

Text Data Samples for Redaction

Sample 1:

i feek the super sewew will have a detremebtal affect on my childs school.which is located directly behind tue proposed site ..the noise heavy lorry traffic and disruption to their school days are far greater than the need for this super sewer...i would like for you to take my views on this matter into account when considering the plans for the super sewer...which is going to have a major impact in grangetown school ,its pupils,parents and the surrounding community.thank yiu james watss parent to christine watts-hugh..pupil at riversude primary school ..

Sample 2:

I object to Drax's application to add carbon capture technology to two of its wood-burning units. I object because I believe the proposal is not a sustainable development as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (<http://smith.biz/>), since it is not compatible with increasing productivity, supporting communities' health, protecting our natural environment or improving biodiversity. According to Drax's planning document, carbon capture will reduce the net efficiency of the biomass boilers to just 28.49% because 28% of the energy generated by each unit will be needed to capture and compress CO₂. The real figure could potentially be even higher. By decreasing electricity generation, there is a high chance that this will cause more fossil gas to be burned in other power stations. This is contrary to the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy's (<http://www.smith.com>) commitment to reduce energy from fossil fuels. I am also very concerned about the potential harm to human health from the amine chemicals which Drax is planning to use to separate the CO₂ from the other flue gases. These amines can form other compounds when they are emitted, including nitrosamines and nitramines which are possible carcinogens (<https://tinyurl.co><http://www.duke-brown.org>). Yorkshire and Humberside already have high levels of air pollution (<http://www.bates-gibson.info/>) and there is a lack of research into the impacts of these chemicals on public health. Moreover, Drax's Ecology Report (<https://powers.com>) for the project states that this development will lead to the degradation and destruction of a number of internationally, nationally and locally important habitats where ecological surveys found rare and protected species, including orchids, water voles, otters, Great Crested Newts and many species of birds. The government classes energy from burning trees as 'low-carbon' and argues that it can help 'tackle climate change'. I strongly disagree with this, as do hundreds of scientists (<http://mendoza.com>) and environmental NGOs around the world (John Dunn) who highlight that burning wood is as bad as fossil fuels and that Drax's claims that BECCS can achieve "negative

emissions” are based on the false assumption that logging, transporting and burning trees in power stations can be “carbon neutral.” (<https://tinyurl.com/>) I urge you to take note of these concerns and refuse permission for Drax’s BECCS application.

Sample 3:

I own the property situated at 14 Halcyon Wharf, 208 High Street, London PH17 1HD, and which I believe will or might be affected by the application.

Sample 4:

Dear Sir/Madam, Please take what we all have to say on board about developing Swanscombe Marshes into a amusement park. I am 75 years old, woman who is very passionate about the environment, nature and biodiversity on Earth. It honestly cuts deep into me when I hear about every single section of land that is destroyed for housing estates, transport, nuclear power stations and now amusement parks. I am so concerned about how we treat our planet because no-body seems to care about anyone but themselves. Were are not the only organisms on this planet, we share it with SO MANY other organisms that have the SAME RIGHTS to be here as us, but yet we keep on taking and taking and TAKING habitats and ecosystems away for our own selfish reasons. We are not going to have any wildlife left at the speed we are destroying everything and if there is no wildlife then there will be no humans. How can you be ok with completely destroying Swanscombe Marshes when you know full well it’s rich breeding bird assemblage includes 15 red-listed Birds of Conservation Concern and 12 Species of Principal Importance- including Marsh harriers, Bearded tit, Nightingales and Black redstart. Furthermore, it is home to the critically endangered jumping spider. Why can you not develop this amusement park somewhere that DOESN’T provide our wonderful and extremely important wildlife with homes. Would you like a bulldozer taken to your house? How about having to watch your kids be killed by mindless people who have no idea what destruction they have caused? Because that’s what the wildlife will have to live through if Swanscombe Marshes is destroyed. I am trying to do my bit for climate change and to help create a safe haven for our incredible wildlife. I really hope you do too, by listening to each and everyone of us that sends these letters to you. We need to protect and preserve the amazing biodiversity on our planet, and these Marshes have so much biodiversity within them. We cannot afford to loose these as it will cause so much damage to our ecosystem. I am literally begging you to do the right thing and change this project to work with nature, not against it. Thank you for taking your time to read this, I really hope you take it into consideration.

Sample 5:

Mr Jamie Daniels is the owner of Old Farm on the north side of the A1. From the farm is also run Rock Club owned by Jamie Daniels sand operates a large number of HGV’s from the site, including the site office and compound. The traffic movements

from the farm are significant. We are concerned that the access to and from the property will be constrained and require confirmation that a suitable access to and from the public carriageway will be installed to enable safe passage for HGV's. we are concerned about the speed of traffic coming along the old A1 from Alnwick if the road is straightened out and the conflict with HGV's crossing over and taking access to Old Farm. We are concerned about the increase noise, dust and vibration from the additional carriageways and the busier road from Alnwick to South Charlton with the traffic taking a new access to the A14 at Charlton Mires. We are concerned about the loss of agricultural land from the farm business. We are concerned about the lack of details surrounding field drainage. The farmland is already low lying and we have real concerns that the new carriageway will mean the flooding of the farmland. We will require proper field drainage to be installed and the culvert under the A14 to be maintained by HE in the future to allow the passage of water to the east which is the natural flow. We are concerned about the lack of screening and loss of hedges that our client currently enjoys to protect the impact of the A1 on their property.

Sample 6:

I have lived in Nether Brandon Haas for 35 years with my husband who was raised in the village and my 3 children. The village is a thriving community, we have a fire station, doctors/pharmacy, school 5yrs to 11 yrs age, butchers, post office/store/tea shop 2 other shops, 3 pubs, 2 hairdressers. village hall, church hall, children's centre, numerous bed and breakfast, Coleridge Cottage owned by National Trust, I could keep going on naming the plus points of my home. The church however is on the other side of the A39 as is the local Dairy and farm shop which employs many local people, to cross the road is very dangerous because the only straight length of the A39 between Bridgwater and Williton is on one of the two junctions to the village. I am not against the development as I can see that it will bring employment to the village, my concern is the junction. I can see that drivers who have become frustrated with traffic flow through Bridgwater and Cannington will be trying to get past the large lorries that frequent this route daily and our bit of the A39 will be the overtaking place as it is now but with added traffic will only be exacerbated. We have asked the highways for help but this has been halted due to lack of funds, would it be possible for EDF to work in conjunction with the highways and perhaps make the junction safe. Although the junction is a staggered crossroads the drivers do not slow down there are accidents on a regular basis and near misses most days. Because we as a village are not 'involved' we feel any requests for help to improve this junction are being ignored. Why should another person be killed or seriously injured when a comparatively small change could make this junction safe to use as a driver and as a pedestrian. I have just this Christmas laid flowers in memory of my friend who was killed at this very junction 19 years ago, please help with my plea so as I will not have to lay flowers for anyone else. Many thanks for allowing me to make my request. Edwin Robinson

Sample 7:

CenturyLink and its incumbent companies, own live assets in the area of the development, on both the public highway and Network Rail land/infrastructure. Whilst we do not object to the works please note that we require unhindered access to our asset at all times. Should our asset on the public highway require moving a formal C3/C4 request should be submitted to our appointed agent **Instalcom** at collins.lisa@example.net. Should our asset on Network Rail or TOC owned land, within the Network Rail infrastructure/boundary require moving a request should be sent to eric03@example.net. Any works that are in the immediate vicinity of our asset, but no contact will be made with our asset (exposing of ducts or excavation works in the public highway or works in trough route or excavation works next to trough route in Network rail land) then please advise mooremichelle@level3.com so a HAZCON can be raised

Sample 8:

I am a Director of Mechtek Engineering Ltd. We occupy Unit K9 Industrial Estate, Lower Road, Northfleet. Manchester. CF95 4PE under a leasehold interest. Our property is within the boundary of the London Resort Development Consent Order. If development consent is granted, our property will be subject to compulsory acquisition. Our business is Mechanical Fabrication & Mechanical site services and we employ 6 staff. We need to remain within the Ebbsfleet and Gravesend area in order to retain both customers and staff. We are concerned that finding a suitable and affordable replacement property will be extremely difficult. The trend over the last five years or so, of the compulsorily acquisition and redevelopment of industrial property for high-density residential purposes, and in this case for leisure purposes, has resulted in a reduction in the supply of affordable industrial property in East London, Essex and Kent. This situation has been exacerbated by an increase in demand for logistics property due to the rise of internet shopping and more recently due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Because of this, industrial values have increased significantly. There is also a diminishing amount of property that is suitable for the businesses that will be displaced if development consent is granted for the London Resort. It seems that little thought has been given to where the many businesses affected by these schemes, and in particular by the London Resort development, will operate from after their premises have been acquired and redeveloped.

Sample 9:

I object to the expansion due to the desiccation of a natural nature environment, the animals that roam the fields and the plant life, I have cancer as does my brother and the fumes affect me when the wind changes and the smell is even stronger, I work in a special needs school that is close by and am shocked at the overpowering smells

that drift into the playground which is not good for the health of the children as they could develop **asthma**, the roads are poorly maintained and cannot cope with the potential increase of traffic, it's a main road with children walking along it to four schools in close proximity so there's the increased risk of accidents.

Sample 10:

The extremely poor quality and complete Lack of detail in all of the hand outs with maps that are impossible to read. When information has been requested no response or no answer given. The habitat and wildlife that will be lost as no one with local knowledge has been asked to show national highways just what is living on some of the land they are going to use some one to come and look and listen would have been nice. I apologise for my spelling as I have migraine and find very hard to write down what I'm trying to express.

Sample 11:

I am the owner of 72 Longcross Rd. The development of area behind my house will impact the view from my house and I am very concerned that there will be noise and flashing lights which will make it difficult or impossible to live in my house. The area behind my house is currently a quiet peaceful haven for wildlife. Also I am concerned about the amount of traffic that the development will attract to the area. The traffic is already very heavy and it is almost impossible to park along Stanhope Rd, this development will virtually make the road unusable. It will be a nightmare for the residents of Stanhope Rd to get to and from their homes with the amount of traffic that will be created during the development and when the resort opens.

Sample 12:

I live in Herne Bay directly under the extreme east to west proposed flight path. I object to the application because:- The applicants intentions regarding night flights is not clear, worst case scenario is said to be eight flights a night, so why is the night noise quota count so big? Why is there no numerical cap on night flights? This would severely affect the sleep quality in my household. Will the Inspector get clarity on those matters please? The applicants estimate of additional HGV movements generated seem very low (64,906 by year 2020). Compare that with East Midlands Airport which currently generates 182,500 HGV movements, yet by year 2020 Manston is forecast to exceed East Midlands freight tonnage. Indeed Sir James Moore stated on the BBC in July 2015 that Manston's location and roads were unsuitable for a possible relief of operation stack and the idea was "completely insane". What has changed in the last 3 years to suggest the roads are now suitable for HGVs? This would cause untold extra pollution travelling down the A299 past my house. Affecting my asthma and quality of life. Will the Inspector please probe the accuracy of the applicants forecast, as the implications for the local road network are significant? Also there is the question of fuel tanker movements per day. The

applicants estimate seems very low. Obviously, the more successful the airport becomes the greater the impact of tanker traffic. Finally the Business Case lacks cash flow, profit and loss and investment projections. It is mainly based on opinions, conjecture and assertions. The main draws of freight and passenger demand are GDP and the exchange rate. The Bank of England, The Treasury and the International Monetary Fund find it virtually impossible to forecast these variables 12 months in advance, yet the applicant forecasts cargo and passenger demand 20 years into the future! Aviation is one of the noisiest and polluting forms of business there is and because of its international nature, avoids much UK taxation e.g. no excise duty or VAT on aviation fuel or aircraft servicing.

Sample 13:

I would like you considered the alternative route outlined by Mr Kelly Saunders, 27 Dessmuir Road.

Sample 14:

I believe Manston Airport can provide the viable capacity if it expanded its few aprons to thirteen plus, offering reliable capacity for cargo carriers that currently operate over in Amsterdam Airport Schiphol this hasn't been done in the past due to its previous owner failing or not intending to expand because of other interests. Infratil sold to Gerald Ramirez for £1 with her to run it for two years, yet less than six months she closes it, rejects Riveroaks offer of the full asking price of £7M. Can this be classed as Corporate Vandalism? 2007-11-06 2015 saw the HOC Transport Select Committee question AG's team, this meeting has concrete evidence that AG had interests in Manston Airports Land for housing (865 Acres), please read the minutes of the meeting and watch the video <https://www.fleming.org/apping> If Riveroak has its portfolio of carriers to provide profitable capacity and bring jobs to Thanet/Kent, tapping into related industries, education apprenticeships, Colleges and Universities this will bring the needed jobs rather than the houses that us people in Thanet do not want, because the existing road structure from Westwood Cross to Margate, Broadstairs and Ramsgate is at gridlock. Thanet District Council and Kent County Council also need investigating to why all the above has happened. Regards Jessica Mendoza

Sample 15:

My name is Angela Hensley of the address 82 Moira Street and I am against the Covantas Incinerator, I feel it will have a nasty impact on our environment and surrounding areas in Blaneau Gwent, I will gladly give hand written views against the proposed plans regards Mrs Angela Hensley

Sample 16:

I, Sheilagh Davies, am a barrister of 40 years standing and appear under that name. I was married to the late Steven Alison and own Nos 90 and 74 Insole Court Under that surname. I have had a home at Insole Court for over 35 years. Initially we had No 90 but then bought No 74 and had some conversion work done. When I sell or pass on, the two dwellings could be converted back again. 2. I wish to be registered as an interested party for the Sizewell C DCO. 3. In the 1960s the rear wing was adapted to form 4 dwellings; the Hintons retained the Tudor part at the front. The rear wing was built in the 1920s in neo-Georgian style by the Stabb family, with no expense spared. We were friends with His Honour Sir William Stabb Kt, QC, whose grandfather had commissioned the building, which created a grander house, sufficient to have 16 servants before WW2. 4. Our community at Insole Court (with the vicarage) is a highly significant part of local history and heritage and should be protected from harm. I oppose the western alignment for a bypass and support the Parish Council's proposal for a more easterly alignment. 5. EDF need to justify the building of a new power station and why they are not also relieving Little Glemham and Marlesford. That new nuclear facility and Scottish Power's windfarms will worsen traffic conditions but EDF has no sound justification for simply shifting the burden of traffic from the existing A12 to affect 20 dwellings, when the eastern alignment has a much more limited effect on the built and natural environment. 6. EDF has not carried out a good enough environmental assessment and has not recognised the number of veteran and noble trees (many oaks and beech) which its alignment will destroy. It has not even investigated ponds here or Pond Wood, which is ancient. Foxburrow Wood must not be put at risk with a deep cutting. There is abundant wildlife in this area so both flora and fauna will be harmed. The western alignment is too close to this part of the village and will also damage the walking network unreasonably, as well as the wildlife corridors. 7. The western alignment is not in the best public interest and the planning balance clearly weighs in favour of an eastern alignment. That will also better accommodate a later extension to relieve Little Glemham and Marlesford, if they cannot be relieved now. extension. 8. I reserve the right to amend, add to and expand on my objections during the DCO process.



Sample 17:

We are extremely concerned that the power lines would have a significant impact on our land, we live in a beautiful unspoilt valley with buzzards, old oak woodlands, bluebell woods and has been kept like this for generations. and any lines would have

a detrimental impact visually and environmentally. We run a holiday cottage business and customers come to walk the land and enjoy the unspoilt environment, a line of power cables would affect our business. We have a cottage at Pentwyn which we are just in the process of seeking planning permission on and we are very concerned that the power lines are not placed in the vicinity of this since this would effect the quality of the development and its future re-sale value. We do not wish to have any lines located on our land which we own and have worked very hard to build into a successful business. We are totally opposed to have a power line on our land.

Sample 18:

Obstruction upheaval to farming and the safety of animals. EMF'S of Health implications - at the moment my daughter is in remission from cancer and more pylons near the house is a worry. Drop in property value - which will make her unable to sell the house and move to a safer environment.

Sample 19:

I wholeheartedly do not want this incinerator built. We already have one nearby in Splott, and I don't really understand why we need another one so close to where we live. I understand the need to reduce waste in landfill but I'm sure there must be other locations away from the south east of Cardiff. We already have a very unpleasant smell outside on a regular basis. This incinerator will further reduce our air quality. I have 5 young boys, I don't want them breathing in toxins or foul smelling air, making them want to stay indoors. This year has proved that being outdoors is vital to mental health and well being. Last weekend the smell outside the front door was so bad, my children didn't want to leave the house. I have severe migraine and have noticed the decrease in air quality over the last ten years. I suffer from far more exacerbations than I ever used to and have been hospitalised six times in three years. Ten years ago my migraine was classed as mild to moderate. Now I am classed a severe fibromyalgia and I firmly believe this is due to the poor air quality in this part of London. There are primary schools near the planned site. Do people not care about our children's health? It will also be a huge blot on our landscape. I don't understand why people living in cities need to be punished for doing so by having these built so close to their homes. It's unfair. I am begging you to reconsider and seek alternative locations.

Sample 20:

This representation is made on behalf of Erika Rodgers, Jennifer Jackson, Patricia Weeksroft T/A C Croft & Sons of Old Farm, Great Barr, Birmingham, WC48 9WM as occupiers of land affected by the A428 scheme. These representations are made without prejudice to making further objections/representations for different reasons, or to amplify these representations. We have reviewed the plans included within the Developer's application insofar as they relate to our client and these representations

are based upon the information contained therein. The proposed scheme affects land occupied by C Croft & Sons located to the west of Black Cat Roundabout on the north and south side of the A421. Based on the information available part of the land to the north of the A421 has been identified as permanent acquisition and the land to the south of the A421 has been identified as temporary acquisition. The proposed scheme affects the main entrance to the land located to the north of the A421. The existing access to this land is via a gate adjacent to the Travel Lodge which is included within the permanent acquisition. Once the new scheme has been developed, it appears that the remaining area of this land will be accessed off the new link road between 'Roxton Road' and 'The Lane'. It is important that this access is as equally commodious as the existing access, and is at a similar level to the finished road level to allow for a safe and efficient operation when exiting the access point with heavy loads and restricted maneuverability such as tractors, sprayers and combines. The land identified also benefits from an existing land drainage scheme and appropriate arrangements should be put in place to provide for, and deal with the continuation of the existing land drainage scheme, so as not to impact the drainage of the remainder of the field to the north. The land located to the south of the A421 has been identified a temporary acquisition, this land should be reinstated to it's former condition and level before being returned back to the landowners. We require further details on the proposed accommodation works to ascertain the full impact on my client's leasehold interest. As a minimum, our client requires commodious access, post scheme land drainage, and fencing and hedge of boundaries to mitigate the detrimental affect of this scheme. This representation has been made by Verity Garlick BSc(Hons) MRICS FAAV of Bletsoes, as Agent on behalf of C Croft & Sons.

Sample 21:

My concerns involve primarily the environmental and archaeological damage that would occur should this project be allowed to go ahead. Ashley Adams sits alongside one of Wiltshire's green roads that is a haven for wildlife and has not been damaged by farming. This new development would have a severe environmental impact on that space. It would also impact on other rare species of bird and most likely butterfly. Noise pollution and the ground turbulence of faster moving traffic, should this plan go ahead would have a detrimental effect on the Stonehenge site and that of other adjacent archaeological sites. Stonehenge is part of the visual scenery of Wiltshire. To curtail the view from the road is not conducive to having open access and any barriers would have a detrimental effect on the view. UNESCO have advised against this planned development as it stands. As Stonehenge is a World Heritage site which belongs to all peoples irrespective of the location (UNESCO <https://www.kelly-moody.com> accessed 1984-01-15), to go against UNESCO advice is of extreme concern. The archaeological damage has already been noted above, however there would be significant damage done to adjacent Mesolithic sites, such as BlicMonica Cowan other sites not yet surveyed. To destroy

these by using large pieces of plant to implement this plan would not only go against UNESCO but would preclude future archaeological opportunities.

Sample 22:

Curtis & James, Mack 86 longcross Rd Cardiff. CF95 4pe With regards to white moss waist tip, We do not agree to it, for the reasons 1, The will be too much heavy traffic 2, The water table it will cause flooding, as the ground there is moss bog land as in the name WHITE MOSS 3, It will attract vermin, flies, & bad smells 4, fly tipping around the grounds of the tip

Sample 23:

As a resident in Oxford who lives on the lake front I currently enjoy an excellent view of this peninsula. I am concerned that this development would change this view of a lovely wildlife setting. In addition I am concerned that there would be noise and light pollution from the development. With the prevailing winds coming from this direction I expect that the noise could be significant. Finally given all of the above concerns I am concerned that this will have a material impact on my property value.

Sample 24:

The A417 missing link is going to be a very damaging road cutting through an area of outstanding beauty. It will also increase emissions by just under a million tonnes. As a result of the government not taking climate change seriously enough, road planners can effectively ignore climate change (<https://www.torres.com/>). For the love of this planet, or if not this planet, for your future children and grandchildren, don't let damaging projects like these go ahead just so a few capitalists can get wealthy in the short term.

Sample 25:

1/ The UK does not need additional power infrastructure from developments such as Sizewell C - not only is the risk of the proposal outlined here <https://www.thompson.net/> there is evidence that the project is more about the survival of the French nuclear industry than the necessity of the Sizewell C scheme to provide electricity to UK customers. Renewables are known to out compete nuclear and would have far less environmental impact yet do not appear to have been considered. Instead we should be proposing more clean energy schemes such as this one announced this week in neighbouring Norfolk if more energy infrastructure is truly needed. 2/ 93% of Conservative voters want to maintain or strengthen protections for habitats and wildlife. <http://walker-martin.com/> Supporting a ten year construction project, will cause so much damage that these sites will never be the same makes no sense. To proceed with this, at a time when public