



Date: Tuesday, 14 November 2023

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: Shrewsbury/Oswestry Room, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY2 6ND

Contact: Tim Ward / Ashley Kendrick, Committee Officer
Tel: 01743 257713 / 01743 250893
Email: tim.ward@shropshire.gov.uk / ashley.kendrick@shropshire.gov.uk

SOUTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE

SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS

NOTE: This schedule reports only additional letters received before 5pm on the day before committee. Any items received on the day of Committee will be reported verbally to the meeting

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 9

SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date: 14th November 2023		
NOTE: This schedule reports only additional letters received before 5pm on the day before committee. Any items received on the day of Committee will be reported verbally to the meeting		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	22/05214/EIA	Agent
<p>For funding longer term habitat management the applicant accepts an escrow mechanism with a target amount of £100,000 after 10 years.</p> <p><i>Note: The agent notes that there was a misleading news item about the application on the BBC website (9/11/23) showing an image of a skip wagon, a skip and general waste. Following a complaint from the agent the image has been removed.</i></p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	22/05214/EIA	Members of the public
<p>A further 29 objections have recently been received after the BBC article referred to above. 28 of these have been received via the form on the Council's online planning portal and one via Committee Services. The objections raise similar issues to those of the 8 pre-existing objections which are referred to in the officer report. Namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about highway safety and HGV movements and inability to monitor • Impact on amenities including noise, working hours and traffic fumes, proximity to residential areas and William Brookes school, effect on AONB • Effects on biodiversity • Effects on tourism • Conflict with Policy including Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan • Questioning exceptional circumstance justification for major development within the AONB • Pollution risk <p>The full wording of these representations is available to view on the Council's online planning portal.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	22/05214/EIA	Much Wenlock Town Council
<p>Members received a further objection from Much Wenlock Town Council dated 13th November 2023. The full comments will not be reproduced here. The main concern is that the proposals conflict with Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan Policy LL2 which is opposed to commercial uses in Farley Quarry. The Town Council also reiterate concerns about the highway implications of the proposals.</p> <p><i>Note: Highway officer Gemma Lawley will be at the committee meeting.</i></p>		

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	22/05214/EIA	Case officer
<p>Policy Clarification.</p> <p>One of the main objections of Much Wenlock Town Council is that the proposals conflict with Neighbourhood Plan Policy LL2 which states that ‘New industrial and commercial uses will not be supported at Lilleshall, Westwood and Farley quarries’.</p> <p>The proposed inert recycling facility at Farley represents a technical conflict with this policy as inert recycling and infilling are commercial uses. However, these operations would be for a temporary period of 10 years (controlled by condition) and the recycling is necessary in order to generate sufficient residual inert materials to infill the quarry void. In this respect the requirements of neighbourhood plan policy LL1 are also relevant:</p> <p><i>LL1 – ‘Proposals for the restoration and the implementation of aftercare proposals for former quarries will be permitted where they deliver restoration for wildlife, biodiversity and public access and are consistent with other Plan policies’...</i></p> <p>The existing quarry void has been left in an unsatisfactory and steep condition and the current proposals for inert infilling would allow a more sustainable landform to be achieved, with benefits for future land management. The Council’s ecologist is satisfied that the restoration proposals would deliver a significant biodiversity net gain and a Legal agreement would secure funding for sustainable longer-term habitat management of the site. This would not be possible if the current proposals did not proceed.</p> <p>Additionally, the Agreement would secure diversion of two existing rights of way traversing the quarry void on unsuitably steep gradients. These would be diverted instead to a more even gradient, allowing improved east-west footpath links between the rights of way network at Wenlock Edge and Much Wenlock Road. SC Rights of Way who have had detailed and constructive dialogue with the agent on this matter (see their supplementary comments below).</p> <p>It is considered that the proposals are necessary in order to secure an acceptable restoration for the former quarry site. The infilling is temporary and is required to facilitate an acceptable restoration to the proposed nature conservation afteruse. As such the proposals align with Policy LL1 and there is no fundamental conflict with Policy LL2. Without infilling the steep gradients would remain within the void, in conflict with the objectives of LL1. The level of infilling is limited to the amount required to achieve a safe and manageable restoration landform.</p> <p>Environment Agency permitting regulations will not allow inert waste materials to be used for infilling unless / until recyclable components have first been recovered. Hence, recycling is necessary in order to generate the materials necessary to infill the void as a non-recyclable residue. The recycling would cease as soon as the void has been infilled and the site would be restored and managed for biodiversity use.</p> <p>In this instance therefore the infilling and associated recycling can be seen as enabling development to facilitate restoration of the site to a sustainable biodiversity afteruse in accordance with the objectives of Policy LL1. As such it is not considered that there is a fundamental conflict with LL2 or the Development Plan when seen as a whole, including Core Strategy Policy CS20 and SAMDev Policy MD17.</p>		

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	22/05214/EIA	SC Rights of Way
<p><u>Update</u></p> <p>As detailed within the Committee report there are two Public Rights of Way that have been affected by the previous expansion of the quarry and that are now obstructed on their Definitive lines. Discussions have taken place with Farley Quarry representatives over the last few years and all parties have agreed on suitable legally defined alternatives for the footpaths which will resolve the anomalies that we have been left. These alternatives will be subject to a legal process with the intention of them becoming footpaths on the Definitive map of Public Rights of Way. The need for legally defined outlets for these footpaths will be detailed within the planning legal agreement and progressed by Officers in the Mapping & Enforcement Team.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	23/02851/FUL	Member of the public
<p>A comment has been received from a member of the public on the 09/11/23 as follows:</p> <p><i>'when the original application was made for a caravan park there was a public meeting and we were told by Morris Leisure that there would not be a further application for static caravans. Several years later there was and now they wish to make it even larger with more static caravans. I find it difficult to believe anything they say. This site though very tidy and clean is large enough. Present users face a 2 mile walk into town or an infrequent bus service.'</i></p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	23/03727/FUL	Agent
<p>Site plan submitted for Members attention which highlights residential addresses in proximity to the proposed site and will be used in the Agent's presentation at the meeting.</p>		

This page is intentionally left blank