

Haverhill Town Council

Minutes of a Meeting of Haverhill Town Council's

PLANNING WORKING PARTY

Held remotely on Tuesday 22nd November 2022 at 7.00pm



HAVERHILL
TOWN COUNCIL

Present: Councillor P Hanlon (Chairman)
Councillor A Brown (Vice Chairman)
Councillor B Davidson
Councillor A Luccarini
Councillor D Smith
Councillor A Stinchcombe
Vacancy

Apologies: Councillor L Smith

In Attendance: Councillor J Burns
Councillor D Roach
West Suffolk District Councillor Peter Stevens

There were no members of the public present.

Welcome:

Councillor P Hanlon welcomed everyone to the meeting and advised that the meeting was being recorded. **To note that this Working Party has no delegated authority and may only make recommendations to Full Council. Urgent actions may be taken under delegated authority given to the Clerk and Chair.**

P22 Apologies for Absence

/180 The above apologies were noted

P22 Declarations of Interest and requests for Dispensation

/181 P22/189 Councillors Hanlon, Brown, D Smith and Luccarini declared an interest in List B, item 2, being West Suffolk District Councillors. A dispensation was granted so as not to impede the ability to discuss the application.
Proposed Councillor Stinchcombe, seconded Councillor Brown.
All in favour
RESOLVED

P22 Minutes of the Meetings held

/182 Councillor A Stinchcombe proposed, Councillor D Smith seconded that the minutes of the meeting held 1st November 2022 were approved as a true record by show of hands.
All in favour.
RESOLVED

P22 Matters Arising from the Minutes

/183 None

P22 Withersfield Draft Neighbourhood Plan

/184 Councillor Brown raised that there is no mention of 30 business units at Hall Farm. To ensure the village's sustainability, support should be given to these. Councillor Burns asked members to note that the West Suffolk Local Plan is ongoing, Councillor D Smith explained that this is mentioned in the plan.

P22 Land at 'Faras Lodge', Anne Sucklings Lane

/185 Members noted appeal decision. There were no further comments.

P22 27 Old Clements Lane, Appeal Decision

/186 Members noted appeal decision.

P22 For members of the Public to speak on Planning Matters other than applications before the Working Party

/187 Appendix (ii) – West Suffolk District Councillor Peter Stevens referred to Steven Whyard's letter (attached). PS stated that many of the objections raised by SW will be answered by the Suffolk County Council's Impact Assessment, along with some concerns on highways. PS would like to see an indicative traffic plan from the applicant for deliveries in and out of the site, but also across various private land and minor roads. PS has visited five similar Bio Energy sites and has urged objectors to do the same. Other similar sites are at A14 at Risby, on the Euston Estate and at British Sugar at BSE. The Adnams site at Southwold and the one at Baldock are very different sites and is a process that deals with food waste. These sites would require different licences and wants reassurance from SCC that food waste will not be used in the future at this site. Concerns that he has will be raised at Withersfield PC.

P22 Planning Applications determined by the Clerk and Chair under Delegated Powers (List A attached)

/188 Applications determined by the Clerk and Chair are shown on List A attached to the Minutes, see Appendix (i)

P22 Planning Applications currently before West Suffolk District Council and received by publication of agenda (List B attached)

/189 Applications determined by the Committee are shown on List B attached to the Minutes, see Appendix (i)

P22 Matters to Report

/190 JB has raised with West Suffolk Planning Manager Rachel Almond, that many enforcements have not be carried out e.g. pallets behind Lidl and has given her a list of outstanding.

P22 Date of next Meeting

/191 The next meeting of the Planning Working Party will be 6th December 2022

P22 Closure

/192 The meeting was closed at 8.32pm

Signed
Chairman

Date.....

Appendix (i)

List A – Approved by Chairman and Clerk under delegated powers

		PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION

List B – To be considered at the Working Party Meeting

		PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION
02.11.22	1	22/01217/REM	<p>Application for the Approval of Reserved Matters (in respect of Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale) pursuant to outline planning permission 15/01477/OUT granted 04.10.2016 for: Construction of access road and the erection of a freestanding drive-thru restaurant with car parking, goal post height restrictor, customer order displays and associated works.</p> <p><i>Revised Site Layout, Revised totem and banner sign locations, Revised Drainage scheme, Revised levels, Technical Note in response to LLFA.</i></p>	Land at Haverhill Business Park, Phoenix Road, Helions Bumpstead	<p>NEUTRAL - Refer to previous comments submitted 5.10.22 by the Town Clerk.</p> <p>Proposed Councillor Luccarini, seconded Councillor Brown 5 for 1 abstained RESOLVED</p>
<p>DR : Braintree has not addressed any objections that individuals and TC have put forward. DR raised that the original outline application for units at this site where access from Bumpstead Road related to industrial units and not considered for a McDonalds, which is very different. Access from Bumpstead Road is unsafe for the number of vehicles which will use McDonalds and access would be more suitable from Phoenix Road, BDC need to visit the site. Pedestrians will need to cross Bumpsted Road several times to access the McDonalds as there is no footpath directly to the site.</p> <p>DS: The size of totem is still 12m high and out of proportion</p> <p>JB: Agrees that Phoenix Road is more suitable for access to the site. WSC have raised questions on the provision of footpath and lighting. JB has not been contacted to request traffic data. SCC Highways have not been consulted since the new re-consultation.</p> <p>Councillor A Luccarini proposed Neutral, refer to previous comments</p> <p>It was then additionally proposed by Councillor A Stinchcombe to amend AL's proposal to add that the Town Council raise that concerns have not been taken seriously and the lack of consideration with neighbouring authority whose settlement in Haverhill have not been taken seriously and lack of consultation with other entities. This was dismissed.</p> <p>Councillor Roach added that BDC asked WSC to deal with all applications on these parcels of land as crossed boundary sites.</p>					

		PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION
07.11.22 Expires 28.11.22	2	DC/22/1888/FUL	a. replacement of entrance door off High Street and associated glazing b. external bin collection point c. external platform lift d. goods lift to service yard Patrick Davey, West Suffolk Council	Provincial House, 32 High Street	
<p>NEUTRAL</p> <p>To increase number of disabled spaces provided and that spaces are placed to consider access to the town centre.</p> <p>Fence to be replaced with close board rather than galvanised mesh, which will be more aesthetically pleasing and ensure that skips and bins are not on display.</p> <p>Whilst work is being carried out, parking spaces must be provided in the 'Cleales' side of the car park.</p> <p>Proposed Councillor Hanlon, seconded T Brown.</p> <p>All in favour</p> <p>RESOLVED</p>					
07.11.22 Expires 28.11.22	3	DC/22/1904/HH	Garage converted to habitable space	12 Hopton Rise	NEUTRAL Proposed Councillor B Davidson, seconded Councillor Brown
08.11.22 Expires 29.11.22	4	DC/22/1816/HH	Single storey rear extension	11 Jobson Road	NEUTRAL Proposed Councillor A Stinchcombe, seconded Councillor Davidson
10.11.22 Expires 01.12.22	5	DC/22/1946/HH	a. two side storey extension following demolition of existing outbuilding b. single storey rear extension c. insertion of window to rear elevation at first floor level d. insertion of wider window to rear elevation at ground floor level	18 Hazel Close	NEUTRAL Proposed Councillor D Smith, seconded Councillor A Stinchcombe
10.11.22 Expires 30.11.22	6	DC/22/1948/EIASCR	EIA Screening Opinion under Regulation 6 (1) of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2017 - solar farm Lee Barratt, EuroAPI	11a Rookwood Way	

		PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION
<p>STRONGLY OBJECT</p> <p>This application will take up a massive area of potential employment land in the centre of the industrial estate, the Local Plan has outlined that there is a desperate shortage of prime employment land compared to needs. This site is included in Vision 2031 for employment land.</p> <p>Proposed Councillor T Brown, seconded Councillor Stinchcombe All in favour</p>					
	7	DC/22/0347/FUL	Three dwellings and associated access	27 Clements Lane	
<p>NEUTRAL</p> <p>Members of the Working Party would like to add that they have been unhappy with the entire process for this application, from demolition of a heritage building through delegated powers to concerns over parking and traffic not being taken into consideration. The voice of residents and the Town Council have been ignored.</p> <p>Proposed Councillor Luccarini, seconded Councillor T Brown All in favour</p>					

Appendix ii)
From: Steve Whyard
Sent: 08 November 2022 11:55
To: Colin Poole <colin.poole@haverhill-tc.gov.uk>
Cc: Sheila Horton
Subject: Acorn Bio Methane Plant proposal

Dear Mr Poole

I watched with interest the video recording of Acorn's presentation to Haverhill Town Council and thought many of the questions from councillors were very insightful, however I was disappointed that nobody asked questions about the following:

- 1) What toxic and odiferous gases are produced by the anaerobic digestion process and what is done to prevent their release to atmosphere
- 2) Similarly, the huge digestate lagoons on the proposed site will continue to produce gases due to ongoing microbial activity, what will be done with these gases and what toxic and odoriferous chemicals will the gases being produced contain. The Acorn representative mentioned that these lagoons will be covered using neoprene sheeting, however, no mention was made about how they will deal with these evolved gases, their containment and how their release will be prevented.
- 3) Will the site flare (burn) waste gases. Flaring of gaseous wastes from anaerobic digestion plants is common. The flaring of waste gases at methane and oil production sites has been linked to increased levels of cancer in populations living near such plants, what will be the risks to people who live and work nearby.
- 4) The Acorn representative quickly slid over the question regarding their consideration of alternative sites. I would have thought that it would be very important for Acorn to justify their choice of site on environmental as well as financial and business considerations.
- 5) Traffic volumes and the impact on roads in and around Haverhill and surrounding villages should receive significant focus particularly at times of peak usage of the proposed facility. Acorn focus on average daily lorry movements but at certain times of the year when, for example, feedstocks are arriving from the farms to be loaded into the silage clamps, the numbers of lorry and tractor/trailer movements will be very high. Environmental considerations (including the impacts on nearby residents) regarding increased tractor and trailer movements over farm tracks should also be carefully evaluated.
- 6) Anaerobic digestion of organic matter does not produce just methane and Carbon Dioxide. Many other toxic and bad smelling gases are also produced. Acorn will need to remove these toxic and odiferous gases from the methane and carbon dioxide they want to sell. What will the plant do with the contaminants removed during the methane and carbon dioxide gas clean-up.
- 7) What safety and contingency systems will Acorn have in place to deal with mechanical and process problems at the proposed plant. Methane is a highly flammable gas that forms explosive mixtures with air - how will Acorn deal with a build-up of excess methane from the digesters, process equipment or lagoons to prevent a hazard to those living and working close to the site or driving by the site? The volumes of methane being produced by the 5 digesters was said to be over 2000 metres cubed per hour - that is a great deal of highly flammable and odiferous gas to have to safely contain if there is a leak or the downstream plant ceases to work properly. You can't just ask the microorganisms to stop metabolising the organic waste/turn off gas production while a process problem is sorted out There are many further detailed questions that the council will I am sure wish to pursue once Acorn's Environment Impact Assessment has been published. There will also be many questions that local residents and those who work close to the proposed plant will need to be answered as the possible/probable impacts on the quality of their lives could be significant.

Yours sincerely

Steve Whyard