

Responses to the Applicant's Responses to Written Representations

Applicant's Consultation

If the applicant was aware that the consultation documents had not been deposited at the correct sites, then this should have been publicised and a note should have been made on updated publicity documentation, and on the applicant's website. This would have then enabled those that had tried to access the documents know they had now been deposited at these sites that previously did not have them. It was a legal obligation of the applicant to ensure this process was followed correctly and not for members of the public to have to keep chasing up where these documents were.

I confirm that Chapel Lane, Keadby, which appears to be in the 3km zone when you look at the consultation zones, did not get any documentation. The map is very difficult to study due to the scale that has been used for it.

Loss of Jobs at Flixborough Wharf

I disagree with the applicant's response that there will be no job losses at the wharf. The applicant in the Compulsory Acquisition Schedule states that: "Option to purchase completed on 2 August 2019." This clearly implies jobs could be lost if RMS decide to sell and it seems likely as they have sold their other two assets: Guinness and Althorpe Wharf. As work progresses on the project, it may be that the two companies may not be able to work in harmony with one another then the applicant will excise their CPO rights.

Humber Low Carbon Pipeline

The applicant cannot assume that "it is reasonable to assume that the project could be connected to the HLCP in the future." Without certainty, there is no weight to their argument.

Designated Sites and Landscape and Visual Impact

The applicant states that: "There are no sites designated for visual or scenic quality within the area." Surely this is contradictory as the whole area is set to be listed as an AONB. Also, there are many SSSIs, SACs, SPAs and LNRs.

When will the lighting strategy be submitted to NLC? It surely needs to be submitted and agreed before the examination ends.

Heritage

The applicant believes that: "the historic core of Amcotts is set well back from the river and is screened from Flixborough Port by trees so, like the listed buildings within it, any impacts from the operational facilities of NLGEP will be minimal." The USI conducted by the Planning Inspectorate on 23rd January 2023 will hopefully have noted that the trees supposedly screening the port, once all the leaves have fallen, have a lesser impact screening Amcotts and any listed buildings. I therefore disagree with the applicant's conclusion that the impact will be "minimal".

Noise

Does the applicant think subjecting residents to potential impacts of noise at night-time of up to 7db above the evening criterion is acceptable? The applicant admits that evening noise will have a "large magnitude impact at times." The applicant is always working on a "what if" scenario and if they are allowed to progress with the application there will be very little that can be done to stop the noise they create. They have said they will liaise with NLC about works outside of "normal working hours" but NLC are already dealing with noise complaints from the wharf and don't seem to be able to deal with the issues already being investigated.

Health

The worst -case scenario presented by the applicant regarding traffic and the health impact as a result of this has to hold weight, particularly if the rail link does not happen and the river cannot be utilised in the way the applicant is proposing. The applicant states: "it has been assumed that 100% of freight movements would arrive and depart via road, which adopts a worst-case scenario i.e. emissions have been overestimated." Is it acceptable to have up to 800 vehicles a day operating in Year 4 creating an adverse impact on health due to emissions?

Nypro and it Associated Impacts

The applicant still manages to avoid the question how they are going to allay fears about another incident and how they will support residents with their mental health due to the ongoing threat/worry of another disaster.

Wildlife

Can the applicant explain how they know the projects: "Potential effects at a local level (i.e. local populations of birds which may use habitats within and surrounding the village of Amcotts) are not considered to be significant"? I don't think it is acceptable to have a "residual effect" on birds onsite considering some of the species identified on the sight are red listed.