

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 June 2024 13:30
To: Planning Services
Subject: Reference FUL/2024/0025

Categories: BSA

WARNING: External email, think before you click!

Further to my earlier emails I would like to make some further comments.

- The Application for Planning Permission asks the following question under the section Trees and Hedges :

Are there trees or hedges on land adjacent to the proposed development site that could influence the development or might be important as part of the local landscape character? To which the applicant has answered "No".

Yet in the Icen Planning Statement in Section 2.1 it states "There are mature trees and hedgerows running along the Site's eastern boundary." It also states in Section 2.2 "There is ancient woodland circa 150m east of the Site and this is elevated from the Site."

I would strongly suggest that there is a conflict between the response in the Application for Planning Permission and the information contained in the Icen Planning Statement

One might reasonably ask, given the size of the proposed site (18,970 square metres which is approximately the size of two full size soccer pitches), why ancient woodland about 150m away from the site and mature trees and hedges along the eastern boundary of the site are not important as part of the local landscape character?

- My next comment relates to the Noise Assessment provided by Entran Ltd. In the Introduction it states :

"The exact specification of the proposed WWTW has not yet been finalised ..."

I understand that in the absence of the yet to be completed exact specification, Entran have sought to use national standards and guidelines. I would have thought that given the size of this proposed development (over 1 million litres of liquid waste throughput annually) one would conduct the Noise Assessment once the specifications are finalised. "Cart before the horse" comes to mind. Why didn't Entran Ltd. conduct an assessment on a similar sized treatment plant already operating elsewhere?

Are those responsible for considering this Planning Application comfortable accepting the notion that the treatment plant's final design will adhere to the proposed background sound level limits in daytime and night-time? Who will be ensuring that the finalised plant design is compliant with Entran's recommendations? I would like to suggest that ongoing noise and odour monitoring be conducted by a body that is independent of the treatment plant operator.

- My next comment relates to Nutrient Neutrality and associated issues contained within the Icen Planning Statement. I see no evidence to support the assumption that the proposed offsite wetland will remove sufficient nutrients from Dobb's Beck to offset the residual nutrient budget, as stated in Section 2.15, item 4.

Are those responsible for considering this Planning Application comfortable accepting this assumption without any supporting evidence? Also, who will be responsible for monitoring the proposed Nitrogen and Phosphorus license limits on an ongoing basis? I would like to suggest that it be a body that is independent of the treatment plant operator.

Regards

