

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

From: Chris Oakes [REDACTED]  
Sent: Thursday, October 26, 2023 10:23 PM  
To: Andrew Rutter [REDACTED]  
Cc: Indy Wijenayaka [REDACTED]  
Subject: Planning application SCC/0045/23SE

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Click here  
<https://suffolk.freshservice.com/support/solutions/articles/50000031829-email-banners-external-emails> for more information or help from Suffolk IT

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

Dear Andy,

I wish to object strongly to the proposed development of an anaerobic digester at Spring Grove Farm, Haverhill.

I am a resident of the village of Withersfield having moved here in 1985. My family and I were truly horrified to be made aware of the industrial development which is proposed on designated agricultural land. I would like the following points to be highlighted and considered when the application is being considered by both yourself initially as the Case Officer and then the members of the planning committee:

1. The development is contrary to policy HV18 (Green Infrastructure in Haverhill) of the Haverhill Vision 2031 Local Plan document.
2. The development is contrary to the National Planning Policy for Waste Appendices B and C (Landscape and Visual Impacts) and J (Noise, Light and Vibration).
3. The siting of this development is wholly inappropriate and the land owner who has 16,000 acres in the locality at its disposal has several other alternative and more appropriate sites where the AD plant could be located without impacting so dramatically on homes and business premises (please see David Huckstep's letter of objection).
4. The AD is potentially smelly, subject to leakage into a flood zone 3 and only 600m from both business and residential premises. The location is just plain and simply inappropriate and wrong.
5. It has been demonstrated that the location is subject to flood and this has occurred 5 times in the last 12 months. It has been revealed recently by a leading professor in climate change that what are now considered to be 1 in 100 year events will be 1 in 1 year events by 2050 due to climate change. Flooding frequency and intensity will increase.

6. The traffic associated with the AD plant will have a significantly adverse effect on the rural roads surrounding the plant (especially Silver Street, Withersfield), conflicting with both the current farming operations and the increasing "rat running" to Cambridge through the villages due to the disastrous changes being made to the A1307 and the increase in HGV movements on the A1307. The Spirit of Enterprise roundabout will become a merry go round. Not what it was designed or indeed built for.
7. Grade 2 agricultural land is to be taken out of the food cycle to produce maize to create a limited amount of methane and digestate. Maize should not be grown on heavy, prime agricultural land. There is good reason it is not grown in the locality already since the crop cycle will lead to significant compaction due to heavy harvesting machinery on clay land resulting in run-off of surplus nutrients into water courses and soil erosion after harvest.
8. The digestate lagoons to be located to the east of Cadge's Wood are either on or very close to Stour Brook. Whatever the assurances given these will leak and result in leaching of nutrients into the Brook which runs through the village of Withersfield, then the Meldham Washlands greenspace (where it could well produce blue-green algal growth which is lethal for dogs) and finally through the centre of the town of Haverhill. It will happen, whatever assurances are given to the contrary.
9. The proposal will create a carbuncle on the face of the town of Haverhill which over recent years has really been picked up through significant investment. It is the fastest growing town in Suffolk. To blight it with a composting and organic waste processing plant at its main entranceway with the prevailing wind blowing its smells over the town (and the village of Withersfield) is bad planning and unacceptable.
10. It is doubtful if full consideration has been given to the possibility of a lightning strike and the impact an explosion could have. The most recent example of this reported from Oxfordshire was thankfully nowhere near a place of habitation.
11. Flaring of excess gas is hardly an appropriate operation only 600m from office premises and a residential development area.
12. The application is clearly a cut and paste lift from other applications which the applicants have submitted around the UK. The reference to the A43 (which is approximately 65 miles away) in the submission suggests that attention to detail is lacking and this would seem to be bourn out by other inconsistencies in the numerous documents submitted as part of the application.
13. The application is at best disingenuous and at worst economical with the truth.

I wish to again state my absolute objection to this application both for the reasons given above (which is not an exhaustive list) but also those stated in submissions of objection already lodged with SCC.

Regards,

Chris Oakes

Duke's Cottage  
Rose Hill  
Withersfield  
Suffolk  
CB9 7SE

