

Laura Crawford

From: olga harper [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 November 2021 22:47
To: Planning
Subject: Re:LA0!/2019/0890/F Rigged Hill Terrydoo OBJECTION

I have become aware of the recommendation to approve at the Planning Meeting on Wednesday next and note the objections made by Diane Greer and Gwyneth and David McQuiston. Both objections refer to the omissions and lacunae in the HRA, yet the case officer's report and summary of objections made **makes no reference to the deficiencies of the HSA.**

I refer you to ECJ ruling C127/02 which refers to the '**precautionary principle**' and the need to take regard to this. It states " **If doubt remains.... they (the Planning Authority) must refuse.**"

The stated intention for the final CEMP Is that it should be assessed AFTER Planning Permission is granted . That runs contra to ECJ 127/02 Paras 52-54 and 59. It would be unlawful to approve in these circumstances

There are many other issues that I could raise but, in the short term, i assert that the HRA does not contain the ' required to ensure that the conclusion is '**capable of removing all reasonable scientific doubt**'. it is therefore necessary to withdraw this application from the lists so that the HRA can be revised and amended.

It would be unlawful for Planning Committee to approve this application and the Case Officer has a responsibility to withdraw the recommendation to approve.

As a separate issue, I note that 5 letters of approval and 8 letters of objection were received- not 5 and 6. The final letter (no14)was identified as 'inconclusive' though Ionan Mclaughlin's earlier letter made plain his objection to the proposal. I note that he had attached ' electricity supply documents', but these documents were not posted on the webPortal as they should have been. I trust that Mr Mclaughlin's sent paperwork will be made available to any reader of the case documentation.

Yours sincerely

Olga Harper