

Email correspondence regarding FOI on Barley Brigg Digester

From: Chris Edwards

Sent: 25 July 2019 08:55

To: 'Bron Curtis'; 'Daniel Cameron'

Cc: 'Parish - Stradbroke' <StradbrokePC@outlook.com>; 'Julie Flatman (Cllr)'; 'Sue Ives'; 'Guy McGregor'; 'Daniel Cameron'

Subject: Barley Brigg planning consent and prior approval , vehicular movements

Importance: High

Dear Bron and Daniel

Re: yesterday's very helpful and constructive meeting and the condition discharge request, Barley Brigg

The Stradbroke NP contains a local policy on traffic movement generated by local business expansion. The Parish Council expect this, and the attached evidence, to be used when considering the application to vary or remove any condition restricting drying barn vehicle movements.

It is our view also that the conditions precedent set by the prior approval determination apply to the subsequent conditioned planning permission **in addition to** any further conditions later imposed to make the development acceptable such as this time use condition.

The store and the digester share an access road. The access road was part of the red line store planning application. The attached information previously sent to Guy and Julie shows current excess tonnage removed from Barley Brigg digester over that stated in the transport report when permission was retrospectively sought to expand the digester.

For ease of reference please see below for the summary vehicle movement extract which is included in my FOI request attached. The detail of the vehicle movements for the original digester application is in the attached traffic statement and supplementary information.

To repeat the two structures the store (MSDC) and the digester (County) share the same access road and the access road was included on the dryer planning application red line plan. So the access road is now "consented" to the store, meaning the conditions for the store can apply from the point of access to site and not further up the road

The attached evidence supports an objection to removal of condition regarding time bound vehicle movements for the store. We repeat what we stated yesterday; this is the first part of a wider plan to locate strategic sites in range of the new factory at Eye. However the applicant is not disclosing his intentions. Neither did the applicant at Denham and now that site is a vehicle depot and has unrestricted travel movements under permit which is not a planning matter.

As the digester shares vehicular access with its excessive tonnage of removed waste and passing over the land conditioned to the new drying barn , enforcing the barn condition will be very difficult but that is no reason to remove it, it must be retained and enforced.

The entire network of development of which Barley Brigg is the apex is a real and pressing threat to the Stradbroke Neighbourhood Plan, not simply for housing but also for possible future business expansion in the village which will generate many new much needed permanent jobs for local residents to support growing families

Kind regards

Chris

From: Chris Edwards
Sent: 09 July 2019 20:23
To: 'Guy McGregor'
Cc: 'Parish - Stradbroke'; 'Julie Flatman (Cllr)'
Subject: RE: DC /19/01673 Barley Brigg

Guy thank you for the update.

The difference is in the tonnage removed from site according to my FOI. The waste removal tonnage is hugely in excess of the amounts in the original assessment and that is the problem. Perhaps we can obtain a specific answer about that matter? The traffic statement calculates p 10 and 11

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 states 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

So 20,000tonnes TOTAL are removed from site, a difference of 15,600 tonnes representing 1000 additional tankers over the figures shown in the planning document

This cannot be right and we fail to see how this huge difference in tonnage can be justified or regularised when the original permission was granted on apparently false information, and the scheme has this history of retrospectively regularised permissions. The EA are apparently toothless in this matter. Upi can see in the supplementary document that the Parish Council's original concerns were considered but not given any weight due to the weight accorded to the transport consultants dismissive statements.

On writing this another 15 tonne tractor and trailer has just passed by at speed through the village away from Barley Brigg, and they all appear to speed.

Chris

From: Guy McGregor
Sent: 09 July 2019 17:51
To: Chris Edwards
Cc: Parish - Stradbroke
Subject: FW: DC /19/01673 Barley Brigg

For information

GUY MCGREGOR
HOXNE & EYE DIVISION
01379668434 (H)
01379870339 (O)

From: John Pitchford
Sent: 09 July 2019 16:33
To: Guy McGregor
Cc: James Cutting ; Graham Gunby ; Jo Lloyd
Subject: FW: DC /19/01673 Barley Brigg

Guy,

I am aware that you have spoken recently to Jo Lloyd on this subject but I have set out below the answer to your question that you sent to James yesterday.

This isn't the end of the SCC involvement. We have asked that the operators submit an application for variation of condition so that the very small exceedances on some of the overall tonnages that are listed in the conditions can be considered by us. In addition we would seek an application for what we consider to be a non-material amendment for a change from thermophilic to mesophilic process. Just to be clear that, in planning terms, there appears to be no difference between the impact of the two processes while the specific mechanisms are governed by the Environment Agency through their environmental permitting process.

We will let you know when we receive an application as described above.

John Pitchford
Head of Planning
Suffolk County Council

Tel: 01473 264804

From: James Cutting
Sent: 08 July 2019 16:22
To: John Pitchford
Subject: FW: DC /19/01673 Barley Brigg

From: Guy McGregor
Sent: 08 July 2019 16:13
To: James Cutting
Subject: DC /19/01673 Barley Brigg

James

I know MSDC has granted PP but I write to enquire as to whether this is the end of SCC's involvement?

GUY MCGREGOR
HOXNE & EYE DIVISION
01379668434 (H)
01379870339 (O)

Freedom of information:



Environmental Information Regulations – Response – 17934

I wish to know the answers to the following questions. My requests refer to the attached committee report and plan

1. *The report states*

2) *Availability of Planning Documents*

A copy of this permission, including all documents hereby approved and any other documents subsequently approved in accordance with any conditions of this permission, shall be kept available for inspection on the site for the life of the development.

Q1: Are all these documents including block plan C283-101A available for inspection on site as required?

yes

2. *The report states*

7) *Noise Limits*

Noise from all components associated with the anaerobic digestion plant must not exceed 35 dB LAeq at each of the positions indicated on the Plan entitled 'MS/3892/15 Barley Brigg Farm AD – Proposed Noise monitoring positions'.

Q2: How frequently are these noise limits monitored and at what times of day and night?

There is no regular noise monitoring, noise is monitored if complaints are received regarding a specific noise issue. The noise would be monitored at the time appropriate to the complaint.

Q3: please supply the results of the monitoring data for the last 12 months

No monitoring has taken place in the last 12 months.

3. *The report states*

Waste Capacity and Origins

15) *Within any 12 month period only the following feedstocks shall be brought into and processed at the site:*

- a) *energy crops (4500 tonnes);*
- b) *sugar beet pulp (4000 tonnes);*
- c) *chicken litter (2000 tonnes);*
- d) *apple pulp (2500 tonnes);*
- e) *herbs (2000 tonnes);*

- f) on site slurry; and
- g) **on site digestate.**

The operator shall keep a record of all imported material, which shall be made available to the Waste Planning Authority upon request.

Reason: To ensure whilst meeting the forecast waste arisings, the waste is treated as close as possible to its source, in accordance with Policy WCS2 of the Waste Core Strategy Adopted Version 2011, setting out general considerations relevant to all waste management facilities and which are required in order to make the development acceptable.

Q4: How often does SCC inspect these records to ensure planning compliance?

The site is visited twice a year, when possible, and feed stocks are discussed.

Q5: What were the last annually accumulated total recorded weights of each of the above input fuels (a-f) to the digester?

Tonnage Actually brought in and processes – 15642 tonnes

On site slurries – 9400 tonnes

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

Q6: How were they verified evidentially?

Figures were supplied by the site manager.

3. The report states that approved drawing -C283 -101A block plan is one of the consented scheme drawings. It contains a weighbridge.

Q6: when did SCC last inspect the weighbridge to ensure it is working properly?

The weighbridge has always been working during annual inspections.

Q7: What was the result of the inspection?

The weighbridge has always been working during annual inspections.