

**From:** Stradbroke Parish Council <stradbrokepc@outlook.com>  
**Sent:** 15 May 2020 15:35  
**To:** Daniel Cameron <Daniel.Cameron@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>  
**Cc:** BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow <planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Fw: Barley Green A/D MSDC Planning Consultation Request - DC/20/01697

Re: DC/20/01697

Stradbroke Parish Council is submitting an initial response to the consultation on the planning application referenced above.

The Parish Council OBJECTS to this application on procedural grounds of jurisdiction and comments that this application should be determined by Suffolk County Council. The email below has been submitted to Cllr Guy McGregor (Suffolk County Council) and is, via this email, submitted to MSDC.

In addition to the point on jurisdiction, the email below makes reference to substantive matters regarding ecology and land use which the Parish Council brings to the attention of MSDC.

---

Regards  
Odile Wladon  
Clerk  
Stradbroke Parish Council  
Mobile: 07555 066147  
website: <https://www.stradbrokepc.org/>



*You have received this email from Stradbroke Parish Council. The content of this email is confidential, may be legally privileged and intended for the recipient specified in the message only. It is strictly forbidden to share any part of this message with any third party, without the written consent of the sender. If you received this message by mistake, please reply to this message and follow with its deletion, so that we can ensure such a mistake does not occur in the future. Stradbroke Parish Council, ensures that email security is a high priority. Therefore, we have put efforts into ensuring that the message is error and virus-free. Unfortunately, full security of the email cannot be ensured as, despite our efforts, the data included in emails can be infected, intercepted, or corrupted. Therefore, the recipient should check the email for threats with proper software, as the sender does not accept liability for any damage inflicted by viewing the content of this email. By contacting Stradbroke Parish Council you agree your contact details may be held and processed for the purpose of corresponding. You may request access to the information we hold on you by emailing [stradbrokepc@outlook.com](mailto:stradbrokepc@outlook.com). You may request to be removed as a contact at any time by emailing [stradbrokepc@outlook.com](mailto:stradbrokepc@outlook.com). To view Stradbroke Parish Council's Privacy Notice click [here](#)*

---

Sent: 15 May 2020 13:06

To: 'Guy McGregor' <[guy.mcgregor@suffolk.gov.uk](mailto:guy.mcgregor@suffolk.gov.uk)>

Cc: 'Stradbroke Parish Council' <[stradbrokepc@outlook.com](mailto:stradbrokepc@outlook.com)>;

Subject: RE: Barley Green A/D MSDC Planning Consultation Request - DC/20/01697

Guy

Many thanks for your response. I have now taken unpaid opinion from a ground source heat expert and his view is this is the precursor to an industrial processing facility: If we follow his reasoning set out below, SCC must determine the proposal and not the district council.

Obviously this is a clever and efficient system but it is a pity the applicant has not been more transparent in his approach. For example we do not have any detail of the traffic movements this proposal will generate.

We do not want a re run of the Cranswick issue, and as you know my FOI to SCC showed the A/D waste output and this lorry movements was several times greater than was put forward by the landowner when he applied for planning to build the digester.

I am requesting the Clerk sends this follow up email to the MSDC planning officer for re consideration of the ecological and land use implications, since the heat pump array in the field may sterilise the land for future agricultural use, contra to the statements of the planning consultant. .

SPC has repeatedly raised concerns about the industrialisation of this site by the back door. To repeat, there have been two separate consultations recently SCC and MSDC in which the site(S) and farm generally could have been promoted for wider use and consulted on publicly but neither opportunity was taken

Kind regards

Chris

++++  
++++

Advice on proposed system at Barley Brigg Farm

*“Anyway, they look like they are using warm air from the AD plant and extracting a percentile of the residual heat/energy from this exhaust gas before discharging into the atmosphere. So basically routing the exhaust to a new plant system within an ISO container, extract some of the heat and then venting as previous, but with a lower exhaust temperature.*

*This is being combined with a ground loop as per a normal GSHP. So basically they are proposing a very large ASHP combined with a GHSP. Neat.*

The system performance will be very dependant upon how 'dry' the exhaust air is. Any moisture may cause the heat exchangers in the container to continually block. There is a noise associated with the air flow through the exchangers, but this should be limited to within a few meters of the container itself. However, there are pull fans on the end and these will produce a reasonable amount of low and infra sound, especially if poorly maintained. Contaminants on the blades increase air flow noise and vibrational noise.

*If it will require some quite complex control systems to manage this extraction. If they get it wrong, they will heat/freeze the field, or increase the heat of the exhaust air.*

*I did not spot the expected output rating of the system. But I expect it is over 100KW. During winter the ground loop may freeze the field if the extraction occurs during overcast days, with low AD plant output.*

*This would affect microbiological (incl worms and ground based insects) when the soil freezes long term. You would need some assurances that freezing of the ground can not occur. Even with pipes 2-3m down, freezing of the layer above with low air temperatures is perfectly possible. And can take months to unfreeze.*

*He is using waste energy from the AD plant via the exhaust system. He is using agricultural land for ground loop heat extraction. The exhaust extraction could be considered a secondary unit, as the ground loop is probably the primary. The output of the system is basically providing low cost heat to the farm. If the AD plant takes in 'waste' externally from the farm, I would consider it an industrial facility, rather than a local agricultural facility for the farm itself.*

*If the AD plant is industrial by processing 3rd party waste, then yes, the farm heat and the AD plant are linked. And the drying process is also industrial. But I don't really know how to link/unlink the various processes on the site. If it just used exhaust extraction, then it could 'sell' heat to the farm, in the same way it would buy electricity or other fuel to dry the produce. But the fact it has a ground loop in the land of the farm, makes it a layer of further complication. Is the farm renting the land to the AD plant or what? But basically I would say the field has become industrial by that fact the pipes belong to the AD plant. The super chilling of the field will prevent it's use for even grass. So agricultural co-use would be negated.*

*If the entire system is 'self sufficient', i.e. the waste plant only uses farm produced waste, then the whole system is agricultural. The moment AD plant uses waste from 3rd parties, or the heat is used to dry 3rd party produce, the whole setup is industrial.*

*Neat plan and system, but I think he is looking at moving away from farming to industrial drying and waste processing. That is the only economic model I can see that makes it all viable. Due to changes in farming regulations, the disposal of farm waste becomes much harder from next year and he has seen an opportunity to to charge people for waste which he can make heat from and sell a rapid drying facility. Basically everyone has to pay him. Pay for waste disposal, pay for drying, all of which is pretty much free to him. “*

**From:** Guy McGregor <[guy.mcgregor@suffolk.gov.uk](mailto:guy.mcgregor@suffolk.gov.uk)>

**Sent:** 14 May 2020 23:24

**To:** Chris Edwards

**Subject:** RE: Barley Green A/D MSDC Planning Consultation Request - DC/20/01697

Chris

I have raised the issue of jurisdiction with legal (planning SCC).

I will advise soonest.

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

I have taken informal advice from a tells you how I collect and use personal data.

**From:** Chris Edwards

**Sent:** 14 June 2020 12:53

**To:** Daniel Cameron <[Daniel.Cameron@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:Daniel.Cameron@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk)>

**Cc:** Ross Walker <[Ross.Walker@suffolk.gov.uk](mailto:Ross.Walker@suffolk.gov.uk)>; Guy McGregor (SCC Councillor) <[guy.mcgregor@suffolk.gov.uk](mailto:guy.mcgregor@suffolk.gov.uk)>; Parish - Stradbroke <[StradbrokePC@outlook.com](mailto:StradbrokePC@outlook.com)>; 'Sue Ives'

**Subject:** Drying shed at Barley Brigg FarmDC/20/01697

**Importance:** High

Dear Daniel

1. The sites are inextricably interconnected
2. The current proposal cannot be built as the applicant is already implementing a previous consent for a much larger consented barn (consented absent the drying array)

This email is to draw your attention to the status of the current shed development at Barley Brigg Farm. The two attached photos show the structure of the shed under construction is consistent with the consented scheme 1837/17 and not with the plan on 20/01697.. The shed encloses the area of the building footprint proposed in the present application 20/01697.

The enclosed structure extends to and touches the boundary of the Digester site. Please refer to attached photographs.

The applicant has therefore implemented in part an earlier consent. The photographs show he has reached roof cover level of finish. (see below this email for copy /paste extract referring to a previous and withdrawn proposal of the same area as 1837/17 )

Consented scheme 1837/17 shows a shared boundary with the digester. This application takes this further. The proposed barn will feed the digester. Even if that generates “clean heat” in return, an explicitly consented agricultural site is feeding material to the waste site and benefiting from the heat generated in return. That heat is being used to dry third party grain. The two uses agricultural and industrial/waste are now combined into an industrial complex driven by the waste site. Legal precedent applies here and I fail to see how it cannot be said the sites are not interconnected and that the shed is now subsumed to the use of the biodigester.

Of course SCC do not want to deal with this as they have just completed their consultation on the Minerals and Waste Plan and the safeguarded site on the policy map includes neither the meadow nor the barn area, but in view of the evidence it difficult to understand the legal advice which presumably underpins SCC's position

The GSHP array is located in a field adjacent to the biodigester site and not the agricultural shed site.

As previously noted the key equipment unit is a sizeable container located on the A/D site. The previous statement extract which accompanied the current building development (“as built”) clearly states an intension to feed product from this as built barn into the biodigester Therefore the biodigester is connected to the shed by input and output.

The shed and the biodigester sites are one and the same for this purpose, due to the synergistic relationship created by implementing application 1837/17 whilst applying for a permission to sue a smaller structure on the pretext of “mere” agricultural use.

It seems obvious that DC/20/01697 cannot be implemented in the manner stated in the planning application. The current structure, the enlarged shed, carries with it the conditions and requirements of the previous consent. More importantly perhaps the current shed physically encloses the proposed location of the proposed hot air pipe to connect the secondary existing shed to the currently consented but superceded new smaller shed. The drawing for DC/20/01697 shows this.. It is therefore not possible to consent DC/20/01697 and require it to be built in accordance with the plans and planning statement put forward by the applicant.

In conclusion the sites are interconnected in five ways;

- the applicant has extended the barn structure, so that it touches the edge of the digester site;
- the barn relies on the digester for its heat (output)
- in its built form the barn will provide straw for the digester (input)
- the barn relies on the digester site to convey the ground heat from the meadow to the barn
- the heat exchange and control mechanism is proposed on the biodigester site.

And as noted the present application cannot be built in its proposed form as the "site" is subsumed into a larger red line consented scheme which is now significantly advanced to prevent the current proposal from being implemented at all

Kind regards

Chris Edwards



# Consultee Comments for Planning Application DC/20/01697

## Application Summary

Application Number: DC/20/01697

Address: Barley Brigg Farm Laxfield Road Stradbroke Eye Suffolk IP21 5NQ

Proposal: Planning Application. Installation of underground 'Ground Source Heat Array' and siting of heat exchange container.

Case Officer: Daniel Cameron

## Consultee Details

Name: Mrs Julie Collett

Address: Bridge Cottage, The Street, Huntingfield, HALESWORTH IP19 0PX

Email: wilbyclerk@outlook.com

On Behalf Of: Wilby Parish Clerk

## Comments

The closure date for responses to the application falls outside the scheduled meetings of council. The details of the application having been circulated, Councillors do not consider that the nature and extent of the proposals merits a special meeting for their consideration and accordingly council is content for the application to be determined by the Planning Authority consistent with the relevant planning policies.

**From:** SM-NE-Consultations (NE)

**Sent:** 19 May 2020 16:13

**To:** BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow <planningyellow@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>

**Subject:** DC/20/01697

Dear Sir or Madam

Application ref: DC/20/01697

Our ref: 316061

Natural England has no comments to make on this application.

Natural England has not assessed this application for impacts on protected species. Natural England has published [Standing Advice](#) which you can use to assess impacts on protected species or you may wish to consult your own ecology services for advice.

Natural England and the Forestry Commission have also published standing advice on [ancient woodland and veteran trees](#) which you can use to assess any impacts on ancient woodland.

The lack of comment from Natural England does not imply that there are no impacts on the natural environment, but only that the application is not likely to result in significant impacts on statutory designated nature conservation sites or landscapes. It is for the local planning authority to determine whether or not this application is consistent with national and local policies on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may be able to provide information and advice on the environmental value of this site and the impacts of the proposal to assist the decision making process. We advise LPAs to obtain specialist ecological or other environmental advice when determining the environmental impacts of development.

We recommend referring to our SSSI Impact Risk Zones (available on [Magic](#) and as a downloadable [dataset](#)) prior to consultation with Natural England. Further guidance on when to consult Natural England on planning and development proposals is available on gov.uk at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/local-planning-authorities-get-environmental-advice>

Yours faithfully

Dawn Kinrade  
Natural England  
Operations Delivery  
Consultations Team

Resource Management  
Bury Resource Centre  
Hollow Road  
Bury St Edmunds  
Suffolk  
IP32 7AY

Philip Isbell  
Corporate Manager - Development Manager  
Planning Services  
Endeavour House  
8 Russell Road  
Ipswich IP1 2BX.

Enquiries to: Kate Batt  
Direct Line: 01284 741227  
Email: [kate.batt@suffolk.gov.uk](mailto:kate.batt@suffolk.gov.uk)  
Web: <http://www.suffolk.gov.uk>

Our Ref: 2020\_01697  
Date: 15/07/2020

For the Attention of Daniel Cameron

Dear Mr Isbell

**Planning Application: DC/20/01697 Barley Brigg Farm Laxfield Road Stradbroke Eye Suffolk - Archaeology**

The proposed development site lies in an area of archaeological potential recorded on the County Historic Environment Record. Cropmarks, finds and a documentary record for a Medieval Market (SBK 056), from the wider vicinity, indicate potential for Medieval and earlier occupation. Given the nature of the development, installation of underground 'Ground Source Heat Array', groundworks associated with the development have the potential to damage or destroy any archaeological remains which exist.

There are no grounds to consider refusal of permission to achieve preservation *in situ* of any important heritage assets. However, in accordance with the *National Planning Policy Framework*, any permission granted should be the subject of a planning condition to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage asset before it is damaged or destroyed.

In this case the following two conditions would be appropriate:

1. No development shall take place within the area indicated [the whole site] until the implementation of a programme of archaeological work has been secured, in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The scheme of investigation shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:

- a. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording
- b. The programme for post investigation assessment
- c. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording
- d. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation

- e. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation
- f. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.
- g. The site investigation shall be completed prior to development, or in such other phased arrangement, as agreed and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

2. No building shall be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed, submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under part 1 and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition.

**REASON:**

*To safeguard archaeological assets within the approved development boundary from impacts relating to any groundworks associated with the development scheme and to ensure the proper and timely investigation, recording, reporting and presentation of archaeological assets affected by this development, in accordance with Core Strategy Objective SO 4 of Mid Suffolk District Council Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2008) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).*

**INFORMATIVE:**

*The submitted scheme of archaeological investigation shall be in accordance with a brief procured beforehand by the developer from Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service, Conservation Team.*

I would be pleased to offer guidance on the archaeological work required and, in our role as advisor to Mid Suffolk District Council, the Conservation Team of SCC Archaeological Service will, on request of the applicant, provide a specification for the archaeological work required at this site. In this case, an archaeological evaluation will be required to establish the potential of the site and decisions on the need for any further investigation (excavation before any groundworks commence and/or monitoring during groundworks) will be made based on the results of the evaluation.

Further details on our advisory services and charges can be found on our website: <http://www.suffolk.gov.uk/archaeology/>

Please do get in touch if there is anything that you would like to discuss, or you require any further information.

Yours sincerely,

Kate Batt BSc (Hons)

Senior Archaeological Officer  
Conservation Team

Your Ref:DC/20/01697  
Our Ref: SCC/CON/1745/20  
Date: 21 May 2020



**All planning enquiries should be sent to the Local Planning Authority.**

Email: [planning@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:planning@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk)

The Planning Department  
MidSuffolk District Council  
Planning Section  
1st Floor, Endeavour House  
8 Russell Road  
Ipswich  
Suffolk  
IP1 2BX

For the attention of: Daniel Cameron

Dear Daniel

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990**

**CONSULTATION RETURN:** DC/20/01697

**PROPOSAL:** Installation of underground 'Ground Source Heat Array' and siting of heat exchange container.

**LOCATION:** Barley Brigg Farm Laxfield Road Stradbroke Suffolk IP21 5NQ

Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Highway Authority make the following comments:

The agent has confirmed that other than installation and servicing, there would be limited traffic movements associated with the new proposal. Therefore, we consider the proposal would not have an impact on the public highway with regard to congestion, safety or parking. The County Council as Highways Authority, does not wish to restrict the grant of permission.

Yours sincerely,

**Samantha Harvey**

**Senior Development Management Engineer**

Growth, Highways and Infrastructure

Your Ref: DC/20/01697  
Our Ref: SCC/CON/1958/20  
Date: 4 June 2020  
Enquiries to: Ross.Walker@suffolk.gov.uk



The Planning Department  
MidSuffolk District Council  
Planning Section  
1st Floor, Endeavour House  
8 Russell Road  
Ipswich  
Suffolk  
IP1 2BX

For the attention of: Daniel Cameron

Dear Daniel Cameron,

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990  
CONSULTATION RETURN:**

**PROPOSAL:** Planning Application. Installation of underground 'Ground Source Heat Array' and siting of heat exchange container.

**LOCATION:** Barley Brigg Farm, Laxfield Road, Stradbroke, Eye, Suffolk, IP21 5NQ

Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Minerals and Waste Authority make the following comments:

"Thank you for consulting Suffolk County Council on the above application. The county Council raise no objection to the proposals but wish to make the following comments.

-The site sits outside a 'Minerals safeguarding zone' so no action would need to be taken in the safeguarding of potential minerals on the site.

-The site sits south west of a 'safeguarded waste site' on which is located an Anaerobic Digestion plant (MS/3892/15) with storage areas and a lagoon related to the AD plant.

-The proposed ground source heat array will draw some heat from the AD plant to be used alongside the ground source heat array for the drying of crops in the barn, this will require machinery to be erected on hard standing to a corner of the AD plant but it is felt that this will not affect/ disrupt the function of the safeguarded waste facility.

-It is asked that the Case officer takes the AD site into consideration when determining this application and give focus to Policy WP18: safeguarding of waste management sites, Suffolk minerals and waste local plan submission draft 2018, policy carried forward from the waste core strategy 2011.

Kind Regards

Yours sincerely,

**Ross Walker**  
**Planning Officer**  
Planning Section  
Strategic Development - Growth, Highways & Infrastructure



11 May 2020

Daniel Cameron  
Mid Suffolk District Council  
Endeavour House  
8 Russell Road  
Ipswich IP1 2BX

By email only

---

*Thank you for requesting advice on this application from Place Services' ecological advice service. This service provides advice to planning officers to inform Mid Suffolk District Council planning decisions with regard to potential ecological impacts from development. Any additional information, queries or comments on this advice that the applicant or other interested parties may have, must be directed to the Planning Officer who will seek further advice from us where appropriate and necessary.*

---

**Application:** DC/20/01697  
**Location:** Planning Application. Installation of underground 'Ground Source Heat Array' and siting of heat exchange container.  
**Proposal:** Barley Brigg Farm Laxfield Road Stradbroke Eye Suffolk IP21 5NQ

Dear Dan,

Thank you for consulting Place Services on the above application.

**No objection subject to ecological mitigation and enhancement measures**

**Summary**

We have reviewed the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Parker Planning Services Ltd, April 2020) relating to the likely impacts of development on designated sites, Protected and Priority Species & Habitats.

We are satisfied that there is sufficient ecological information available for determination. This provides certainty for the LPA of the likely impacts on designated sites, Protected and Priority Species & Habitats and, with appropriate mitigation measures secured, the development can be made acceptable.

The mitigation measures identified in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Parker Planning Services Ltd, April 2020) should be secured and implemented in full. This is necessary to conserve Protected and Priority Species.

Furthermore, we agree that the development will we not result in a net loss for biodiversity. However, we recommend that reasonable biodiversity enhancement should be delivered to secure measurable net gains for biodiversity, as outlined under Paragraph 170d of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019. The biodiversity enhancement measures contained within the Preliminary



Ecological Appraisal (Parker Planning Services Ltd, April 2020) should be outlined within a Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy, to be secured as a condition of any consent.

This will enable LPA to demonstrate its compliance with its statutory duties including its biodiversity duty under s40 NERC Act 2006.

Impacts will be minimised such that the proposal is acceptable subject to the conditions below based on BS42020:2013.

Submission for approval and implementation of the details below should be a condition of any planning consent.

### **Recommended conditions**

#### **1. ACTION REQUIRED IN ACCORDANCE WITH ECOLOGICAL APPRAISAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

*“All mitigation and enhancement measures and/or works shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Parker Planning Services Ltd, April 2020) as already submitted with the planning application and agreed in principle with the local planning authority prior to determination.”*

**Reason:** To conserve and enhance Protected and Priority species and allow the LPA to discharge its duties under the UK Habitats Regulations 2017 (as amended), the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 as amended and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority habitats & species).

#### **2. PRIOR TO BENEFICIARY USE: BIODIVERSITY ENHANCEMENT STRATEGY**

*“A Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy for Protected and Priority species shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, following the details contained within the Ecological Assessment (Ecology Solutions Ltd, June 2019).*

*The content of the Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy shall include the following:*

- a) Purpose and conservation objectives for the proposed enhancement measures;*
- b) detailed designs to achieve stated objectives;*
- c) locations of proposed enhancement measures by appropriate maps and plans;*
- d) persons responsible for implementing the enhancement measures;*
- e) details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance (where relevant).*

*The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained in that manner thereafter.”*

**Reason:** To enhance Protected and Priority Species/habitats and allow the LPA to discharge its duties under the s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (Priority habitats & species).



Please contact us with any queries.

Yours sincerely,

**Hamish Jackson** GradCIEEM BSc (Hons)  
Ecological Consultant  
[ecology.placeservices@essex.gov.uk](mailto:ecology.placeservices@essex.gov.uk)

**Place Services provide ecological advice on behalf of Mid Suffolk District Council**

Please note: This letter is advisory and should only be considered as the opinion formed by specialist staff in relation to this particular matter.

**From:** Andy Rutson-Edwards <Andy.Rutson-Edwards@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 07 October 2020 11:28  
**To:** Daniel Cameron <Daniel.Cameron@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>; BMSDC Planning Mailbox <planning@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>; BMSDC Planning Area Team Blue <planningblue@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** further reconsultation DC/20/01697

Environmental Health -  
Noise/Odour/Light/Smoke

**APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION - DC/20/01697**

**Proposal:** Planning Application. Installation of underground 'Ground Source Heat Array' and siting of heat exchange container.

**Location:** Barley Brigg Farm, Laxfield Road, Stradbroke, Eye Suffolk IP21 5NQ

**Reason(s) for re-consultation:** Further information received by the Local Planning Authority on the 29th September 2020.

Thank you for re consulting me on this application.

Having reviewed the submitted noise impact assessment, I note that this is 5 years old and therefore not current. The report is for an anaerobic digester and not for the heat recovery plant proposed. Having said this I also have regard to the comment in the report dated 2015 which states that the noisiest item of equipment is the CHP plant and this dictates noise levels at distances greater than 50 m from the site. I also note the Sharps Gayler Technical Note dated 7.7.2017 relating to condition 6 and 7 of the previous planning permission MS/3892/15.

The noise levels at the monitored positions, although within the levels set in condition 7 were close to the limit of 35dB LAeq.

In an email from the Agent on 16<sup>th</sup> September 2020 he proposes the following as a condition as a way of controlling the noise levels and to keep them in line with those previously imposed on this site:

*"In fact if it helps, please consider applying a planning condition(s) which echo those on the county site-wide permission and along these lines:*

*Condition: Prior to commissioning of the heat exchanger, plant testing and noise monitoring shall be undertaken at the 'assessed dwellings' identified in the Sharps Acoustics report of 28<sup>th</sup> August 2015 – an approved document of County Council planning permission MS/3892/15. In the event that predicted noise levels are breached further measures to limit noise shall be submitted to and approved by the LPA prior to commissioning of the heat exchanger.*

*Then:*

*Condition: Noise from the heat exchanger must not exceed 35dB LAeq at each of the positions indicated on the County Council approved plan 'MS/3892/15 Barley Brigg Farm AD – Proposed Noise monitoring positions'.*

The new application refers to a bank of 4 fans within a container, each fan having an Sound pressure level at 3 metres of 87dBA. I am concerned that this new noise source could potentially cause the levels to exceed those previously conditioned for this site.

I would however be satisfied with conditions being imposed **but** the proposed conditions are modified so that the assessment and levels are based on both the existing AD plant and

the proposed new plant running together at full capacity to ensure that these levels are not breached.

#### Conditions

- Prior to commissioning of the heat exchanger, plant testing and noise monitoring to include the existing AD running at full capacity and the new heat exchange units running shall be undertaken at the 'assessed dwellings' identified in the Sharps Acoustics report of 28<sup>th</sup> August 2015 – an approved document of County Council planning permission MS/3892/15. In the event that predicted noise levels from the existing AD plant are breached further measures to mitigate noise from the proposed plant shall be submitted to and approved by the LPA prior to commissioning of the heat exchanger.
  
- Noise from the existing AD plant combined with the heat exchanger, both running at full capacity shall not exceed 35dB LAeq at each of the positions indicated on the County Council approved plan 'MS/3892/15 Barley Brigg Farm AD – Proposed Noise monitoring positions'. The plant shall be maintained and serviced to ensure that the above levels are not breached. These conditions shall remain in force during the lifetime of the permission remaining in effect.

*Andy*

**Andy Rutson-Edwards**, MCIEH AMIOA

Senior Environmental Protection Officer

**Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Council - Working Together**

Tel: 01449 724727

Email [andy.rutson-edwards@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:andy.rutson-edwards@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk)

[www.babergh.gov.uk](http://www.babergh.gov.uk) [www.midsuffolk.gov.uk](http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk)

**From:** Peter Chisnall **Sent:** 20 May 2020 19:46  
**To:** BMSDC Planning Area Team Yellow <planningyellow@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** DC/20/01697

Dear Daniel,

APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION - DC/20/01697

Proposal: Planning Application. Installation of underground 'Ground Source Heat Array' and siting of heat exchange container.

Location: Barley Brigg Farm, Laxfield Road, Stradbroke, Eye Suffolk IP21 5NQ

Many thanks for your request to comment on the sustainability aspects of this proposal.

I have no objection or comment to make.

Regards,

Peter

**Peter Chisnall**, CEnv, MIEMA, CEnvH, MCIEH  
Environmental Management Officer  
**Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Council**