

APPENDIX 2

Consultee Comments from:

- * Colsterworth and District Parish Council
- * Lincolnshire County Council
- * Leicestershire County Council



Sue Grant
Clerk to Colsterworth and District Parish Council
42 Bourne Road
Colsterworth
Grantham
NG33 5JE
5th June 2024

S24/O568 | Erection of an anaerobic digestion (AD) facility and carbon capture, improvement of existing and part creation of new access track, landscaping and other associated infrastructure. | Development East of Sewstern Industrial Estate South of Sewstern Road Gunby Lincolnshire NG33 5RD

This response has been ratified by the Colsterworth and District Parish Council at their meeting on 04 June 2024.

1. INTRODUCTION

1. The Parish Council would like to thank SKDC as the Planning Authority for extending the deadline for our comments to 14 June 2024 due to the significance of this application to our Parish. This has allowed the Parish Council to have a clear picture of the strength of opposition to this proposal demonstrated by the objections and comments submitted and published by the Planning Authority.
2. The Parish Council also supports this application being considered at full Planning Committee and not delegated to Officers.
3. The Parish Council also acknowledges the wide range of consultees across boundaries with Lincolnshire and Leicestershire due to the proposal affecting communities within a 10-15 mile radius of the site.
4. Stainby and Gunby are the nearest villages in our Parish to the proposal however, this affects our whole Parish including North Witham, Lobthorpe, Colsterworth and Woolsthorpe by Colsterworth. We would urge the Planning Authorities and other consultees to pay due regard to the representations made from all those communities.
5. The Parish Council is concerned regarding a number of omissions and inconsistencies and reliance on “desktop” modelling which appear subjective in its conclusions therefore, we do not believe that the evidence presented supports the conclusions in the applicants Non-Technical Summary which states: *“No unacceptable impacts have been identified in relation to residential amenity, odour, noise, archaeology, designated nature conservation sites, the water environment, landscape character, or the highway network.”*
6. In the light of the extensive objections and representations made to the Parish Council over several months by the community and which you will be fully aware, we **object to the application as presented to the Planning Authority.**

The following are just some observations to support the reasons for this:

2. IMPACT ON HIGHWAY SAFETY AND TRAFFIC GENERATION

As identified in SKDC's pre-planning response to the applicant, we believe there are significant gaps in the information provided and several inconsistencies. We do not believe that it is the role of the Planning Authority at this stage to impose a Traffic Management Plan when the information required is not sufficiently provided. This may also impact on the decision by Highways England, Leicestershire and Lincolnshire County Councils' Highways assessment. We do not believe therefore, that this complies with ID2 Transport and Strategic Transport Infrastructure requirements.



The size and scale of this development across a wide area means that there will be a significant impact on the road network and transportation infrastructure. This will lead to increased traffic with more congestion and longer commuting times. In addition, it will cause safety issues particularly for pedestrians and cyclists.

The application suggests that the majority of crops to site will not be on internal roads and tracks and the application does actually state that *“it is likely that the majority of the HGV movements would subsequently be via the A1 Trunk Road”* (presumably accessed from the B676). The application suggests that 40% of the crops will be delivered from Buckminster land on internal tracks. We would suggest that this is in fact 20% (25,000 tonnes), half of the Buckminster land contribution which suggests that the site proposed is only “local” to 20% of the crops to site with 80% (105,000 tonnes) from elsewhere. Can the applicant provide more specific details and a Traffic Management Plan to clarify so this can be accurately assessed/verified?

We have identified some specific observations and have also been made aware of another review of Highways and Transport Issues prepared by Bruce Bamber (May 2024) and submitted to the Planning Authority in response to the local residents’ concerns which we would expect is considered:

Because the external storage areas are not included in the Transport Plan Lincolnshire CC Highways and Leicestershire CC Highways should be re consulted when these are known. The location of these is a requirement of Local Plan Renewable Energy Appendix Biomass Energy Criterion 5(d).

1. Crucially, the study area in the Traffic and Transport Statement did not include the B676 through Stainby and Colsterworth to the A1 and focussed on the proposed internal tracks and access road to the site from the B676. This is a major omission.
2. We believe that the study area should also have referenced the A1 from Stamford to Grantham which falls within the 10-15 mile radius of the proposed site. This should include details of the routes proposed to consider the adequacy of access and exit slip roads to and from the A1, the current and anticipated traffic flows through all villages including North and South Witham (and Parishes within Leicestershire)
3. It is unclear if crops to site and digestate will be from and to land accessing and crossing the A1 from the B6403 or A151; this will have a particular impact on the projected increased traffic on the A1 using the access/exit on Bridge End, Colsterworth (which is a major flood risk); this is particularly relevant bearing in mind the impact of the Waste and Digestor Plant being considered by Lincolnshire County Council at Easton. (SKDC: S24/0544 and LCC: PL/0022/24)
4. We would expect a multi-agency emergency/enforcement plan for any closures on the A1 to stop A1 traffic (particularly HGVs ignoring the weight restrictions) diverting through North Witham, Stainby and Gunby and Colsterworth (particularly High Street, Colster Way, Stamford Road and Old Post Lane.)
5. Bearing the above in mind, and Highways England’s response to the application at Easton *“no further analysis of the nearby A1/B6403 junction would be necessary”* we believe that this would need to be referred to Highways England to address concerns raised in this consultation, e.g.,
6. The figures provided in the application are inconsistent and do not appear to support the narrative/assessments regarding traffic movements. The following is our interpretation based on what we understand is being proposed:-
 - The stated tonnage of crops to site over the year is 130,000 tonnes with 80% from outside of the local Buckminster land
 - 25,000 tonnes will be harvested (September to October) from Buckminster land and taken to the facility on internal Buckminster tracks and access roads. The application states no change to current traffic movements. However, this does not appear to be the case as in the application, it confirms the tonnage of harvest from fields may be unchanged, but the destination is (i.e., all crops will be intended for the one site to be processed). These tractors and trailers do not appear anywhere in the Traffic and Transport Plan.
 - 25,000 tonnes will be harvested (September to October) from other Buckminster land further away and taken to the facility using the local highways? The location of this land is not identified in the Traffic and Transport Plan.



- 80,000 tonnes will be harvested and stored in satellite hubs, feeding the digester over the year using local highways? The location of this land is not identified in the Traffic and Transport Plan.
 - In addition to the “crops to site” at the public consultation it was anticipated that the digestate was expected to be 70,000 tonnes. Some of it to Buckminster farmland and some to external (farmer) customers. Can more information be provided on the proportion by internal and external customers to evidence the associated vehicle movements?
 - A further stage of the process is to have the liquid CO₂ taken from the site by road haulier; estimated at 24,000 tonnes (20,000t at the public consultation). There is some debate whether this is actually “gaseous waste” transported long distances, therefore, a public responsibility of the relevant Authorities, e.g., Highways and Environmental Protection? Can you ask these relevant Authorities to confirm if this is the case? The Traffic Management Plan needs to identify the routing for this and impact on B676 and A1
7. There is no information identifying the land where the crops will be grown or where the remote satellite clamps will be located. Can the applicant provide this information to consider vehicle movements further?
8. In the absence of full details of the crops sites and satellite hubs we can only speculate (as has the applicant) on the impact of the number of vehicle movements on local roads of which the majority will be HGVs.
9. There is no clarification on the suggestion that there will be a rotation of crops (i.e., rye, maize, barley, grass). Does this mean one type of crop is grown every year, or will there be a constant mix of crops over the entire year? This is relevant to identify the harvest periods which we understand will be at various times of the year depending on the crops resulting in more than one intensive harvest period. Or must be assume that the harvest period will actually be constant from June to October? This would again impact on identifying the vehicle movements. (Reference 1.7.15 Transport Statement for Gonerby Moor January 2023 as a comparison (LCC Planning: PL/0016/23).
10. Due to the inconsistencies and omissions the Parish Council has not been able to verify for itself the HGV traffic flows but understand:
- 25,000 tonnes from local Buckminster Estate farmland – brought in via tractors & trailers on farm tracks
 - 25,000 tonnes from Buckminster Estate farmland further afield – brought in via HGVs on public highway
 - 80,000 tonnes from satellite storage hub(s) in undeclared location – brought in via HGVs on public highway

It is also not clear that these “tractors and trailers” can undertake the dual role of bringing to site and removing digestate negating the requirement for additional vehicles taking away the digestate (70,000 tonnes)?

As stated above, we are unable to verify the HGV movements accurately but can only speculate. During the consultation, the applicant suggested around 1,000 movements a week during harvest was a more accurate estimate.

We believe that the independently commissioned report by Bruce Bamber (May 2024 and submitted to the Planning Authority) confirms the anomalies we have also identified. Could the applicant provide the clarification required to inform the assessment on the impact on the local tracks and road networks?

11. Most of the roads from the B676 have 7.5t limits in place as environmental protection zones. This is in place to protect the small rural villages and the very small surrounding rural lanes within our own and neighbouring parishes from HGV traffic. Whilst we recognise that “access” is permitted, the scale of this operation potentially relies on a substantial increase in HGVs having access on currently restricted roads unsuitable for HGVs - potentially exceeding the % threshold acceptable to allow permissions to be granted. This is not clear from the application and will be an unacceptable increase?
12. In the absence of a detailed Traffic Management Plan and the limited traffic site survey covering the wider Parish, we must as an example, assume and expect there will be no requirement for access or an increase of traffic on:



- From A1 at Lobthorpe via Bull Lane, Water Lane, Rectory Lane, North Witham, Gunby Road, Witham Road, Main Street Gunby, Sewstern Road and Sewstern
 - South Witham to North Witham
 - Stamford Road, Colsterworth from North Witham to Colsterworth High Street/B676 crossroads
 - Old Post Lane from North Witham through to Woolsthorpe Road into Woolsthorpe by Colsterworth
 - No access to the A1 (north or southbound) from Bridge End, Colsterworth
 - Gunby Road through Gunby
 - South Witham, Thistleton, Sewstern Village and to the site
 - No access to or from B6403
 - No access to or from A151
13. The proposed single access/exit to the site from the B676 is a safety concern with further survey work still required on the bridge on the B676 which is proposed to be lowered. This access is on a bend and in a 60mph zone only a few metres from the 30mph speed limit in Stainby – a notorious road for speeding traffic. There are no footpaths and extremely narrow and unkempt verges. We would urge the relevant authorities to ensure that this proposal is considered carefully due to the volume and size of the traffic to be generated.
14. The open countryside around our Parish encourages cycling, walking, horse-riding and tourists. There is likely to be an increased risk to those who use the lanes in the surrounding areas. Any increase in HGV traffic means that the risk to road safety is increased – particularly from all the HGVs crossing the Gunby, Sewstern Road from the new access as well on the B676 at Stainby
15. Reference on different carriageway widths (Manual for Streets MfS1) sets out guidance and what can and should accommodate traffic flows safely:
- 2.75m – suitable for single lane working only (passing places required).
 - 4.1m – two cars can pass each other.
 - 4.8m – a car can pass an HGV.
 - 5.5m – two HGVs can pass each other
- Having confirmed the width of the road in Stainby and in other affected places, it is between between 5.3 to 5.4m. Also, the point in Colsterworth coming from Stainby when entering the village from the west, just past the little bridge and before the 'slow' sign and again the road is only about 5.3 m.
16. The crossroads on the B676 at Stainby (to Skillington and Gunby) and Colsterworth (Stamford Road and High Street) are particular pinch points for passing traffic with poor visibility and gradients.
17. The hours of operation are also ambiguous in terms of assessing the vehicle movements and we would not expect heavy good vehicles operating through the villages 24 hours a day 7 days a week all year. This needs to provide more robust assessment and detail being provided.
18. At the public consultation, Ironstone Energy say that they enter into partner agreements with contracted hauliers and between them they buy specialist trailers that will carry bulk crop in and are able to carry liquids as well to take away the liquid digestate, i.e., if the same vehicle can be used to carry both products there is a clear reduction in vehicle movements for the same tonnage. However, this has not been set out clearly in the application and there is no Traffic Management Plan to confirm this will actually happen.
19. They also said at their other sites the hauliers are given strict routeing instructions. As their operations use contracted 'partner' hauliers and not 'ad-hoc, general haulage market' transport, they can stipulate the routes and manage compliance to the Traffic Management Plan, which needs to be put forward. We would expect there to be conditions to ensure compliance with their Traffic Management Plan such as a £1,000 "fine" into a local amenity fund for each vehicle found to deviate from the Traffic Management Plan.
20. We would also suggest if a Traffic Management Plan were forthcoming as a condition, a voluntary 20mph speed limit on the B676 through the 30mph zones in Stainby and Colsterworth to reduce the noise and vibration of large lorries – particularly where there are narrow or no footpaths.



21. We do not consider that the B676 is fit for any additional heavy goods traffic particularly through Stainby and Colsterworth where there are narrow or no footpaths and an already increase in HGV aggregate lorries making it a safety issue for drivers, pedestrians and cyclists.
22. The impact of the Newton Meadows housing development on the A1 in Colsterworth on the approach to the northbound A1 is also not known; the traffic entering and exiting the A1 north and southbound must negotiate a small roundabout which is often damaged (along with the road surface) due to the HGV traffic (mostly aggregate lorries). This is of particular concern now that the condition for a fourth arm as a safety control on that roundabout has not been implemented.

We do not believe that enough information or assurance for the Planning Authority has been provided to adequately assess the full impact on Highway Safety and Traffic Generation

3. CHOICE OF SITE AND TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT

In summary, the Development is contrary to Local Plan Policy: E7 Rural Economy

Policy E7 states :-

Proposals for the following types of small business schemes will be supported provided that it is demonstrated that the business will help support or regenerate the rural economy.

- *Farming*
- *Forestry*
- *Equine*
- *Rural Enterprise*
- *Sports and Recreation*
- *Tourism*

Proposals must demonstrate that they meet the following criteria.

- a) *Be of a scale appropriate to the rural location*
- b) *Be for a use which is appropriate or necessary in a rural location providing local employment opportunities which make a positive contribution to supporting the rural economy.*
- c) *The use / development respects the character and appearance of the local landscape, having particular regard to the Landscape Character Assessment and will not impact on the neighbouring uses through noise, traffic, light and pollution impacts.*

Any new building or extension to an existing building will only be permitted where it is clearly demonstrated that it is an essential element of the viability of the business proposal. The scale design and construction of any new building or extension must be appropriate to its rural setting and fully justified by the business proposal.

We do not believe that this application meets the criteria:

- The proposed development is not of a scale appropriate for the rural location contrary to E7(a).
- It is not necessary for this industrial scale development to be in a rural location, 80% of the fuel is coming from outside the immediate area. The plant should be directly adjacent to a major trunk road such as the A1 as per the Gonerby Moor AD development. The proposed development is therefore, contrary to E7(b)
- The use/development does not respect the character and appearance of the local landscape and will impact on neighbouring uses particularly the residents of the surrounding small villages contrary to E7(c) . Although 2.92 of the Local Plan supporting narrative does support rural development in principle it does say that this should be discrete. Although each planning application should be decided on its own merits this application if approved would set a precedent for large scale industrial plants in open countryside. Also expanding the existing industrial estate to what appears to be three/four times its current size with such large structures is contrary to the principle of E7 and SP5 and EN1.

1. The proposed access road although in existence is a farm track. At many times during the year as such is impassable and the HGV vehicles accessing the current businesses on the industrial estate have to negotiate Sewstern crossroads on 7.5t weight limited roads. To upgrade this farm track to year round 24/7 use is a development in open countryside contrary to Local Plan Policy SP5.



2. The facility is being sited on greenfield land in the open countryside; the Planning Authority must consider whether this is a breach of National Planning Policy resulting in long term harm to the “intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside”. We do not believe that this complies with policy SP5: Development in Open Countryside.
3. The site selection process appears to have restricted options to a very small area around Gunby and Sewstern and we would agree with the Planning Authority’s suggestion in their pre-planning advice that applicants are *“required to carry out an extensive search for derelict or brownfield sites. This test should not necessarily be confined to the District.”*. There does not appear to be any evidence of this?
4. We have received representations that this is not an agricultural process; the raw materials are crops being brought in from locations 10-15 miles away to a centralised processing plant. This is, therefore, an industrialised process producing by-products including methane gas pumped directly into the national grid sold to industry and carbon capture and removal on public roads. It is unclear therefore if this meets the Principles of Sustainable Development in SKDC (SD1).
5. The application does not identify how and where the connection to the national grid will be and how that may impact on the construction and ongoing operation of the plant? Bearing in mind Cadent Gas has stated that there are no gas assets nearby that they are required to comment on this seems to be a major omission when the primary objective of this process is to produce biomethane gas to promote commercial net zero gains for industry?
6. The visual impact of such a huge development which will be seen from Colsterworth High Street and across the Parish, particularly from North Witham and is contrary to priorities in the Colsterworth and District Neighbourhood Plan where the rural views are highly valued.
7. It is unlikely that the planned screening would mature and develop sufficiently over the life of the lease for this facility to mitigate the visual impact.
8. The impact of other developments in the area (e.g., SKDC Local Plan land allocation, the Gonerby Moor ADP, the redevelopment and updating of an existing wastewater treatment facility and the installation of an anaerobic digestion plant at Easton (SKDC: S24/0544 and LCC: PL/0022/24) must be considered alongside this application. The Planning Authority will be aware of the discussion now taking place within the County regarding the haste with which planning applications are being granted for ADPs.
9. The other Future Biogas plant at Gonerby is very nearby and that our area also holds the proposed AD plant at the Easton cold store site. The Gonerby site is best located on the A1 with good access and should in the future more capacity is required, that could be expanded. The AD plant at Easton is using internally generated food waste and is therefore truly 'green'.

4. RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION

1. RE1 renewable energy generation states that any proposal will not negatively impact on the District’s land assets. As far as we are aware, the applicant has not provided the Planning Authority with the required Land Agricultural Survey to confirm the grade of land to have it removed from agricultural production and support our food security? This is also contrary to Biomass Energy Criterion 7 of the Local Plan Renewable Energy Appendix.
2. RE1 also states that there is a requirement for community support, so we look forward to seeing the Planning Authority response to the public interest in this application.
3. It is important to emphasise that this ADP will not use any other materials other than purpose grown crops. i.e., this is not an “energy from waste” facility which would fall under the authority of Lincolnshire County Council and the Environment Protection Agency. These conditions must, therefore, be imposed by the Planning Authority clearly stating that no other materials will be used in the process (i.e., food waste (household or commercial), animal waste, sludge or slurry, farm manure, sewage, etc.

5. BIODIVERSITY



1. It is not clear if the protected/priority species assessment has been submitted yet as the application states it does not apply? This is a material consideration for the Planning Authority?
2. As government strategy for sustainable energy generation through waste is not a material consideration for this application, any adverse effect on biodiversity and food security is. The Planning Authority is therefore, urged to monitor and review (implementing a formal process for this) the ongoing impact on local wildlife and hedgerows during both the construction and operational phases of the facility.
3. Several surveys still need to be undertaken including trees, so it is not clear if the biodiversity gains are accurately identified.

6. ODOUR, NOISE, POLLUTION

1. The meteorological data used does not appear to be current (2017 to 2021) and was taken from a site 23.7km south-east from the site.
2. Our local community has first-hand lived experience of the smell generated from the green household waste facility at Honeypot Lane which at certain times of the year depending on the wind and weather conditions the smell of rotting vegetation is pervasive and overpowering. Can the Planning Authority ensure that conditions are imposed and enforced for any incidents reported through the Environment Protection Authority? (There is also a personal account of the odour and noise generated from a similar plant in the Buckminster Parish Council December 2023 minutes)
3. Our concerns regarding the vehicle movements have been documented above which will have an impact on noise, pollution, vibration and well-being of the community; this has not been appropriately assessed.
4. The hours of work causes concern regarding the 24 hour, 365 days a year operations; there should be more detail around this including the noise of HGVs operating, the noise created from the plant and machinery, the use of spotlights and light pollution; we would urge the Planning Authority to ask for a detailed plan/assessment of all activity anticipated on, to and from the site to develop appropriate conditions.
5. It is not clear what drainage issues have been considered including foul water, silage storage and leeching and watercourses. Can the Planning Authority ensure that this has been accurately assessed; particularly regarding long term impact on the land which will revert to its "normal" use when the plant is decommissioned on the expiry of the lease? We would therefore support the Environment Agency's objection on the grounds that *"the proposed development may pose an unacceptable risk of causing a detrimental impact to water quality because the applicant has failed to indicate the means of disposal of foul water."* This is contrary to the Local Plan Policy EN4 Pollution Control.

7. S106/CIL CONTRIBUTION

1. The £40,000 per annum community fund has been noted. However, we would ask the Planning Authority to seek a firm commitment of openness and transparency to identify how this will be distributed, e.g., will this be index linked over the 30 year lease of the facility, will there be a stipulation limiting applications within a specific radius of the site to define "local area".
2. We would expect Highways (national and county) to request a contribution for road repairs and maintenance and enforcement; the current B676 and minor lanes are already in a state of disrepair; including verges which are a safety measure and were destroyed in many places when traffic has been diverted from the A1.
3. This application relies on leased land with a timeframe of up to 30 years. The proposed site is also in a mineral safeguarding area. Are the Planning Authorities assured (including Lincolnshire County Council) regarding the plans and financial liability for the restoration to return the site to agricultural use should the operation cease and what contingencies are in place if the mineral resources (limestone) are required within those 30 years, or will this be removed?



Report Compiled by: Cllr C Hainsworth
On behalf of the Colsterworth and District Parish Council
Date: 05 June 2024

Sue Grant - Parish Clerk
Telephone: 01476 861888 Email: clerk@colsterworthanddistpc.co.uk
Website: <https://colsterworth.pariah.lincolnshire.gov.uk/>



Sue Grant
Clerk to Colsterworth and District Parish Council
42 Bourne Road
Colsterworth
Grantham
NG33 5JE
5th June 2024

S24/O568 | Erection of an anaerobic digestion (AD) facility and carbon capture, improvement of existing and part creation of new access track, landscaping and other associated infrastructure. | Development East of Sewstern Industrial Estate South of Sewstern Road Gunby Lincolnshire NG33 5RD

This response has been ratified by the Colsterworth and District Parish Council at their meeting on 04 June 2024.

1. INTRODUCTION

1. The Parish Council would like to thank SKDC as the Planning Authority for extending the deadline for our comments to 14 June 2024 due to the significance of this application to our Parish. This has allowed the Parish Council to have a clear picture of the strength of opposition to this proposal demonstrated by the objections and comments submitted and published by the Planning Authority.
2. The Parish Council also supports this application being considered at full Planning Committee and not delegated to Officers.
3. The Parish Council also acknowledges the wide range of consultees across boundaries with Lincolnshire and Leicestershire due to the proposal affecting communities within a 10-15 mile radius of the site.
4. Stainby and Gunby are the nearest villages in our Parish to the proposal however, this affects our whole Parish including North Witham, Lobthorpe, Colsterworth and Woolsthorpe by Colsterworth. We would urge the Planning Authorities and other consultees to pay due regard to the representations made from all those communities.
5. The Parish Council is concerned regarding a number of omissions and inconsistencies and reliance on “desktop” modelling which appear subjective in its conclusions therefore, we do not believe that the evidence presented supports the conclusions in the applicants Non-Technical Summary which states: *“No unacceptable impacts have been identified in relation to residential amenity, odour, noise, archaeology, designated nature conservation sites, the water environment, landscape character, or the highway network.”*
6. In the light of the extensive objections and representations made to the Parish Council over several months by the community and which you will be fully aware, we **object to the application as presented to the Planning Authority.**

The following are just some observations to support the reasons for this:

2. IMPACT ON HIGHWAY SAFETY AND TRAFFIC GENERATION

As identified in SKDC's pre-planning response to the applicant, we believe there are significant gaps in the information provided and several inconsistencies. We do not believe that it is the role of the Planning Authority at this stage to impose a Traffic Management Plan when the information required is not sufficiently provided. This may also impact on the decision by Highways England, Leicestershire and Lincolnshire County Councils' Highways assessment. We do not believe therefore, that this complies with ID2 Transport and Strategic Transport Infrastructure requirements.



The size and scale of this development across a wide area means that there will be a significant impact on the road network and transportation infrastructure. This will lead to increased traffic with more congestion and longer commuting times. In addition, it will cause safety issues particularly for pedestrians and cyclists.

The application suggests that the majority of crops to site will not be on internal roads and tracks and the application does actually state that *“it is likely that the majority of the HGV movements would subsequently be via the A1 Trunk Road”* (presumably accessed from the B676). The application suggests that 40% of the crops will be delivered from Buckminster land on internal tracks. We would suggest that this is in fact 20% (25,000 tonnes), half of the Buckminster land contribution which suggests that the site proposed is only “local” to 20% of the crops to site with 80% (105,000 tonnes) from elsewhere. Can the applicant provide more specific details and a Traffic Management Plan to clarify so this can be accurately assessed/verified?

We have identified some specific observations and have also been made aware of another review of Highways and Transport Issues prepared by Bruce Bamber (May 2024) and submitted to the Planning Authority in response to the local residents’ concerns which we would expect is considered:

Because the external storage areas are not included in the Transport Plan Lincolnshire CC Highways and Leicestershire CC Highways should be re consulted when these are known. The location of these is a requirement of Local Plan Renewable Energy Appendix Biomass Energy Criterion 5(d).

1. Crucially, the study area in the Traffic and Transport Statement did not include the B676 through Stainby and Colsterworth to the A1 and focussed on the proposed internal tracks and access road to the site from the B676. This is a major omission.
2. We believe that the study area should also have referenced the A1 from Stamford to Grantham which falls within the 10-15 mile radius of the proposed site. This should include details of the routes proposed to consider the adequacy of access and exit slip roads to and from the A1, the current and anticipated traffic flows through all villages including North and South Witham (and Parishes within Leicestershire)
3. It is unclear if crops to site and digestate will be from and to land accessing and crossing the A1 from the B6403 or A151; this will have a particular impact on the projected increased traffic on the A1 using the access/exit on Bridge End, Colsterworth (which is a major flood risk); this is particularly relevant bearing in mind the impact of the Waste and Digestor Plant being considered by Lincolnshire County Council at Easton. (SKDC: S24/0544 and LCC: PL/0022/24)
4. We would expect a multi-agency emergency/enforcement plan for any closures on the A1 to stop A1 traffic (particularly HGVs ignoring the weight restrictions) diverting through North Witham, Stainby and Gunby and Colsterworth (particularly High Street, Colster Way, Stamford Road and Old Post Lane.)
5. Bearing the above in mind, and Highways England’s response to the application at Easton *“no further analysis of the nearby A1/B6403 junction would be necessary”* we believe that this would need to be referred to Highways England to address concerns raised in this consultation, e.g.,
6. The figures provided in the application are inconsistent and do not appear to support the narrative/assessments regarding traffic movements. The following is our interpretation based on what we understand is being proposed:-
 - The stated tonnage of crops to site over the year is 130,000 tonnes with 80% from outside of the local Buckminster land
 - 25,000 tonnes will be harvested (September to October) from Buckminster land and taken to the facility on internal Buckminster tracks and access roads. The application states no change to current traffic movements. However, this does not appear to be the case as in the application, it confirms the tonnage of harvest from fields may be unchanged, but the destination is (i.e., all crops will be intended for the one site to be processed). These tractors and trailers do not appear anywhere in the Traffic and Transport Plan.
 - 25,000 tonnes will be harvested (September to October) from other Buckminster land further away and taken to the facility using the local highways? The location of this land is not identified in the Traffic and Transport Plan.



- 80,000 tonnes will be harvested and stored in satellite hubs, feeding the digester over the year using local highways? The location of this land is not identified in the Traffic and Transport Plan.
 - In addition to the “crops to site” at the public consultation it was anticipated that the digestate was expected to be 70,000 tonnes. Some of it to Buckminster farmland and some to external (farmer) customers. Can more information be provided on the proportion by internal and external customers to evidence the associated vehicle movements?
 - A further stage of the process is to have the liquid CO₂ taken from the site by road haulier; estimated at 24,000 tonnes (20,000t at the public consultation). There is some debate whether this is actually “gaseous waste” transported long distances, therefore, a public responsibility of the relevant Authorities, e.g., Highways and Environmental Protection? Can you ask these relevant Authorities to confirm if this is the case? The Traffic Management Plan needs to identify the routing for this and impact on B676 and A1
7. There is no information identifying the land where the crops will be grown or where the remote satellite clamps will be located. Can the applicant provide this information to consider vehicle movements further?
8. In the absence of full details of the crops sites and satellite hubs we can only speculate (as has the applicant) on the impact of the number of vehicle movements on local roads of which the majority will be HGVs.
9. There is no clarification on the suggestion that there will be a rotation of crops (i.e., rye, maize, barley, grass). Does this mean one type of crop is grown every year, or will there be a constant mix of crops over the entire year? This is relevant to identify the harvest periods which we understand will be at various times of the year depending on the crops resulting in more than one intensive harvest period. Or must be assume that the harvest period will actually be constant from June to October? This would again impact on identifying the vehicle movements. (Reference 1.7.15 Transport Statement for Gonerby Moor January 2023 as a comparison (LCC Planning: PL/0016/23).
10. Due to the inconsistencies and omissions the Parish Council has not been able to verify for itself the HGV traffic flows but understand:
- 25,000 tonnes from local Buckminster Estate farmland – brought in via tractors & trailers on farm tracks
 - 25,000 tonnes from Buckminster Estate farmland further afield – brought in via HGVs on public highway
 - 80,000 tonnes from satellite storage hub(s) in undeclared location – brought in via HGVs on public highway

It is also not clear that these “tractors and trailers” can undertake the dual role of bringing to site and removing digestate negating the requirement for additional vehicles taking away the digestate (70,000 tonnes)?

As stated above, we are unable to verify the HGV movements accurately but can only speculate. During the consultation, the applicant suggested around 1,000 movements a week during harvest was a more accurate estimate.

We believe that the independently commissioned report by Bruce Bamber (May 2024 and submitted to the Planning Authority) confirms the anomalies we have also identified. Could the applicant provide the clarification required to inform the assessment on the impact on the local tracks and road networks?

11. Most of the roads from the B676 have 7.5t limits in place as environmental protection zones. This is in place to protect the small rural villages and the very small surrounding rural lanes within our own and neighbouring parishes from HGV traffic. Whilst we recognise that “access” is permitted, the scale of this operation potentially relies on a substantial increase in HGVs having access on currently restricted roads unsuitable for HGVs - potentially exceeding the % threshold acceptable to allow permissions to be granted. This is not clear from the application and will be an unacceptable increase?
12. In the absence of a detailed Traffic Management Plan and the limited traffic site survey covering the wider Parish, we must as an example, assume and expect there will be no requirement for access or an increase of traffic on:



- From A1 at Lobthorpe via Bull Lane, Water Lane, Rectory Lane, North Witham, Gunby Road, Witham Road, Main Street Gunby, Sewstern Road and Sewstern
 - South Witham to North Witham
 - Stamford Road, Colsterworth from North Witham to Colsterworth High Street/B676 crossroads
 - Old Post Lane from North Witham through to Woolsthorpe Road into Woolsthorpe by Colsterworth
 - No access to the A1 (north or southbound) from Bridge End, Colsterworth
 - Gunby Road through Gunby
 - South Witham, Thistleton, Sewstern Village and to the site
 - No access to or from B6403
 - No access to or from A151
13. The proposed single access/exit to the site from the B676 is a safety concern with further survey work still required on the bridge on the B676 which is proposed to be lowered. This access is on a bend and in a 60mph zone only a few metres from the 30mph speed limit in Stainby – a notorious road for speeding traffic. There are no footpaths and extremely narrow and unkempt verges. We would urge the relevant authorities to ensure that this proposal is considered carefully due to the volume and size of the traffic to be generated.
14. The open countryside around our Parish encourages cycling, walking, horse-riding and tourists. There is likely to be an increased risk to those who use the lanes in the surrounding areas. Any increase in HGV traffic means that the risk to road safety is increased – particularly from all the HGVs crossing the Gunby, Sewstern Road from the new access as well on the B676 at Stainby
15. Reference on different carriageway widths (Manual for Streets MfS1) sets out guidance and what can and should accommodate traffic flows safely:
- 2.75m – suitable for single lane working only (passing places required).
 - 4.1m – two cars can pass each other.
 - 4.8m – a car can pass an HGV.
 - 5.5m – two HGVs can pass each other
- Having confirmed the width of the road in Stainby and in other affected places, it is between between 5.3 to 5.4m. Also, the point in Colsterworth coming from Stainby when entering the village from the west, just past the little bridge and before the 'slow' sign and again the road is only about 5.3 m.
16. The crossroads on the B676 at Stainby (to Skillington and Gunby) and Colsterworth (Stamford Road and High Street) are particular pinch points for passing traffic with poor visibility and gradients.
17. The hours of operation are also ambiguous in terms of assessing the vehicle movements and we would not expect heavy good vehicles operating through the villages 24 hours a day 7 days a week all year. This needs to provide more robust assessment and detail being provided.
18. At the public consultation, Ironstone Energy say that they enter into partner agreements with contracted hauliers and between them they buy specialist trailers that will carry bulk crop in and are able to carry liquids as well to take away the liquid digestate, i.e., if the same vehicle can be used to carry both products there is a clear reduction in vehicle movements for the same tonnage. However, this has not been set out clearly in the application and there is no Traffic Management Plan to confirm this will actually happen.
19. They also said at their other sites the hauliers are given strict routeing instructions. As their operations use contracted 'partner' hauliers and not 'ad-hoc, general haulage market' transport, they can stipulate the routes and manage compliance to the Traffic Management Plan, which needs to be put forward. We would expect there to be conditions to ensure compliance with their Traffic Management Plan such as a £1,000 "fine" into a local amenity fund for each vehicle found to deviate from the Traffic Management Plan.
20. We would also suggest if a Traffic Management Plan were forthcoming as a condition, a voluntary 20mph speed limit on the B676 through the 30mph zones in Stainby and Colsterworth to reduce the noise and vibration of large lorries – particularly where there are narrow or no footpaths.



21. We do not consider that the B676 is fit for any additional heavy goods traffic particularly through Stainby and Colsterworth where there are narrow or no footpaths and an already increase in HGV aggregate lorries making it a safety issue for drivers, pedestrians and cyclists.
22. The impact of the Newton Meadows housing development on the A1 in Colsterworth on the approach to the northbound A1 is also not known; the traffic entering and exiting the A1 north and southbound must negotiate a small roundabout which is often damaged (along with the road surface) due to the HGV traffic (mostly aggregate lorries). This is of particular concern now that the condition for a fourth arm as a safety control on that roundabout has not been implemented.

We do not believe that enough information or assurance for the Planning Authority has been provided to adequately assess the full impact on Highway Safety and Traffic Generation

3. CHOICE OF SITE AND TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT

In summary, the Development is contrary to Local Plan Policy: E7 Rural Economy

Policy E7 states :-

Proposals for the following types of small business schemes will be supported provided that it is demonstrated that the business will help support or regenerate the rural economy.

- Farming
- Forestry
- Equine
- Rural Enterprise
- Sports and Recreation
- Tourism

Proposals must demonstrate that they meet the following criteria.

- a) *Be of a scale appropriate to the rural location*
- b) *Be for a use which is appropriate or necessary in a rural location providing local employment opportunities which make a positive contribution to supporting the rural economy.*
- c) *The use / development respects the character and appearance of the local landscape, having particular regard to the Landscape Character Assessment and will not impact on the neighbouring uses through noise, traffic, light and pollution impacts.*

Any new building or extension to an existing building will only be permitted where it is clearly demonstrated that it is an essential element of the viability of the business proposal. The scale design and construction of any new building or extension must be appropriate to its rural setting and fully justified by the business proposal.

We do not believe that this application meets the criteria:

- The proposed development is not of a scale appropriate for the rural location contrary to E7(a).
- It is not necessary for this industrial scale development to be in a rural location, 80% of the fuel is coming from outside the immediate area. The plant should be directly adjacent to a major trunk road such as the A1 as per the Gonerby Moor AD development. The proposed development is therefore, contrary to E7(b)
- The use/development does not respect the character and appearance of the local landscape and will impact on neighbouring uses particularly the residents of the surrounding small villages contrary to E7(c) . Although 2.92 of the Local Plan supporting narrative does support rural development in principle it does say that this should be discrete. Although each planning application should be decided on its own merits this application if approved would set a precedent for large scale industrial plants in open countryside. Also expanding the existing industrial estate to what appears to be three/four times its current size with such large structures is contrary to the principle of E7 and SP5 and EN1.

1. The proposed access road although in existence is a farm track. At many times during the year as such is impassable and the HGV vehicles accessing the current businesses on the industrial estate have to negotiate Sewstern crossroads on 7.5t weight limited roads. To upgrade this farm track to year round 24/7 use is a development in open countryside contrary to Local Plan Policy SP5.



2. The facility is being sited on greenfield land in the open countryside; the Planning Authority must consider whether this is a breach of National Planning Policy resulting in long term harm to the “intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside”. We do not believe that this complies with policy SP5: Development in Open Countryside.
3. The site selection process appears to have restricted options to a very small area around Gunby and Sewstern and we would agree with the Planning Authority’s suggestion in their pre-planning advice that applicants are “*required to carry out an extensive search for derelict or brownfield sites. This test should not necessarily be confined to the District.*”. There does not appear to be any evidence of this?
4. We have received representations that this is not an agricultural process; the raw materials are crops being brought in from locations 10-15 miles away to a centralised processing plant. This is, therefore, an industrialised process producing by-products including methane gas pumped directly into the national grid sold to industry and carbon capture and removal on public roads. It is unclear therefore if this meets the Principles of Sustainable Development in SKDC (SD1).
5. The application does not identify how and where the connection to the national grid will be and how that may impact on the construction and ongoing operation of the plant? Bearing in mind Cadent Gas has stated that there are no gas assets nearby that they are required to comment on this seems to be a major omission when the primary objective of this process is to produce biomethane gas to promote commercial net zero gains for industry?
6. The visual impact of such a huge development which will be seen from Colsterworth High Street and across the Parish, particularly from North Witham and is contrary to priorities in the Colsterworth and District Neighbourhood Plan where the rural views are highly valued.
7. It is unlikely that the planned screening would mature and develop sufficiently over the life of the lease for this facility to mitigate the visual impact.
8. The impact of other developments in the area (e.g., SKDC Local Plan land allocation, the Gonerby Moor ADP, the redevelopment and updating of an existing wastewater treatment facility and the installation of an anaerobic digestion plant at Easton (SKDC: S24/0544 and LCC: PL/0022/24) must be considered alongside this application. The Planning Authority will be aware of the discussion now taking place within the County regarding the haste with which planning applications are being granted for ADPs.
9. The other Future Biogas plant at Gonerby is very nearby and that our area also holds the proposed AD plant at the Easton cold store site. The Gonerby site is best located on the A1 with good access and should in the future more capacity is required, that could be expanded. The AD plant at Easton is using internally generated food waste and is therefore truly 'green'.

4. RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION

1. RE1 renewable energy generation states that any proposal will not negatively impact on the District’s land assets. As far as we are aware, the applicant has not provided the Planning Authority with the required Land Agricultural Survey to confirm the grade of land to have it removed from agricultural production and support our food security? This is also contrary to Biomass Energy Criterion 7 of the Local Plan Renewable Energy Appendix.
2. RE1 also states that there is a requirement for community support, so we look forward to seeing the Planning Authority response to the public interest in this application.
3. It is important to emphasise that this ADP will not use any other materials other than purpose grown crops. i.e., this is not an “energy from waste” facility which would fall under the authority of Lincolnshire County Council and the Environment Protection Agency. These conditions must, therefore, be imposed by the Planning Authority clearly stating that no other materials will be used in the process (i.e., food waste (household or commercial), animal waste, sludge or slurry, farm manure, sewage, etc.

5. BIODIVERSITY



1. It is not clear if the protected/priority species assessment has been submitted yet as the application states it does not apply? This is a material consideration for the Planning Authority?
2. As government strategy for sustainable energy generation through waste is not a material consideration for this application, any adverse effect on biodiversity and food security is. The Planning Authority is therefore, urged to monitor and review (implementing a formal process for this) the ongoing impact on local wildlife and hedgerows during both the construction and operational phases of the facility.
3. Several surveys still need to be undertaken including trees, so it is not clear if the biodiversity gains are accurately identified.

6. ODOUR, NOISE, POLLUTION

1. The meteorological data used does not appear to be current (2017 to 2021) and was taken from a site 23.7km south-east from the site.
2. Our local community has first-hand lived experience of the smell generated from the green household waste facility at Honeypot Lane which at certain times of the year depending on the wind and weather conditions the smell of rotting vegetation is pervasive and overpowering. Can the Planning Authority ensure that conditions are imposed and enforced for any incidents reported through the Environment Protection Authority? (There is also a personal account of the odour and noise generated from a similar plant in the Buckminster Parish Council December 2023 minutes)
3. Our concerns regarding the vehicle movements have been documented above which will have an impact on noise, pollution, vibration and well-being of the community; this has not been appropriately assessed.
4. The hours of work causes concern regarding the 24 hour, 365 days a year operations; there should be more detail around this including the noise of HGVs operating, the noise created from the plant and machinery, the use of spotlights and light pollution; we would urge the Planning Authority to ask for a detailed plan/assessment of all activity anticipated on, to and from the site to develop appropriate conditions.
5. It is not clear what drainage issues have been considered including foul water, silage storage and leeching and watercourses. Can the Planning Authority ensure that this has been accurately assessed; particularly regarding long term impact on the land which will revert to its "normal" use when the plant is decommissioned on the expiry of the lease? We would therefore support the Environment Agency's objection on the grounds that *"the proposed development may pose an unacceptable risk of causing a detrimental impact to water quality because the applicant has failed to indicate the means of disposal of foul water."* This is contrary to the Local Plan Policy EN4 Pollution Control.

7. S106/CIL CONTRIBUTION

1. The £40,000 per annum community fund has been noted. However, we would ask the Planning Authority to seek a firm commitment of openness and transparency to identify how this will be distributed, e.g., will this be index linked over the 30 year lease of the facility, will there be a stipulation limiting applications within a specific radius of the site to define "local area".
2. We would expect Highways (national and county) to request a contribution for road repairs and maintenance and enforcement; the current B676 and minor lanes are already in a state of disrepair; including verges which are a safety measure and were destroyed in many places when traffic has been diverted from the A1.
3. This application relies on leased land with a timeframe of up to 30 years. The proposed site is also in a mineral safeguarding area. Are the Planning Authorities assured (including Lincolnshire County Council) regarding the plans and financial liability for the restoration to return the site to agricultural use should the operation cease and what contingencies are in place if the mineral resources (limestone) are required within those 30 years, or will this be removed?



Report Compiled by: Cllr C Hainsworth
On behalf of the Colsterworth and District Parish Council
Date: 05 June 2024

Sue Grant - Parish Clerk
Telephone: 01476 861888 Email: clerk@colsterworthanddistpc.co.uk
Website: <https://colsterworth.parish.lincolnshire.gov.uk/>

LINCOLNSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

District: South Kesteven District Council

Application number: S24/0568

Application Type: Full – Major Planning Application

Proposal: Erection of an anaerobic digestion (AD) facility and carbon capture, improvement of existing and part creation of new access track, and landscaping and other associated infrastructure

Location: Development east of Sewstern Industrial Estate, south of Sewstern Road, Gunby, Lincolnshire, NG33 5RD

Response Date: 12 July 2024

This report includes the Substantive response of the Local Highway and Lead Local Flood Authority to a planning consultation received under the Development Management Order and includes details of any planning conditions or informatives that should be attached in the event that permission is granted and any obligations to be secured by way of a S106 agreement.

General Information and Advice

Please note that although the Definitive Map and Statement proves the existence of any recorded rights of way, there may be further or higher rights that are not shown on this document that the County Council is not currently aware of. This would be especially relevant where the public has had informal access to the site or where there are references to routes across this in maps or other historic documents. As the County Council has received no application to recognise further rights of way affecting the site, no more informed guidance can be offered at this stage.

Application number: S24/0568

Application Type: Full – Major Planning Application

Location: Development east of Sewstern Industrial Estate, south of Sewstern Road, Gunby, Lincolnshire, NG33 5RD

Highway and Lead Local Flood Authority Report

Substantive Response provided in accordance with article 22(5) of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015:

Recommendation: No Objections

Comments:

The application site falls between Sewstern and Gunby and the proposed access road joins the B676 to the West of Colsterworth and the A1. The site is to be located adjacent to an existing industrial estate. The site will be accessed via a private access road, currently serving Brooks Brothers Timber Yard. The access road will cross Sewstern Road, which has a 7.5t weight limit. The applicant has provided detail of how traffic will be controlled when crossing this road, which has satisfied safety concerns of this crossing point.

The Transport Statement has confirmed that there will be between 6-7 staff working at the site once it has been constructed, they will arrive/depart at various times throughout the day. Materials to be processed at the site will generate HGV movements, during the harvest period the site could see a total of 63 daily two-way HGV movements, outside of the harvest period it is expected there will be 17 daily two-way movements. In addition to these movements, the output of material could see another 11 daily two-way movements. The majority of these movements are from nearby land farmed by Buckminster Estate. Compared to the Annual Average Daily Traffic movements, the proposals are not seen to have a severe impact on the road network.

There is no precise definition of "severe" with regards to NPPF Paragraph 115, which advises that "Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe." Planning Inspector's decisions regarding severity are specific to the locations of each proposal, but have common considerations:

- The highway network is over-capacity, usually for period extending beyond the peak hours
- The level of provision of alternative transport modes
- Whether the level of queuing on the network causes safety issues

In view of these criteria, the Highways and Lead Local Flood Authority does not consider that this proposal would result in a severe impact with regard to NPPF.

As Lead Local Flood Authority, Lincolnshire County Council is required to provide a statutory planning consultation response with regard to Drainage on all Major Applications. For this site, infiltration is poor. Therefore, the applicant has proposed a variety of SuDs techniques to capture, cleanse, store and discharge surface water at a controlled rate. Therefore, the Lead Local Flood Authority does not consider that this proposal would increase flood risk in the immediate vicinity of the site.

No Objections

Having given due regard to the appropriate local and national planning policy guidance (in particular the National Planning Policy Framework), Lincolnshire County Council (as Highway Authority and Lead Local Flood Authority) has concluded that the proposed development would not be expected to have an unacceptable impact upon highway safety or a severe residual cumulative impact upon the local highway network or increase surface water flood risk and therefore does not wish to object to this planning application.

Informatives

Highway Informative 02

In accordance with Section 59 of the Highways Act 1980, please be considerate of causing damage to the existing highway during construction and implement mitigation measures as necessary. Should extraordinary expenses be incurred by the Highway Authority in maintaining the highway by reason of damage caused by construction traffic, the Highway Authority may seek to recover these expenses from the developer.

Highway Informative 03

The permitted development requires the formation of a new/amended vehicular access. These works will require approval from the Highway Authority in accordance with Section 184 of the Highways Act. Any traffic management required to undertake works within the highway will be subject to agreement. The access must be constructed in accordance with a current specification issued by the Highway Authority. Any requirement to relocate existing apparatus, underground services, or street furniture because of the installation of an access will be the responsibility, and cost, of the applicant and must be agreed prior to a vehicle access application. The application form, costs and guidance documentation can be found on the Highway Authority's website, accessible via the following link: <https://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/licences-permits/apply-dropped-kerb>.

Highway Informative 04

The road serving the permitted development is approved as a private road which will not be adopted as a Highway Maintainable at the Public Expense (under the Highways Act 1980). As such, the liability for the future maintenance of the road will rest with those who gain access to their property from it.

Highway Informative 08

Please contact the Lincolnshire County Council Streetworks and Permitting Team on 01522 782070 to discuss any proposed statutory utility connections, Section 50 licences and any other works which will be required within the public highway in association with the development permitted under this Consent. This will enable Lincolnshire County Council to assist in the coordination and timings of these works. For further guidance please visit the Highway Authority's website via the following link: Traffic Management - <https://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/traffic-management>

Officer's Name: Joseph Walden

Officer's Title: Senior Development Management Officer

Date: 12 July 2024



Lincolnshire
FIRE & RESCUE

Fire and Police Headquarters
Deepdale Lane
Nettleham
Lincoln
LN2 2LT
Tel: 01522 555777
www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/lfr

Our Ref: LC
Your Ref: S24/0568

Highways SuDS Support
Lincolnshire County Council
County Offices
Newland
Lincoln
LN1 1YL

For the attention of Venezia Ross-Gilmore
Sent by email to HighwaysSUDsSupport@lincolnshire.gov.uk

9 May 2024

Dear Madam,

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

PLANNING CONSULTATION: ERECTION OF AN ANAEROBIC DIGESTION (AD) FACILITY AND CARBON CAPTURE, IMPROVEMENT OF EXISTING AND PART CREATION OF NEW ACCESS TRACK, LANDSCAPING AND OTHER ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE

LOCATION: DEVELOPMENT EAST OF SEWSTERN INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, SOUTH OF SEWSTERN ROAD, GUNBY, LINCOLNSHIRE, NG33 5RD

I refer to the planning application reference S24/0568. The Fire Authority object to the application on the grounds of inadequate access and water supply for the Fire and Rescue Service. It is opinion of the Fire Authority that in order to remove the objection the following measures are required.

ACCESS

According to the plans provided it would appear that the access to and around the site are in accordance with the requirements of Approved Document B, Part B5. However, Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue requires a minimum carrying capacity for hard standing for pumping appliances of 18 tonnes, not 12.5 tonnes as detailed in the Building Regulations 2010 (As Amended) Part B5. Particular attention should be given to the section of unmade track on the access road from the main carriageway to the development site.

WATER SUPPLY

According to the plans provided on the planning portal, it would appear that one surface water attenuation pond is to be included in the proposed site. If this is to be used as an alternative supply of water for firefighting purposes, it must meet the requirements of Approved Document B, Part B5, and be capable of fulfilling both of the following conditions:

- Providing or storing a minimum of 45,000 litres of water at all times.
- Providing access, space and a hardstanding for a pumping appliance.

If the surface water attenuation pond does not or cannot meet this requirement then Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue will require the installation of one fire hydrant conforming to BS750-2012 within 90m of the premises entrance in respect of this planning application to be provided at the developer's expense. Fire hydrant acceptance testing will be carried out by a Hydrant Inspector on completion and a standard hydrant marker "H" plate will be fitted nearby. Following adoption the Fire Service will be responsible for the ongoing maintenance and repairs for the lifetime of the fire hydrant.

Should you wish to discuss this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me on the telephone number below.

Yours faithfully,

Lee Coles

Fire Safety Inspector
Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue

Telephone: 01522 553 868

Email: fire.safety@lincolnshire.gov.uk

Joshua Frost

Fire Safety Supervisor
Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue

Tel : 01522 553868

Email: fire.safety@lincolnshire.gov.uk

Cc : LFRWaterManagement@lincolnshire.gov.uk

Substantive response of the Local Highway Authority to a planning consultation received under The Development Management Order.

Response provided under the delegated authority of the Director of Environment & Transport.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Planning Application Number: S24/0568

Highway Reference Number: 2024/0568/20/H

Application Address: Development East Of Sewstern Industrial Estate South Of Sewstern Road
Gunby Lincolnshire NG33 5RD

Application Type: Full

Description of Application: Erection of an anaerobic digestion (AD) facility and carbon capture, improvement of existing and part creation of new access track, landscaping and other associated infrastructure.

GENERAL DETAILS

Planning Case Officer: Venezia Ross-Gilmore

Applicant: C/O Agent

County Councillor:

Parish:

Road Classification: Adopted Unclassified

Substantive Response provided in accordance with article 22(5) of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015:

There would appear to be no material impact on the public highway and therefore the Local Highway Authority has no comments to make.

Advice to Local Planning Authority

Background

The Local Highway Authority (LHA) has been consulted by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) South Kesteven District Council (SKDC) on a planning application at Land East Of Sewstern Industrial Estate South Of Sewstern Road Gunby Lincolnshire NG33 5RD. This application is for the erection of an anaerobic digestion (AD) facility and carbon capture, improvement of existing and part creation of new access track, landscaping and other associated infrastructure.

The LHA's advice below is provided following a review of the following information provided by the LPA:

- 27729/SK10 Rev H Proposed Site Layout
- 27729/SK15 Rev A Proposed Highway Access Boundary Sketch
- Transport Statement March 2024

Site Access

This Application site is within SKDC's jurisdiction and the two points of access join the highway within Lincolnshire Local Highways Authority jurisdiction (LHA). The LHA do note that one access will be via an existing agricultural access onto Buckminster Road and the other will be via a new cross road arrangement on Sewstern Road. Buckminster Road is a Classified B Road, subject to the national speed limit. Sewstern Road is an unclassified road subject to national speed limit and a 7.5t weight restriction.

In light of the above, Leicestershire LHA will therefore not provide comment on the access arrangements.

Trip Generation

Staff Trips

The LHA note in the Transport Statement that once constructed the number of staff working on site will be between 6 and 7. Staff will arrive/depart at various times throughout the day to fit in with the operational requirements of the AD plant. The working hours are between 07:00 and 19:00, 7 days a week.

The Applicant has advised that the worst case scenario in terms of trip generation, would be all 7 members of staff working on site on any one day, arriving and departing in separate cars. This would generate 14 two way trips throughout the day.

Input Material via HGV

The Applicant has advised within Section 1.15.6 to Section 1.15.10 the number of trips associated with the delivery of materials to the site.

The Applicant has advised that 50,000t of materials will arrive to the site during the harvest period (June/July and September/October). 25,000t (50%) will come from the surrounding fields that already have associated harvest trip generations, and the remaining 50% will come from Buckminster Estate fields further away and arrive by HGV. This will result in an additional 22.9 HGV movements per day equating to a total of 46 two way trips over a day.

A further 80,000t of material will be stored in satellite hubs and supplied to the site on a "just in time" basis at a constant rate throughout the year. This will result in 8.5 HGV arrivals per day, equating to a total of 17 two way trips.

For the worst case scenario during the harvest period the site could see a total of 63 two-way trips by HGV to the site, however during the non-harvest period a total of there will be a total of 17 two way trips by HGVs.

Output trips

The site will generate 24,000t of carbon dioxide which will be liquefied and transported off-site per year. This would result in 3.3 vehicles arriving per day, equating to a total of 7-way trips per day.

Furthermore an additional 11,000t of liquid biofertilizer and 4,000t of solid biofertilize will be transported off site to Buckminster Estate fields further away by HGV. This would result in an additional 1.8 HGV movements per day (4 two way trips per day).

To conclude

The trip generation concludes that during the harvest period the Leicestershire highway network could expect to see a total of 50 two way trips from HGVs during the harvest period travelling to the Buckminster Estate fields.

However during the non-harvest period the LHA could expect to see a total of 21 two way HGV movements per day to the Buckminster Estate fields.

The LHA note that not all the HGV movements will be carried out during the AM and PM peak periods and the HGV will utilise the B676. The number of HGVs associated with this development are negligible when compared against the Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT). Therefore it is not considered that the proposed will have a severe impact on the local highway network, in accordance with Paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Date Received
2 May 2024

Case Officer
Robyn Green

Reviewer
GG

Date issued
17 May 2024

Substantive response of the Local Highway Authority to a planning consultation received under The Development Management Order.

Response provided under the delegated authority of the Director of Environment & Transport.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Planning Application Number: S24/0568

Highway Reference Number: 2024/0568/20/H/R1

Application Address: Development East Of Sewstern Industrial Estate South Of Sewstern Road
Gunby Lincolnshire NG33 5RD

Application Type: Full

Description of Application: Re-consultation. Erection of an anaerobic digestion (AD) facility and carbon capture, improvement of existing and part creation of new access track, landscaping and other associated infrastructure.

GENERAL DETAILS

Planning Case Officer: Venezia Ross-Gilmore

Applicant: C/O Agent

County Councillor:

Parish:

Road Classification: Adopted Unclassified

Substantive Response provided in accordance with article 22(5) of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015:

There would appear to be no material impact on the public highway and therefore the Local Highway Authority has no comments to make.

Advice to Local Planning Authority

Background

The Local Highway Authority (LHA) has been re-consulted by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) Melton Borough Council (MBC) on a planning application at Sewstern Industrial Estate, South Of Sewstern Road, Gunby. This application is for the erection of an anaerobic digestion (AD) facility and carbon capture, improvement of existing and part creation of new access track, landscaping and other associated infrastructure.

The LHA previously responded to this application on 17th May 2024, advising that there would appear to be no material impact on the Leicestershire County Council (LCC) maintained public highway, therefore the LHA has no comments to make.

The LHA note that the Applicant has submitted a series of revised plans relating to the vehicular access arrangements and the internal private road layout.

The LHA note that whilst amendments have been provided to the vehicular accesses, the accesses join the highway within Lincolnshire LHA jurisdiction, therefore LCC LHA will not provide comments on the access arrangement.

The LHA also note from the information there are no proposed alterations to the use or size of the facility and therefore the LHA comments from the 17th May 2024 relating to trip generation remain unchanged. For avoidance of doubt the LHA trip generation comments from the 17th May 2024 have been repeated below:

“The trip generation concludes that during the harvest period the Leicestershire highway network could expect to see a total of 50 two way trips from HGVs during the harvest period travelling to the Buckminster Estate fields.

However during the non-harvest period the LHA could expect to see a total of 21 two way HGV movements per day to the Buckminster Estate fields.

The LHA note that not all the HGV movements will be carried out during the AM and PM peak periods and the HGV will utilise the B676. The number of HGVs associated with this development are negligible when compared against the Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT). Therefore it is not considered that the proposed will have a severe impact on the local highway network, in accordance with Paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)”

To conclude, there would appear to be no material impact on LCC public highway, therefore LCC LHA, have no further comments to make.

Date Received
19 June 2024

Case Officer
Robyn Green

Reviewer
GG

Date issued
05 July 2024

Substantive response of the Local Highway Authority to a planning consultation received under The Development Management Order.

Response provided under the delegated authority of the Director of Environment & Transport.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Planning Application Number: S24/0568

Highway Reference Number: 2024/0568/20/H/R2

Application Address: Development East Of Sewstern Industrial Estate South Of Sewstern Road Gunby Lincolnshire NG33 5RD

Description of Application: Re-consultation. Erection of an anaerobic digestion (AD) facility and carbon capture, improvement of existing and part creation of new access track, landscaping and other associated infrastructure.

GENERAL DETAILS

Planning Case Officer: Venezia Ross-Gilmore

Substantive Response provided in accordance with article 22(5) of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015:

There would appear to be no material impact on the public highway and therefore the Local Highway Authority has no comments to make.

Advice to Local Planning Authority

Background

The Local Highway Authority (LHA) has been re-consulted by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) Melton Borough Council (MBC) on a planning application at Sewstern Industrial Estate, South Of Sewstern Road, Gunby. This application is for the erection of an anaerobic digestion (AD) facility and carbon capture, improvement of existing and part creation of new access track, landscaping and other associated infrastructure.

The LHA previously responded to this application on 17th May 2024 and 5th July 2024, advising that there would appear to be no material impact on the Leicestershire County Council (LCC) maintained public highway, therefore the LHA has no comments to make.

Given that the accesses join the highway within Lincolnshire LHA jurisdiction, LCC LHA will not provide comments on the access arrangement.

The LHA also note from the information there are no proposed alterations to the use or size of the facility and therefore the LHA comments from the 17th May 2024 relating to trip generation remain unchanged. For avoidance of doubt the LHA trip generation comments from the 17th May 2024 have been repeated below:

“The trip generation concludes that during the harvest period the Leicestershire highway network could expect to see a total of 50 two way trips from HGVs during the harvest period travelling to the Buckminster Estate fields.”

However during the non-harvest period the LHA could expect to see a total of 21 two way HGV movements per day to the Buckminster Estate fields.

The LHA note that not all the HGV movements will be carried out during the AM and PM peak periods and the HGV will utilise the B676. The number of HGVs associated with this development are negligible when compared against the Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT). Therefore it is not considered that the proposed will have a severe impact on the local highway network, in accordance with Paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)”

To conclude, there would appear to be no material impact on LCC public highway, therefore LCC LHA, have no further comments to make.

Date Received
19 September 2024

Case Officer
Simon Herbert

Reviewer
GG

Date Issued
07 October 2024