

-----Original Message-----

From: Steve Heath [REDACTED]  
Sent: Saturday, September 14, 2024 12:35 PM  
To: [REDACTED] environment-agency [REDACTED]; Andrew Rutter  
Subject: (application no. SCC/0045/23SE) Acorn Bioenergy Digester

Hello

My name is Steve Heath and I am a resident of Newton Longville where Acorn Bioenergy have permission for a gas injection site.

It appears that Acorn have been less than accurate in their application and not disclosed that the amount of gas storage would require a Hazardous Storage Consent.

There will be 64 tones of LPG, Natural Gas and biomethane stored on site as they declared in the application form. However the fact that is will require a Hazardous Substance Consent changes the flood risk position.

The fact that the site floods and is on Zone 3a is very clear - Acorn actually agree with this. However as they have then forgotten the HSC and gas storage, they have argued that it is allowed in the NPPF.

This neatly sidesteps the point that the need for a HSC makes the site "Highly vulnerable" and the NPPF states that no development of this type of site should be permitted.

In the Newton Longville case (Bucks AVDC 20\03539\APP), the EA stated that unless the gas storage was reduced, they would object and permission should be refused. Acorn agreed but have made several attempts to double the gas storage and thus requiring an HSC. I have attached the EA correspondance. Yes this site is also in a flood zone 3a. They performed a similar trick with their injection hub in Banbury (Cherwell planning 20/03184/F) where the original application declared there would be no gas use of storage - a blatant lie - and the development, also on a flood zone 3a was approved on a delegated decision.

I am seeing this tactic by Acorn in most of their current applications and if it is not noticed, results in them sidestepping the NPPF. This is clearly not acceptable and I urge you to make it clear to Acorn that this tactic is not acceptable.

Regards

Steve Heath