

3rd August 2012

National Infrastructure Planning

Temple Quay House

Temple Quay

Bristol

BS1 6PN

E mail ablemarineenergypark@infrastructure.gsi.gov.uk

Dear NIP

Able Marine Energy Park- Representation On Behalf of Simon Taylor

Further to my representation to the IPC dated 27 June 2012 and in reply the answers supplied by ABLE in their response document dated June 2012.

I accept and thank ABLE for their responses No's 2,3,4,5,and 7. I still have concerns about 19.6 which the applicant has failed to address.

I am also concerned there is no independent review of the reports submitted.

I am far from convinced the applicant has grasped the importance of level drainage or the vital strategic importance of Stone Creek.

There are no, "what if we are wrong" remedial actions included.

I fully support and endorse the concerns raised by the Stone Creek Boat Club.

End of Representation.

Can you please confirm that my submission has been received by the NIP?

Due to the lack of notice given by the NIP system I am unable to provide a more detailed response.

Thank you

Simon Taylor

On Wed, Jun 27, 2012 at 3:55 PM, simon taylor <xxxx> wrote:

Wednesday, 27 June 2012

National Infrastructure Planning

Temple Quay House

Temple Quay

Bristol

BS1 6PN

E mail ablemarineenergypark@infrastructure.gsi.gov.uk

Dear NIP

Able Marine Energy Park- Representation On Behalf of Simon Taylor

I wish to add further detail to concerns raised in my initial representation (No.21). Can you please confirm this representation has been received and included for consideration by NIP?

My representations relate to the Compensation site only.

Diversion of the Public Footpath. The existing Public Footpath runs along the bank top. In the scheme proposed by the developer the new Public Footpath runs along the bottom and on the outside of the new bank. This effectively excludes the public from viewing any benefits from the site. There is no justification for imposing this condition; inclusion of the public should be an overriding consideration. Moving the Public Footpath suggest undue influence upon the developer by others.

Long Term Flood Protection provided by the new bank. The new bank has to provide or better the greater long term protection as set out by the Environment Agency. The quality of construction and materials used must also meet this new standard. Who will be responsible for quality control during construction? What legal assurances will be in place to prevent an adequate but inferior defence bank being built?

Who will take on the long term responsibility for the new bank? Clarity is sought on who will legally adopt and take responsibility for the new bank should the developer fail.

The Developer does not say how the new bank will be built given the existing, on site material is unsuitable.

Size of compensation site! The proposed compensation site is approx three times bigger than the habitat being lost. I understand this is not a legal requirement but a condition imposed by Natural England. How can this be justified?

Why has the developer not been allowed to take into consideration the emergence of the new enlarged mud banks off Cherry Cobb Sands. The developer should be allowed to include this vast area of new habitat gain against any losses due to the proposed development. The need for any compensation site has not been shown by the developer, Natural England or others.

Silting up of Stone Creek – The developers' proposal says there will be additional silting of Stone Creek but do not discuss in detail or offer any remedial actions. Stone Creek is vital for the safe drainage of a very large area of Holderness any changes will increase flood risk. From the documents provided it is clear the developer has not grasped the importance of Stone Creek and the potential dire implications of their proposals.

The developer has only carried out a desk top study of Stone Creek and the immediate estuary and is therefore unaware of the full consequences their proposed development will have on the study area. The investigation work carried out so far is inadequate to support the application.

I fully support and endorse the concerns raised by the Stone Creek Boat club.

Location of the new Southern Flood bank. I have been given assurances by the developer that the new flood bank as proposed has been moved North 300m, this would be acceptable. However the scheme as submitted to the IPC/NIP does not show this and so far the developer has not taken the opportunity to amend the drawings.

Loss of valuable farmland - Currently the UK is a net exporter of wheat, this will change as more land is taken out and the crop is used for alternative non food uses. The compensation site consists of high grade farm land used for growing our food. Once lost it cannot be replaced. In the documentation submitted there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate the cumulative effects this loss of crops will have or that consideration of alternative sites has been exhaustively researched.

End of Representation.

Simon Taylor

xxxx,

xxxx,

xxxx,

xxxx.

xxxx

xxxx

xxxx

Note. Unable to attach Doc file due to current poor internet connection.

This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless Worldwide in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please

call your organisation's IT Helpdesk.
Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded
for legal purposes.

Correspondents should note that all communications to Department for Communities and Local Government may be
automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for lawful purposes.
