

From: Karen Hartwell Baker [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 December 2022 09:50
To: Tansley, Mark <mttansley@herefordshire.gov.uk>
Cc: Durkin, Barry (Cllr) <Barry.Durkin@herefordshire.gov.uk>;
tracey.colman@herefordshire.gov.uk; James, Terry (Cllr)
<Terry.James@herefordshire.gov.uk>; Bishop, Kevin <Kevin.Bishop@herefordshire.gov.uk>;
Hardwick, John (Cllr) <jhardwick1@herefordshire.gov.uk>; Fagan, Toni (Cllr)
<Toni.Fagan@herefordshire.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning application 222625

This message originated from outside of Herefordshire Council or Hoople. Please do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr Tansley

This objection following the documents recently submitted by the applicant for their application, which extended the comment deadline.

Permission for this tank cannot be looked at in isolation from the whole AD site, since it is in relation to expanding this site that permission is being sought.

The documents are not an independent survey [REDACTED] some very basic which perhaps indicates the level of research, some more convoluted and it is full of possibilities not facts. Some of the [REDACTED] are sited below:

The site is not 500m from the River Wye but just over 200m.

The tank was built without prior permission on greenfield not within the farmyard.

It is not a retrospective planning application for dirty water, it is a new application for a tank built without planning which has an enforcement on it, meanwhile there is an outstanding appeal against the enforcement. Despite the enforcement, the tank is in use and overflows.

Fawley is not a village.

This tank has expanded the site area without planning permission, or EA permit. By whom is it 'confirmed that the permit is being prepared' ? EA or applicant - what is the intention of this statement?

There is no washing down of cattle yards since the yards are not washed down. There are now calves on deep litter, not dairy cows.

The report states that site drainage towards the river has been discussed with a neighbour. Which neighbour and is there written evidence of this? Pipes were laid on this neighbour's land [REDACTED] and have been the source of contamination on and off since 2010.

This need to lay pipes demonstrates implicit acknowledgement that following the building of the site, drainage had to be altered; Something the planners did not

foresee. A lack of foresight causing damage to woodland, river banks and resulted in the river being polluted in dribs and drabs with 'dirty water' and sediment for 12 years, both through the laid pipes and because of increased hard standing and site flooding .

How much rainwater the tank can hold is irrelevant, since it is not designed as a rainwater butt. It's relevance is only in how much extra storage is being sought.

Run off from the hill above, frequently runs into a yard full of feedstock for the digester , which is highly polluting to the river. If incidental rainwater is the issue, then the advice given in the water pathway management plan by the Catch Sensitive Farming report, to stop the flow of water from above the site, and from below it towards the river, must be the priority; not providing storage for either digestate or dirty water, to an occasionally flooded site, erroneously built in the path of downhill run off towards the river. Has all this advice been undertaken?

If the yard was prevented from flooding from above the site, would there be a need for the tank to store incidental rainwater. Additionally, as stated, the cattle yards do not require washing down due to being cows in deep litter not dairy cows, therefore storage of said water is not required either.

This site was given building permission to process on-farm waste. Today, the farm is a mix of arable and barn reared beef calves. Previously, it was dairy, IPU's and arable. Now no IPU waste, so presumably there is even less on-farm waste to process than before?

Why do tanker loads of waste from outside the farm trundle down these tiny lanes (Chase distilleries /Weston's?) to be processed here - to produce more digestate? If the farm used on-farm feedstock for the digester, presumably it would not now need extra storage?

If less digestate was produced, would there be a need for extra storage?

The documents say the combined area farmed is 340 acres. It lies in a NVZ, ANOB, SSSI. Can this acreage, more precisely this *particular* acreage with these caveats, sustain the amount of digestate being produced to be spread on this land?

Other Considerations

Why was this tank built without planning permission ?

Was it with intent to avoid planning permission, or because in Herefordshire it is easier to get retrospective planning on agricultural buildings, than to seek permission in the first place?

Or is it because the practice of building, then seeking retrospective planning, (or not), has historically always been successful on this site and the wider farm.

Is this an application for dirty water or, an appeal against an enforcement for digestate? A tank, despite its enforcement which is in use and overflows.

Herefordshire Council have been guilty of permitting planning at this site without thought to its location, leaving the EA to pick up the pieces. This has been to the detriment of the rivers, the soil, the landscape and local residents.

This site has polluted the river, directly or indirectly, in dribs and drabs for 12 years.

It has caused odours so severe that in the past we have felt nauseous, visitors have felt sick, neighbours have actually vomited. The recent operators, prior to their departure, identified why this was happening. Have the planners any notion of this? Erstwhile neighbours witnessed rivets blowing off the roof from noxious gas building up in one of the digesters.

The noise levels from site generators are unremitting. 24 hours a day at varying levels, because it is apparently not possible to close the engine room doors. Neighbours cannot sleep with windows open at times. We live with a continual drone in our garden, like living beside an industrial site, which of course this has become. And this is without increased noise from pumps.

Is this really what the planners envisaged? Did they envisage river pollution, air pollution, noise pollution, more like an industrial than agricultural enterprise, amidst residential houses, in an AONB, NVZ, directly above an SSSI?

Why have the Herefordshire Council failed so atrociously, to protect the landscape, the river and residents who live beside this site?

Why did planning officers tell the planning committee that the last 'illegal' building here would still go to the planning inspectorate, regardless of the committee's decision.

Was it ignorance of a process they should have known, or told to mislead the committee, Which one was it and equally important, why?

My objection is based on a fear that there is further potential for pollution; it is based on the effects this site already has on our daily lives and that allowing this site to extend further, will lead to ever greater industrialisation and potential problems in this highly sensitive location. It is a site which the EA and HSE have struggled to get on top of and this is in part due to its planning permission at this location in the first instance.

I don't know what idiom best sums up this site, it's management and it's planning? Is it that 'the road to hell is paved with good intentions?' 'You can't make a silk purse out of a sow's ear?' The cobra effect (good intentions, bad outcomes).

Granting planning permission to this tank is expanding the site, giving credence to history that Herefordshire condone and reward agricultural building without planning, seeking retrospective rather than prior permission ... please don't allow it.

Kind regards

Karen Baker