

Dear Andrew

RE Anaerobic Composting Plant Spring Grove Farm Withersfield

The application by Acorn, SLR, with the support and presumably in the knowledge of Robin and George Vestey has been submitted either by intent or default of the truth.

The sub heading of the Portal Application “Industrial or Commercial Process and Machinery” clearly asks “Is the proposal for a waste management development” The answer given is **NO**.

The applicant is fully aware that County only manage applications related to Minerals/Waste/County Council developments. The initial application by Acorn was to District, which is a deliberate ploy adopted Nationwide by the applicant to circumvent the planning process. District to their credit redirected it as a waste application to County.

The validation letter from SLR of the 27th June acknowledges the application is waste “and identified as such to enable its submission to Suffolk County Council”

Their justification for lying on the Portal submission was that the Waste streams listed, four in number were not seen as “an option for selection.”

The drop down box on the Portal offers twenty waste stream options, option number fourteen is “Anaerobic Digestion”

Is this crass ineptitude, ignorance, or again a deliberate ploy to deceive?

The applicant also confirms in the sub heading on the Portal Application

Site Visit

“Can the site be seen from a public road, public footpath, bridleway way or other public land?”

Answer **NO**.

- Does that mean that we will not see the tank farm from any angle?

- Will we not see the 2.4m spiked top palisade (rural) security fencing?
- Will we not see the vast stockpiles of feed stock?
- Will we not see the gas flare off stack?
- Will we not see the gas being flared off which will happen as it does on every such site across the country?
- Will we not see the light pollution of the 24/7 operation in the evening sky?

Perhaps the rationale we are being asked to accept is that the site will be screened by the existing deciduous trees, (with autumn approaching), or indeed by the new planting as proposed. Such is the cut and paste professionalism of the application.

The application is signed off as stating “we confirm that to the best of our knowledge any facts stated are true and accurate”

This is clearly and woefully not the case, their best leaves a lot to be desired.

How can we, and the general public, reconcile such blatant untruths?

Yours Sincerely

David Huckstep