

**NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE  
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS**

**Date: 19<sup>th</sup> April 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**

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>15/05563/FUL</b>	<b>Applicant</b>

In response to the comments of the Council's Historic Environment Officer (as set out in the Committee report (section 4.1.8) the applicant's heritage consultant has provided the additional clarification over the scope of the submitted Heritage Report:

*The historic environment desk based assessment did consider designated and non-designated heritage assets and the potential affect of the scheme upon them, but the report considers those heritage assets which we felt, following the review of the proposed scheme and a detailed site visit to the various heritage assets and surrounding landscape, may be affected by the scheme and were therefore described in detail rather than not being considered at all. Given the location of the scheme next to an existing agricultural buildings and the proposed mitigation including positioning the scheme below surrounding ground level and mitigation landscape screening it is considered in accordance with para 135 of the NPPF that there the scale of indirect harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage assets is negligible if not non-existent. I note that the archaeological consultee had no objections or required any further mitigation with regard to non-designated archaeological assets.*

*Although the Grade I obelisk is not individually assessed it is mentioned as part of the baseline and assessed when the setting of the park is considered. I appreciate the main Hawkstone Hall was assessed separately which may look like other elements were not considered but this is because it is the principal structure within the park. The parkland provides the key contribution to the heritage significance of the structure within the park, not the application site, and as such the assessment considered the assets with the parkland as a group within the parkland designation. I refer to paragraphs 5.1.10 to 5.1.12 which assesses the parkland and its parkland assets. It is considered the scheme will not result in harm to the heritage significance of the park or obelisk due to changes within the very wider landscape setting of both designated heritage assets. Given the obelisk was outside of the ZTV, the scheme is located over 2 km away, the scheme is of a scale to existing agricultural buildings along with the proposed landscape mitigation, it is my professional opinion that the proposed scheme will not overshadow or detract from the prominence of the obelisk on the skyline or the experience of its parkland setting.*

*I trust this clarifies our assessment and addresses the raised concerns.*

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>15/05563/FUL</b>	<b>Planning Officer</b>

To provide additional clarity regarding planning conditions, it is recommended that proposed conditions 9 and 12 are re-worded as follows:

9. (a) Excluding water inputs, the maximum tonnage of materials processed in the anaerobic digester in any calendar year shall not exceed 15,250 tonnes. For the avoidance of doubt a calendar year shall comprise the period between 1<sup>st</sup> January and

31<sup>st</sup> December.

(b) The Site operator shall maintain a record of the tonnage and type of materials processed in the anaerobic digester. The record shall be made available to the Local Planning Authority upon prior written request.

Reason: To ensure that the development remains within the general levels of activity specified in the planning application in the interests of highway safety and general amenity, and facilitate monitoring of tonnages processed in the anaerobic digestion facility by the Local Planning Authority.

12. The anaerobic digester shall not process feedstock material other than chicken manure produced at the adjacent Lower Heath Farm, and material derived from: agricultural, forestry and biomass processing residues and purpose grown energy crops. Purpose grown energy crops shall not be processed other than in line with the criteria set out in the Renewable Heat Incentive (RHI) scheme.

Reason: To control the type of feedstock and ensure sustainable development.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	15/05563/FUL	Local resident

An objection from local residents has been received, summarised as follows:

- Have only just become aware of the proposal
- As the closest house, and referred to in the planning application (Moat House), surprised that we had no formal notification of the proposal
- Has been considerable development of the site over the years; the view of storage silos has altered the feel of our location
- During the early part of the chicken house development, there was a low frequency hum at night that although I am sure would be below any permitted acceptable limits, still kept us awake for a period at night
- As an airline pilot the ability to sleep is required at all times of day and every day of the year; from a noise perspective the 22dB proposed level of noise from the AD plant I view as unacceptable. It may well be viewed as a quiet room officially, but if I can hear it, I will not sleep properly
- The report states "Tone associated with Lower Heath Farm would be clearly perceptible at NSR5, compared to the existing ambient sound climate".
- On the dates the survey was allegedly carried out (12th & 13th Oct 2015), we were at home all day, and no survey was carried out
- From a light pollution perspective, the previous development of the site resulted in a neon flood light erected on top of one of the sheds facing our house. We can no longer leave curtains open enjoying the darkness of the countryside anymore due to the light shining into the room
- Our objection is to any further noise or light pollution from this site and preferably enforce the removal of the neon light and build a big bund with adequate planting facing Fauls.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	15/05563/FUL	Planning Officer

In response to the above objection, Officers would make the following comments:

Noise:

Moat House is located approximately 445 metres to the north-east of the application site.

The nearest residential property is, as stated in para. 2.1 of the Committee report, approximately 290 metres to the west. Section 6.4.3 of the Committee report summarises the findings of the submitted noise report. The noise report was undertaken by a consultant certified as 'competent' in environmental noise monitoring. It states that the background sound climate at the nearest receptors was undertaken by a survey conducted from Monday 12<sup>th</sup> October to Tuesday 13<sup>th</sup> October 2015. The report identifies Moat House as one of the six nearest receptors. However background noise monitoring was only carried out at two of these six receptors. Monitoring was undertaken at Fauls Farm, approximately 530 metres to the east of the application site, and the levels recorded at this location were used to represent the background sound levels at Moat House. The residents are therefore correct to say that noise monitoring was not carried out at their property.

Based upon the above monitoring, the noise report assesses noise impact at Moat House farm based upon guidance set out in BS4142:2014. It concludes that 'tone associated with Lower Heath Farm would be clearly perceptible at Moat House, compared to the ambient sound climate, if the specific sound level is great enough', and that there would be a low impact in the daytime, and a low impact during night-time at the property.

The noise report identifies the sound power level for each process associated with the proposed anaerobic digestion plant. To ensure that the BS4142:2014 assessment is worst-case, it has been assumed that all fixed plant sources would operate continuously. The noise report concludes that "the assessment, in accordance with BS4142:2014, indicates that the noise emissions associated with the proposed anaerobic digestion plant at Lower Heath Farm is likely to have a low impact at the nearest receptors, as such; it is recommended that noise should not be a constraint to the consideration of this planning application".

This conclusion is supported by the Council's Public Protection Officer, as set out in paras. 4.1.3 and 6.4.3 of the Committee report.

#### Lighting:

In relation to lighting, the planning application states that external lighting would be required during low light levels in the winter months. It states that there is no requirement for 24 hour external lighting; the proposed lighting would be the minimum required for safety; the lighting would be directed into the site; the lighting would have shielding to minimise unnecessary light spill.

Officers recommend that an additional condition is added to the decision notice, if permission is granted, to require prior approval of external lighting at the site as follows:

- a) *Prior to the installation of external lighting at the site as part of the operation of the anaerobic digestion plant, details of all external lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*
- b) *The lighting scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme and shall thereafter be maintained.*

*Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to minimize light spillage beyond the site and thus minimize the potential for light pollution and nuisance.*

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	14/00834/FUL	Local resident
<p>A further letter of objection has been received from the occupiers of Hornspike House.</p> <p>The letter re-iterates previous objections, raising concerns about a significant increase in vehicle movements along a single track road. It is considered that there is no essential need for a dwelling at this location. Site not considered suitable for the type of agriculture as proposed. Questions are raised about the financial viability of the business as proposed. Caravans and sheds on site are visual in the local landscape. Concerns are raised about the track record of Shropshire Council's Planning and Enforcement. Also concerns about the Officer report and the dwelling reverting to affordable housing if no longer required for the specific agricultural purpose.</p> <p>Officer comments. – Many of the issues as re-iterated above are covered in the Officer report. With regards to the siting of the temporary caravan, this is in order to allow the applicants a sufficient time in order to demonstrate whether the proposal is a viable business or not, if after 3 years it is not demonstrated that there is a viable business then the caravan would need to be removed off site. (Condition number 2 as attached to Appendix B of the report indicates permission for a limited period of 3 years from the date of the permission). The issue with regards to the dwelling reverting to affordable housing in this instance is not relevant as the application is for a temporary dwelling in the form of a caravan, as stated in paragraph 6.2.15 of the Officers report. The affordable housing issue is only relevant in cases of permanent dwellings on site.</p> <p>No change to recommendation.</p>		