

**Regulation Committee - Thursday 9 February 2023 (14.00)**  
**Public Speakers etc**

**Item 5 - application – Unit 22, Evercreech Junction, Shepton**  
**Mallet, BA4 6NA (SCC/3854/2021)**

**Objectors:**

1. **Statement** from S Ulph and L Suckey

I write to you as a statement of objection for planning application  
SCC/3854/2021

Unfortunately, I am unable to attend and speak at the meeting, therefore  
I trust my statement will be put forth in my absence.

As residents of Railway Cottage (at the entrance to Evercreech Junction)  
we are very concerned as to the impact this planning request will have  
on our daily lives and also on the value of our property which could then  
leave us in a very difficult position.

Since purchasing our home 16 months ago, which was bought in a poor  
state of repair, we have completed the building work on an extension,  
including having a slate roof done, three skin walls including  
stonemasonry work for outer wall and window framing, had windows  
fitted, rendering, lime rendering and plastering done, as well as extensive  
works, comprising an average of 2 days per week each, carried out  
ourselves. We have even had a famous signed graffiti artist paint every  
interior wall of our barn.

Therefore, in our time here, we have added much greater value to our  
home (to which we expect to be at least (*figure removed*) but will be  
getting formerly valued soon) as well as our personal efforts and heart  
we have put into this.

As well as this, it is important for me particularly, as a driver of a special  
needs school bus to get a good night sleep every night. Not doing so  
would put myself and the children on my taxi at risk! Which would of  
course, be absolutely unacceptable!

I would like to note, as on my previous objection, that we looked into this planning and decided it was ok to proceed with the purchase given the mitigations in place.

However, I now feel it is rather obvious that the company will and have likely always intended to ensure this planning goes through in full eventually, given the stage they are currently at with it, and further research makes me wonder if the plant could even run on the premiss of the original agreement!

And wish to point out that while there is conflicting research on the effect of house prices and the local area in general in regards to biogas plants, most favourable research seems to be in countries where there are limits on proximity to houses to over at least 3KM, our home is less than half of this and every lorry will have to drive past adjacent to my boundary wall. Which as stated is not acceptable during night hours.

Ultimately, hopefully I am wrong, but very much doubt this planning will not be approved, therefore, if my concerns of being put into a position of unenjoyment of home life, risk at work through lack of sleep and not being able to move due to devalue of our property are realised, I will most certainly seek abatement to the fullest of my abilities and failing that would have no other choice than legal proceedings under Land Compensation Act 1973 to recover our loss.

In the meantime, we will pause works on our home until we know more of the situation.

Yours Faithfully

**Supporters / Applicant / Agent:**

Alex Fitzgerald - Plandescil on behalf of applicant (BioConstruct)

Jasmin Ayton –Plandescil on behalf of applicant (BioConstruct)

Good afternoon, my name is Jasmine and this is my colleague Alex. We are representing Plandescil Consulting Engineers who are acting as Agents to the Applicant, assisting with the planning and civil engineering design of Evercreech AD Plant.

The Applicant is applying to vary conditions 2 and 3 of their existing planning permission to permit design changes which are required due to upgrades in technology. The plant is currently partially operational based on the design and layout applied for under this S73.

The proposed variation of condition 2 would permit the design changes, which most notably include alteration of the reception building footprint (not height), removal of the digestate evaporator unit, relocation and resizing of the odour control filter, the removal of 2 of the 3 previously proposed combined heat and power units (known as CHPs) and the repositioning of the remaining CHP. These amendments do not materially alter the character or principle of the approved development; the input and output of the plant and resulting transport movements will remain unchanged as per the previous application, the red line area will not be affected, there are no changes to the plant's process, and no increase in noise levels.

The reduction of CHPs from three individual units to a single larger unit necessitates the variation of Condition 3 because, as demonstrated by the latest noise impact assessment, the previously proposed acoustic barrier is not necessary to mitigate the noise levels of the revised equipment proposals. Instead, a number of mitigation measures have been proposed in the noise impact assessment which include acoustic enclosures to specific items of plant, selection of the quietest available equipment, and specification of silencers to the CHP and odour abatement unit exhaust systems.

The noise impact assessment concludes that with these mitigation measures installed, the development can achieve the 25dB limit required by condition 4, thus negating the need to vary this condition anymore. Therefore, the variance of condition 4 no longer forms part of this application and noise levels will adhere to the 25dB limit.

The Applicant has received notification of a noise complaint made to the Environment Agency recently. If this application is approved and the mitigation proposed in the noise impact assessment installed, the noise

levels will be reduced to meet the required 25dB limit and should prevent any further noise concerns.

It should be noted that the Applicant and their Noise Consultant have worked with statutory consultees to alleviate their concerns regarding noise, and this has resulted in Environmental Health removing their objection.

Thank you for your time and please let us know if you have any queries.

**Item 6 - application – Abbey farm, Chilkwell Street,  
Glastonbury, BA6 8DB (SCC/4015/20220)**

**Objectors:**

1. Rowena Beaumont

**I would like to speak on the day:**

- Planning application letters went out to residents in Bere Lane in the Autumn 2022 with no reference to the Sign being placed in **BERE LANE**, the residents assumed the sign was in Chilkwell Street therefore the letter was misleading. **Why wasn't it made clear to the residents in BERE LANE?**
- No-one seems to be able to visually find what the sign will look like online. I have contacted the Rural Life Museum and they couldn't find it either. I have also tried to contact South West Heritage Trust. **Where is there a visual sign so we can see what it will look like and the dimensions of it?**
- If Satnavs and Route Planners take cars to Abbey Farm (small sign on a gate) Chilkwell Street then **why isn't there a sign on the BERE LANE JUNCTION** for *Rural Life Museum* directing traffic left into Bere Lane or from the Wells Road into Chilkwell Street and directing traffic right into Bere Lane? Once you find BERE LANE you **can't miss the entrance as there is a HUGE SIGN** in the grounds already in place which you can easily see from the road as you drive down the road. **So why another sign?**
- I have lived opposite the *Rural Life Museum* entrance gate for 18 years and **I do not wish to have a COMMERCIAL SIGN** opposite my home, I have a view of the TREES which are very special. I care about the environment and neighbourhood and most importantly the **TREES need to be Protected** as they are very precious especially now with all the traffic and pollution in Bere Lane. I don't feel anyone has really taken into account the neighbourhood?

**Supporters / Applicant / Agent:**

None