

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Tilbury2](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: The Planning Inspectorate Preliminary Meeting 20th February
Date: 19 February 2018 15:22:58

My Reference TIL2-AFP1482

Dear Sir,

I received notice of this meeting but was extremely disappointed to note that it will take place at a time which will prohibit many people from attending, including myself, and at a venue which will ensure that there is limited accessibility for large sectors of the community. This is inexcusable and one cannot help but wonder whether this is a deliberate and unpalatable strategy to ensure that those who have the most to lose are given the least opportunity to make their voices heard. It is not acceptable that this project is advanced at the expense of the people of Tilbury.

I have also been disappointed to note that my concerns have not been included on the National Infrastructure Planning Representations site, although I forwarded these to you in July for inclusion. I attach a further copy of my original comments.

I have spoken at length today with Councillor Steve Liddiard, who is fully conversant with local concerns and is deeply committed to working with the community, investigating the wide ranging issues and seeking to ensure the best possible outcomes for the people that he represents. I look forward to supporting his work and that of like-minded groups to ensure that this area of Thurrock is not written off.

Yours

Stephanie Lakin

[REDACTED]



Virus-free. www.avg.com

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

**EXPANSION OF THE PORT OF TILBURY – “TILBURY2”
STATUTORY CONSULTATION ON A PROPOSED APPLICATION FOR DEVELOPMENT CONSENT
SECTION 42 PLANNING ACT 2008**

Stephanie Lakin
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

July 25th 2017

Comments arising from investigation into content of available information and discussion with John Speakman – Exhibition at Tilbury Hub, Civic Square, Tilbury 26th June 2017

In addition to the issues raised between March and April during informal (non-statutory) consultation, which you have listed in your Consultation Document June 2017 I would like to add the further points:

- In your document ‘GUIDE TO CLAIMS FOR LOSS OF PROPERTY VALUE ARISING FROM TILBURY2’ a number of specific factors are clearly referenced which indicate that these are very real concerns and probabilities. This is contradictory to the placatory messages regarding the ‘taking into account the above issues’, ‘minimising’ and lessening impact. The Guide refers to, noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, artificial lights and the discharge to the property of any solid or liquid substances. This is totally unacceptable.**
- The ‘processing of a variety of goods’ has hitherto been a well concealed aspect of this project. It is not acceptable to introduce facilities for the processing of aggregates into an area which is ill prepared, essentially residential and already suffering from poor air quality. ‘Respirable dust may be released during processing...loading and unloading. Long term exposure to respirable dust i.e. bricks, sand and clay found in bricks and concrete can lead to respiratory damage and disease. Silica dust has been associated with pulmonary disease and cancer.’ This is a public health and safety issue.**
- The impact of heavy vehicles on the area has been insufficiently highlighted. It is insulting to propose an improvement to the Asda roundabout in order that ‘less queuing would lessen the impact of pollution from HGVs on the area’. There can be NO impact and the current situation needs to be urgently addressed i.e. the whole area has become a lorry park and rubbish, including bottles of urine, litter the area. The vibration and fumes from these vehicles is damaging and the impact on infrastructure is obvious, highway conditions are appalling. Driving is hazardous and local people feel ‘at risk’ on the roads and junctions. Vehicles frequently create dangerous conditions when they take the wrong turning and then attempt to negotiate their exit through public areas.**
- There is no mention of, for example, a sound barrier so that excavation work could include a green footprint. Neither is there a mention of specific benefits to the community, should there be a compromise between public concerns and project proposals in the future, for example, what amenities would be included in the development proposals which would make improvements to the area?**

- There has been very little outline included in the proposals regarding the use of waterways. This would be a vital part of the project in terms of alleviating road usage and making use of existing transport facilities. This could be a positive. I have accessed further information through the website but this is not prominent in the generally distributed literature which is not encouraging.
- I have already drawn my other concerns to your attention and note that these are referenced in your documentation as causes for investigation before the project can move forward. I now reiterate these in terms of public health and safety, air quality and conservation. It is vital that these concerns are fully addressed when the proposals are refined and finalised ahead of planning application for a DCO later this year.

I would like to be included in all further consultations and for my concerns as highlighted above to be registered and fully investigated.

Yours sincerely

Stephanie Lakin