

There continues to be a lack of detailed design within any of the Developers submissions. As has been said on numerous occasions, the applicant is trying to undertake the minimum to obtain approval and then dispose of the asset with no future responsibility or liability. I would strongly argue that should such a substantial and controversial scheme be approved it should at least contain detailed design that the developer is legally obliged to deliver by way of 106 agreement or similar such that the next owner cannot avoid any of the fundamental design issues. Examples of this but by no means limited to, are water quality, flood risk, traffic management both during construction and during periodic maintenance and final decommissioning, residual soil quality, presence of major below ground infrastructure, superficial surveys in particular regards traffic flow and Archeology, grossly inaccurate Carbon generation figures, the fact that all the current surveys will be seriously out of date by the time of construction and many more highlighted by others.

As I have said before if the project proceeds it should be subject to ongoing independent audits in terms of any alterations to final design and the construction implementation process. It is very difficult otherwise for the various authorities to police the development due to their lack of resource, both physical and financial. Independent auditing should be required at each stage by an experienced company whose fees should be paid in advance by the Developer. This is normally standard practice for any substantial scheme.

The effect of traffic movements has been deliberately, dramatically underestimated and I would respectfully request that these be examined in much more detail - the applicants drive through was incomplete, and misleading and surveys were not conducted with consideration of normal traffic survey guidance.

It is a known fact that due to the scale of the development only a few haulage contractors will be capable of providing the resources needed. The drivers will use Satnav to take the most advantageous routes and effectively ignore any written Traffic Management Plans. In the event of gross abuse, which is inevitable, there will be no effective policing system. To avoid major local disruption and provide safety, it should be a legal requirement for a rigid management process to be in place run by an independent company that would enforce the conditions of the Traffic Management Plan.

The applicant's representative at the Specific Floor Hearing was advocating a "three strikes and you are out" process but was not clear on how this would be enforced. I strongly believe there should be a zero-tolerance approach. The local roads are very narrow, unsuitable and in places known accident black spots. It is unreasonable to only act if there are serious injuries and or / fatalities when these are entirely foreseeable. In the event of accident investigations, the huge amounts of concerns raised relating to this subject will be in the public domain and those culpable for ignoring constant warnings will be personally culpable.

To iterate the point that is being made time and time again this is the 'wrong scheme in the wrong location and only being pursued as a few can make substantial profits. The Development should be refused on these grounds alone. If more evidence is required as to why the Development is unsuitable, please refer to the numerous submissions made and do not be swayed by the Developers disingenuous submissions and interpretation of those made by others.