane is too dangerous to use for such activities. Any heavy plant will exacerbate this problem.   | 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_0180_013_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.4                          | <b>4.4 Socio-economics</b><br>The project will have a variety of negative socio economic impacts, which are important to consider alongside the benefits of renewable energy production. Here are some potential negative impacts:<br><b>Visual Impact and Aesthetics:</b> the cable corridor, work and sub stations will have an impact on the visual landscape of rural areas, impacting the scenic beauty and potentially affecting tourism and property values. People will find large wind farms visually intrusive and disruptive to the natural environment.<br><b>Property Values:</b> There is evidence to suggest that the work will and can lower nearby property values. Concerns about noise, aesthetics, and perceived impacts on health can reduce the desirability of properties near wind farms, leading to potential economic losses for property owners.<br><b>Tourism and Recreation:</b> Our rural areas rely on tourism and outdoor recreation for economic activity. The presence of large wind farms might deter tourists who come to rural areas seeking untouched natural landscapes or peaceful surroundings, impacting local businesses like hotels, restaurants, and shops.<br><b>Employment and Local Economy:</b> While the Project can create jobs during the construction phase, the long-term employment impact might be limited. Maintenance and operations of wind farms often require specialized skills that might not benefit the local workforce. Additionally, if the wind farm is owned by external companies, much of the revenue generated might not circulate within the local economy.<br><b>Community Disruption:</b> The Project will lead to social tensions within local communities. Some residents might support the project due to potential economic benefits, while others might oppose it due to concerns about aesthetics, noise, or perceived impacts on health. This can lead to divisions within communities and strain social cohesion.<br><b>Impact on Agriculture:</b> The Project will occupy significant land area, potentially displacing agricultural activities. This might affect local farmers and agriculture-related businesses. Moreover, construction and maintenance activities can disrupt farming operations and access to farmland. | Detailed assessments are 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, socio-economic impacts are set out in section 2.11 of Volume 4, Chapter 2: Socio-economics of the ES (document reference F4.2). 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 Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F1.5.1). 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.<br>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.<br>The UK Government has also produced a series of plain English general guides to compulsory purchase and compensation which you may find useful:<br>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)<br>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  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | <p>Infrastructure Costs: The Project to even be considered will impact remote rural areas that might require significant investment in new or upgraded infrastructure, such as roads, power lines, and substations. These costs might be borne by the local community or government, impacting public finances and resources.</p> <p>Cultural and Heritage Impact: Some wind farm developments might encroach upon culturally significant or protected areas, impacting local heritage and traditions. This can have intangible socioeconomic costs related to community identity and well-being.</p> <p>Addressing these potential negative impacts requires careful planning, community engagement, and consideration of broader socioeconomic factors. Strategies such as community consultation, fair compensation for affected parties, and investments in local infrastructure and skills development can help mitigate these impacts and maximize the benefits of renewable energy projects in rural areas.</p>  |   |
| TA_0180_014_170424          | S44     | Email           | 7                      |                              | <p>Agriculture Land</p> <p>Agricultural activity in Fylde is characterised by a relatively large number of small agricultural holdings, as is the case at REDACTED, their contribution to the rural economy of Fylde is significant.</p> <p>The proposed cable alternative route crosses agricultural units that would therefore inevitably be subdivided during the construction phase. The width of the construction corridor will have a relatively greater impact on these smaller agricultural holdings than would be the case on larger farms, as the land taken during construction would be a proportionally greater percentage.</p> <p>In the longer term, cable easements would mean that the availability of land to site agricultural buildings would be restricted and would have an impact on the sustainability of individual businesses, the rural economy as a whole and ultimately the character of the wider rural area. The siting of access points to the cable joints would also potentially impact the efficiency of agricultural holdings. It is considered that greater consideration needs to be given to the routing of cables across individual agricultural holdings to prevent subdivision and loss of productive land.</p> <p>The proposed alternative route appears to split into two at Great Carr Side Farm – surely only one route should be necessary/required, to have two routes is completely obliterating there being any useable land! This is a further example of how the consultation on this project appears to be premature as the necessary design details that would allow more effective consultation are simply not available.</p> <p>The indicated width of the construction corridor is 122m. Much of this is accounted for by the proposed linear storage of topsoil and subsoil during construction. The utilisation of a series of top and subsoil storage areas could reduce the width of the construction corridor by approximately 40% and reduce the adverse impact not only on agricultural holdings but on ecology, and transport infrastructure and reduce the development footprint of the project as a whole.</p> <p>Finally on this point, as the majority of the agricultural land that the project crosses is regarded as BMV, if the project goes ahead, it is essential that the land be reinstated to a high quality that does not impact upon the long-term viability and sustainability of the individual agricultural units.</p> | <p>The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found 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> <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 Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F3.6)</p> |
| TA_0180_018_170424          | S44     | Email           | 16                     |                              | <p>Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REDACTED</p> <p>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great.</p> <p>The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered.</p> <p>The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it</p>   | <p>The Applicants will work with agricultural landowners to mitigate impacts on farm holdings. Impacts on hedgerows will be minimised where possible.</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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected. Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents. Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will impact negatively wildlife and hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has.   | 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_0180_020_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | Annex 1b Q1                  | As per the above, the amendments are not acceptable, they will further add stress to the estate/community. All of the above will be compounded as the proposed amendments are closer to our properties, use our existing road infrastructure and take over our community footpath. The whole estate will be alongside a building site, affecting the views and prices of our properties.   | The Transmission Assets has made design changes since the PEIR and have 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_0180_020_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | Annex 1b Q3                  | Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REG-REDACTED<br>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great. The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered, and at the worst to the original route. The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected. Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents. Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will impact negatively wildlife and hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has. The tracks are in a poor state of disrepair and not suitable for heavy plant. The community struggles with the maintenance of the public roads and we cannot approve any projects that causes more damage. | 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). 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 access being discussed in this response is an operational access which will include light vehicular ad-hoc use through the operational phase of the Project. |
| TA_0181_001_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.1                          | The cable routing crosses active agricultural production land. This route is classified as Grade 2 and so regarded as the Best and Most Versatile land (BMV). The proposed alternative routing appears to exacerbate the detrimental effect further as a greater extent of priority habitat and grade 2 classified land is encompassed in the cable corridor.  | 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  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              |  | 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).<br>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.   |
| TA_0181_006_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.6                          | The public footpath that is used by residents of the REDACTED is shown on the map within the proposed alternative route, showing that access to the site will be along this footpath from Huck Lane to Great Carr Side Farm, this footpath is used by all residents and the project will create problems for families that use this for recreational walks into Lytham and surrounding areas.<br>Huck Lane is currently a Bridle path used by walkers and horse riders, with an Equestrian Centre (Woodside Stables) at the end of Huck Lane. The proposed new alternative route will impact riders and their horses and create animal stress for such activities.<br>Wrea Brook Lane is used by residents for cycling, walking and running, at present due to the heavy rain and mud, the lane is too dangerous to use for such activities. Any heavy plant will exacerbate this problem.   | 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_0181_013_170424          | S44     | Email           | 7                      |                              | Agriculture Land<br>Agricultural activity in Fylde is characterised by a relatively large number of small agricultural holdings, as is the case at REDACTED, their contribution to the rural economy of Fylde is significant.<br>The proposed cable alternative route crosses agricultural units that would therefore inevitably be subdivided during the construction phase. The width of the construction corridor will have a relatively greater impact on these smaller agricultural holdings than would be the case on larger farms, as the land taken during construction would be a proportionally greater percentage.<br>In the longer term, cable easements would mean that the availability of land to site agricultural buildings would be restricted and would have an impact on the sustainability of individual businesses, the rural economy as a whole and ultimately the character of the wider rural area. The siting of access points to the cable joints would also potentially impact the efficiency of agricultural holdings. It is considered that greater consideration needs to be given to the routing of cables across individual agricultural holdings to prevent subdivision and loss of productive land.<br>The proposed alternative route appears to split into two at Great Carr Side Farm – surely only one route should be necessary/required, to have two routes is completely obliterating there being any useable land! This is a further example of how the consultation on this project appears to be premature as the necessary design details that would allow more effective consultation are simply not available.<br>The indicated width of the construction corridor is 122m. Much of this is accounted for by the proposed linear storage of topsoil and subsoil during construction. The utilisation of a series of top and subsoil storage areas could reduce the width of the construction corridor by approximately 40% and reduce the adverse impact not only on agricultural holdings but on ecology, and transport infrastructure and reduce the development footprint of the project as a whole. | The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).<br>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).<br>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 Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F3.6) |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | Finally on this point, as the majority of the agricultural land that the project crosses is regarded as BMV, if the project goes ahead, it is essential that the land be reinstated to a high quality that does not impact upon the long-term viability and sustainability of the individual agricultural units.  |   |
| TA_0181_014_170427          | S44     | Email           | 16                     |                              | <p>Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REDACTED</p> <p>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great.</p> <p>The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered.</p> <p>The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected. Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents.</p> <p>Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will impact negatively wildlife and hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has.</p> | <p>The Applicants will work with agricultural landowners to mitigate impacts on farm holdings. Impacts on hedgerows will be minimised where possible.</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 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> <p>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_0182_001_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   |                        | 3.1                          | <p>The cable routing crosses active agricultural production land. This route is clarified as Grade 2 and so regarded as the Best and Most Versatile land (BMV).</p> <p>The proposed alternative routing appears to exacerbate the detrimental effect further as a greater extent of priority habitat and grade 2 classified land is encompassed in the cable corridor.</p> <p>3.1 Geology, hydrogeology and ground conditions (see volume 3, chapter 1 of our PEIR)</p> <p>See paragraph under Q3</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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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> <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). These measures seek to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.</p> |
| TA_0182_006_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   |                        | 3.6                          | <p>Disruption of public footpaths, bridlepath, and lane for cycling – currently used by residents of REDACTED.</p>  | <p>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_0182_013_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   | 7                      |                              | <p>The proposed cable route will subdivide a number of small agricultural holdings in the construction phase, and the impact on smaller holdings will be much greater than on larger farms. The cable easements are of greater</p>  | <p>The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | concern to smaller holdings for the same reason.<br>We would request further information as to why specific proposals around REDACTED have been made as we feel the proposed alternative route in entirely inappropriate.   | engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found 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).<br>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). |
| TA_0182_019_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   |                        | Annex 1b Q2                  | The proposed changes may be classed as "minor" but the environmental impacts on the farmlands surrounding, and dwellings at, REDACTED are major and our comments and feedback on the changes are extensive – as noted in the enclosed statutory consultation feedback form. | Detailed assessments are 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).  |

## Traffic and Transport

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
| TA_0171_001_150324          | S44     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | Further to your previous correspondence, I have reviewed the documentation on behalf of my client, REDACTED who has his agricultural property on REDACTED, as identified on the sheet 6 of 40 within the Section 42 Minor Changes Detailed Map Book.<br>As you are more than aware, the cable route of both Morgan and Morecambe completely take out my client's land holding, he only owns 14 acres of land and your cable route takes out the majority of land. The only solace to my client was that his modern portal frame agricultural building and yard area was still operational and indeed my client has continued to improve and invest, most recently spending £150,000 in concrete yard and additional buildings. Yet, you have now highlighted a shared operation access to run through his yard, which effectively completely stops my client from farming and using the farm buildings for a health and safety, security and privacy issue.<br>We strongly rebut the use of the access through my client's land. If you are accessing the cable route, then you can continue to use the access track that is already there established that is within the Ownership of REDACTED, not through my client's land.<br>Please confirm receipt and confirmation that this access will be taken out and removed from your operational access requirements. | As set out in the Project Description chapter of the ES (Volume 1, Chapter 3), no construction is proposed for operational accesses (i.e. only a permanent right of access is being sought) for the onshore export cable corridor and 400kV grid connection cable corridor, and where possible, operational accesses have been identified using existing access routes or gates/ gaps in the hedgerows. They have been designed to be approximately 3.5 m in width and follow existing paths, where practicable. The width of operational accesses may vary in places, for example, to ensure alignment with the boundaries of existing access tracks. Operational access will be taken to undertake low-level non-intrusive routine inspections (for example, inspections of joint bays via link boxes), and can be expected on an infrequent annual basis. |
| TA_0173_001_210324          | S44     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | Further to your previous correspondence and the updated Statutory Consultation Period, I have taken the opportunity to download the plans and discuss the various changes with my client.   | Following route refinement, Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interests to discuss Heads of Terms to secure the   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | I understand that the Morecambe offshore temporary compound construction is identified on my client's land REDACTED. Obviously, it still leaves an area to the north on the Morgan side of the cable route which is effectively severed. This provides useful access onto Hillock Lane and it would make sense for the Morgan compound to be located there.<br>Other points to include:<br>• The design and route of the cable route now has severed an area of land completely to the south of the cable route which would require access off Hillock Lane, or alternatively become severed and dealt with under usual compensation matters. Please provide for an access road off Hillock Lane within your design drawings.  | rights for the compound which will include provisions for compensation of severed land and impact on farming operations.   |
| TA_0174_001_210324          | S44     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | Further to your previous correspondence, I have taken the opportunity to inspect the Targeted Statutory Consultation plans and discuss the contents of which with my clients.<br>I am conscious that the Targeted Statutory Consultation period closes on the 24th which doesn't leave a lot of time for feedback however my observations and comments are contained on the attached plan, but also to reiterate:<br>• The Targeted Consultation area in line with the original preliminary Environmental Information Report identified a small severed area to the south of Morecambe onshore temporary compound. This area would be completely severed and therefore IT would make more sense to use this within the compound area.<br>• The shared occupational access to the south of Ballam Road is rejected. You have already identified a shared access road adjoining the southern tip of the Morgan onshore temporary compound and this provides sufficient access to the working width. It is unpalatable for my client to lose and disrupt yet another field for a temporary access. Please remove this from the drawings.  | 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.  |
| TA_0175_001_210324          | S44     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | Further to our previous email correspondence I can confirm that I met with my clients on Wednesday afternoon to discuss the latest Targeted Statutory Consultation areas identified on the detailed maps and more specifically my client's affected area which are identified between Pages 33 to 36 of the detailed booklet.<br>Overall my clients are pleased with the amendments showing the route which effectively now sits south of the overhead pylons. This will hopefully reduce the impact of the scheme on my client's land holding notwithstanding the fact that it will still have a major detrimental effect on my client's farm and farming operations but I am pleased and grateful for the project's revision of the route. My clients still have concerns and observations in relation to the shared operational access as highlighted reference OAR.1.005F and OAR.1.005G which on the legend is identified as shared operational access and operational access routes. My clients request better detailed plans and information of the extent of these routes. In addition, my client requires better and more detailed plans of the Morgan onshore temporary construction access which leads off Bryning Lane. The design of such impacts considerably on the important grassland field close to the farm buildings. No doubt you will report the findings and be able to answer the questions in due course. | Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interest to show detail on the access routes and discuss Heads of Terms to secure the rights for the accesses.  |
| TA_0177_002_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.2                          | There are already substantial amounts of flooding in the fields, this concerns residents greatly that any construction work will have adverse effects. Wrea Brook is frequently at full capacity, with the feeder ditches then taking the strain of water. This affects all properties in our community but has a direct impact on REDACTED.<br>The fields that are targeted for construction also double up as floodplains and are underwater for approximately one hundred days per year. Many times during the year the land is too wet to access with farm vehicles, therefore heavy plant and construction traffic will struggle. Any traffic entering the highway after  | 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).<br>Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2).<br>An Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) has been prepared and submitted with the application for development |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | being in the fields will leave dangerous amounts of mud and soil on the public highway, causing danger to drivers and cyclists.  | consent. The Outline CoCP includes measures in relation to flood risk during the construction phase.  |
| TA_0177_007_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.7                          | <p>REDACTED is a narrow single track in extremely poor condition (photographs attached), during the summer there is grass growing in the middle of this road, which once wet becomes dangerous to drivers. The road is currently unsuitable to carry residential vehicles that use the road to access residential properties, this is due to the potholes caused by the heavy rain and the unstable road surface. Additional construction and heavy plants will destroy the road surface further, causing harm to vehicles using the road, please note that this is not through the road and the only means of access to eight residential properties. There are currently a limited number of passing places on REDACTED making this road unsuitable for construction vehicles. There are a significant number of vehicles that deliver and use the road that have unfortunately ended up in the run-off dykes, this is due to the slippery surface and the narrowness. Due to the revised route, it's apparent that multiple additional operational access roads are required further affecting the land, hedgerows, planting and wildlife.</p> <p>There is a section where access is required via a privately maintained road, although this road is owned by the REDACTED, it is maintained by the REDACTED, at great expense. This road is not suitable for the proposed use.</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. 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_0177_018_110424          | S44     | Email           | 16                     |                              | <p>Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REG-REDACTED</p> <p>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great. The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered. The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected. Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents. Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will impact negatively wildlife and hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has.</p>   | <p>The Applicants will work with agricultural landowners to mitigate impacts on farm holdings. Impacts on hedgerows will be minimised where possible. 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_0177_021_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | Annex 1b Q3                  | <p>Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REG-REDACTED</p> <p>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great. The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered, and at the worst to the original route. The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected. Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents. Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will impact negatively wildlife and hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has. The tracks are in a poor state of disrepair and not suitable for heavy plant. The community struggles with the maintenance of the public roads and we cannot approve any projects that causes more damage.</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). 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 access being discussed in this response is an operational access</p> |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              |  | which will include light vehicular ad-hoc use through the operational phase of the Project.   |
| TA_0179_002_160424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.2                          | <p>There are already substantial amounts of flooding in the fields, this concerns residents greatly that any construction work will have adverse effects. Wrea Brook is frequently at full capacity, with the feeder ditches then taking the strain of water. This affects all properties in our community but has a direct impact on REDACTED</p> <p>The fields that are targeted for construction also double up as floodplains and are underwater for approximately one hundred days per year. Many times during the year the land is too wet to access with farm vehicles, therefore heavy plant and construction traffic will struggle. Any traffic entering the highway after being in the fields will leave dangerous amounts of mud and soil on the public highway, causing danger to drivers and cyclists.</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 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_0179_005_160424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.6                          | <p>The public footpath that is used by residents of the REDACTED is shown on the map within the proposed alternative route, showing that access to the site will be along this footpath from Huck Lane to Great Carrside Farm, this footpath is used by all residents and the project will create problems for families that use this for recreational walks into Lytham and surrounding areas. Huck Lane is currently a Bridlepath used by walkers and horse riders, with an Equestrian Centre (Woodside Stables) at the end of Huck Lane. The proposed new alternative route will impact riders and their horses and create animal stress for such activities.</p> <p>Wrea Brook Lane is used by residents for cycling, at present due to the heavy rain and mud, the lane is too dangerous to use for such activities. Any heavy plant will exacerbate this problem. It cannot be stressed enough how unsuitable Wrea Brook Lane is for the proposed purpose you define as "Operational Access Route" .</p>   | <p>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_0179_006_160424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.7                          | <p>REDACTED is a narrow single track in extremely poor condition, during the summer there is grass growing in the middle of this road, which once wet becomes dangerous to drivers. The road is currently in such a [poor condition that it is almost unsuitable to carry residential vehicles that use the road to access residential properties, this is due to the pot holes caused by the heavy rain and the unstable road surface. Additional construction and heavy plants will destroy the road surface further, causing harm to vehicles using the road, please note that this is not a through road, and is the only means of access to eight residential properties.</p> <p>There are currently a limited number of passing places on REDACTED making this road unsuitable for construction vehicles. There are a significant number of vehicles that deliver and use the road that have unfortunately ended up coming off the lane and crashing into the run-off dykes, this is due to the slippery surface and the narrowness.</p> <p>Due to the revised route at ECC.1.001, it's apparent that multiple additional operational access roads are required further affecting the land, hedgerows, planting and wildlife.</p> <p>There is a section where access is required via a privately maintained road, although this road is owned by REDACTED, it is maintained by REDACTED, at great expense. This road is not suitable for the proposed use.</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) with measures to control impacts set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference J8).</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>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_0179_016_160424          | S44     | Email           | 16                     |                              | <p>Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REG-0077 - REDACTED</p> <p>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great.</p> <p>The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered.</p> <p>The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected.</p>   | <p>The Applicants will work with agricultural landowners to mitigate impacts on farm holdings. Impacts on hedgerows will be minimised where possible. 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>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents. Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will negatively impact wildlife and hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has.   | 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).<br>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_0180_002_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.2                          | There are already substantial amounts of flooding in the fields, this concerns residents greatly that any construction work will have adverse effects. Wrea Brook is frequently at full capacity, with the feeder ditches then taking the strain of water. This affects all properties in our community but has a direct impact on REDACTED.<br>The fields that are targeted for construction also double up as floodplains and are underwater for approximately one hundred days per year. Many times during the year the land is too wet to access with farm vehicles, therefore heavy plant and construction traffic will struggle. Any traffic entering the highway after being in the fields will leave dangerous amounts of mud and soil on the public highway, causing danger to drivers and cyclists.  | 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).<br>Mitigation measures are discussed within Table 2.20 of of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and flood risk of the ES (document reference F3.2).<br>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_0180_006_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.6                          | The public footpath that is used by residents of REDACTED is shown on the map within the proposed alternative route, showing that access to the site will be along this footpath from Huck Lane to Great Carrside Farm, this footpath is used by all residents and the project will create problems for families that use this for recreational walks into Lytham and surrounding areas.<br>Huck Lane is currently a Bridlepath used by walkers and horse riders, with an Equestrian Centre (Woodside Stables) at the end of Huck Lane. The proposed new alternative route will impact riders and their horses and create animal stress for such activities.<br>Wrea Brook Lane is used by residents for cycling, at present due to the heavy rain and mud, the lane is too dangerous to use for such activities. Any heavy plant will exacerbate this problem.  | 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 (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_0180_007_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.7                          | REDACTED is a narrow single track in extremely poor condition (photographs attached), during the summer there is grass growing in the middle of this road, which once wet becomes dangerous to drivers. The road is currently unsuitable to carry residential vehicles that use the road to access residential properties, this is due to the potholes caused by the heavy rain and the unstable road surface. Additional construction and heavy plants will destroy the road surface further, causing harm to vehicles using the road, please note that this is not through the road and the only means of access to eight residential properties. There are currently a limited number of passing places on REDACTED making this road unsuitable for construction vehicles. There are a significant number of vehicles that deliver and use the road that have unfortunately ended up in the run-off dykes, this is due to the slippery surface and the narrowness.<br>Due to the revised route, it's apparent that multiple additional operational access roads are required further affecting the land, hedgerows, planting and wildlife.<br>There is a section where access is required via a privately maintained road, although this road is owned by REDACTED, it is maintained by REDACTED, at great expense. This road is not suitable for the proposed use. | 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).<br>Details of the operation and maintenance phases are set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).<br>Onshore maintenance would be limited to essential maintenance and/or emergency works.<br>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_0180_018_170424          | S44     | Email           | 16                     |                              | Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REDACTED<br>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great.<br>The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered.  | The Applicants will work with agricultural landowners to mitigate impacts on farm holdings. Impacts on hedgerows will be minimised where possible. 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected. Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents. Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will impact negatively wildlife and hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has.   | 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_0180_020_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | Annex 1b Q3                  | Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REG-REDACTED<br>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great. The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered, and at the worst to the original route. The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected. Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents. Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will impact negatively wildlife and hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has. The tracks are in a poor state of disrepair and not suitable for heavy plant. The community struggles with the maintenance of the public roads and we cannot approve any projects that causes more damage. | 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). 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 access being discussed in this response is an operational access which will include light vehicular ad-hoc use through the operational phase of the Project. |
| TA_0181_002_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.2                          | There are already substantial amounts of flooding in the fields, this concerns residents greatly that any construction work will have adverse effects. Wrea Brook is frequently at full capacity, with the feeder ditches then taking the strain of water. This affects all properties in our community but has a direct impact on REDACTED. The fields that are targeted for construction also double up as floodplains and are underwater for approximately one hundred days per year. Many times during the year the land is too wet to access with farm vehicles, therefore heavy plant and construction traffic will struggle. Any traffic entering the highway after being in the fields will leave dangerous amounts of mud and soil on the public highway, causing danger to drivers and cyclists.   | 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 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_0181_006_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.6                          | The public footpath that is used by residents of the REDACTED is shown on the map within the proposed alternative route, showing that access to the site will be along this footpath from Huck Lane to Great Carr Side Farm, this footpath is used by all residents and the project will create problems for families that use this for recreational walks into Lytham and surrounding areas. Huck Lane is currently a Bridle path used by walkers and horse riders, with an Equestrian Centre (Woodside Stables) at the end of Huck Lane. The proposed new alternative route will impact riders and their horses and create animal stress for such activities. Wrea Brook Lane is used by residents for cycling, walking and running, at present due to the heavy rain and mud, the lane is too dangerous to use for such activities. Any heavy plant will exacerbate this problem.   | 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.  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
| TA_0181_007_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.7                          | <p>REDACTED is a narrow single track in extremely poor condition (photographs attached), during the summer there is grass growing in the middle of this road, which once wet becomes dangerous to drivers. The road is currently unsuitable to carry residential vehicles that use the road to access residential properties, this is due to the pot holes caused by the heavy rain and the unstable road surface. Additional construction and heavy plants will destroy the road surface further, causing harm to vehicles using the road, please note that this is not through the road and the only means of access to eight residential properties. There are currently a limited number of passing places on REDACTED making this road unsuitable for construction vehicles. There are a significant number of vehicles that deliver and use the road that have unfortunately ended up in the run-off dykes, this is due to the slippery surface and the narrowness. Due to the revised route, it's apparent that multiple additional operational access roads are required further affecting the land, hedgerows, planting and wildlife.</p> <p>There is a section where access is required via a privately maintained road, although this road is owned by REDACTED, it is maintained by REDACTED, at great expense. This road is not suitable for the proposed use.</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.</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).</p>  |
| TA_0181_014_170427          | S44     | Email           | 16                     |                              | <p>Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REDACTED</p> <p>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great. The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered.</p> <p>The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected. Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents.</p> <p>Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will impact negatively wildlife and hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has.</p>  | <p>The Applicants will work with agricultural landowners to mitigate impacts on farm holdings. Impacts on hedgerows will be minimised where possible. 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 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> <p>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_0182_002_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   |                        | 3.2                          | <p>Grave concerns over flooding which already directly affects our property and the access roads. The targeted fields surrounding the properties currently act as flood plains and are underwater for a 100 days/year. Construction traffic is not suitable for the access roads.</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 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_0182_006_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   |                        | 3.6                          | <p>Disruption of public footpaths, bridlepath, and lane for cycling – currently used by residents of REDACTED.</p>  | <p>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>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| TA_0182_007_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   |                        | 3.7                          | REDACTED is a narrow single track lane in a terrible state. It has been permanently underwater since Oct/Nov 2023 and hides multiple wide and deep dangerous potholes. The lane is slippery, very narrow and has deep dykes either side. It is unsuitable for heavy plant. | 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). |

### Noise and Vibration

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
| TA_0177_008_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.8                          | Given that the construction will predominantly occur in rural areas characterised by comparatively low background noise levels, there is an increased likelihood of noise disruption originating from the development. Any assessment of noise disturbance should prioritise its effect on residential amenities, rather than relying on higher WHO thresholds primarily designed to gauge the potential impact on human health. Vibration from the drills and plants will cause distress to animals and birds. There are a significant number of residents who work from home, and as such require an element of peace to undertake their everyday tasks. Severe vibration will potentially create damage to the foundations of properties across the REDACTED   | 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_0178_001_140424          | S47     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | As a client of REDACTED I am writing to express my alarm at the unsuitability of the proposed siting of the compound adjacent to the riding school and to urge you to reconsider the location I understand that the consultation period has ended but I have only recently become aware of your proposals and their implications for the riding school. I understand the need for wind power to meet our government's targets for clean energy, but the proposed location of the compound would have such a devastating effect on the riding school that it would force it to close completely. Horses are sensitive creatures and they would not be able to tolerate the noise and disruption which the compound would generate. The riding school is a highly regarded establishment within the equine industry and for over 40 years has been supporting a huge local community of riders, volunteers, students and staff, serving hundreds of clients, providing training and opportunities for young people, disabled riders, colleges and young people with mental health and behavioural challenges. For people like myself who have caring responsibilities for family members it provides weekly wellbeing which I could not do without. I urge you to take my points into consideration and find an alternative location. | 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).<br><br>Daclour Maclaren on behalf of the applicant will work with the interest to discuss mitigation measures for the construction phase. |
| TA_0179_007_160424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.8                          | Vibration from the drills and plant machinery will cause distress to animals and birds. There are a significant number of residents who work from home, and as such require an element of peace to undertake their everyday tasks. Severe   | 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).   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | vibration and the proposed proximity of the re-routed cable corridor will potentially create damage to the foundations of properties across the REDACTED.   | 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_0180_008_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.8                          | Given that the construction will predominantly occur in rural areas characterised by comparatively low background noise levels, there is an increased likelihood of noise disruption originating from the development. Any assessment of noise disturbance should prioritise its effect on residential amenities, rather than relying on higher WHO thresholds primarily designed to gauge the potential impact on human health. Vibration from the drills and plants will cause distress to animals and birds. There are a significant number of residents who work from home, and as such require an element of peace to undertake their everyday tasks. Severe vibration will potentially create damage to the foundations of properties across REDACTED     | 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_0181_008_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.8                          | Given that the construction will predominantly occur in rural areas characterised by comparatively low background noise levels, there is an increased likelihood of noise disruption originating from the development. Any assessment of noise disturbance should prioritise its effect on residential amenities, rather than relying on higher WHO thresholds primarily designed to gauge the potential impact on human health. Vibration from the drills and plants will cause distress to animals and birds. There are a significant number of residents who work from home, and as such require an element of peace to undertake their everyday tasks. Severe vibration will potentially create damage to the foundations of properties across the REDACTED | 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_0182_008_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   |                        | 3.8                          | The area around REDACTED is extremely quiet and any works to the degree suggested by this proposal will have a significant impact and potentially cause damage to 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). |

## Air Quality

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
| TA_0177_009_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | Air quality<br>Due to the construction work, there will be unacceptably high levels of dust. Some residents who have breathing difficulties like asthma will find this damaging to their everyday health and well-being.<br>The existing route is already identified as a high risk, the proposed reroute is now even closer to eight properties than previously identified, majorly affecting residents. Please could you confirm what the recommended minimum distance should be from construction work of this kind? | An assessment of dust generated during the construction phase has been undertaken in the Environmental Statement (ES) and mitigation measures recommended to ensure the effects are not significant (Volume 3, Chapter 9 of the ES, document reference F3.9). The mitigation measures have been included in the dust management plan (document reference J25) |
| TA_0179_008_160424          | S44     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | Air quality<br>Due to the construction work, there will be unacceptably high levels of dust. Some residents who have breathing difficulties like asthma will find this damaging to their everyday health and well-being. The existing route is already identified as a high risk in your EIA Assessment, the proposed reroute ECC.1.001 set out in the Targeted Consultation pushes the cable   | An assessment of dust generated during the construction phase has been undertaken in the Environmental Statement (ES) and mitigation measures recommended to ensure the effects are not significant (Volume 3, Chapter 9 of the ES, document reference F3.9). The mitigation measures have been included in the dust management plan (document reference J25) |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | corridor even closer to eight properties than previously identified, majorly affecting residents. Please could you confirm what the recommended minimum distance should be from construction work of this kind?   |  |
| TA_0180_009_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | Air quality<br>Due to the construction work, there will be unacceptably high levels of dust. Some residents who have breathing difficulties like asthma will find this damaging to their everyday health and well-being.<br>The existing route is already identified as a high risk, the proposed reroute is now even closer to eight properties than previously identified, majorly affecting residents. Please could you confirm what the recommended minimum distance should be from construction work of this kind? | An assessment of dust generated during the construction phase has been undertaken in the Environmental Statement (ES) and mitigation measures recommended to ensure the effects are not significant (Volume 3, Chapter 9 of the ES, document reference F3.9). The mitigation measures have been included in the dust management plan (document reference J25)  |
| TA_0181_009_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | Air quality<br>Due to the construction work, there will be unacceptably high levels of dust. Some residents who have breathing difficulties like asthma will find this damaging to their everyday health and well-being.<br>The existing route is already identified as a high risk, the proposed reroute is now even closer to eight properties than previously identified, majorly affecting residents. Please could you confirm what the recommended minimum distance should be from construction work of this kind? | An assessment of dust generated during the construction phase has been undertaken in the Environmental Statement (ES) and mitigation measures recommended to ensure the effects are not significant (Volume 3, Chapter 9 of the ES, document reference F3.9). The mitigation measures have been included in the dust management plan (document reference J25). |
| TA_0182_009_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   |                        | 3.9                          | Unacceptable levels of dust which may have a serious impact on residents.   | An assessment of dust generated during the construction phase has been undertaken in the Environmental Statement (ES) and mitigation measures recommended to ensure the effects are not significant (Volume 3, Chapter 9 of the ES, document reference F3.9). The mitigation measures have been included in the dust management plan (document reference J25). |

## Human Health

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
| TA_0177_008_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.8                          | Given that the construction will predominantly occur in rural areas characterised by comparatively low background noise levels, there is an increased likelihood of noise disruption originating from the development. Any assessment of noise disturbance should prioritise its effect on residential amenities, rather than relying on higher WHO thresholds primarily designed to gauge the potential impact on human health.<br>Vibration from the drills and plants will cause distress to animals and birds.<br>There are a significant number of residents who work from home, and as such require an element of peace to undertake their everyday tasks. Severe vibration will potentially create damage to the foundations of properties across the REDACTED | 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).<br>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_0177_009_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | Air quality<br>Due to the construction work, there will be unacceptably high levels of dust. Some residents who have breathing difficulties like asthma will find this damaging to their everyday health and well-being.<br>The existing route is already identified as a high risk, the proposed reroute is now even closer to eight properties than previously identified, majorly affecting residents. Please could you confirm what the   | An assessment of dust generated during the construction phase has been undertaken in the Environmental Statement (ES) and mitigation measures recommended to ensure the effects are not significant (Volume 3, Chapter 9 of the ES, document reference F3.9). The mitigation measures have been included in the dust management plan (document reference J25)  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | recommended minimum distance should be from construction work of this kind?   |   |
| TA_0177_010_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.1                          | Fylde has a flat, rolling, rural character interspersed with limited tree cover (the area of tree cover has been identified as falling within the lowest 10% of all English local authority administrative areas). The visual impact of the work will be significant.<br>Some of the properties have extensive views of the surrounding area, which is an area of outstanding beauty. Properties with these views command a higher price which all eight residents have paid. This disruption in views will significantly impact the everyday living of residents, their health and well-being, the wildlife and also the property prices.  | 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_0178_001_140424          | S47     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | As a client of REDACTED I am writing to express my alarm at the unsuitability of the proposed siting of the compound adjacent to the riding school and to urge you to reconsider the location.<br><br>I understand that the consultation period has ended but I have only recently become aware of your proposals and their implications for the riding school.<br><br>I understand the need for wind power to meet our government's targets for clean energy, but the proposed location of the compound would have such a devastating effect on the riding school that it would force it to close completely. Horses are sensitive creatures and they would not be able to tolerate the noise and disruption which the compound would generate.<br><br>The riding school is a highly regarded establishment within the equine industry and for over 40 years has been supporting a huge local community of riders, volunteers, students and staff, serving hundreds of clients, providing training and opportunities for young people, disabled riders, colleges and young people with mental health and behavioural challenges.<br><br>For people like myself who have caring responsibilities for family members it provides weekly wellbeing which I could not do without.<br><br>I urge you to take my points into consideration and find an alternative location. | 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). Daclour Maclaren on behalf of the applicant will work with the interest to discuss mitigation measures for the construction phase. |
| TA_0179_008_160424          | S44     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | Air quality<br>Due to the construction work, there will be unacceptably high levels of dust.<br>Some residents who have breathing difficulties like asthma will find this damaging to their everyday health and well-being. The existing route is already identified as a high risk in your EIA Assessment, the proposed reroute ECC.1.001 set out in the Targeted Consultation pushes the cable corridor even closer to eight properties than previously identified, majorly affecting residents. Please could you confirm what the recommended minimum distance should be from construction work of this kind?  | An assessment of dust generated during the construction phase has been undertaken in the Environmental Statement (ES) and mitigation measures recommended to ensure the effects are not significant (Volume 3, Chapter 9 of the ES, document reference F3.9). The mitigation measures have been included in the dust management plan (document reference J25)   |
| TA_0179_009_160424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.1                          | The visual impact of the work will be significant.<br>Some of the properties have extensive views of the surrounding area, which is an area of outstanding beauty. Properties with these views command a higher price which all eight residents have paid. This disruption in views will significantly impact the everyday living of residents, their health and well-being, the wildlife and also the property prices.   | 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  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              |  | and visual resources of the ES) (document reference F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects.  |
| TA_0180_009_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | Air quality<br>Due to the construction work, there will be unacceptably high levels of dust. Some residents who have breathing difficulties like asthma will find this damaging to their everyday health and well-being.<br>The existing route is already identified as a high risk, the proposed reroute is now even closer to eight properties than previously identified, majorly affecting residents. Please could you confirm what the recommended minimum distance should be from construction work of this kind?  | An assessment of dust generated during the construction phase has been undertaken in the Environmental Statement (ES) and mitigation measures recommended to ensure the effects are not significant (Volume 3, Chapter 9 of the ES, document reference F3.9). The mitigation measures have been included in the dust management plan (document reference J25)   |
| TA_0180_010_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.1                          | Fylde has a flat, rolling, rural character interspersed with limited tree cover (the area of tree cover has been identified as falling within the lowest 10% of all English local authority administrative areas). The visual impact of the work will be significant.<br>Some of the properties have extensive views of the surrounding area, which is an area of outstanding beauty. Properties with these views command a higher price which all eight residents have paid. This disruption in views will significantly impact the everyday living of residents, their health and well-being, the wildlife and also the property prices. | 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_0181_009_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | Air quality<br>Due to the construction work, there will be unacceptably high levels of dust. Some residents who have breathing difficulties like asthma will find this damaging to their everyday health and well-being.<br>The existing route is already identified as a high risk, the proposed reroute is now even closer to eight properties than previously identified, majorly affecting residents. Please could you confirm what the recommended minimum distance should be from construction work of this kind?  | An assessment of dust generated during the construction phase has been undertaken in the Environmental Statement (ES) and mitigation measures recommended to ensure the effects are not significant (Volume 3, Chapter 9 of the ES, document reference F3.9). The mitigation measures have been included in the dust management plan (document reference J25).  |
| TA_0181_010_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.1                          | Fylde has a flat, rolling, rural character interspersed with limited tree cover (the area of tree cover has been identified as falling within the lowest 10% of all English local authority administrative areas). The visual impact of the work will be significant.<br>Some of the properties have extensive views of the surrounding area, which is an area of outstanding beauty. Properties with these views command a higher price which all eight residents have paid. This disruption in views will significantly impact the everyday living of residents, their health and well-being, the wildlife and also the property prices. | 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_0182_009_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   |                        | 3.9                          | Unacceptable levels of dust which may have a serious impact on residents.  | An assessment of dust generated during the construction phase has been undertaken in the Environmental Statement (ES) and mitigation measures recommended to ensure the effects are not significant (Volume 3, Chapter 9 of the ES, document reference F3.9). The mitigation measures have been included in the dust management plan (document reference J25).  |

## Landscape and visual resources

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| TA_0177_010_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.1                          | Fylde has a flat, rolling, rural character interspersed with limited tree cover (the area of tree cover has been identified as falling within the lowest 10% of all English local authority administrative areas). The visual impact of the work will be significant.<br>Some of the properties have extensive views of the surrounding area, which is an area of outstanding beauty. Properties with these views command a higher price which all eight residents have paid. This disruption in views will significantly impact the everyday living of residents, their health and well-being, the wildlife and also the property prices.   | 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_0177_013_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.4                          | The project will have a variety of negative socio economic impacts, which are important to consider alongside the benefits of renewable energy production. Here are some potential negative impacts:<br>Visual Impact and Aesthetics: the cable corridor, work and sub stations will have an impact on the visual landscape of rural areas, impacting the scenic beauty and potentially affecting tourism and property values.<br>People will find large wind farms visually intrusive and disruptive to the natural environment.<br>Property Values: There is evidence to suggest that the work will and can lower nearby property values. Concerns about noise, aesthetics, and perceived impacts on health can reduce the desirability of properties near wind farms, leading to potential economic losses for property owners.<br>Tourism and Recreation: Our rural areas rely on tourism and outdoor recreation for economic activity. The presence of large wind farms might deter tourists who come to rural areas seeking untouched natural landscapes or peaceful surroundings, impacting local businesses like hotels, restaurants, and shops.<br>Employment and Local Economy: While the Project can create jobs during the construction phase, the long-term employment impact might be limited. Maintenance and operations of wind farms often require specialized skills that might not benefit the local workforce. Additionally, if the wind farm is owned by external companies, much of the revenue generated might not circulate within the local economy.<br>Community Disruption: The Project will lead to social tensions within local communities. Some residents might support the project due to potential economic benefits, while others might oppose it due to concerns about aesthetics, noise, or perceived impacts on health. This can lead to divisions within communities and strain social cohesion.<br>Impact on Agriculture: The Project will occupy significant land area, potentially displacing agricultural activities. This might affect local farmers and agriculture-related businesses. Moreover, construction and maintenance activities can disrupt farming operations and access to farmland.<br>Infrastructure Costs: The Project to even be considered will impact remote rural areas that might require significant investment in new or upgraded infrastructure, such as roads, power lines, and substations. These costs might be borne by the local community or government, impacting public finances and resources.<br>Cultural and Heritage Impact: Some wind farm developments might encroach upon culturally significant or protected areas, impacting local heritage and traditions. This can have intangible socioeconomic costs related to community identity and well-being. | Detailed assessments are 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, socio-economic impacts are set out in section 2.11 of Volume 4, Chapter 2: Socio-economics of the ES (document reference F4.2). 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 Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F1.5.1). 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.<br>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:<br>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)<br>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   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | Addressing these potential negative impacts requires careful planning, community engagement, and consideration of broader socioeconomic factors. Strategies such as community consultation, fair compensation for affected parties, and investments in local infrastructure and skills development can help mitigate these impacts and maximize the benefits of renewable energy projects in rural areas.   |  |
| TA_0177_019_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | Annex 1b Q1                  | As per the above, the amendments are not acceptable, they will further add stress to the estate/community. All of the above will be compounded as the proposed amendments are closer to our properties, use our existing road infrastructure and take over our community footpath. The whole estate will be alongside a building site, affecting the views and prices of our properties.  | Detailed assessments are 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_0179_009_160424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.1                          | The visual impact of the work will be significant. Some of the properties have extensive views of the surrounding area, which is an area of outstanding beauty. Properties with these views command a higher price which all eight residents have paid. This disruption in views will significantly impact the everyday living of residents, their health and well-being, the wildlife and also the property prices.  | 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_0180_010_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.1                          | Fylde has a flat, rolling, rural character interspersed with limited tree cover (the area of tree cover has been identified as falling within the lowest 10% of all English local authority administrative areas). The visual impact of the work will be significant. Some of the properties have extensive views of the surrounding area, which is an area of outstanding beauty. Properties with these views command a higher price which all eight residents have paid. This disruption in views will significantly impact the everyday living of residents, their health and well-being, the wildlife and also the property prices.   | 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_0180_013_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.4                          | <p>4.4 Socio-economics</p> <p>The project will have a variety of negative socio economic impacts, which are important to consider alongside the benefits of renewable energy production. Here are some potential negative impacts:</p> <p>Visual Impact and Aesthetics: the cable corridor, work and sub stations will have an impact on the visual landscape of rural areas, impacting the scenic beauty and potentially affecting tourism and property values. People will find large wind farms visually intrusive and disruptive to the natural environment.</p> <p>Property Values: There is evidence to suggest that the work will and can lower nearby property values. Concerns about noise, aesthetics, and perceived impacts on health can reduce the desirability of properties near wind farms, leading to potential economic losses for property owners.</p> <p>Tourism and Recreation: Our rural areas rely on tourism and outdoor recreation for economic activity. The presence of large wind farms might deter tourists who come to rural areas seeking untouched natural landscapes or peaceful surroundings, impacting local businesses like hotels, restaurants, and shops.</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). Specifically, socio-economic impacts are set out in section 2.11 of Volume 4, Chapter 2: Socio-economics of the ES (document reference F4.2). 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 Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F1.5.1). 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. The Transmission Assets will be fully compliant with the compensation |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | <p>Employment and Local Economy: While the Project can create jobs during the construction phase, the long-term employment impact might be limited. Maintenance and operations of wind farms often require specialized skills that might not benefit the local workforce. Additionally, if the wind farm is owned by external companies, much of the revenue generated might not circulate within the local economy.</p> <p>Community Disruption: The Project will lead to social tensions within local communities. Some residents might support the project due to potential economic benefits, while others might oppose it due to concerns about aesthetics, noise, or perceived impacts on health. This can lead to divisions within communities and strain social cohesion.</p> <p>Impact on Agriculture: The Project will occupy significant land area, potentially displacing agricultural activities. This might affect local farmers and agriculture-related businesses. Moreover, construction and maintenance activities can disrupt farming operations and access to farmland.</p> <p>Infrastructure Costs: The Project to even be considered will impact remote rural areas that might require significant investment in new or upgraded infrastructure, such as roads, power lines, and substations. These costs might be borne by the local community or government, impacting public finances and resources.</p> <p>Cultural and Heritage Impact: Some wind farm developments might encroach upon culturally significant or protected areas, impacting local heritage and traditions. This can have intangible socioeconomic costs related to community identity and well-being.</p> <p>Addressing these potential negative impacts requires careful planning, community engagement, and consideration of broader socioeconomic factors. Strategies such as community consultation, fair compensation for affected parties, and investments in local infrastructure and skills development can help mitigate these impacts and maximize the benefits of renewable energy projects in rural areas.</p> | <p>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:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)<br/>Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>  |
| TA_0180_020_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | Annex 1b Q1                  | <p>As per the above, the amendments are not acceptable, they will further add stress to the estate/community. All of the above will be compounded as the proposed amendments are closer to our properties, use our existing road infrastructure and take over our community footpath. The whole estate will be alongside a building site, affecting the views and prices of our properties.</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_0181_010_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.1                          | <p>Fylde has a flat, rolling, rural character interspersed with limited tree cover (the area of tree cover has been identified as falling within the lowest 10% of all English local authority administrative areas). The visual impact of the work will be significant.</p> <p>Some of the properties have extensive views of the surrounding area, which is an area of outstanding beauty. Properties with these views command a higher price which all eight residents have paid. This disruption in views will significantly impact the everyday living of</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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | residents, their health and well-being, the wildlife and also the property prices.  | F3.10) is based on the maximum design scenario to minimise likely effects.  |
| TA_0182_010_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   | 4                      | 4.1                          | Our position and aspect is of rural character with limited tree cover, and we paid a premium for this when we bought the property. This will be significantly impacted. | 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. |

### Aviation and radar

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
| TA_0177_011_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.2                          | It is worthy of note that there are two airfields within proximity, Blackpool and Warton. | The Applicants have engaged with the airport operators. The impacts on aviation have been considered at Volume 3, Chapter 11: Aviation and radar of the ES (document reference: F3.11) |
| TA_0179_010_160424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.2                          | It is worthy of note that there are two airfields within proximity, Blackpool and Warton. | The Applicants have engaged with the airport operators. The impacts on aviation have been considered at Volume 3, Chapter 11: Aviation and radar of the ES (document reference: F3.11) |
| TA_0180_011_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.2                          | It is worthy of note that there are two airfields within proximity, Blackpool and Warton. | The Applicants have engaged with the airport operators. The impacts on aviation have been considered at Volume 3, Chapter 11: Aviation and radar of the ES (document reference: F3.11) |
| TA_0181_011_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.2                          | It is worthy of note that there are two airfields within proximity, Blackpool and Warton. | The Applicants have engaged with the airport operators. The impacts on aviation have been considered at Volume 3, Chapter 11: Aviation and radar of the ES (document reference: F3.11) |
| TA_0182_011_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   |                        | 4.2                          | Both Blackpool and Warton airports are within close proximity.                            | The Applicants have engaged with the airport operators. The impacts on aviation have been considered at Volume 3, Chapter 11: Aviation and radar of the ES (document reference: F3.11) |

### Climate Change

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
| TA_0177_012_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.3                          | Biodiversity net gain is seen as legitimising the carving up of the landscape, however, surely this should not be seen as justifiable. The area in question is farmland, we cannot afford to diminish the use of farmland for crops, once the land has been disturbed it will take years to regain the biodiversity to enable a farmer to continue successfully growing crops. As a nation, we need to do more to support growers of arable crops to continue to feed our nation. | 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 |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | The proposed route will affect other aspects of concern caused by climate change, including flooding.  | 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.<br>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).<br>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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction.  |
| TA_0179_011_160424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.3                          | Biodiversity net gain is seen as legitimising the carving up of the landscape, however, surely this should not be seen as justifiable. The area in question is farmland, we cannot afford to diminish the use of farmland for crops, once the land has been disturbed it will take years to regain the biodiversity to enable a farmer to continue successfully growing crops. As a nation, we need to do more to support growers of arable crops to continue to feed our nation.<br>The proposed route will affect other aspects of concern caused by climate change, including flooding. | 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.<br>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.<br>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).<br>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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction. |
| TA_0180_012_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.3                          | Biodiversity net gain is seen as legitimising the carving up of the landscape, however, surely this should not be seen as justifiable.<br>The area in question is farmland, we cannot afford to diminish the use of farmland for crops, once the land has been disturbed it will take years to regain the biodiversity to enable a farmer to continue successfully growing   | 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   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | <p>crops. As a nation, we need to do more to support growers of arable crops to continue to feed our nation.<br/>The proposed route will affect other aspects of concern caused by climate change, including flooding.</p>   | <p>parameters of the project.<br/>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.<br/>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).<br/>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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction.</p>   |
| TA_0181_012_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.3                          | <p>Biodiversity net gain is seen as legitimising the carving up of the landscape, however, surely this should not be seen as justifiable.<br/>The area in question is farmland, we cannot afford to diminish the use of farmland for crops, once the land has been disturbed it will take years to regain the biodiversity to enable a farmer to continue successfully growing crops. As a nation, we need to do more to support growers of arable crops to continue to feed our nation.<br/>The proposed route will affect other aspects of concern caused by climate change, including flooding.</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.<br/>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.<br/>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).<br/>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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction.</p> |

## Socio-economics and community

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| TA_0171_001_150324          | S44     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | <p>Further to your previous correspondence, I have reviewed the documentation on behalf of my client, REDACTED who has his agricultural property on REDACTED, as identified on the sheet 6 of 40 within the Section 42 Minor Changes Detailed Map Book.</p> <p>As you are more than aware, the cable route of both Morgan and Morecambe completely take out my client's land holding, he only owns 14 acres of land and your cable route takes out the majority of land. The only solace to my client was that his modern portal frame agricultural building and yard area was still operational and indeed my client has continued to improve and invest, most recently spending £150,000 in concrete yard and additional buildings. Yet, you have now highlighted a shared operation access to run through his yard, which effectively completely stops my client from farming and using the farm buildings for a health and safety, security and privacy issue.</p> <p>We strongly rebut the use of the access through my client's land. If you are accessing the cable route, then you can continue to use the access track that is already there established that is within the Ownership of REDACTED, not through my client's land.</p> <p>Please confirm receipt and confirmation that this access will be taken out and removed from your operational access requirements.</p> | <p>As set out in the Project Description chapter of the ES (Volume 1, Chapter 3), no construction is proposed for operational accesses (i.e. only a permanent right of access is being sought) for the onshore export cable corridor and 400kV grid connection cable corridor, and where possible, operational accesses have been identified using existing access routes or gates/ gaps in the hedgerows. They have been designed to be approximately 3.5 m in width and follow existing paths, where practicable. The width of operational accesses may vary in places, for example, to ensure alignment with the boundaries of existing access tracks.</p> <p>Operational access will be taken to undertake low-level non-intrusive routine inspections (for example, inspections of joint bays via link boxes), and can be expected on an infrequent annual basis.</p> |
| TA_0172_001_200324          | S44     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | <p>Further to your previous correspondence, I have spoken with my client, REDACTED, in relation to their land holding off REDACTED.</p> <p>I have attached a screenshot of the targeted consultation plan which identifies the slight movement/reduction of the working width for Morgan and Morecambe, but also the introduction of the Morecambe onshore ECC temporary construction compound to the land to the south-west.</p> <p>Given that my client is potentially burdened with the access road to the north of the land that has effectively got a small triangle of land to the north of the Morgan onshore ECC and Hillock Lane, this could be described as a redundant severed parcel of land if the cable comes through and therefore your client should consider taking this area as compound area which provides access directly off Hillock Lane. I believe that the post-consultation amended is identified as TCC.1.002.</p> <p>Maybe you will put forward this proposal to your clients. No other obvious matters arising other than below the proposed Morecambe temporary compound my client will be left with a small severed area to the south of which would not be able to be accessed and therefore all of my client's land holding REDACTED will be occupied by your clients causing major impacts on their farming operations going forward.</p>            | <p>Following route refinement, Dalcour McLaren 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.</p>  |
| TA_0175_001_210324          | S44     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | <p>Further to our previous email correspondence I can confirm that I met with my clients on Wednesday afternoon to discuss the latest Targeted Statutory Consultation areas identified on the detailed maps and more specifically my client's affected area which are identified between Pages 33 to 36 of the detailed booklet.</p> <p>Overall my clients are pleased with the amendments showing the route which effectively now sits south of the overhead pylons. This will hopefully reduce the impact of the scheme on my client's land holding notwithstanding the fact that it will still have a major detrimental effect on my client's farm and farming operations but I am pleased and grateful for the project's revision of the route.</p> <p>My clients still have concerns and observations in relation to the shared operational access as highlighted reference OAR.1.005F and OAR.1.005G which on the legend is identified as shared operational access and operational access routes. My clients request better detailed plans and information of the extent of these routes. In addition, my client requires better and more detailed plans of the Morgan onshore temporary construction access which leads off Bryning Lane.</p>  | <p>Dalcour Maclaren on behalf of the Applicants will be in touch with interest to show detail on the access routes and discuss Heads of Terms to secure the rights for the accesses.</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | The design of such impacts considerably on the important grassland field close to the farm buildings. No doubt you will report the findings and be able to answer the questions in due course.  |   |
| TA_0176_001_040424          | S44     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | <p>Please see below and attached from REDACTED, who is the agent acting for REDACTED. He has provided some feedback on the 400kv routing through his client's land and has suggested some amendments to the lessen the impact on them which have been annotated on the attached plans. I appreciate that this feedback comes at the eleventh hour, but I wanted to make sure it was sent across for your consideration. The requested changes are not enormous, and I have detailed REDACTED comments below.</p> <p>22003214_PLN_INFO_REDACTED – in respect of this plan, it is suggested by our client that the impact of this scheme could be significantly lessened by moving the route to the north of this land parcel, so that the works would not sever the fields in questions. This would lessen the impact on our client's farming operation, and avoid the costs and difficulties required in the scheme providing the necessary crossings, separate water supplies etc.</p> <p>22003214_PLN_INFO_REDACTED it is suggested by our client that the compound area shown south of the corridor could be better sited in the severed area to the north of the cable corridor, between this and the caravan dealership. This would both lessen the impact of the scheme south of the corridor and make better use of an area to the north, which will otherwise be severed and serve little or no practical purpose during the works. It would also potentially provide better access to the compound from Blackpool Road.</p> <p>22003214_PLN_INFO_REDACTED – again, it has been suggested by our client that the route could be moved to the southern end of this land parcel, south of the pond, which would lessen the impact of the scheme, avoid land being unnecessarily severed, and potentially remove the need for crossing points, additional water supplies etc, saving cost/complication for the scheme.</p> <p>22003214_PLN_INFO_REDACTED - in respect of this plan, it is suggested by our client that the impact of this scheme could be significantly lessened by moving the route to the north, to avoid severing the western field.. This would lessen the impact on our client's farming operation, and avoid the costs and difficulties required in the scheme providing the necessary crossings, separate water supplies etc.</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.</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_0177_005_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.5                          | <p>While this is not a typical historic area, the rolling hills around our community draw visitors in from across the UK and beyond. The devastating effect the cable corridor will have on visitor numbers will affect the local economy of Kirkham, Wrea Green, Freckleton, Lytham and Warton. There are significant numbers of businesses that rely on the tourism trade.</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 ES (document reference F3.5).</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> |
| TA_0177_012_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.3                          | <p>Biodiversity net gain is seen as legitimising the carving up of the landscape, however, surely this should not be seen as justifiable.</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</p>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | <p>The area in question is farmland, we cannot afford to diminish the use of farmland for crops, once the land has been disturbed it will take years to regain the biodiversity to enable a farmer to continue successfully growing crops. As a nation, we need to do more to support growers of arable crops to continue to feed our nation.</p> <p>The proposed route will affect other aspects of concern caused by climate change, including flooding.</p>  | <p>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>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. 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> <p>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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction.</p> |
| TA_0177_013_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.4                          | <p>The project will have a variety of negative socio economic impacts, which are important to consider alongside the benefits of renewable energy production. Here are some potential negative impacts:</p> <p>Visual Impact and Aesthetics: the cable corridor, work and sub stations will have an impact on the visual landscape of rural areas, impacting the scenic beauty and potentially affecting tourism and property values. People will find large wind farms visually intrusive and disruptive to the natural environment.</p> <p>Property Values: There is evidence to suggest that the work will and can lower nearby property values. Concerns about noise, aesthetics, and perceived impacts on health can reduce the desirability of properties near wind farms, leading to potential economic losses for property owners.</p> <p>Tourism and Recreation: Our rural areas rely on tourism and outdoor recreation for economic activity. The presence of large wind farms might deter tourists who come to rural areas seeking untouched natural landscapes or peaceful surroundings, impacting local businesses like hotels, restaurants, and shops.</p> <p>Employment and Local Economy: While the Project can create jobs during the construction phase, the long-term employment impact might be limited.</p> <p>Maintenance and operations of wind farms often require specialized skills that might not benefit the local workforce. Additionally, if the wind farm is owned by external companies, much of the revenue generated might not circulate within the local economy.</p> <p>Community Disruption: The Project will lead to social tensions within local communities. Some residents might support the project due to potential economic benefits, while others might oppose it due to concerns about aesthetics, noise, or perceived impacts on health. This can lead to divisions within communities and</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). Specifically, socio-economic impacts are set out in section 2.11 of Volume 4, Chapter 2: Socio-economics of the ES (document reference F4.2). 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 Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F1.5.1). 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> <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>   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | <p>strain social cohesion.</p> <p>Impact on Agriculture: The Project will occupy significant land area, potentially displacing agricultural activities. This might affect local farmers and agriculture-related businesses. Moreover, construction and maintenance activities can disrupt farming operations and access to farmland.</p> <p>Infrastructure Costs: The Project to even be considered will impact remote rural areas that might require significant investment in new or upgraded infrastructure, such as roads, power lines, and substations. These costs might be borne by the local community or government, impacting public finances and resources.</p> <p>Cultural and Heritage Impact: Some wind farm developments might encroach upon culturally significant or protected areas, impacting local heritage and traditions. This can have intangible socioeconomic costs related to community identity and well-being.</p> <p>Addressing these potential negative impacts requires careful planning, community engagement, and consideration of broader socioeconomic factors. Strategies such as community consultation, fair compensation for affected parties, and investments in local infrastructure and skills development can help mitigate these impacts and maximize the benefits of renewable energy projects in rural areas.</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:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>  |
| TA_0177_014_110424          | S44     | Email           | 7                      |                              | <p><b>Agriculture Land</b></p> <p>Agricultural activity in Fylde is characterised by a relatively large number of small agricultural holdings, as is the case at REDACTED, their contribution to the rural economy of Fylde is significant.</p> <p>The proposed cable alternative route crosses agricultural units that would therefore inevitably be subdivided during the construction phase. The width of the construction corridor will have a relatively greater impact on these smaller agricultural holdings than would be the case on larger farms, as the land taken during construction would be a proportionally greater percentage.</p> <p>In the longer term, cable easements would mean that the availability of land to site agricultural buildings would be restricted and would have an impact on the sustainability of individual businesses, the rural economy as a whole and ultimately the character of the wider rural area. The siting of access points to the cable joints would also potentially impact the efficiency of agricultural holdings. It is considered that greater consideration needs to be given to the routing of cables across individual agricultural holdings to prevent subdivision and loss of productive land.</p> <p>The proposed alternative route appears to split into two at Great Carr Side Farm – surely only one route should be necessary/required, to have two routes is completely obliterating there being any useable land! This is a further example of how the consultation on this project appears to be premature as the necessary design details that would allow more effective consultation are simply not available.</p> <p>The indicated width of the construction corridor is 122m. Much of this is accounted for by the proposed linear storage of topsoil and subsoil during construction. The utilisation of a series of top and subsoil storage areas could reduce the width of the construction corridor by approximately 40% and reduce the adverse impact not only on agricultural holdings but on ecology, and transport infrastructure and reduce the development footprint of the project as a whole.</p> <p>Finally on this point, as the majority of the agricultural land that the project crosses is regarded as BMV, if the project goes ahead, it is essential that the land be reinstated to a high quality that does not impact upon the long-term viability and sustainability of the individual agricultural units.</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. The final cable easement will restrict the ability to add additional buildings, but small nature of the holdings suggests the viability will naturally restrict the number of agricultural buildings per holding. 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> <p>The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found 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> <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 Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F3.6)</p> <p>Soil storage and management is set out in the relevant plan along with the code of construction practice. It is not good practice to mix soils from different holdings, but rather replace in the location it was excavated so as not to create biosecurity and</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              |   | waste transfer issues. Transporting soil to a single storage location would also significantly increase the volume of traffic movements.<br>All land will be reinstated to a minimum of the same condition post construction.  |
| TA_0177_015_110424          | S44     | Email           | 13                     |                              | As already mentioned - biodiversity net gain is seen as legitimising the carving up of the landscape, however, surely this should not be seen as justifiable.<br>The area in question is farmland divided by hedgerows, we cannot afford to diminish the use of farmland for crops, once the land has been disturbed it will take years to regain the biodiversity to enable a farmer to continue successfully growing crops.   | 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.<br>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. 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).<br>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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction. |
| TA_0177_017_110424          | S44     | Email           | 15                     |                              | If ultimately it is considered that wider national and global benefits of the scheme outweigh the concerns expressed by 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. We 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 | 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_0177_018_110424          | S44     | Email           | 16                     |                              | Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REG-REDACTED<br>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great.<br>The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered.<br>The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has  | The Applicants will work with agricultural landowners to mitigate impacts on farm holdings. Impacts on hedgerows will be minimised where possible.<br><br>The potential impacts of the Transmission Assets with respect to agricultural land, including the temporary and permanent loss   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected. Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents.<br>Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will impact negatively wildlife and hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has.   | 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).<br>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).<br>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_0177_019_110424          | S44     | Email           |                        | Annex 1b Q1                  | As per the above, the amendments are not acceptable, they will further add stress to the estate/community. All of the above will be compounded as the proposed amendments are closer to our properties, use our existing road infrastructure and take over our community footpath.<br>The whole estate will be alongside a building site, affecting the views and prices of our properties.   | Detailed assessments are 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_0178_001_140424          | S47     | Email           |                        | n/a                          | As a client of REDACTED I am writing to express my alarm at the unsuitability of the proposed siting of the compound adjacent to the riding school and to urge you to reconsider the location<br>I understand that the consultation period has ended but I have only recently become aware of your proposals and their implications for the riding school. I understand the need for wind power to meet our government's targets for clean energy, but the proposed location of the compound would have such a devastating effect on the riding school that it would force it to close completely. Horses are sensitive creatures and they would not be able to tolerate the noise and disruption which the compound would generate.<br>The riding school is a highly regarded establishment within the equine industry and for over 40 years has been supporting a huge local community of riders, volunteers, students and staff, serving hundreds of clients, providing training and opportunities for young people, disabled riders, colleges and young people with mental health and behavioural challenges.<br>For people like myself who have caring responsibilities for family members it provides weekly wellbeing which I could not do without.<br>I urge you to take my points into consideration and find an alternative location. | 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).<br>Daclour Maclaren on behalf of the applicant will work with the interest to discuss mitigation measures for the construction phase.   |
| TA_0179_011_160424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.3                          | Biodiversity net gain is seen as legitimising the carving up of the landscape, however, surely this should not be seen as justifiable. The area in question is farmland, we cannot afford to diminish the use of farmland for crops, once the land has been disturbed it will take years to regain the biodiversity to enable a farmer to continue successfully growing crops. As a nation, we need to do more to support growers of arable crops to continue to feed our nation.<br>The proposed route will affect other aspects of concern caused by climate change, including flooding.  | 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.<br>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.<br>Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on onshore ecology and nature |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              |   | <p>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> <p>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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction.</p>   |
| TA_0179_012_160424          | S44     | Email           | 7                      |                              | <p><b>Agriculture Land</b><br/>The proposed alternative route appears to split into two at Great Carr Side Farm – surely only one route should be necessary/required, to have two routes is completely obliterating there being any useable land! This is a further example of how the consultation on this project appears to be premature as the necessary design details that would allow more effective consultation are simply not available. Furthermore, we have been advised that preliminary investigative works are due to start imminently, leading me to think that this further consultation is just a box ticking exercise, and your decision is already predetermined.</p> | <p>The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found in Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description of the ES (document reference F1.3).</p> <p>Ongoing survey work is undertaken to assist in continued refinement of the design of the Transmission Assets.</p>  |
| TA_0179_013_160424          | S44     | Email           | 13                     |                              | <p>As already mentioned - biodiversity net gain is seen as legitimising the carving up of the landscape, however, surely this should not be seen as justifiable.<br/>The area in question is farmland divided by hedgerows, we cannot afford to diminish the use of farmland for crops, once the land has been disturbed it will take years to regain the biodiversity to enable a farmer to continue successfully growing crops.</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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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> <p>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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance</p> |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              |  | with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction.   |
| TA_0179_015_160424          | S44     | Email           | 15                     |                              | If ultimately it is considered that wider national and global benefits of the scheme outweigh the concerns expressed by 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. We 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  | 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_0179_016_160424          | S44     | Email           | 16                     |                              | Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REG-0077 - REDACTED<br>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great.<br>The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered.<br>The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected. Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents. Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will negatively impact wildlife and hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has. | The Applicants will work with agricultural landowners to mitigate impacts on farm holdings. Impacts on hedgerows will be minimised where possible.<br>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).<br>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).<br>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_0180_005_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.5                          | While this is not a typical historic area, the rolling hills around our community draw visitors in from across the UK and beyond. The devastating effect the cable corridor will have on visitor numbers will affect the local economy of Kirkham, Wrea Green, Freckleton, Lytham and Warton. There are significant numbers of businesses that rely on the tourism trade.  | 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 ES (document reference F3.5).<br>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_0180_012_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.3                          | Biodiversity net gain is seen as legitimising the carving up of the landscape, however, surely this should not be seen as justifiable.   | As set out in the Onshore Biodiversity Benefit Statement (document reference J11), the Transmission Assets are not   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | <p>The area in question is farmland, we cannot afford to diminish the use of farmland for crops, once the land has been disturbed it will take years to regain the biodiversity to enable a farmer to continue successfully growing crops. As a nation, we need to do more to support growers of arable crops to continue to feed our nation.</p> <p>The proposed route will affect other aspects of concern caused by climate change, including flooding.</p>  | <p>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>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. 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> <p>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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction.</p> |
| TA_0180_013_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.4                          | <p><b>4.4 Socio-economics</b></p> <p>The project will have a variety of negative socio economic impacts, which are important to consider alongside the benefits of renewable energy production. Here are some potential negative impacts:</p> <p><b>Visual Impact and Aesthetics:</b> the cable corridor, work and sub stations will have an impact on the visual landscape of rural areas, impacting the scenic beauty and potentially affecting tourism and property values. People will find large wind farms visually intrusive and disruptive to the natural environment.</p> <p><b>Property Values:</b> There is evidence to suggest that the work will and can lower nearby property values. Concerns about noise, aesthetics, and perceived impacts on health can reduce the desirability of properties near wind farms, leading to potential economic losses for property owners.</p> <p><b>Tourism and Recreation:</b> Our rural areas rely on tourism and outdoor recreation for economic activity. The presence of large wind farms might deter tourists who come to rural areas seeking untouched natural landscapes or peaceful surroundings, impacting local businesses like hotels, restaurants, and shops.</p> <p><b>Employment and Local Economy:</b> While the Project can create jobs during the construction phase, the long-term employment impact might be limited.</p> <p><b>Maintenance and operations of wind farms</b> often require specialized skills that might not benefit the local workforce. Additionally, if the wind farm is owned by external companies, much of the revenue generated might not circulate within the local economy.</p> <p><b>Community Disruption:</b> The Project will lead to social tensions within local communities. Some residents might support the project due to potential economic</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). Specifically, socio-economic impacts are set out in section 2.11 of Volume 4, Chapter 2: Socio-economics of the ES (document reference F4.2). 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 Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F1.5.1). 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> <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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | <p>benefits, while others might oppose it due to concerns about aesthetics, noise, or perceived impacts on health. This can lead to divisions within communities and strain social cohesion.</p> <p>Impact on Agriculture: The Project will occupy significant land area, potentially displacing agricultural activities. This might affect local farmers and agriculture-related businesses. Moreover, construction and maintenance activities can disrupt farming operations and access to farmland.</p> <p>Infrastructure Costs: The Project to even be considered will impact remote rural areas that might require significant investment in new or upgraded infrastructure, such as roads, power lines, and substations. These costs might be borne by the local community or government, impacting public finances and resources.</p> <p>Cultural and Heritage Impact: Some wind farm developments might encroach upon culturally significant or protected areas, impacting local heritage and traditions. This can have intangible socioeconomic costs related to community identity and well-being.</p> <p>Addressing these potential negative impacts requires careful planning, community engagement, and consideration of broader socioeconomic factors. Strategies such as community consultation, fair compensation for affected parties, and investments in local infrastructure and skills development can help mitigate these impacts and maximize the benefits of renewable energy projects in rural areas.</p>  | <p>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:<br/>Compulsory purchase and compensation - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) Guide books 1 and 4 being the most appropriate.</p>  |
| TA_0180_014_170424          | S44     | Email           | 7                      |                              | <p><b>Agriculture Land</b></p> <p>Agricultural activity in Fylde is characterised by a relatively large number of small agricultural holdings, as is the case at REDACTED, their contribution to the rural economy of Fylde is significant.</p> <p>The proposed cable alternative route crosses agricultural units that would therefore inevitably be subdivided during the construction phase. The width of the construction corridor will have a relatively greater impact on these smaller agricultural holdings than would be the case on larger farms, as the land taken during construction would be a proportionally greater percentage.</p> <p>In the longer term, cable easements would mean that the availability of land to site agricultural buildings would be restricted and would have an impact on the sustainability of individual businesses, the rural economy as a whole and ultimately the character of the wider rural area. The siting of access points to the cable joints would also potentially impact the efficiency of agricultural holdings. It is considered that greater consideration needs to be given to the routing of cables across individual agricultural holdings to prevent subdivision and loss of productive land.</p> <p>The proposed alternative route appears to split into two at Great Carr Side Farm – surely only one route should be necessary/required, to have two routes is completely obliterating there being any useable land! This is a further example of how the consultation on this project appears to be premature as the necessary design details that would allow more effective consultation are simply not available.</p> <p>The indicated width of the construction corridor is 122m. Much of this is accounted for by the proposed linear storage of topsoil and subsoil during construction. The utilisation of a series of top and subsoil storage areas could reduce the width of the construction corridor by approximately 40% and reduce the adverse impact not only on agricultural holdings but on ecology, and transport infrastructure and reduce the development footprint of the project as a whole.</p> <p>Finally on this point, as the majority of the agricultural land that the project crosses is regarded as BMV, if the project goes ahead, it is essential that the land be reinstated to a high quality that does not impact upon the long-term viability and sustainability of the individual agricultural units.</p> | <p>The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found 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> <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 Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F3.6)</p> |
| TA_0180_015_170424          | S44     | Email           | 13                     |                              | <p>As already mentioned - biodiversity net gain is seen as legitimising the carving up of the landscape, however, surely this should not be seen as justifiable.</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</p>   |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | The area in question is farmland divided by hedgerows, we cannot afford to diminish the use of farmland for crops, once the land has been disturbed it will take years to regain the biodiversity to enable a farmer to continue successfully growing crops.   | 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. 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). 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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction. |
| TA_0180_017_170424          | S44     | Email           | 15                     |                              | If ultimately it is considered that wider national and global benefits of the scheme outweigh the concerns expressed by 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. We 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  | 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_0180_018_170424          | S44     | Email           | 16                     |                              | Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REDACTED<br>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great.<br>The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered.<br>The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected. Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents.<br>Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will impact negatively wildlife and hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has. | The Applicants will work with agricultural landowners to mitigate impacts on farm holdings. Impacts on hedgerows will be minimised where possible.<br>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).<br>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).<br>These measures include the provision of an Outline Soil Management Plan (document reference J1.7). In addition, the  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              |   | Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference J1) seeks to limit disruption to the operation of individual farm holdings.  |
| TA_0180_020_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | Annex 1b Q3                  | <p>Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REG-REDACTED</p> <p>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great.</p> <p>The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered, and at the worst to the original route.</p> <p>The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected. Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents.</p> <p>Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will impact negatively wildlife and hedgerows, which will take years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has.</p> <p>The tracks are in a poor state of disrepair and not suitable for heavy plant. The community struggles with the maintenance of the public roads and we cannot approve any projects that causes more damage.</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, 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>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> <p>The access being discussed in this response is an operational access which will include light vehicular ad-hoc use through the operational phase of the Project.</p> |
| TA_0181_005_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 3.5                          | <p>While this is not a typical historic area, the rolling hills around our community draw visitors in from across the UK and beyond. The devastating effect the cable corridor will have on visitor numbers will affect the local economy of Kirkham, Wrea Green, Freckleton, Lytham and Warton. There are significant numbers of businesses that rely on the tourism trade.</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 ES (document reference F3.5).</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>  |
| TA_0181_012_170424          | S44     | Email           |                        | 4.3                          | <p>Biodiversity net gain is seen as legitimising the carving up of the landscape, however, surely this should not be seen as justifiable.</p> <p>The area in question is farmland, we cannot afford to diminish the use of farmland for crops, once the land has been disturbed it will take years to regain the biodiversity to enable a farmer to continue successfully growing crops. As a nation, we need to do more to support growers of arable crops to continue to feed our nation.</p> <p>The proposed route will affect other aspects of concern caused by climate change, including flooding.</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.</p> <p>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</p>  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              |   | <p>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. 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> <p>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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction.</p> |
| TA_0181_013_170424          | S44     | Email           | 7                      |                              | <p><b>Agriculture Land</b></p> <p>Agricultural activity in Fylde is characterised by a relatively large number of small agricultural holdings, as is the case at REDACTED, their contribution to the rural economy of Fylde is significant.</p> <p>The proposed cable alternative route crosses agricultural units that would therefore inevitably be subdivided during the construction phase. The width of the construction corridor will have a relatively greater impact on these smaller agricultural holdings than would be the case on larger farms, as the land taken during construction would be a proportionally greater percentage.</p> <p>In the longer term, cable easements would mean that the availability of land to site agricultural buildings would be restricted and would have an impact on the sustainability of individual businesses, the rural economy as a whole and ultimately the character of the wider rural area. The siting of access points to the cable joints would also potentially impact the efficiency of agricultural holdings. It is considered that greater consideration needs to be given to the routing of cables across individual agricultural holdings to prevent subdivision and loss of productive land.</p> <p>The proposed alternative route appears to split into two at Great Carr Side Farm – surely only one route should be necessary/required, to have two routes is completely obliterating there being any useable land! This is a further example of how the consultation on this project appears to be premature as the necessary design details that would allow more effective consultation are simply not available. The indicated width of the construction corridor is 122m. Much of this is accounted for by the proposed linear storage of topsoil and subsoil during construction. The utilisation of a series of top and subsoil storage areas could reduce the width of the construction corridor by approximately 40% and reduce the adverse impact not only on agricultural holdings but on ecology, and transport infrastructure and reduce the development footprint of the project as a whole.</p> <p>Finally on this point, as the majority of the agricultural land that the project crosses is regarded as BMV, if the project goes ahead, it is essential that the land be reinstated to a high quality that does not impact upon the long-term viability and sustainability of the individual agricultural units.</p> | <p>The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found 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> <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 Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference F3.6)</p>  |



| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response   |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| TA_0181_014_170424          | S44     | Email           | 13                     |                              | As already mentioned - biodiversity net gain is seen as legitimising the carving up of the landscape, however, surely this should not be seen as justifiable. The area in question is farmland divided by hedgerows, we cannot afford to diminish the use of farmland for crops, once the land has been disturbed it will take years to regain the biodiversity to enable a farmer to continue successfully growing crops.   | 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. 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). 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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction. |
| TA_0181_016_170426          | S44     | Email           | 15                     |                              | If ultimately it is considered that wider national and global benefits of the scheme outweigh the concerns expressed by 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. We 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  | 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_0181_014_170427          | S44     | Email           | 16                     |                              | Re Plan reference: BP-GBR-MORG-REDACTED<br>While we all appreciate the project and its aims, the impact on society, the environment and communities is too great.<br>The disruption is not minimal nor short term and therefore the cable corridors should be reconsidered.<br>The original route, although disruptive, would be a better option, whereby it has less of an impact on the extent of valuable agricultural land affected. Furthermore, the original route only affects the rear of one agricultural holding, rather than multiple properties/residents.<br>Finally, the original route will not require the building of numerous operational access tracks which will impact negatively wildlife and hedgerows, which will take | The Applicants will work with agricultural landowners to mitigate impacts on farm holdings. Impacts on hedgerows will be minimised where possible.<br>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).<br>Measures adopted as part of the Transmission Assets to mitigate potential impacts on land use and recreation are   |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received  | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              | years and years to recover, and obliterate the rich and varied wildlife which it currently has.   | 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_0182_005_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   |                        | 3.5                          | Beautiful countryside will be disturbed; this may affect tourism and visitors bringing trade to the area.   | 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 ES (document reference F3.5). 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_0182_013_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   | 7                      |                              | The proposed cable route will subdivide a number of small agricultural holdings in the construction phase, and the impact on smaller holdings will be much greater than on larger farms. The cable easements are of greater concern to smaller holdings for the same reason.<br>We would request further information as to why specific proposals around REDACTED have been made as we feel the proposed alternative route in entirely inappropriate. | The cable route proposed as part of the application aims to avoid as much of this sensitive area as possible. This has been considered as part of the iterative site selection process, together with design and engineering constraints. Full details of Transmission Assets Order Limits can be found 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). 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). |
| TA_0182_014_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   | 13                     |                              | We feel that the proposed Biodiversity Net gain is not justifiable due to the BMW farmland which is divided by hedgerows, and once disturbed will take many years to regain to enable successful growing of crops.  | 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.  |

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |         |                 |                        |                              |  | <p>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. 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> <p>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 application for development consent. The measures to be implemented as part of the Soil Management Plan are in general accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IQ) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (IQ, 2021) and British Society of Soil Science (BSSS) Working with Soil Guidance Note on Benefiting from Soil Management in Development and Construction (BSSS, 2022) which seek to minimise impacts on soil health and protect and maintain soil quality during construction.</p> |
| TA_0182_016_060424          | S44     | Hardcopy form   | 15                     |                              | It would be good to have a financial benefit to local schools, communities, charities etc by way of reduced energy costs, and/or permission of community facilities for the benefit of the local area residents. | 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.   |

### Draft DCO

| Unique Reference Identifier | S42/S44 | Feedback method | Feedback form question | Feedback form sub - question | Statutory consultation response received   | Applicants' response  |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| TA_0177_016_110424          | S44     | Email           | 14                     |                              | There is no guidance as to what this means, and how we are expected to respond comprehensively. We have struggled to find further information on this element of the consultation. | 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. |
| TA_0179_014_160424          | S44     | Email           | 14                     |                              | There is no guidance as to what this means, and how we are expected to respond comprehensively. We have struggled to find further information on this element of the consultation. | 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.   |
| TA_0180_016_170424 | S44 | Email         | 14 |  | There is no guidance as to what this means, and how we are expected to respond comprehensively. We have struggled to find further information on this element of the consultation. | 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. |
| TA_0181_015_170425 | S44 | Email         | 14 |  | There is no guidance as to what this means, and how we are expected to respond comprehensively. We have struggled to find further information on this element of the consultation. | 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. |
| TA_0182_015_060424 | S44 | Hardcopy form | 14 |  | There is insufficient information available on this tops – it is unfair to not have this information available for us to review.   | 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. |