

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF PLAISTOW & IFOLD PARISH COUNCIL MEETING;
HELD ON TUESDAY 12TH AUGUST 2014; 7-30 pm; WINTERTON HALL, PLAISTOW.**

Present: Sara Burrell(Chair) Stuart East(Vice Chair) John Kirby, Françoise Lillywhite, David Ribbens Sophie Capsey, Viv Forwood, Ronnie Perrin, Sallie Baker, Nick Whitehouse

C/055/14 Representations from Members of the public; Approximately 150 people present; The Chair thanked everyone for coming to the meeting. The main purpose of which is to consider the Crouchland Biogas planning application. In order to balance the meeting, Mr Angus Cameron Chairman of Crouchlands Bio Gas Ltd (CBGLtd.) had been invited to attend and address the meeting and was supported by representatives from CBGLtd. Leon Maketarian and Barry Evans, and also representatives from PORE (Protect Our Rural Environment) Mrs Clarissa Bushell and Mr Dave Jordan. Leaflets were distributed by Crouchland Bio Gas Ltd to those present and PC distributed some copies of Temple Group conclusions and FAQ from the Environment Agency.

The Chair advised the re-ordering of the Agenda to allow public representation and discussion under the consideration of the Planning Application

C/056/14 Apologies: Apologies were received from Parish Cllr.David Lugton, County Cllr Janet Duncton and District Cllr Josef Ransley

C/057/14 Minutes: The Minutes from the meeting held on 15th July 2014 having been previously circulated were signed as a true and correct record of the meeting.

C/058/14 Declarations of interest by members; There were no declarations of interest from any attendees.

No members of the press, television or radio were present. There were no objections to the meeting being recorded. Before commencing with the main issue of the evening, routine matters were attended to.

C/059/14 Chairman's report:

A meeting had been held with Ms Goldsmith, Leader of the West Sussex County Council and members of Kirdford Parish Council to discuss failure in communication between WSCC and the Parishes and how this may be improved. The Chair had attended a Northern Parishes Cluster meeting at which the consultation for the changes of the flight patterns from Gatwick airport were discussed. Kirdford Parish Council's response to the consultation had been previously circulated to Councillors and in view of parishioners concerns it was agreed to respond in a similar manner by the closing date 14th August. It was considered that the consultation process was poor and the process muddled and that greater evidence was required before responding, but in view of the time constraint it was agreed the Chair would respond.

The closing date for response to the WSCC Minerals Local Plan: Mineral Sites Study is 22nd September. The Chair will review the document and circulate a draft response to all members for consideration before that date, because the next PC meeting is not until 23rd Sept. The plan will include matters such as gas and oil site location and so it is important to consider and respond.

C/060/14 To Consider the Planning Application WSCC/042/14/PS: Crouchland Bio Gas Ltd Proposed upgrade of an existing anaerobic digester facility to enable the export of biomethane to the national grid installation of a new digestion tank two CHP engines digestate lagoon and associated infrastructure Crouchland Farm Rickmans Lane Plaistow Billingshurst West sussex RH14 0LE

The Chair introduced Angus Cameron of Crouchland Biogas Ltd and he gave the following presentation (Script provided by Mr Cameron for the minutes):

"Before I say anything else I would like to apologise for the unnecessary angst our site has caused this community. This was never our intention and, though it is no excuse, it is in small part due to the complexity of the planning process.

But we have not communicated our intentions well and for that again I apologise.

So there are three things I would like to cover this evening:

- 1. how we got to where we are today,*
- 2. how we can address some of your concerns, and*
- 3. what are our plans for the future?*

Crouchland Farm has been owned for hundreds of years by the Luttmann Johnson family. It employs 10 people and in total we provide 25 jobs. But dairy farming is changing.

In 2007, William was one of the first farmers to realise the potential of Anaerobic Digestion or AD to complement dairy farming, at a time when it was becoming near impossible for dairy farmers to survive.

In 2010 Crouchland Farm was granted broad permission to develop an AD plant – that permission still forms the basis of the current application.

Since then we have been in lengthy consultation first with Chichester District Council and then later with West Sussex County Council when it became clear that they wanted oversight of the planning consent. That necessitated the re-start of the confirmation process with a massive amount of information to be evaluated and provided. The net result is that more than a year elapsed between the start of the application and its finalisation. This is of course far from ideal.

We do understand that our AD site is a cause for concern for the local community.

Two of the wettest winters in modern history have had a major impact on the farm. Huge quantities of rain fell and when roof water mixed with the cow slurry it had to be stored. Until the rain stopped there was no alternative but to dig lagoons to store the dirty water in anticipation of spreading the effluent as manure during the summer. One summer was so wet that even that was impossible and the slurry built up, as well as the resulting smell. When the rains finally stopped we had to transport all that slurry to local farms. It is this slurry that has been the source of most of the outgoing transport and it had nothing to do with the AD plant.

We have spent a lot of money and effort resolving the drainage arrangements on the farm so that rainfall no longer mixes with slurry. In future there will be no recurrence of the huge quantities requiring transportation, whatever the weather throws at us.

It is evident from the consultation process that transport is a major concern. We also recognise that our application appears to call for a lot of movements to and from the site, although far fewer than the PORE campaign leaflet suggests. If you compare with this time last year we have implemented a 60% reduction in lorry movements. In part that is a result of the preference expressed by the Council that we use tractors, which are smaller, rather than fewer journeys with larger transport (lorries). The gas we plan to produce will be exported to the grid by just four trailers a day. The inputs to the plant will come in on tractors from other farms, but such movements would take place anyway.

All lorries turn right out of our drive onto Rickmans Lane and then left into Foxbridge Lane before joining the Plaistow Road at Loxwood. We do not permit our drivers to go through Plaistow itself and we never will. We will also not allow them to move outside normal working hours. Most importantly, they are restricted to a speed of 25 mph and we record their actions at all times.

Some people have expressed concern about the lack of a pavement on Foxbridge Lane and access to the Scout Hut. We are more than happy to work with the Parish Council to establish a pavement, at our expense.

So – what are our plans for Crouchland? Those of you who have looked closely at the plant will see three digesters, which are no more than large concrete cans with a roof, in which the composted ingredients mature. Beside them there is equipment, housed in three shipping containers which purify the methane gas produced to a quality that you could use in your domestic boiler or your cooker. Then there are two engines that are driven by the gas to generate electricity to light your house. All of

this is situated between two large cow barns on the farm. And we are now landscaping the site so that very little will be visible from 'outside'.

Finally, there is a lagoon in which waste slurry is stored –incidentally it is slightly smaller than a football pitch, not five times the size as suggested. I am afraid that the cows will still generate waste, and during the winter months it must be stored until it can be spread on neighbouring fields. The lagoon is covered both to contain any smell and also to capture the methane gas that would occur naturally. The result is that we now capture a lot more methane than before the introduction of AD to the site, any smell is minimised and the environment and the community benefit.

Bar the installation of one more piece of equipment the size of a small greenhouse, which is intended to capture CO₂, there are no further plans for development of the site. Both CO₂ and methane hurt the environment but if we can capture them both the whole process will become carbon negative. We will be taking gases out of the atmosphere and putting them to productive use.

For example, the local supermarket could use the methane to power their lights and the CO₂ to run their freezer cabinets. The inputs are the cows, then there are local farmers who wish to grow energy crops such as maize and there are the local fruit producers who need to dispose of the fruit that the supermarkets are too picky to take.

So we are making the best of locally sourced energy that would otherwise go to waste. There is no transport from Leicester that I heard mentioned and there is no food waste – just local farms trying to make a living and providing even more employment for the area.

We are proud of what we are doing at Crouchland, but we also want to be better neighbours. We want to become one of the first to bring gas to grid in the country but we also want to do it with the support of the local community. Local gas for local communities is an exciting prospect. Just think if you could replace your expensive oil fired boilers with locally produced gas at a half or even a third of the cost that you currently pay, and with no tanker deliveries?

We'd like to help the community get clean, cheap fuel in the very near future. Why don't we explore the possibilities for local distribution together?"

Mr Cameron asked those assembled if this was of interest and the general response was that it was not worth the impact of the proposed scheme.

Clarissa Bushell representing PORE then gave the following presentation (Script provided by Mrs Bushell for the minutes):

"If you take a look at the WSCC website it is possible to read the long list of objections from local people about this application. Very few, however, will have had the time to delve deeply into all the documents. Dave and I will highlight some further concerns which may not immediately be obvious to the public and with these will represent the objections on behalf of P.O.R.E.

P.O.R.E stands for 'Protect Our Rural Environment' and has been formed by a group of local residents concerned about the development at Crouchland over the past few years and alarmed at this new application. Some of us in the group have lived here for a lifetime, some for several years and some have moved here recently – but all of us have chosen it for its rural and tranquil nature and it would seem we're not alone in identifying these increasingly rare characteristics. Indeed it was E. V. Lucas the most celebrated travel writer of the last century who said in "Highways and Byways of Sussex" "Plaistow is on the road to nowhere and has not its equal for quietude in England".

The Chichester District Local Plan includes Plaistow as an area of special character that deserves protection from intensive development as it is characterised by "a feeling of remoteness and tranquillity which is rare in the South East of England".

It is extremely difficult to suppress our anger and disbelief at the fact that Crouchland Biogas has/have gone ahead and constructed this AD Facility without the required permissions and without consulting this close-knit community. However, for tonight we must just consider the Application before us on the table.

This application is very large scale. It is no longer a small scale farm facility.

The WSCC Waste Policy states that a Plant of 10-20,000 tpa is 'likely to be acceptable in rural parts of the country'. This Application is for the significantly higher tonnage per annum of 34,755.

I will start with our concerns about the choice of site with respect to the physical location and surroundings. I think that everyone here will understand the reason for selecting Crouchland Dairy Farm as the site for the original, permitted and locally supported AD unit in 2009, which dealt solely with the Crouchland farm dairy waste. However, we can find no good reason for the Industrial Anaerobic Digester to be sited here in this village. An enormous amount of waste must be imported by road; the gas exported 60 miles to Portsmouth by road and 73% of the digestate to also be exported by road.

We live here in a unique ecological setting with highly valuable and species rich ecosystems – all of which are very susceptible to the greenhouse gases produced by the AD plant, the CHP engines and the HGV tankers and tractors.

- *Within 1.5 miles there is the European 'Annex 1' Protected Site and Special Area of Conservation 'Ebernoe Common'*
- *Within 2.5 miles there is the European 'Annex 1' Protected Site and Special Area of Conservation The Mens;*
- *Within a mile there is also the Site of Special Scientific Interest Chiddingfold Forest -of National value*
- *Within 1 km there are two Sites of Nature Conservation Importance which are of County value*
- *And Six Ancient Woodlands surround the farm*

In short, I cannot think of many less appropriate sites in Sussex for an Industrial sized AD Facility.

We have some profound concerns about the impact that this Industrial expansion will have on the environment;

*Impacts caused by the **Construction** of the site;*

I suppose if there was a benefit of a retrospective planning application, it is in the fact that it is possible to see what harm has already been done. There should have been no significant construction impact on the Environment if done properly, but there are some obvious issues seen today;

- *Numerous dead and dying oak trees surrounding the lagoons and the site itself;*
- *Algal blooms visible in wet areas indicating eutrophication due to leakage of nitrate rich material.*
- *Continuous noise which keeps residents awake through the night.*
- *Sulphur rich bad eggs odours*
- *Dead foxes and badger in one of the 3 lagoons recently discovered to have been built with no permission. More trees dying on the edge of lagoons where spoil has been thrown up against them and they sit in inches of water. Rusting tins of corrosive chemicals left discarded and leaking around the lagoon*

The Archaeology Response has summed up the foolishness of it all; It is to be strongly regretted that because excavation of the lagoon has already taken place, it must now be presumed that any archaeological site which may formerly have been present, within the lagoon footprint, will have been completely destroyed without effective assessment or mitigation of development impact.

Archaeological heritage assets, once destroyed, are an irreplaceable resource.

*Impacts caused by the **Operation** of the site (on the Environment)*

Anaerobic digestion and the use of CHP generators lead to emission of the very dangerous, acidic gases which spread with the wind, dissolve in rain, and fall into the surface and ground water in surrounding areas having detrimental long-term impacts on the flora and fauna. Principal among these are carbon dioxide, oxides of nitrogen, oxides of sulphur and carbon monoxide.

It is these emissions of acidic gases that have a significant negative impact on our environment.

CHP generators

I hope that this scale diagram of the CHP situation will help clarify our understanding of the situation. This shows the CHP generators that Crouchland have already installed; 1MW permitted and a further

3.2 MW being applied for retrospectively. This shows that they are increasing their capacity from 1MW to 4.2MW (as in AQ Report) – at least a 4 fold increase.

1. What is hard to understand is that when they were using imported food waste as well as the on farm waste - together totalling 42,000 tonnes/waste per year, they only needed the 1MW CHP generator to process this. It seems surprising that they have increased their generator capacity 4 fold in order to process 7,000 less tonnes a year. It just doesn't make sense.

Now we come to the interesting bit – with which we are most concerned; the calculation of the crucial emissions from the A/D Facility, shown in the Air Quality Assessment Document;

2. Keeping strictly to this planning application Crouchland Biogas propose to only use the 2 new CHP generators for just 4.2% of the year – a total of 15 days. The calculation of the emissions has only therefore included these 15 days from this proposed 3.2MW capacity. The original 1MW CHP has been used as a baseline. Of course, understandably, just 15 days has not proved to be significantly detrimental to the environment, but in our opinion we believe these levels of emissions for 15 days must be added to the emissions already being produced in order to ascertain their significance. It should be taken into consideration that they are already producing emissions from a 1 MW generator. It is rather like a policeman allowing someone to drive because they've had just one glass of wine, without taking into consideration the 2 glasses they have already had – which then tips them over the safety and legal limit.

3. It just doesn't make business sense to invest in 4.2MW of CHP engines and have a spare capacity of 3.066MW.

4. The shocking fact is that should they use the full capacity of the CHP engines then the noxious emissions levels would be 23.8 times higher. This would lead to highly significant, dangerous and damaging levels of emissions for the countryside and for us.

5. On top of this, as Dave will explain, we have concerns about the number of vehicle movements and their associated emissions to add to the cumulative total of the whole development. Emissions from the emergency flare have not been included either.

6. In Crouchland's 'Planning Policy Statement' they admit that if they are unable to generate gas for whatever reason, the installation of two new CHP engines will ensure they can combust the biogas to produce electricity and heat. If they have the facility and possible intention to use all the CHP generators to produce electricity, then the emissions must be calculated accordingly.

7. May I urge that further investigation is done to confirm that this anticipated use of the generators (4.2%) is 'Normal' in units such as this – and that procedures are put in place to ensure that this useage is never exceeded, should the plant be ever permitted.

NOISE; There have been many complaints from residents near the site, including Rickmans Lane about the sound of the continuous whirring of engines, high pitched intermittent beeps and the clanking of construction. These sounds have prevented residents sleeping and spoilt their enjoyment of their gardens and the countryside. How much greater will have been the effect on those noise sensitive animals, such as the bats and the owls? No wonder no one in Rickmans Lane has seen the Barn Owls that frequented our fields at dusk and dawn up until several years ago. No wonder the Nightingale's powerful and beautiful nighttime song is now rarely heard. There are 6 species of bats that live in the area with 2 species; the Barbastelle and the Bechstein's which are so rare that they are European Protected Annex II Species. The Barbastelle is listed as Near Threatened on the global IUCN Red List of mammals.

How much greater will the noise impact become in winter when the trees are bare and when the unit operates fully?

We have concern that no studies have been done on the impact of the noise, vibration and odour on these flying animals.

ODOUR

The houses closest to the Site suffer greatly from the rotten egg smells which arrive swiftly and can linger. People who choose to use the footpaths and bridleways also risk these unpleasant smells.

One resident wrote this description of the odour '**It is a sickening smell which permeates clothing and all building that the odour reaches**'. Combined with this is the uncertainty of not knowing what chemicals one is breathing in. The effect on the wildlife is unknown. With the proposed expansion, we question the odour controls and monitoring.

Parish Council; I speak on behalf of a large group of residents when I urge the Parish Council to proceed with caution. We are aware that the Application Documents reject any environmental concerns, but we cannot take a risk; cannot play with the future of the fragile and unique habitats of this area. It may well be right that Crouchland Biogas Ltd will only use 4.2% of their Generator Capacity, but we have learnt that we cannot trust all that we read and we urge you to investigate this further.

With regard to the anticipated use of the CHP generators, may I draw your attention to part of an article written by someone at Crouchland Farm in August 2012 in the West Sussex Gazette which reads as follows; The bio-digester has been running well with both engines at maximum power for several weeks, and the flare roaring away at times as we get better at running it and getting the most out of the feedstock.

It is vital to protect and conserve these ecologically rich and diverse ecosystems. There is so much at stake.

We urge you to be certain about your decision.....to take no risks..... and have no doubts.”

David Jordan, also representing PORE gave the following presentation (Script provided by Mr Jordan for the minutes):

“We will be hosting the UK's largest biomethane to grid plant in one of West Sussex's smallest villages – it doesn't make sense.

1. We are concerned about a facility that will handle just under 35,000 (34,755) Tonnes of waste and feedstocks but we're even more concerned that what has been built means it will have the capacity to handle up to **4 times more**. There is plenty of evidence to suggest this:-

- Currently the largest Biomethane to grid plant is Rainbarrow Farm in Poundbury, Dorset. It handles 40,000 Tonnes of waste & feedstocks and from this exports just over 2,000 (2,300) Tonnes of Biomethane to the grid. Crouchland say they will export 8,000 Tonnes of Biomethane – that's **about 4 times** as much and yet they say they will do this using only 35,000 Tonnes of inputs. Unless they have found a miracle process – it doesn't make sense.
- The digestate storage lagoon capacity at Crouchland is just over 60,000 m³. Rainbarrow Farms is 13,200 – That means Crouchlands lagoons are **4.5 times as big**
- Crouchland will sell the gas to SGN gas networks as do Rainbarrow Farm . SGN's chairman said in his annual report that the Crouchland project “has the potential to be **4 times** the size of Poundbury”
- As Clarissa pointed out they are increasing the CHP engine capacity from 1MW to 4.15MW – **4 times**. Interestingly when Rainbarrow Farm upgraded from electricity generation to Gas to grid they reduced their CHP's by a ¼ (From 2MW to 400Kw). Given they cost in the region of £400k we find it hard to believe it would be done without the intention to use them for just 15 days per year (4.2%)

So just to recap Rainbarrow farm inputs 40,000 Tonnes of waste and Crouchland is built to be **4 times as big**. The implication being that the application is only stating a quarter of what it could – so 35,000 Tonnes could be over 100,000 Tonnes
This is like building an 8 bedroom house and then submitting an application saying you're only going to use 2 rooms

1. **Our small rural lanes will suffer from over 28,000 Vehicle movements associated with the plant**

They are needed because the increase in size means that the Farm itself cannot produce enough materials to “feed the biodigester” the application shows that 40% of what is required will have to be imported by road and 73% of the resulting digestate will not be used on the Farm but exported by road and all of the Biomethane will travel 60 miles to Portsmouth

Over half (that’s 15,500) of these vehicle movements will be large HGVs Tankers and large Tractor trailers that’s a 68% (6,324 movements) increase in large vehicle movements over the applicants baseline, if you accept that – which we don’t.

To put it in context, WSSC said that the fracking proposal that they recently rejected in Wisborough Green would result in periods of intensive HGV movements, up to between 20 to 40 HGV movements each day during. For Crouchland combined HGV/Tanker and large tractor trailer movements will average 51/day - it doesn’t make sense.

All of these will use the “winding narrow lanes” like Foxbridge Lane, Rickmans Lane, Plaistow Road – These lanes are small, single track in places with no footpaths and wholly unsuitable for both the size and volume of traffic .

These vehicle movements represent significant safety, noise and disturbance issues in this rural environment.

It represents safety issues

- **For other drivers** who have to either back up or drive onto the verge or ditch
- **For leisure users** who use the lanes extensively - Pedestrians, dog walkers, joggers, cyclists, horse riders . The narrow lanes and lack of footpaths means they are inches away from these large vehicles
- **For children** – many of our school kids take buses to Plaistow School and the Weald and they wait in groups at the side of the road on a narrow grass verge, others walk and there are no paths on most of the roads in Plaistow and Ifold – the current level and the 68% proposed increase in the HGVs and large vehicles represent a real safety issue for them and a totally unacceptable risk that we and WSSC should not accept.
- **Parents at the Scout hut** on Foxbridge Lane, park up against the hedge and drop their children off on the road side – I have witnessed the HGV’s truly struggle to squeeze past and squeeze past they do - in winter with no street lighting it is unacceptably dangerous.

Many of us here tonight will complain about the **state of the roads** and the damage caused by the large vehicles and yes they are awful and the cost of constantly repairing is unacceptable but roads can be repaired with peoples’ lives it’s not that simple.

The report showing only one accident locally is no predictor of future accidents – No one plans an accident but they should plan properly to prevent them and that means using appropriate routes like the lorry network.

A facility requiring vehicle movements of this size and scale should be located close to the lorry route network as stipulated by WSSC as part of their policy to “minimise lorry movements and the use of local roads for the movement of waste”. This facility is not near the lorry network – it’s simply in the wrong place and it doesn’t make sense.

2. Detriment of our Amenity and quality of life

After talking about safety it feels slightly friperous to talk about **quality of life** – but it is important the right to enjoy your surroundings and quality of life. WSSC has a stated strategic objective to protect and, where possible, enhance the health and amenity of residents but the plant itself will only be to the detriment of our quality of life and the application dismisses traffic as an issue (“barely perceptible” and therefore a “minor impact”).

If like me you live on their route you will know that they are noisy and intrusive – both the engine noise and the braking noise. They start as early as 5.15 am and finish well into the evening the application states that they could be up to six trips per hour - that’s one every 10 minutes and the gas tankers 7 days a week. This represents a real loss of amenity for residents and cannot possibly be considered a “minor impact”.

4. Inaccuracies and Insufficient data in application

There are too many inaccuracies in the application to discuss them all here

- *The baseline vehicle figures seem inflated as its hard to reconcile the export of 64,000 tonnes of dirty water from a herd of 350 dairy cattle. Using standard dairy industry figures this is massively over stated*
- *The development history and number of original lagoons is incorrect*
- *Stating that “use of local roads would mainly be for the transport of gas” Digestate export accounts for 53% Gas only 16%*
- *Ignoring some local houses as receptors*

There is also insufficient data in several areas

- *No assessment of traffic impacts beyond Rickmans lane*
- *No noise assessments of traffic*

We would urge the Parish Council and WSSC to dig deep into the application and figures presented.

In Summary

- *It can handle 4 times the tonnage it's applying for which has major implications for lorry movements*
- *It is in the wrong place away from the lorry route network*
- *It represents significant safety issues and will severely affect our quality of life*
- *Represents a threat to environment and local ecology*
- *There is no local benefit to us and it doesn't serve a local need - we can't even use the gas as we're not on the grid*
- *There has been no community involvement*
- *The benefits most certainly don't outweigh the negatives.*

In Chichester District's Local Plan, Policy 39 it states;

Development should be located and designed to minimise additional traffic generation and movement, and should not create or add to problems of safety, congestion, air pollution, or other damage to the environment;

We hope that the Parish council will object strongly to this application.”

The chairman thanked the speakers and indicated that the Council will go through the report in detail and make a response to WSSC.

The meeting was opened to Councillors and the public and various questions were raised:

Cllr. East asked why did Crouchlands not consult with the Parish Council? No consultation was carried out and generally it is normal to have a pre-application consultation on such a major scheme. Mr Cameron responded that permission for an on-site AD unit had been granted in 2008. The process was long and complex and he offered an apology for not consulting with the Council.

The Crouchland representatives were asked whether other sites had been considered. They responded that no other site location had been considered. They said there was a large dairy herd on site at Crouchland.

Cllr. Burrell stated that the site selection was poor, along with poor access to major roads and to main arterial roads; all traffic goes through country lanes and heavy traffic using numerous small lanes had been reported.

Cllr. Perrin stated that the Parish Council had no objection to the original scheme for an AD unit to process on-farm cow slurry and at the time this was considered a very good idea.

Combustibility was questioned. Crouchlands explained that the material is difficult to combust and that various and many safety procedures had been put in place. There are over 150 AD plants in the UK and they assured the meeting that the plant in Plaistow had been correctly constructed. Safety in general was discussed.

Concern was expressed about the site growing from the initial consented size and the lack of control. Mr Cameron explained that everything has to be recorded; they have an open book policy and are happy to explain things. He said the threat to the environment and ecology is negligible. Scottish and Southern had eventually installed a cable for the electricity, but they do not wish to run the engine for electricity and therefore do not require the cable. They now wish to export biogas. The Chair asked if the full CHP engines were not required could the surplus be decommissioned and removed. It was explained that the additional capacity was needed as backup if one CHP unit fails and to reduce any need to flare the gas.

The size of plant and output in relation to Poundbury was questioned. Mr Maketarian CBG Ltd. explained that Poundbury do not have cows, they only use maize and do not have covered lagoons. This makes the Plaistow site more efficient than Poundbury. It was also stated that they wish to sell the gas locally, resulting in fewer lorry movements.

Mr Maketarian CBG Ltd. explained that the purpose of the application was to regularise and control the situation. Farms are able to do anything, but the regularisation process would help and they would like to work with everybody.

Mr Maketarian explained that Crouchland consisted of very poor quality land which has been improved over the last 30 years. The plant was previously running at a loss, but has recently spent £50K on the new lagoon, which has the benefit of being covered, which reduces the smell. It was reported that the Environment Authority has not found any issues with smell.

Many local residents have complained about the noise from the site. This is particularly bad in the summer when windows are open. Those present were advised to use the 0800 319 6175 telephone number to report any incidents of noise pollution. Crouchland stated that if permission was granted to go ahead with the gas the CHP would stop.

Cllr. Burrell stated that the Parish Councils Planning Consultants had advised that the applicants noise assessment report did not use up-to-date methodology and that the information in the application in general was lacking information in many areas, too many to detail. Mr Cameron expressed his regret with this as they had spent £100K to produce truthful reports. He also said they had nothing to hide.

Mr Maketarian confirmed that the 34,000 tonnes will be the maximum capacity. A weigh bridge will record all traffic movements.

Much discussion took place with regard to access to and from the plant and the noting of vehicles in unsuitable locations; HGV have been noted in Balls Cross recently and in Ebernoe, Pipers Lane delivering digestate. Crouchland stated that the digestate can be transported from the AD plant without restriction on all roads. A greater number of vehicle activity took place in 2013 because of the very wet summer and lack of drainage facility. During that year they built a third lagoon earlier than anticipated because of the high rainfall, to store the waste.

It was also confirmed that maize being delivered to site will not come through Plaistow. It was confirmed that records will be kept of every single journey and that routes would not be deviated. Crouchland stated that all vehicles have GPS to record their movements Mr Maketarian said that all vehicles, except tractors, would be powered by gas. He also said that the gas washing process was just starting to be efficient.

A member of the public had worked out that there would be 7 shipments out per day, every day of the year to Portsmouth. Crouchland advised that this was in fact 3 or 4 out-bound shipments, with the remaining being the vehicles on their return journey. Discussion took place about the route and mileage to Portsmouth and Crouchland confirmed that the vehicles would access main roads as soon as possible after leaving the villages. One resident had calculated that the route to Portsmouth

identified in the application was 60miles, 120 round trip; Mr Cameron disputed this and said it was 39. When questioned about routes around the area, Mr Cameron indicated that he did not know the area, as he was from London.

Cllr Burrell requested to see the Advisory Note from WSCC dated 20th January 2014 about the use of roads and confirm the basis of the transport document. Mr Cameron said he would look into this. Mr Maketarian said he would release the document if he was given permission to do so by WSCC.

Jeremy Mudford thanked Clarissa Bushell and David Jordan for their proposals and commented that there appeared to be very great discrepancies between their proposals and the Crouchland proposal and he urged the Council not to support the application.

Simon Barrow felt that 28,000 transport movements per year to be excessive. Crouchland said the AD plant is an approved plant.

Francis King asked why they were changing from electricity to gas. Crouchland explained that the purpose is to take the methane and reduce emissions.

The owner of Lanelds asked why he had not received any formal notice of the planning permission. He also commented about a tanker without number plates which he had encountered. The owner of Lanelds felt the documents were misleading and the Council should do everything they could to postpone the application. Cllr. Burrell responded that they had requested an extension to 22nd August 2014 but to extend later than that would result in a delay to the decision making. Mr Cameron said he was happy to extend if necessary.

The Public Discussion was brought to a close:

In summary The Chair reiterated that there were issues with site selection and suitability of the site but confirmed that there were no issues with the concept of using waste to generate electricity. She said the site was not well located and the road access was extremely poor. The impact of the industrial sized scheme on the countryside is great and outweighed the benefit.

The Parish Councils retained Planning and Environmental consultants, Temple Group, had advised in their technical review that there were a significant number of errors, inconsistencies and information gaps (30 listed in the conclusion) and as such significant questions remained unanswered about environmental, technical and safety matters that a positive planning determination could result in a legal challenge.

Cllr. East proposed that the Parish Council OBJECT to the planning application, this was seconded by Cllr. Perrin; voted unanimously by Councillors present. The Chair will submit the Parish Councils full response to WSCC in consultation with Temple Group.

Clr.Kirby requested that the application be 'red flagged', to be dealt with by WSCC at Committee and not delegated to Officers.

C/061/14 Agenda items for next meeting: at present there were none.

C/062/14 Dates of future meetings:

Planning meeting: 27th August ; 7-30 pm Winterton Hall.

Parish Council meeting Tuesday 23rd September 2014; 7-30 pm; Winterton Hall.

Finance Committee Meeting Wednesday 8th September at Kelsey Hall

The Chair closed the meeting thanked the Crouchland team and the representatives from PORE, together with all the public for attending the meeting.

The Meeting Closed at 10.00pm

Chair.....

Date.....

12 August 2014