

I think the MMO has a simple choice.

Do they approve this application and then oversee the very quick, far reaching destruction of this ancient and unique coastal and marine environment forever, or do they try to protect it.

I respectfully beseech the MMO to refuse this application and retain this unique habitat enjoyed by so many, human and otherwise. This application has never made environmental sense, and it certainly no longer makes economic sense.

I am a resident, not a professional, but my response is heartfelt and from the years of living across the estuary on the Roseland, and have had concerns regarding A & P's operational priorities and pollution, long before this application. I truly worry about the impact of 24/7 demolition and construction will have for the area.

Environmental impact if approved

If approved, irrevocable damage will occur to this precious maritime environment, the AONBs/ Cornwall National Landscape and SSSIs, despite all the paperwork promising they'd do their best to avoid "significant" harm with too many unsubstantiated claims. It's just common sense. Why has it even got this far ? Even their own reports state their activity could lead to adverse affects.

Frankly the 2009 Marine Water Quality Report should have stopped this project stone dead, now backed up with the findings of the recent 90 page Sediment Containment and Plume Modelling report which is truly devastating reading. I am staggered, that knowing this information about heavy metals and poisonous compounds in the sediment, this project has got past first base. The fact A & P has carried on with the application and tried to justify and gloss over the impact of disturbing it, 200m from an ancient Maerl and sea grass habitat, and where the fishing fraternity and marine life catch food, speaks volumes about their attitude to the environment. Stating they would keep the sediment disruption as "low as possible" is criminal.

I am also stunned by the proposed sea dump area as I know it is a very popular fishing spot and that the currents and waves will transport the toxic sediment for miles, all across the bay and along the coast, onto beaches. I regularly see scuba divers in this area, presumably attracted to the pristine underwater environment that they are proposing to use a dump for dangerously toxic chemical waste.

We had to abandon plans to have a small holding growing produce in New Zealand, when we discovered from soil samples our land was unsafe to do so, due to the high cadmium/heavy metal levels from the use of superphosphate fertiliser distributed on the land decades before, which would be unsafe for at least 120 years. Offal from grazing animals reared on such land cannot legally be sold due to the high levels of toxic heavy metal retained in the animals organs. What will be the short and long term, unknown and known effect for the local harvested and wild aquaculture and consumers, when the heavy metals and other poisons are released in such quantities back into the Carrick Roads, Falmouth Bay and English Channel as well as the dumping onto land they describe ?

I was an international scuba diver for over 20 years and I know the effect and devastation of underwater events, and how delicate and sensitive these are to change. I have seen too many pristine environments lost, whose value will never be fully appreciated, due to lesser activity than is proposed here, manmade or otherwise.

I believe the area around Falmouth, Carrick Roads and Falmouth Bay is unique in the UK, if not the world, and this long standing, fragile ecosystem has until now, been protected from over-development and large scale industrialisation after the 'naivety' of yesteryear and the affects of tin mining outfall. Surely we know better now, than to allow this to happen again ?

Control of its wide-ranging properties should not be effectively sold off to an International company, whose inevitable priority is profit for the Board and Shareholders.

Just because Falmouth Docks are next to the largest NATURAL deep water port in Western Europe, and on their portfolio, does not make it suitable for what they plan, given its current

importance to many many local businesses, residents, tourists and land and marine habitat, and here as a direct result of it's uniqueness.

Light, Noise and Air pollution in the local and wider area of Falmouth Docks

I am a 10 year resident across the estuary on the Roseland who sails in the area and for several years I have been complaining about marine noise (yes I can hear it), and air pollution to A & P, Environmental Health and the Harbour Masters on the current set up. This has been exacerbated by larger and larger ships being repaired in the dry dock. I am now dreading the 24/7 operation if approved, as I hear even the current low key operations now at times, especially at night. I don't live in direct sight of the docks some distance away, and yet an area not covered by the noise monitors. A & P know where I live, and how long I have been complaining.

I have also walked through the streets of Falmouth to the constant thrum of noise from ships moored in the docks, which gets worse when there is a gap in the buildings towards the water. Goodness only knows how the marine-life copes. Perhaps this is why, too often, they beach upstream to everyone's heartache.

In my personal experience of living here, the curved and hillside geography of the area, land and sea, creates an echo chamber effect, so sound travels for some distance over land, water and no doubt underwater.

I speculate that that the increase in ship size being repaired in the A & P dry dock, and other visits, may correlate with the recently reported significant and sudden decline in the quality and health of the sea grass and maerl beds around the port. Is this also connected to the exceptionally high levels of Tributyltin described in the 90 page sediment report ?

Who monitors the chemical toxic dump of waste into the estuary when these enormous ships leave the dry dock, or the effect of the cruise ships visiting the port ? No one, from what I have been told, so sadly I don't trust any promises made, even to keep it to a minimum, as they know no one can/will monitor effectively and if breached, it will be too late anyway. A bit like a millionaire deciding they can afford any fine for chopping protected trees down that are blocking their view. It's a cost they can afford as part of the financial plan, except we will all be paying the price.

The air pollution emanating from the current ships is palpable and highly toxic and I have been told no one is monitoring any air and noise pollution from these or any other ships visiting the harbour and Falmouth Bay, when they produce the most toxic air of any transportation in the area.

I have watched and listened to cruise ships arrive, berth and leave the current port. The plumes of black exhaust they billow towards homes, businesses and schools, especially when accelerating and manoeuvring, is frightening.

When sailing close to anchored chemical tankers in Falmouth Bay we have had to quickly change tack due to the stench of toxic fumes coming from the anchored vessel, which are often there for months, and very close to shore. How many more of those will there be if this is approved, anchored and waiting to dock with their cargo. No one is monitoring and collecting the data of the pollution they emit. I doubt, with all the cutbacks, anyone is monitoring whether they are still using the highly toxic "ocean" fuel in such close proximity to land, and a large population.

In the 10 years I have lived on the Roseland the significant increase in light pollution from Falmouth has materially affected the dark sky we used to enjoy. We no longer see the Milky Way which was easy to see on clear nights. Now we are lucky to see the stars. This is likely to be even worse if this is approved, and I can only speculate how the marine environment will be affected, certainly above-water nature will be.

Need not demonstrated

Despite the claims in the application, I do not believe there is a need nor justification for the significant, widespread and permanent negative impact this will cause, if approved. How can this be remotely considered if a detailed demolition and environmental impact assessment report hasn't actually been conducted ? It seems they need approval and money first, presumably in the form of Dock Regeneration and Green Energy grants, paid for by the British taxpayer. Cart before the horse, and deeply suspicious given the volume of content submitted.

A & P International Group own Cammell Laird <https://www.cammell-laird.co.uk/renewables>. and Tyne <https://www.ap-group.co.uk/a-p-tyne> and from what I have read, they already have suitable infrastructure of land, personnel and transportation routes. Falmouth Docks is within a small town, at the end of a very long, convoluted, narrow and height restricted route from the already congested roads, in complete contrast to what has been described. Local businesses rely on regular footfall which is likely to be lost due to the impact the demolition and construction will have in the area for several years and non stop, unless it suits A & P.

This application has been years in the making, and in that short time the landscape for over-sized cruise ships and offshore windfarms has changed. Ports and their residents across the world are protesting and refusing and restricting entry to these ships due to their well documented and significant negative impact on the local economy and residents. Offshore windfarms projects are being abandoned as they are not cost effective, despite all the government grants.

It has been reported that the windfarm being built with these wind turbines will destroy a hugely important fishing area and sailing rights in a very wide area of Cornwall. I have also been told they become exclusion zones, due to the danger from the blades, so the impact on local businesses and infrastructure will be far reaching, if facilitated.

Support of local residents and businesses ?

I believe if a poll were taken in Falmouth and the significant wider working and living population affected by these proposals as to whether they want the port extended to become a megaport, inviting over-sized cruise ships (and wind turbine manufacture), descending at intermittent intervals, and overwhelming the town, I think the answer would be "No thank you. Why would we ?" I doubt, even if they believed the figures given re job creation, they would believe this justifies the damage caused, given the time it would take to come to fruition, if at all.

I believe the job and business losses would be far greater than those gained as permanent A & P employees in Falmouth. The current glorious outlook for residents across the harbour would be dire, and polluted with significant noise and air pollution during and after construction, enhanced due to the curved hillside geography of the harbours location and residents which amplifies sound above and below water. I doubt it would win the "best place to live in the UK" if this goes ahead.

5-6,000 passengers plus crew descending on this small town and wider area for the day, getting onto high volumes of road clogging coaches, only to totally swamp and ruin their ultimate destination for ordinary tourists, as we experienced recently. We were literally the first through the gate, mid week, at the Monet Gardens in France, only to find several coach parties had been allowed early entry and the whole experience was so miserable we left early, vowing never to return, despite it being a long held desire to visit. I can imagine this will be the same at Minack, Eden, Heligan and other popular spots including Falmouth itself, for tourists and locals who actually stay and eat in Cornwall supporting the local economy, and not global enterprises, whose tax is unlikely to be seen in the UK.

Bless you for reading so far, I respectfully submit this as an objection to this application.