

Rebecca Biggs

From: David Harrold
Sent: 19 September 2017 08:27
To: Rebecca Biggs
Subject: RE: 4555/16

Hi Rebecca,

No specific comments and broadly agree with the representation by AW.

My recommendation to developers for these sites has been that up to 3 ou will be acceptable. Going above this limit is then a matter for the planning process for consideration of the balance of housing need and socio economic benefits. Exposure between 5 and 10 odour units is not supported as this may give rise to complaints. The intensification with residential use may increase the number of complaints to the council but if AW are doing all that is reasonable and practicable within water industry standards and practice, there will be nothing the Council can do to reduce emissions under nuisance legislation.

David Harrold

Rebecca Biggs

From: Enquiries_EastAnglia <Enquiries_EastAnglia@environment-agency.gov.uk>
Sent: 15 September 2017 14:40
To: Rebecca Biggs
Subject: EAN/2017/57747 Site Phase 3a and 3c- Gun Cotton Way
Attachments: Stowmarket WRC Permit.pdf

Dear Rebecca

RE: Request for information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) / Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR) regarding Gun Cotton Way

Thank you for your enquiry which was received on 18 August 2017.

We have a total of 5 incidents relating to the works (from 2009 onwards). All are for minor effluent quality breaches. All are resolved. We expect that there haven't been any odour complaints because there aren't any houses bordering the site.

I hope that we have correctly interpreted your request.

Please refer to the Open Government Licence available here <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/> which explains the permitted use of this information.

We respond to requests for recorded information that we hold under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and the associated Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR).

If you are not satisfied with our response to your request for information you can contact us within 2 calendar months to ask for our decision to be reviewed.

If we can be of any further assistance, please do contact the Customers and Engagement Team on 0203 02 55472.

Yours sincerely

Victoria Clemence
Customer and Engagement Officer

☎ 0203 02 58512

✉ vicki.clemence@environment-agency.gov.uk

✉ Icen House, Cobham Road, Ipswich, Suffolk. IP3 9JD

Information in this message may be confidential and may be legally privileged. If you have received this message by mistake, please notify the sender immediately, delete it and do not copy it to anyone else.

We have checked this email and its attachments for viruses. But you should still check any attachment before opening it.

We may have to make this message and any reply to it public if asked to under the Freedom of Information Act, Data Protection Act or for litigation. Email messages and attachments sent to or from any Environment Agency address may also be accessed by someone other than the sender or recipient, for business purposes.

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam

Rebecca Biggs

From: David Harrold
Sent: 06 September 2017 14:12
To: Rebecca Biggs
Subject: RE: Planning ref 4555/16/FUL. EH Air quality EA & EC Cedars Park.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Rebecca,

Re number of complaints:

2017 – 2
2016 – 1
2015 – 1
2014 – 2
2013 – 0
2012 – 1
2011 – 1
2010 – 0
2009 – 1
2008 – 2
2007 – 1

The 2017 complaints were of a general nature about odour and wanting something done. Looking through the history of the previous complaints, nothing has been proved but suspect equipment failure, tank cleaning, unusually heavy rainfall and storing sewage cake from other works on site to be amongst the most likely causes of odorous events.

I hope this information is of assistance.

David

Rebecca Biggs

From: Wilson Hannah <hWilson4@anglianwater.co.uk>
Sent: 04 September 2017 16:15
To: Rebecca Biggs
Subject: RE: 4555/16

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Rebecca Biggs,

Thank you for your email regarding Phases 3A & 3C Cedars Park Stowmarket.

The development sites 3A and 3C are sufficiently close to the operational boundary of Stowmarket WRC to be exposed to odour emissions from the normal operation of the WRC and to an extent that may impair the amenity of the proposed developments. Previous assessments have demonstrated the impracticability of substantially reducing the odour potential of the WRC by applying odour abatement techniques to the odour sources, beyond the measures that are already in place.

The submitted odour risk assessment has produced results broadly in line with those produced in the earlier 2013 analysis, which was undertaken by REC Ltd in consultation with Anglian Water. While we are comfortable with the analysis methodology used in this most recent analysis, we could not agree with the conclusions reached. We can not accept that land exposed odour emissions in excess of 5 OUE/m³ is suitable for residential development and would recommend that the layouts of both sites are designed to ensure that the residential elements are not exposed to emissions in excess of 3 OUE/m³.

In reaching this conclusion, we have considered the potential changes to the current WRC operation. Anglian Water need to maintain the operational area available to meet future demand and increase process capacity, which would be expected to require an increase in reactor or odour source area.

With regard to site 3A specifically, the predicted exposure of the eastern edge of this land to emissions in excess of 10 OUE/m³ may not be compatible with the proposed B1 land use and we would recommend that the applicant provides evidence to demonstrate a feasible mitigation of the odour risk, incorporated within their design of the development, that will provide credible protection of the required amenity.

We note from the submitted site layout drawing no. 1467-3A-P001 that the proposed layout for site 3C has broadly positioned residential buildings and private gardens beyond the predicted dispersion range of the 3 OUE/m³ odour concentration. As such we would conclude that the risk posed to the development proposed in site 3C is minimal and that this development is considered acceptable.

If you have any questions please contact me.

Kind regards

Hannah Wilson

Pre-Development Planning Manager