

Planning Inspectorate  
Able Marine Energy Park

Your Ref: TR030001  
My Ref: 10015509  
Tel: 01482 612387  
Fax: 01482 612382  
Email: alex.codd@hullcc.gov.uk

Date: 13th September 2012

**HULL CITY COUNCIL UNIQUE REFERENCE NUMBER: 10015509**  
**ABLE MARINE ENERGY PARK ON THE SOUTH BANK OF THE RIVER HUMBER AT**  
**IMMINGHAM, NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE**  
**PLANNING INSPECTORATE REFERENCE NUMBER: TR030001**

Hull City Council attended the hearing sessions on the Able Marine Energy Park on the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> September 2012 which were specifically focused on the Habitats Regulation Assessment. There appears to be some confusion over what Hull City Council's position regarding the application is following questions from the lead Inspector and I thought it beneficial to clarify this.

For information I attach the Council's previous responses to the Able Marine Energy Park proposal (AMEP). The response dated the 29<sup>th</sup> June 2012 confirms the City Council in paragraph 3.1 supports the principle of the proposed development at AMEP, and paragraph 4.4 confirms that as the development impacts on the Humber Estuary a rigorous application of the Habitats Regulations is required. The only concerns raised by the council relate solely to the equitable application of these regulations to both the Greenport Hull (GPH) site and AMEP.

These are the points that I drew out at the sessions on the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> of September and a recording of what I specifically said is available. There was no other representative from either of the other 3 authorities across the Humber to voice their opinion of support or not for the proposal and the appropriate application of the Habitats Regulations.

During the session it was unfortunate that Able UK presented a further revised site for compensation on the North Bank of the Humber beside Cherry Cobb Sands. Neither Hull City Council nor East Riding of Yorkshire Council (the authority where the site is proposed) has had the opportunity to comment on. This is particularly concerning as the introduction of an area of land in excess of 30 hectares is a significant change to the compensation proposed and there has been no opportunity for any Local Authority or environmental organisation to comment on the suitability of this site.

In ensuring an equitable process is followed with the determination of GPH and AMEP the Council are concerned that if this proposal had come forward for GPH the red line

boundary of the site would have changed and a significant revision to the Environmental Impact Assessment would have been required. This would have meant the application being withdrawn and then resubmitted due to the change in red line boundary, the resubmitted document would then have been consulted upon again. I would have expected the IPC would require the same level of public consultation to occur on this revision as has been done with the rest of the application, after all my understanding of the IPC process for dealing with Nationally Significant Infrastructure projects is for all these details to be submitted upfront when the application is validated. Such a significant change at such a late stage in the process surely means the date for the examination to close on the 25<sup>th</sup> November 2012 needs to be reconsidered for this information to be fully considered.

I also attach with this letter the Council's most recent written submission on AMEP which was made to the Statement of Common Ground regarding the shadow Habitats Regulation Assessment.

As is evident in this letter and previous submissions the Council is supportive of the principle of this site being developed out for a marine energy park but does have reservations with the determination process regarding the Habitats Regulation Assessment. These concerns will be expanded upon within a further submission from the Council to be submitted by the 24<sup>th</sup> September deadline.

Yours sincerely

**Mr Alex Codd**  
**City Planning Manager**