Able Marine Energy Park

Attention Mike Harris, Grimsby hearing 12th November 2012.

At the hearing today I was given a brief opportunity to list the topics I had hoped to raise with the panel, for personal reasons I had to leave early. From memory:-

<u>Navigation in Stone Creek for the SCBC.</u> The club has raised concerns about the effects the scheme will have at two points in the navigation channel, 1, entrance to Stone Creek and 2, 'The battery'.

In the ABLE documents ex 28.3 Prt. 3 page 68, states, *If management operations cause some sediment build up in the entrance to SC,* Able will clear.

- However who will decide trigger point?
- Worthless without legal agreement,
- Only considers one location.
- No navigation, no SCBC.

The SCBC has put forward positive idea's, ie 'the finger' they feel will resolve the silting problem and have a positive effect on the sluice gates, '

Effects the scheme will have on opening of the Keyingham Drain sluice gates.

ST has been a lone voice on raising this concern. Now the EA has picked up on the problem and they discuss in their submission.

Note EA have telemetry on the sluice gates.

Legal Agreement Local stake holders should be included.

ABLE document EX 28.3 Part 10 Draft Legal Agreement Schedule 3.

The advisory group is made up exclusively of external bodies. Persons directly affected by the issues should be included. Ie Residents, ST, SCBC, Tenants etc. This should apply to all legal agreements which are part of this application.

<u>David keiller statement at Grimsby hearing 11^{th} October 2012</u> Clarified of his spoken word in writing.

Refering to Stone Creek he admits there is a real risk of flooding in the short term.

- Define 'short term'? (EA suggest this could be years!)
- Absolutely not acceptable that area is put at a higher flood risk as a result of This development
- Having confirmed the risk we need to see legal acceptance of liability from ABLE.
- EA can explain what 1 in 50 means in practice.

Simon Taylor

<u>Salt water levels in Keyingham Drain.</u> As part of the new wet grasslands site, fresh water needs to be pumped in from the Keyingham Drain. However one option for keeping Stone Creek clear is to allow in a full tide, close the sluice and release at low tide.

ABLE requirement for fresh water must not prevent the sluicing option. I believe amending the design could provide an acceptable solution.

<u>Dredging Stone Creek.</u> Submissions give Contradictory evidence.

- David Keiller says, 'creek will benefit from scheme in the long term' Then why the need for dredging?
- Who sets the parameters, Trigger point.
- What and where does the baseline come from?
- What is the agreement with the IDB and why? I IDB have no responsibility for SC. It is very important this is made public as the IDB have stayed away, why?
- Legal agreement must include all parties with an interest.

The use of Lidar to measure Stone Creek. Ex 28.3 Prt 3 Page 83.

Previous surveys show errors when working down to this detail. Crops have been known to show up as high ground.

<u>Public Footpath.</u> Ref. ABLE Letter to the panel 1st Nov. Rule 17 Ans. Question 2. Pressure appears to be put on ABLE to re reroute the public foot path away from the bank top.

There is considerable evidence that human behaviour, (+dogs) can affect bird populations. - Complete baloney!

- Dog owners have always walked the bank tops, if the statement made is true, why is there so much wild life for the panel to take into consideration?
- NE + RSPB must not under the cover of this application create conditions to suit their own agenda.
- Excluding the public will encourage resentment.

The importance of Stone Creek has not been understood. The EA are able to provide a map + figures which show the catchment area draining into Stone Creek. This should be given to the panel/applicant

Thank you

Simon Taylor
12th November 2012.