

In App061 the applicant states there will be no "significant impact on the road network". This assessment, based on 5.4.11 has not been made on real time monitoring but on pre-covid assessment levels with no reference to any current data that, as far as my enquiries have shown, no specific referenceable data is available and is based purely on the applicants assumptions/computer modelling.

In the public hearings the applicant stated that 175 one way journeys daily would be what they based their data on. However that also means it should be double that at 350 as vehicles travel in both directions. What data/methodology was used to arrive at this figure?

In the same vein, the applicant's assessment of road and rail transport in regards to air quality at 6.2.5 and noise at 6.2.7 as having negligible impact. What does negligible impact mean? The creation of congestion pinch points and creating significant driver waiting as demonstrated in part of the applicant's assessment with figures not obtained by traffic surveys as according to NLC and Highways England do not exist. Another figure of "up to 750 truck movements a day" plus staff vehicles, maintenance vehicles, visitors to the "visitor centre" are obviously going to have a considerable impact in my humble opinion.

Public Health England asked about emissions: The response was incomplete regarding emissions assessed. The applicant responded: "All emissions should be considered". In that case Why are PM10 to PM2.5 of " no interest for ecology" when they are considered for Human receptors? Also what about the more dangerous PM2.5 to PM1's as the most damaging particulates not considered for any class of receptor?

In APP061 at 8.1.1.17 The applicant has not made any consideration to the adverse effect on traffic flow on the A18 north to the "Tesco's" roundabout and more crucially, the effect on the much more sensitive "Berkely Circle" to changes in traffic volumes, why?

Using the % figures for traffic flows in 8.1.1.14 only minimal traffic flow has been considered relating to the site. It would be helpful to know what data was used to base this assumption on? Also how does this affect the volume of traffic already accessing the other businesses on the site during construction and operation of the facility?

In APP063 at 8.3.1.4 The CBMF will produce 2,720 tonnes of waste p.a. what will this very specific volume of waste consist of?

At 8.3.1.5 9,800 tpa of waste water will be produced. What will this be contaminated with? As I have previously referenced that Colin Hammond for the applicant stated that "water wasn't clean enough to wash the plastic for reprocessing"? Also how will this waste water be disposed of as, Severn Trent have already stated their public sewers don't have capacity for effluent processing from the site? Also from the Plastics reprocessing "there will be 500 tpa of metal waste". How can this be justified as the applicant has stated on many occasions "no sorting of waste on site" and "plastics will be delivered to site that have previously been sorted"? Also what is "waste that is oversize"?

In 8.3.1.6, going on from the above, if water isn't clean enough to wash plastic for reprocessing, what chemicals are used for cleaning the plastics? Where is this chemical stored? In what Volumes and how is the waste or soiled chemical cleaner disposed of and stored prior to disposal? In Figure 4 the waste chemical has been omitted also.

In 8.3.1.12 the applicant states that the waste proximity principle is to be observed, if so there will be little or no waste available for the project in the county as stated by the NLC previously.

Going on from the above statement, in 8.3.1.11 (and subsequently in 9.2.1.2) the applicant states the volume of waste exported through the Humber ports justifies "the need for a regional waste treatment facility". What waste justifies the need? In what volume and what treatment process? Also where will this waste originate from please?

In 8.3.1.1.13 The likely negative effects during the operational phase are considered as "not significant". A sweeping statement that will not affect the applicant but will definitely have a substantial effect on those who will have zero benefit from any part of the project i.e. established villages and local ecosystems - and potentially the national food chain by dioxins contaminating very productive grade 1 agricultural land and also the AB Agri feed mill adjacent.