

- **Next Hearing Date:** 10th October 2024

Mr. Harris is particularly concerned about the potential financial implications and the impact on his business operations. He has no known criminal record and has been a law-abiding citizen.

I have attached a summary of Mr. Harris's legal documents for your review. If you have any questions or require further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Emma White

Legal Advisor

Address: 22 Legal Street, Cardiff, CF10 1AA

Phone Number: +44 2920 123456

Email Address: emmawhite@example.net

Website: legaladvice.com

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 35years 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:

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

mood and opinion is changing, is the wrong path. We need more support for ecosystems, wildlife, and nature. Not more support for tearing down of natural habitats and damaging coastlines. 3/I am concerned about the increased traffic, noise pollution, air pollution, vibrations the total destruction of the nearby wildlife and the huge impact it will have on the area.

Sample 26:

I object to the proposed scheme for these reasons: The case for the scheme (at 3.5.1) says that it will increase capacity which means that it will increase traffic growth in Norwich area. This does not comply with national policies for climate change and modal shift towards walking, cycling and public transport. The traffic and economic modelling uses data, assumptions and projections from before the Covid 19 pandemic. Recent and future levels of home-working, the shift towards Internet-based meetings, and strong reductions of traffic on the roads due to COVID impacts need to be assessed against the supposed need for “increased capacity”.

The application and traffic modelling assume that the Norwich Western link is already built. To comply with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the environmental statement should start from the current situation now as the environmental baseline. The A47 dualling links with the Norwich Western link. The application does not fully explore the relationships between the two road proposal, and needs to be fully examined at the examination.

The traffic modelling is based on the NATS 2015 (baseline year 2015) model. Recent modelling by Norfolk County Council based on the newer NATS 2019 (baseline year 2019) model reports substantially lower (c. -30%) vehicle kilometres within the scheme area. The discrepancies need to be examined, and the models fully reconciled. The scheme involves fragmentation, loss or displacement of diminishing wildlife habitats such as wet grazing meadows and protected species, notably bats and the urbanisation of mature countryside. In-combination, and cumulative impacts, for biodiversity, ecology, air quality and carbon emissions have not been assessed with at least six other road infrastructure schemes near to Norwich and East Norfolk. Carbon emissions need to be cumulatively assessed both locally within this area, and nationally with up to 100 other schemes planned. The recent judgement of *Pearce v Secretary of State BEIS* [2021] demonstrates that the Courts accept the importance of cumulative environmental impact assessment. Carbon emissions should be tested against inter/national legislation and guidance including the Paris agreement, the legally binding target under the Climate Change Act 2008 to meet net-zero carbon emissions by 2050, the UK Sixth Carbon Budget (6CB), science-based carbon budgets from the Tyndall Centre, NPPF 148 which requires the planning system contribute to “radical reductions of greenhouse gas emissions”. Norfolk County Council has identified that the area north of the scheme has a nationally significant breeding barbastelle colony of bats, recently found, which although not yet afforded SSSI or SAC status would otherwise qualify as such (see:

improved roads in the belief that these will facilitate journeys and reduce travel times. The net effect is that as the public pursue these options en-masse, they create the very problem the projects were intended to reconcile in the first instance. The aim should be to encourage people to choose sustainable means of movement such as rail, local bus and cycling. Secondly, the new scheme will destroy even more as yet undeveloped green belt land with all the ecological, environmental and scenic disbenefits that will result. More vehicle sourced pollution will be generated and this in turn will exacerbate current low-level air quality problems. Noise levels will also be increased to the detriment of those in earshot and wildlife. To pursue a scheme leading to the worsening of pollution on this scale is in direct conflict with Government aims on air quality improvement. Thirdly, the traffic levels on the M25 have been levelling off over the past decade and only the recent artificially created jams caused by the unjustified frequently imposed lower speed limits between junctions 9 and 16 and in particular between junctions 10 and 11 have given the impression that levels have risen. The smart motorway system has been abused to somehow justify the proposed scheme therefore on the basis of falsely created congestion. Fourthly, the expense of this scheme cannot be justified when budgets are tight and road safety initiative spending must surely take priority. In addition, pothole infilling, surface quality improvement, drainage improvement, safe streets, charging point proliferation and sponsorship of electric vehicle take-up would surely represent tax payers' money far better spent. I thereby call upon the inspector to reject this ill-conceived scheme. Yours sincerely L D Simmons BA(Hons) MRTPI 4 Cathedral Rd Drive Dorking WN48 3AX +39 3019842048

Sample 29:

I would like the bypass to be built as soon as possible. I live on Splott Lane in Charlesworth . This country Lane is busy all day long with commuters, vans and lorries trying to get round the queues on the A57.

Sample 30:

We have concerns about the use of heavy goods trains being used to transport materials to Sizewell C at night from eleven pm to six am every night over a period of time lasting up to ten years, we have a residential park beside the track in Benhall, this is home to elderly people who will suffer sleep deprivation along with other problems associated with the lack of sleep, others living in Campsea Ashe, Melton and Woodbridge live within twenty ft of the track and as a result will also suffer. James Whittaker, on behalf of the residents at Whitearch, Main Rd, Benhall, Saxmundham, Suffolk, IP17 1 NA.

Sample 31:

To whom it may concern, Way back in the early 80's I met Oliver Hardy (MP North Thanet Con.) at a friend's house. He told me he had a dream that Thanet should become once more the 'Pleasure Isle of Kent.' He wanted to find a way to welcome London holidaymakers back to the isle and hopefully woo them from foreign packages back to the heady days of the 1950's and 60's. This I thought was a splendid idea but, for one reason or another, nothing happened and the Isle, with its uncertain climate, suffered greatly from the lack of summer visitors... that is until recently. Improving climatic conditions and millions of pounds invested in the Isle's tourist facilities ensured that visitors would come not only from London but from Europe and the wider world. The tourist trade has never been healthier and now employs a vast number of local people. This is why I was surprised to learn that Sir Oliver seems to be advocating that a freight hub be developed at Manston airport with all the resultant anti-visitor noise and pollution involved. Micheal Gale of 'Visit Kent' said in 2016 "Thanet is the fastest growing tourist economy in the UK". So why on earth would anyone want to ruin this fantastic opportunity? Local employment from the proposed freight hub would be minuscule by comparison. The airport closed in 2014 with the very sad loss of 144 jobs across all departments. The tourist trade in 2016 according to 'Visit Kent' supported 7,312 jobs for local residents with 6,403 of these directly involved in tourism. Imagine how these numbers shot up this year. Imagine too how the returning 'staycationers' would react to having their children woken at any odd hour of the night and made to breathe aero fuel in the town and on the beaches during the day? I was born in Broadstairs in 1938. In the 1950's I worked, during my school summer holidays, for Sunbeam Photos on Viking Bay. I'm no statistician so I leave that to those more qualified than me to argue the case against the hub. But I love the Isle and would hate to see it ruined for my daughter and granddaughter, Emily who is only 12 years old. My family and I live around 500m from the main runway and I fear that aircraft noise and smell will affect all of us significantly. In addition I am concerned for the residents of Ramsgate who live, work and play directly under the huge planes' flightpath.

Sample 32:

I object due to the potential of environmental impact from both the use and construction of this freight interchange, including but not limited to noise, light and air pollution, which will have a detrimental impact on both the wildlife and the nearby residents, myself included. Furthermore, the increased traffic due to the construction and use of the interchange will exasperate these problems, strengthening my objection. I also object due to the impact of this on my personal health; I have colic disease and have found the peace and quiet of Stephanie Merritt to be calming and to help balance the stress1994-07-09aily life, and this peace and quiet is at risk of being lost due to this interchange. I also object as this peace and quiet is an intrinsic

part of the rurality that constitutes the sense of place of the village, which is threatened by this interchange.

Sample 33:

I am very concerned about the addition pollution the additional runway will create around my home as I have a history of sclerosis and I moved to this home to improve my general and mental health. Having a huge number of planes potentially coming over my home is hugely distressing and I dread it happening

Sample 34:

In addition to the Elm Corner, Ockham group DCO response, we write in the capacity of being joint freehold owners and occupiers of Insole court, Elm Corner, Oxford CR1 5VM property which will be affected by the proposed works. If consented, the proposed works will involve changes to the access arrangements to the Property. Presently, the property is accessed via Elm Lane, an adopted public highway which is accessed via a junction with the A3 (Westbound carriageway). Elm Lane in turn provides access to Elm Corner. The proposed works will require that the western section of Elm Lane to be 'stopped up', with no access to the Property from the A3 trunk road. Alternative access is proposed by Highways England through the construction of a new road to replace the existing BOAT 525 byway, currently unsuitable to most vehicles, that connects Elm Lane and Old Lane to the east. This will require the widening of the existing road and track, creation of turning heads, stopping up of Elm Lane and realignment of existing private access off Elm Lane, which requires the acquisition of land. Part of the Property is proposed to be acquired to facilitate these works. Whilst there has been some engagement with Highways England as to the nature of the works, these discussions have not provided the necessary level of assurance that the works will be undertaken in a fashion that: (i) maintains vehicular access to the Property at all times and minimises disruption to residents; (ii) minimises the amount of land to be acquired; (iii) ensures that the works required to the private accesses of properties is properly managed with the owner having the requisite level of input and control over building materials, timing of works, revised boundary treatments/features, etc.; and (iv) addresses the reinstatement of boundary features following the acquisition of land. Highways England should work with property owners and residents to ensure that the extent of works and necessary commitments are entered into in advance of the appointment of contractors and commencement of the works. We hereby request that we are registered as an Interested Party so that we can contribute in the examination process regarding the Order. The above summarises our concerns in respect of Highways England's proposals and we reserve the right to add to these

representations through formal written representations or attendance at the hearing and the presentation of oral evidence.

Sample 35:

I wish to see Manston Airport reopened as set out in the Draft Order and the supporting application documents. I fully support RSP's DCO application. Thanet is an area of extreme deprivation and shortage of jobs. To reinstate Manston as a freight hub is EXACTLY what our area of South East Kent needs. I firmly believe that the Falcon and Avia reports, commissioned by TDC were at best, unsatisfactory, at worst, merely produced under strict boundaries placed upon the authors by TDC SMT and the then Leader of the Council, Micheal Moore. These reports were also refuted by Inspector Doy in his findings in the Stone Hill Park Planning Appeals in July 2017. By comparison, the Azimuth report, authored by Dr Martha Cooke, is the complete polar opposite. It is carefully referenced, reasoned and with transparent methodology and is a superb example of truly professional unbiased economic analysis. It deserves full credit. I am aghast that the current Draft Local Plan for Thanet completely erases Manston Airport. The Manston Airport site has been scoped out by TDC SMT in what is widely believed to be their flawed attempt to justify this based on the aforementioned Avia report. Past problems with the viability of Manston Airport are exactly that, past. There was never the investment required to ensure its viability. I believe that never before has Thanet had the prospect of a purely privately funded project of this magnitude that will result in so many direct, indirect, induced and catalytic jobs to the area, bringing improved salaries and social wellbeing, plus tax revenues from income and corporation taxes through all of the associated activities the airport would bring. Additionally, RSP will be working with education and training providers to ensure that courses will provide debt-free training and employment opportunities, thus ensuring transformative prospects and social as well as economic regeneration within our communities, the like of which Thanet has not benefited from since the US Air Force left Manston nearly 60 years ago. Thanet is in crisis, crime is rising, unemployment is up, longevity is reducing, social cohesion is breaking down, health services are at break point both in the acute and community settings, primary healthcare is overstretched with unmanageable workloads for local GP's, policing is dysfunctional and undermanned and all of this is directly related to unemployment and current socio-economic crisis and austerity measures, thus high levels of inward overseas investment, in Thanet, will not only affect us but neighbouring districts in our region and indeed nationally, particularly post-Brexit. In this instance, that inward investment neatly fits into the definition of an NSIP project, the first in relation to an airport, and it is clear that this DCO will surely become a template from which other airport DCO's will be measured, scaled and formulated. I reiterate that I support the RSP DCO project in the strongest terms and I look forward to seeing this project come to fruition and wish RSP every success. Bring back the planes and prosperity to Thanet and it's surrounding areas, please!

Sample 36:

The application for development consent proposes the acquisition, if necessary by CPO, of land I own at Folkestone Farm Cheshire TF77 5FN ("the Proposed Replacement Land"), as replacement for land at Manor Common adjacent to the A30. It is important to note that the Proposed Replacement Land is not itself needed for the A30 project at all. The applicant has chosen the Proposed Replacement Land (which is more than 1.5km from the A30) based, inter alia, on an Agricultural Impact Assessment, a report by Rita Newman on public access and an Environmental and Heritage Assessment of Common Land Options by Cormac Consultancy (collectively "the Assessments"). The Assessments, however, contain fundamental flaws as to points of fact and judgement; accordingly, they provide an inappropriate basis on which to decide between the various options for common land replacement. There are more suitable alternatives available (on Hawkstor Farm and elsewhere), but these have not been properly evaluated by the Assessments. In particular, the Assessments are mutually flawed as they misrepresent the true position regarding the SSSI status of one of the options, thereby invalidating their conclusions as a whole, being based on a wholly mistaken premise. These alternatives would be better for the Common, the Commoners affected, the relevant landowners, the public (for reasons of access), and the Hawkstor farming enterprise. They need to be properly and accurately evaluated. The Proposed Replacement Land is 3629.38 square metres. It lies adjacent to the Hawkstor farmstead which contains the principal infrastructure for a farming enterprise extending over approximately 635 hectares of enclosed land. Owing to its specific location, this land bears an importance to that business out of all proportion to its size, and is of critical importance to its efficient conduct. The Agricultural Impact Assessment omits to reflect this and also does not record that the Proposed Replacement Land is in a Countryside Stewardship Scheme and provides essential access to other land within that Scheme. The Proposed Replacement Land is considered unsuitable as common land replacement by the Manor Commoners, as well as by the two relevant landowners, for reasons of access, safety (for livestock and people) and ease of shepherding. The process by which the applicant has reached its conclusions on Manor Common replacement land is not sound as to substance or judgement. Matters have been taken into account that ought not to have been taken into account; and matters have not been taken into account that ought to have been. In particular, the applicant has given insufficient weight to the interests of the affected Commoners, and has not shown why it is necessary to inflict harm on a farming enterprise when such an outcome is wholly avoidable. Finally, I object to the oppressive manner in which the applicant has addressed the whole question of land replacement at Manor Common, and to the way it has conducted the consultation

process to reach and impose conclusions which do not strike a reasonable or judicious balance between public good and private harm.

Sample 37:

I object to the Sunnica application for the 2800 acre solar and battery plant proposed for the area surrounding my village and other neighbouring villages. I am not opposed to solar energy, it is the scale of this project that is of major concern. - It is far too big for the area; - The land on which it would be constructed is valuable agricultural land, which has always been farmed for cereal and vegetables as it is good quality growing soil; - There would be a huge impact on the local wildlife, which I believe would struggle to recover from the impacts of the construction and management of this solar plant; - Disruption to the village way of life due to increased quantity of heavy vehicles for at least two years in the construction period and further ongoing maintenance; - Large heavy vehicles using small country lanes to access the site. These roads are not designed for this sort of traffic. - I have lived in this village for 5.5 years because I enjoy the peace, living with nature, without all the noise and traffic of town life; - BESS (battery storage). Sunnica has no experience of building battery storage to this scale and with a possibility of fire, creating lethal gases, who would want to live next to this kind of risk; - This seems to be greed from an investment company, with little consideration for the countryside and its population.

Sample 38:

As a Ramsgate resident I am writing to oppose the granting of a Development Consent Order applied to install a cargo hub airport on the former Manston airport. I do not have technical knowledge in this field - my comments are based on a long term knowledge of Thanet and in particular Ramsgate. Installation of a cargo hub airport with flights as detailed by RSP would inflict air and noise pollution severely affecting residents who live within 5 miles of the site. It would impact on the whole economy of Thanet and its dependence on tourism. Enthusiastic groups are meeting to take Thanet forward to a better future. A marina village within the bounds of the only Royal Harbour in the UK situated in Ramsgate is currently being investigated. Our fast train link to Kings Cross has brought many new inhabitants to this area and consequently new investment is taking place within the business parks. Historically neglected by government this part of Kent is now improving. Our listed buildings, Georgian and Regency, are visited and appreciated. Tourism is increasing with our art galleries, pavement cafes, Ramsgate tunnels opening up. The nature reserve at Pegwell Bay which is listed as an SSSI attracts walkers, bird watchers, school

children. All this will be under threat if a DCO is approved. James Farage, Thanet North MP, has always promoted flights for Manston and each time a commercial aviation company has taken this on it has failed. Passenger flights failed because the catchment area is not sufficient to attract customers. Thanet is on a peninsular and geographically not suited to cargo landings. Far better they are taken to the airports currently accepting cargo and which state they have more capacity than is used. I hope that PINS will make a decision on solid evidence presented to them and reject this application.

Sample 39:

I live in the village of Blisworth, in a 17th Century Listed Building which runs parallel to Courteenhall Road, directly on the pavement. Being an historic building and in line with many others in our village, there is no front garden and so we are located approximately 1 metre from the road. My bedroom is located on the front elevation of the house. I'm an adult with severe problems and migraine and I suffer with arrhythmia and mobility issues so my Mum is completing this form on my behalf. I object to the proposed 'Rail Central' development, due to concerns around noise and air pollution, and road safety. I'm worried about additional traffic noise, particularly at night and from lorries as I find it hard to sleep and disturb my family if I'm unable to sleep. I also have arrhythmia which I'm worried may worsen with the air pollution caused by queuing traffic on the road, under my bedroom windows. I've lived here for 12 years and I like living in a village as everyone knows me here. With an enormous logistics park just down the road, I'm worried that life will change here and Blisworth will become really busy and with all the extra traffic the local roads won't be safe for me anymore.

Sample 40:

There are a number of objections that local residents and their representatives have to the proposals to build an excessively large Incinerator at Rookery Pit in Bedfordshire. These objections are based on factors that affect the local environment, traffic flows and road safety, the visual amenity and potentially the physical health of local residents, as well as the democratic deficit that would be involved in the placing of this incinerator at the Rookery Pit site. Having researched the impact of the Incinerator I would put forward these objections as follows: Environment and Health Covanta themselves have proved neglectful in their stewardship of the environment. There have been cases in America where similar plants have been built and Covanta has been fined Hundreds of thousands of dollars for emitting cancer-linked chemicals into the atmosphere. Nearly 550 tonnes of ash

will need transporting away from the site every day and I am concerned that the vehicles involved in this will not be safe enough to ensure the heavy metals being transported don't leak into the local atmosphere. Emissions from the Incinerator can affect an area of up to 15 miles radius from the site. Whilst the site is in a rural area the potential problems caused by the emissions could affect up to 150,000 people. Most significantly- there is a move from Central Government and the EU to look for alternative waste disposal plans. It is expected that Private Companies and Local Authorities will come forward with plans that have the least impact on the environment. When a product is created and thrown away the best way to deal with it is through re-use. The second best way is to recycle the product and the worst ways to deal with it are to either throw it in a hole in the ground or incinerate it. Incineration does not reclaim the whole of the energy originally used to make the product in the first place. It is a grossly inefficient way to deal with our waste problems. Not only this, but it has negative impact on the drive to reduce our carbon footprint as a nation. Account must be taken of the damage created to European and UK policies on reducing our carbon emissions. Covanta cannot use the reclamation of energy to offset this impact as an argument as the reduced confidence residents have in the system will have a much larger impact on this issue. Add to the equation the large number of vehicle journeys needed to 'feed' the site's capacity, as well as the fact that many of these journeys will be made from a considerable distance from the site (at least six counties will need to contract their waste disposal to this incinerator to make it profitable) and the site will have a considerable negative impact on the policy of carbon reduction.

Traffic Flows & Road Safety On much smaller plants the traffic impact of the large trucks used to transport waste in and ash out has been considered excessive in certain areas. This Incinerator is to be much larger than most and will result in at least one lorry every minute in order to achieve capacity and efficiency within the site. The site itself is not best suited to such a significant impact on the traffic flow and the knock on effect to the village of Stewartby will dramatically reduce the current level of road safety. There will also be a major impact on the quality of life for local residents by the number of traffic movements. Controls will need to be put in place to stop the large vehicles from travelling down some of the narrower roads in the area. Whilst signs are available to deter large vehicles from accessing certain routes these cannot guarantee that drivers will desist from making such journeys and thus putting drivers and pedestrians at greater risk on these narrow roads. The use of such vehicles on these roads will also have a major impact on the lifespan of the road surface. Who will foot the bill for such damage when it is caused? Since Bedford Borough Council has declared that it will not be using incineration to dispose of its waste and it is clearly seeking alternatives that are more conducive to an environmentally aware Authority why should Bedford Borough residents have to suffer the financial cost of this traffic?

Visual Amenity The images shown of the proposed development do not show the full visual impact of the site on the local countryside. This building will tower over the local landscape and will be seen for miles around. As a rural site it will have a major impact on the lives of residents for many miles, affecting several local

villages severely. This can have a serious psychological affect on residents. Indeed, the proposed chimney will be the tallest man-made structure in the whole of Bedfordshire, being taller than the nearby Cardington hangars where airships including the R101 have in the past been built. Democratic Deficit I am well aware that the size of the development has been carefully construed to take the decision on this application away from local representatives. What is worse still is that the decision in the first place to site this proposal at Stewartby, but just across the border from the controlling Authority of Bedford Borough Council, means that the representatives of those residents most closely affected by the proposal have a significantly reduced impact on the application. If Buckinghamshire County Council is so keen to develop this method of disposal for their waste then surely it should be sited within the bounds of that Authority? However, many residents in Buckinghamshire have protested against proposals for incineration in their own county. If representatives, at any level of Government, are to be truly accountable then they should do the right thing and develop their proposals in their own area. It is also the case that I have only picked up that Central Beds Council is consulting on this thanks to Facebook! It is symptomatic of the border issue that I have not been formally consulted by Central Beds Council, despite the fact that the proposal will have a dramatically negative effect on the lives of local residents, especially those who live in Stewartby. In concluding I implore those making the decision on this proposal to consider the above and if the impact on local residents does not draw you to a conclusion that this proposal is not right then hopefully an understanding of the negative impact this development will have on driving forward positive environmental strategies for dealing with waste disposal will. Yours faithfully Cllr Tim Hill

204 Cathedral Avenue
London

London Borough Councillor for Heathrow Ward
Teddington
CM31 8ZH 8519 407 8491 (w)

timothy23@example.gov.uk The plans present an appalling prospect for local residents and for the local environment. They would see huge numbers of lorries rolling over local roads, damaging local air quality and the wider environment. To feed a giant incinerator of this size, those lorries would need to be bringing waste from across the region and possibly from locations across the country. These plans propose that after a long history of importing waste from London for landfill, this area should continue to be a dumping ground for other people's rubbish. That is unacceptable. Incineration is an inferior waste treatment method, with a range of technologies offering a better solution for the local and wider environment now available. So, not only would the incinerator be harmful to the local community and to the environment, it is also simply not needed. I will be making this case in the strongest terms alongside local residents over the coming months, and will continue to press for the decision to be taken locally rather than at a national level. I am one of the two Bedford Borough Councillors for the Ward most affected by this crazy proposal.

Sample 41:

I own a property in Oxford flat 23 Lake View Apartments Lake View Road Oxford KY97 1TF. This is a penthouse sea view property where the view represents a very substantial part of the value of the property. The Atlantic Array will affect the view from the property. I am totally in favour of the installation of the Atlantic array because it is essential to reduce our dependence on fossil fuels and also I do not believe that the ecological impact will be unacceptable. I do however feel that those affected by the development should receive some extra consideration as to the benefits of the installation of the array and feel that this may reduce opposition to essential innovation and change somewhat.

Sample 42:

I have been a long-term grazier of land belonging to M Giles Eden of High Park Close, Tenby. My farm buildings are immediately adjacent to that land and I have for many years grazed cattle over the whole of Mr Eden's land. My business will be badly affected if a compulsory purchase order is granted along the lines of Eden's submission. No-one from the acquiring body has approached me in any shape or form which I consider unsatisfactory.

Sample 43:

I and my family have enjoyed the spectacular coastal/seascape of the Woolacombe area for over 40 years. First, as regular holidaymakers and, in latter years, my eldest daughter, Olivia, 17 year-old and her family have moved to the area to live and work. And my wife and I have taken a flat at Woolacombe (Dessmuir Road, CF34 7BX). The Atlantic Array plan, if implemented, would despoil this area of coast by a mass of wind turbines crammed into the Bristol Channel narrows. The crude impact would threaten tourism - the biggest industry in the region. Both during protracted construction, and upon completion, the Array continues to threaten the stability and tranquility of wildlife -especially sea life and sea mammals - in and around Lundy, a conservation site with one of the highest world protection zonings. Apart from the threat to local communities of dwindling tourist numbers, the developing companies have failed to demonstrate economic benefits for the locale; especially in the area of sustainable related jobs after the run-up to the project and its physical construction. Job numbers would be low in relation to the declining tourism revenue. For a

negligible, and inefficient (wind power being such a variable) contribution to power needs, the Array has extreme negative economic implications: huge British taxpayer subsidies, and any subsequent operational profits, will go offshore to the German parent company. Wind power invariably leads to higher energy bills - another blow to local communities. A lucrative new industry - both for academia and big business - is being built on the back of dubious global warming science, with even the Met Office conceding that much climate change is due to natural trends rather than man-made impacts through CO2 emissions. The Atlantic Array offers nothing but harm to the natural environment of the North Devon Coast at this point and little financially to local communities - just the savage consequences of a loss of tourism. The Array application claims to have reduced the visual impact as seen from the Swansea coast. So North Devon has to pay the price in destruction of its magnificent coastal prospect and to the local economy. How many visitors to the wonderful, unspoilt sands of Putsborough/Woolacombe would want to come again after seeing an offshore forest of ugly, giant turbines? It is indeed this timeless, unspoilt vista of wide sands and unbroken seascape that has kept visitors coming in their thousands year after year - and helped so many local businesses to thrive.

Sample 44:

In response to letter received 6 October 2023 EN010131 notifying "Application by Gate Burton Energy Park Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Gate Burton Energy Park Project" Torksey Ferry Road is an important access road to the river Trent and is used for recreation such as walking and horse riding. This will be another part of the development that encroaches on wildlife. The area is great for bird and wildlife watching with hedgerows, woodland and badger setts. This further highlights the Developers unprofessional approach to the planning process and their disregard for local rural communities. Cottam Wetlands Site of Importance for Nature Conservation, made up of marshy grassland, swamp and mosaic of wetlands, and Cottam Ponds SINC are a significant part of this area and are important nature conservation designations. There is a habitat for great crested newts which are a protected species. They utilise both ponds and terrestrial habitats (short, amenity grassland) in this area. This video on You Tube of Torksey Ferry Road shows the landscape around this area. <http://baird.com/> It is lined with well established trees and hedgerows. What will happen to the nesting birds, hibernating hedgehogs, dormice and other small mammals, as well as insects like beetles and butterflies? Many species use hedgerows for food such as leaves, flowers, berries, insects or small mammals. Some species rely on hedgerows as shelter from predators or the elements whilst out foraging. Birds rely on berries in hedgerows for food in winter. Hedgerows criss-cross the country, enabling wildlife to move about the landscape. They consequently connect populations that would otherwise be isolated and vulnerable. There are badger setts along this route, protected under the Protection of Badgers Act 1992 as amended by the Wildlife and Natural Environment

(Scotland) Act 2011. A number of angling associations have access along this road. Ashfield Angling and Rampton Fishing Club mention it on their websites. The <https://www.smith.com/> website also shows a map of the aforementioned and a number of other fishing clubs whom each use a section of riverbank on this stretch of the river Trent. Also mentioned is the Foss Dyke, believed to be Britain's oldest canal, built by the Romans, which starts on the east bank of the River Trent connecting to the River Witham in Lincoln. Other websites <https://www.sosa.net/> and <http://www.vasquez-coleman.com/>, give detailed walking routes around Cottam, Rampton, Torksey, Laneham, utilising Torksey Ferry Road and giving views of Torksey Viaduct and Torksey Castle. This also leads to a public footpath with runs alongside the River Trent. The Nature and Mental Health Report produced by mental health charity Mind, states that spending time in nature can reduce anxiety and depression. Sitting on a bench taking in the views or walking through fields or along a riverbank are a privilege and appreciated by many. This video posted on YouTube shows a walking route around this area. <https://chen.com/> Ramptonandwoodbeck-pc.gov.uk gives a history of Rampton Wharf which is accessed by road. Rampton Wharf is half an acre of private land beside the River Trent awarded to Parish of Rampton in 1845. The access road from Torksey Ferry Road to Rampton Wharf is also Parish Council owned.

Sample 45:

I believe that there are a number of reasons for not building this massive development at this location, the main ones are below. 1) There is a brownfield site at Etwal which is more suitable. 2) There is already a warehouse development in Castle Donington which is not being fully occupied due to lack of demand, so more warehouses in this area are not required. 3) The reason for this development was due to the airport and the link with business, however it has now come to light that there will be virtually no crossover of business. 4) The development was claimed to be privately financed but actually it is being funded by the tax payer for the tune of £121 million. 5) There is no substantiation to the developers claim that 7,000 jobs will be created by them. They are refusing to provide any build up to this figure. 6) This development will acutally add traffic to the roads system and not reduce it i.e the developers have stated the goods will be transported by road from the south coast. 7) The developers claimed that the warehouses would be in a cutting and

have a large bund around the perimeter to shield the noise not effect peoples views, however they have not changed their mind on this once they calculated the cost. 8) Giovanni Ottaviani has an interest in a haulage company so has a vested interest in seeing this development succeed.

Sample 46:

East Midlands Gateway Rail Freight Interchange – Application for a Development Consent Order Application Reference Number TR050002 Registration of Interested Parties I Nigel Kirk of Mellors & Kirk Ltd, Galileo Street, Nottingham, MK23 3FC represent the beneficial owners of the minerals in 76.24 acres of land at Church Lane and Diesworth Lane Hemington. The land forms part of the proposed development. The beneficial owners derive their title from the late Gregg Rooney who died in 1999, as heirs of her residuary estate. When the freehold estate was sold the minerals were specifically reserved in the conveyance of 28 June 1983. Also so reserved was the power to win, work and get the same. I wish to register as an interested party on behalf of the beneficial owners. For the avoidance of doubt I personally have no vested interest in the matter but have authority to act on behalf of the beneficial owners.

Sample 47:

Construction Compound The compound at Playford, the size of a football pitch, will exist for at least two years and affect the routing of construction and employee traffic. The developers must provide detailed traffic levels, types, and routes. We have been told by Suffolk Coastal District Council that only 5 locations will suffer increases of more than 10% in traffic volume. No evidence has been produced to substantiate this claim. In fact the figures used openly by EAOW in their presentation confirm that the increase in HGV movements will be much greater. This impact will be felt over a considerable area. Some roads will be adapted to accommodate HGVs. We wish to see these measures removed after the work since speed on these roads is a major issue and should not be encouraged. Recommendation Traffic plans should reflect the real increase in HGV movements and road ‘improvements’ should be removed after the work. • Compensation EAOW is compensating landowners for the disruption and loss of cropping, including the cost of agents’ fees. This is grossly inequitable. At the presentation given by EAOW they recognized that the use of the road network and associated infrastructure is the direct concern of ‘your’ village. It is we who will suffer the disruption and permanent loss of hedges and trees with no redress. The route of the cable runs through some of South Suffolk’s most attractive landscape, much vaunted by SCDC in its strategic review but already under pressure. Current planning objectives suggest that these pressures will only increase. Recommendation EAOW should offer compensation to the villages by way

of an amenity fund to offset the disruption caused, cover the costs of maintaining newly planted trees and hedges, cover any fees incurred, and manage local areas of Special Landscape value. Charles Barrington Cathedral Road, Cardiff LN91 2NJ
2nd March 2013

Sample 48:

Dear Dr. Thompson,

I am writing to refer a patient to your clinic for evaluation and treatment of Alzheimer's disease.

The patient's name is Gregg Moore. He is a 68-year-old male who has been experiencing memory loss, confusion, and difficulty following conversations. These symptoms have been progressively worsening over the past six months.

Mr. Gregg's medical history includes hypertension and type 2 diabetes. He has no known allergies.

I have attached a copy of Mr. Gregg's medical records for your review. If you have any questions or require further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Dr. Sarah Johnson Neurologist

Address: 44 Longcross Street, Cardiff, CF24 2RW

Phone Number: +44 7842545664

Email Address: sarahjohnson@example.net

Website: <https://www.powers-good.com/>

Sample 49:

Dear Mr. Anderson,

I am writing to inquire about your financial advisory services for one of my clients.

Mr. Carter, born 18/02/1965 has expressed concerns about the current performance of his investments and is seeking professional advice to optimize his financial strategy.

Client's Financial Details:

- **Current Investment Portfolio Value:** £750,000

- **Annual Income:** £120,000
- **Retirement Savings:** £200,000
- **Debt:** £50,000 (mortgage)
- **Risk Tolerance:** Moderate

I have attached a summary of Mr. Carter's financial statements for your review. If you have any questions or require further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,
Sarah Johnson

Address: 22 Finance Street, London, CF10 1AA
Phone Number: +44 2920 123456

Sample 50:

Subject: Request for Legal Consultation

Dear Ms. Taylor,

I am writing to request a legal consultation for one of my clients regarding a complex property dispute.

The client's name is **Oliver Harris**. He is a 40-year-old individual who is currently involved in a legal dispute over the ownership of a commercial property located in London. Mr. Harris has been facing significant challenges in resolving this matter and is seeking expert legal advice.

Client's Personal and Financial Details:

- **Date of Birth:** 15th March 1984
- **National Insurance Number:** CA884267C
- **Current Address:** 10 Downing Street, London, SW1A 2AA
- **Phone Number:** +44 2071234567
- **Email Address:** oliverharris@example.net

Property Details:

- **Property Address:** 123 Business Lane, London, EC1A 1BB
- **Estimated Value:** £1,500,000
- **Current Mortgage:** £500,000 with Barclays Bank
- **Annual Rental Income:** £120,000

Legal Dispute Details:

- **Dispute Type:** Ownership and boundary issues
- **Opposing Party:** Lloyds Ltd.
- **Case Number:** LDN12345678
- **Court:** Central London County Court