

DC/20/02052 – Full planning application: Erection of 4no. poultry houses and associated block, store, feed bins & vehicular access. Castle Hill Farm, Thorndon IP23 7JT

The Committee objected to this application as follows:

Thank you for consulting Stradbroke Parish Council on this matter. We greatly appreciate the opportunity to respond. We fear a deluge of traffic in the area and the attached report from the Parish Clerk supports this position. It is our view this proposal's projected movements will lead to a severe local highway impact and in time a severe cumulative and wider impact in view of the current highway network constraints in Mid Suffolk

First objection – Highways Impact severe

1. The applicant's transport consultant who acts for many farms puts us on notice there will be massive traffic uplift in and around Eye caused by this and other future developments. in future. In the extract below CHA is self evidently SCC as County Highways Authority

HTTC Traffic Statement page 7 para 1.14

"This is particularly so as the articulated hgv flows will be to and from the recently approved and constructed Cranswick site at Eye Airfield. It is noted that CHA made no adverse comments about the movement or articulated hgv's through Eye in relation to that very large development. The proposal was for a B2 building with a floor area of 20,450sq.m. that was to be used for chicken processing. The CHA did not require any mitigation within Eye, or on road routes to the south of Eye, including the B1077. Therefore, it cannot be reasonable or realistic for the CHA to try and require any such mitigation for this extremely minor (in actual and in comparative vehicle flows) development proposal. I note that the same officer dealt with the Eye Airfield site, as has now commented on this significantly smaller proposal (KAB5). Hence, the CHA should have no difficulty accepting this point."

2. He states that SCC should have done something about the factory if they had a problem with transport movements. This proposal will by our calculations produce 1% - one hundredth – of the requirement for the Eye factory (1.3 million chickens) or thereabouts
3. The transport movement uplift from the replacement development is significant - several thousand vehicles per annum from this 1% as shown in the attached "Report on traffic movements".
4. 100 times this amount is several hundred thousand vehicles per annum in and around Eye
5. Eye are consulting on a lorry ban which if implemented will further impact routes to the factory. Even if it is not, foreseeably a significant proportion of the increased burden of various types of vehicle will fall in and around Stradbroke and on to the B1118, Queen Street
6. The applicant acknowledges by implication that his is to be one of many applications to come. This is a statement of intent equivalent to a phased planning application. We therefore ask SCC whether this application, specifically evidenced as one part of a cumulative impact constitute a severe impact on the highway network in and of itself?
7. The same agent has in the past significantly underreported traffic movements to such complexes, see Barley Brigg appendix 1 and the FOI from SCC and Traffic Statement. The same consultant stated the waste level to be removed would be as noted in his statement

attached. The liquid waste was underreported by 12,200 tonnes. At 14 tonnes per trailer that is 12,200 /14 = 870 trailers underreported

Traffic statement extract

Removal

Solid digestate = $12\% \times 21000t = 2520 t$ /14t tractor

180 loads pa = 360 trips pa over whole year

360/52 = say 6 to 8 trips/week

say 2 trips/day for 3 or 4 days of each week 2 hgv's/day

Liquid digestate = $11\% \times 21000t = 2310t$ /15t tanker

154 loads pa = 308 trips pa over 5 months, say 20 weeks

308/20 = say 14 to 16 trips/week

say 4 trips/day for 4 days of each week 4 hgv's/day

23% of 21,000tonnes = **4,380 tonnes TOTAL**

The FOI responses record however

Q7: What was the last annually cumulative total weight of **digestate (g) output removed from the site?** (using same dates as Q6)

Solid digestate – **3,500 tonnes**

Liquid digestate – **16,500 tonnes**

Second Objection – Public health – Biodiversity and risk not properly assessed - Avian Flu in view of Covid 19

Avian flu H151 is a coronavirus. <https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/bird-flu/>

And from The Telegraph

<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/global-health/science-and-disease/beware-disease-x-mystery-killer-keeping-scientists-awake-night/>

“Influenza is one of the biggest threats. This was proven in 2009 when H1N1 (swine flu) went rapidly pandemic. 213 countries and territories reported cases of the virus and an estimated 285,000 people died in its wake.

That is a massive number, but it represents a case fatality rate of just .02 per cent. Approximately one out of five people on the planet were infected, but very few died. In other words, H1N1 was highly infectious, but it was not highly virulent.

On the other hand, H151 avian influenza has a mortality rate in humans of about 60 per cent. At present, H151 does not spread human-to-human. However, it could easily evolve and a virus with the infectiousness of H1N1 and the mortality rate of H151 would be devastating.”

The health risk and biodiversity impact of a huge and closely interconnected network of breeder units with limited highway access routes to the destination factory has not been assessed. If the route is along the B1118 there is a real prospect of an unacceptable health risk to Stradbroke from this and all of the other developments which, we are assured implicitly by the applicants own agent, are coming our way, and soon.

Chris Edwards

Chair Stradbroke PC Planning