

Good afternoon, my name is Helena Berry, I object to this proposal and I am speaking today from my experience of living here on Portland for the last 7 years.

I've commented at every stage so far and there were lots more points I wanted to make but I'm aware, Sir, that you may well have heard many of them already, and that there are a lot of people who want to speak, so I've cut it down to those most important to me.

My husband & I moved to Portland for the sea air, the wild landscape, the tranquility & the naval connections (my husband is ex-Merchant Navy) and in order to escape the noise of living under the flight path at Gatwick airport, the pollution and the congested road network.

Based on our experience of living here, I can't see how the Appellant's traffic modelling (which is somewhat out of date in any case) can GUARANTEE that there'll be little impact from up to 80 lorry movements a day during operation (and I couldn't find a limit for construction lorry movements in the 2 years or so preceding, but I'll assume it's the same) on traffic flow.

Our experience of living here is that traffic and congestion has increased markedly in the last 2 years, to the extent that we have changed our behaviour to only drive in periods which are NOT the rush hour or school pickup/drop-off times, and to double the time to reach important hospital appointments in Dorchester - we never had to do this pre-lockdown.

The roadwork network on Portland is very vulnerable and grinds to a halt to unpredictable incidents such as accidents, emergency gas & water repairs, floods, wide loads leaving Sunseeker etc, such that for people like us who live on Tophill on several occasions in the last 2 years it has taken 30-60 minutes to get from our house to Victoria Square (the roundabout closest to this building), let alone get off the Island.

There are also physical pinch points from Weymouth to Portland that are create single alternate line traffic when there is a large vehicle coming in one direction for example Buxton Road Railway Bridge, between Cross & Connaught Roads and down through Wyke at similar times due to school run parking.

All these things increase the opportunity for congestion in several places along the route from Weymouth to Portland in addition to the narrow approach along Castletown to the Port gates, where plant construction & operation lorries will be competing with other bulk transports, buses of cruise passengers & construction workers, vehicles of Port & tenant staff & their visitors, tourists accessing hotels & the D-Day Museum, leisure users of Osprey Centre & the slipway & residents of Castletown going about their daily business.

I have an 80-year old friend who lives there who told me 2 two years ago when they heard about the proposal that the noise & vibration from the grain lorries too much already. How will they & the other residents of Castletown - the elderly, children - those who can't move (for example because their accommodation goes with their job, they're in a B&B due to being on the Council's housing waiting list) or can't afford to, those who do shift work (so sleep in the day) - cope with all this extra noise & disturbance from construction traffic initially & then from 24 hour operation of the plant?

There is robust scientific evidence of the impact of sleep disturbance on human health, particularly increased incidence of cardiac events and stroke. Regardless of arguments

over acoustics about noise being within 'safe' limits or not, the Appellant CANNOT guarantee that the health of residents of Castletown & the area above the plant (since sound rises) will not be adversely affected by noise.

As a [REDACTED] survivor & someone with [REDACTED] who walks the Island for physical & mental health, I'm aware of the long history of discussions about a 'Round the Island' path and would welcome that, but I'm very disappointed in the proposal.

A high metal fence will considerably affect the character of the open landscape itself, this seems to me harmful in itself to the setting of the assets, so not really successful as a mitigation. Plus although the path brings me closer to the assets, it physically cuts me off from them & limits my field of view to what I can see through the 15cm gaps of the palisade fence.

Also if I have understood the plan correctly, for about 1/4 of its length - the 'loop' bit - the path will be enclosed, both sides with security fencing on the seaward side & stock mesh on the other. I have previously walked an 'enclosed' stock fencing pathway across open pastureland; walking it was not pleasurable - it looked & felt like some kind of prison fencing, it was ugly, oppressive and I felt cut off from the countryside I was walking in, not connected to it.

Another problem that significantly detracts from the value is that the path will only be permissive i.e. there is no guarantee it will exist in perpetuity, nor that it will actually be open at a particular time that either residents or organised groups wanting to do 'Round the Island' walk might want to.

My final main concern is that the feedstock has changed from RDF to include the forms of residual waste 'which has been subject to pre-treatment, which includes by way of source segregation and / OR further mechanical and /or biological treatments'.

That can be interpreted as the lowest form of treatment as source segregation could be as basic kerbside separation into recyclables & black bag waste. Black bag waste when stored is malodorous, attracts vermin and can be dangerous if batteries have been left in it, so I'm hoping that the statement does not mean that they'll be storing it onsite & burning it.

It does worry me that if something so fundamental as the feedstock can be changed at this late stage of the planning process and what other changes may be made through other planning applications if this Appeal is granted so that what gets built is not what we are discussing today.

Finally, just because change is a constant in the development of the port and it has been involved with aspects of power supply before, these are hardly cogent arguments for building the wrong thing in the wrong place.

Sir, for these & all the many sound planning considerations and strong arguments you have already read and heard against this proposal which you can consider in the balance, I urge you to recommend to the Secretary of State that this Appeal be refused.