

SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date: 01.03.2016		
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	14/04740/FUL	Planning Officer
<p>Should permission be granted it is recommended that the following additional condition is imposed:</p> <p>Prior to the commencement of development details of all boundary treatments to the site, including the dimensions, design, materials and colour of walls, fences and other boundaries, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	14/05768/FUL	Neighbour Objection
<p>I object on the following points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the development will not employ any local people. In fact due to the degradation of the AONB, it could negatively impact on existing employment. - there are many alternative sites. The area already has two substantial equestrian facilities, and a search of the internet lists many alternatives in the area which are currently for sale. There is no need to develop yet another one. - The SAMDev supports conversion of existing buildings, infill and affordable housing. This classes a none of the above. In fact it is an unacceptable expansion of the Norbury envelope. - degradation of AONB. The proposed building is 20 ft high., 120 ft long and 65 ft wide. It will be visible for miles, especially in winter - Road safety. The road on which the development is proposed is 60mph. Traffic turning into and out of the development will pose an unacceptable risk - Lack of Business case. The Planning Committee report points out that there is no business case presented. The development looks too small to support a viable business, and it will result in application for expansion in the future. - the ground is very boggy and in my experience unsuitable for horses. 		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	14/05768/FUL	Objection
<p>Para 12 of the appendix to the Committee's decision states (a) that permission is given for a temporary dwelling for 3 yrs, after which it must be removed and (b) that at this point consideration will be given to a permanent dwelling</p> <p>I object on the basis that this appears to give de facto future permission or consideration for the erection of a permanent dwelling, without potential local objectors having been given notice that such a permanent dwelling was ever envisaged.</p> <p>This appears to be a particularly blatant example of planning creep by stealth</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	14/05768/FUL	Objection
<p>I feel very strongly that this application is based on using loop holes to eventually erect a property on this land. Buy some land, put a shelter on it, then apply for a house! The proposal for this site gives no indication that this is a short term project, indeed I feel that it will rely on getting bigger to give a valid excuse to build a permanent residence. The</p>		

size of this application is very large, it is outside the village envelope and as such stands very much on its own. It is possible that the impact of such structures may not have alerted residents. The original planning given for a horse shelter only, was given with much reservation as again it was considered that this would eventually lead to greater things. It seems that our fears are now coming to fruition. We as a village have already had five properties erected/refurbished. The impact for three chimneys which neighbours this land could be very destructive. We live in AONB area but I feel that this quite simply is not worth the paper on which it is written.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	14/05768/FUL	Neighbour Objection

This development does not meet SAMDev criteria

It would be extremely intrusive in an environmentally sensitive area.

It is likely to increase the risk of flooding, already frequent on the adjacent road.

There are more suitable sites available and it is most likely to be an attempt to obtain "back door" planning for a market house, some thing that has already happened in Norbury.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	14/05768/FUL	Neighbour Objection

As a retired farmer of 50 years, it saddens me to see this application made in the first place. The applicant has and will in the future have every opportunity to purchase a suitable holding for themselves, the papers and land agents verify this week in week out. Why must good commercial farmland and a green field site be transformed into this monstrosity. Everyone is entitled to try to create and modify there businesses, but not at the expense and detriment of local people which have farmed the land and lived in this area for very many years, the country side that surrounds us needs preserving not commercially taken advantage of. Think very carefully please, before you turn this appeal into reality, it will result into a travesty of the countryside for ever. Thank you Chris Edwards.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	14/05768/FUL	Neighbour objection

Letter received from owner of neighbouring property and former owner of the site. The concerns raised, that are not simply personal between property owners are as follows:-
 No discussion from the applicants
 The ground will not support large livestock
 The applicants will not be allowed to purchase additional land from the objector
 Wrong kind of development in the countryside.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
10	15/05359/FUL	Third Party Comment

-Unhappy that top soil is being removed from farms and would be of more use as a soil improver on the neighbouring fields to the ponds; this use complies with all EA regulations as it is not a waste.
 -Have evidence from all over the country where this is being done where water storage areas have been created.

-Use of top soil to help create calcareous grassland is contrary to Natural England guidelines; has evidence for this as they farm an SSSI at Wenlock Edge and were not allowed to improve it at all.

-When they provided a site for the Council to place unstable rock removed from Harley Hill there were very challenging environmental controls/conditions; are similar conditions to be imposed on Shropshire Council?

-Comment on presence of peregrine falcons.

-Council was offered to be able to tip top soil on neighbouring land at a considerably cheaper rate than taking it further away; why did they decide to go out and purchase a disused quarry considering the Council's financial situation?

-Why is the Council selling of small holding estate, affecting people's livelihoods, and then acquiring land?

-Carrying out work in the winter months would damage agricultural land.

-Have lived at Newhouse Farm, Much Wenlock for over 40 years, and their family has farmed here almost 100 years.

-Have personally experienced the problems of being flooded on three separate occasions.