

Date: Tuesday, 12 February 2019

Time: 2.00 pm

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

Contact: Linda Jeavons, Committee Officer
Tel: 01743 257716
Email: linda.jeavons@shropshire.gov.uk

SOUTH 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

SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date: 12 February 2019		
<p>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</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5.	17/04603/OUT	Case officer
<p>Additional condition to be added to any approval notice (as referred to within officer report):</p> <p>The dwelling hereby permitted shall be no more than 1.5 storeys in height.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the dwelling does not result in an overly dominant development and to minimise any loss of amenity to neighbouring properties.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	17/05026/EIA – Aston Munslow poultry unit	Munslow community
<p>The following objection has been received 'on behalf of residents and businesses in Munslow and Aston Munslow:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1. Introduction</p> <p>The Shropshire Council Planning Department have provided an assessment of this application in the committee report. We would like to present to the committee some alternative assessments, backed up by an analysis of Shropshire Council's <i>Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy</i> and alignment with the <i>Economic Growth Strategy for Shropshire 2017–2021</i> and the input from other expert bodies such as the Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership and the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE). We believe that these assessments enable the committee to determine that this application can, and should, be safely rejected, in line with the public comments received, being over 95% objections.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2. Policy CS5</p> <p>The requirements of Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy are that before development is permitted it must be established that all of the following criteria are satisfied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the site is appropriate • the development maintains and enhances countryside vitality and character • the development improves the sustainability of rural communities by bringing local economic and community benefits • and further in relation to large scale new agricultural development, it must be demonstrated that there are no unacceptable adverse environmental impacts <p style="text-align: center;">3. Appropriateness of site</p> <p>Within the context of CS5 the villages of Munslow and Aston Munslow form a Community Cluster (section 4.68) of the two settlements because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A single parish council covers both villages • Munslow has the church and a restaurant 		

- Aston Munslow has the shop/garage and pub
- The two villages form a single community and are closely linked through personal associations
- The parish council has recently enhanced the footpath between the two villages to enable more people to walk between the villages (as the road is not a safe option)
- In historic documents Aston Munslow is referred to as Munslow's Aston

This section of CS5 is clear that development will not be allowed between the settlements but this is exactly what this application proposes.


The applicant has indicated that the location chosen is the least unsuitable of the land that is owned by the applicant. But that does not make it suitable within the context of policy CS5 since it would involve placing an industrial unit (as determined by the Environment Agency) that is far larger than any other structure in the parish in the middle of the Community Cluster whereas it should be located within the context of an existing agricultural complex.

The villages of Aston Munslow and Munslow are conservation areas in which 23 dwellings are listed buildings (out of a total of 40 in the Parish). Locating an industrial facility (as defined by Environment Agency) in the middle of this rural and historic community is totally out of character.

As the Spatial Vision section of CS5 states "Thus, proposals which would result in isolated, sporadic, out of scale ... development ... will not be acceptable.". The application before you does not attempt to address this issue and should therefore be considered unacceptable.

4. Vitality and character of countryside

The site of this application lies about 100m outside the Shropshire Hills AONB but will be clearly visible from many parts of the Corvedale including those that are in the AONB.



The Corvedale is a rural location and whilst there are obviously farm structures within the parish they are not of the same scale or intrusiveness as that in the application. The dominant feature of the Corvedale is the patchwork of fields used for arable production and stock rearing.

The Corvedale is criss crossed by footpaths and the 11 mile Three Castles Walk, which features in the Long Distance Walkers Association trails where it is classified as "Heritage". The Three Castles Walk was created, and is maintained and promoted, by local people as a means of attracting visitors to the Corvedale.

Local business sell the Three Castles Walk leaflet. The site would be a visible eye-sore for a good deal of the route.

The local efforts described above, and the extensive use of the footpaths, indicates that this area is a **valued landscape**.

The vitality of the area is dependent on an appropriate balance between recreation and farming activities. The introduction of large industrial units such as that in the application is totally out of character with the existing character of the Corvedale.

The application makes no reference to how the site will be manned but the applicant has made clear that should permission be granted a further application would be made for the construction of a dwelling next to the site. This dwelling would be deemed “necessary” for the facility but would have to be located such that it would have a high visual impact (and this has not been included in the Visual Impact Assessment). We contend that the application should be considered as a whole and not piecemeal.

The Spatial Vision section of CS5 states “Thus, proposals which would ... individually or cumulatively erode the character of the countryside, will not be acceptable.” The applicant has provided a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) which (upon revision) has been accepted by the Planning Department. However, it is at variance with the submission from the AONB which provides expert evidence of a high impact on the landscape, a view shared by the CPRE, local residents and the Ramblers Association.

It is clear that this proposal would “erode the character” of the local countryside and should be considered unacceptable in terms of Policy CS5.

5. Sustainability and benefits

The emphasis on this section of the policy is “bringing local economic and community benefits” to “rural communities”, that is to the communities **as a whole** not to one particular enterprise.

For Shropshire tourism is the second highest economic contributor (behind healthcare) and there are estimated to be about [15,000 jobs](#) (full time equivalent - FTE) in the tourism sector in Shropshire and this is growing by about 750 jobs pa. For Agriculture there are about [10,000 jobs](#) and this number is steady.

In Shropshire the economic contribution for agriculture is £170M pa whereas the figure for tourism is £500M.

The application states that the facility will provide one FTE (Full Time Equivalent) of employment. This is in line with the generally accepted figure of employment for poultry units is 1.6 FTE per 100,000 birds. Set against this would be the impact on the economy of our Parish which can only be negative as people are put off coming to the area because of the degradation of the landscape by industrial units like the one proposed. Indeed the applicant himself recognized this, as demonstrated by his first submission in which he stated he did not wish to site the factory close to his own farm due to the potential detrimental impact on his touring site business. Realising that this was an own goal it was removed from the submission

Munslow and Aston Munslow together have enterprises with in excess of 40 holiday beds which, with other businesses dependent on tourism, would be at risk if the application is successful.

The community would be adversely affected by the increased traffic which would go to the site, situated as it is on a road that has suffered in recent years from fatalities involving farm vehicles. The entrance to the site is on a derestricted stretch of road outside the 30mph zone of Aston Munslow.

From the above it will be seen that the proposed industrial unit brings no benefit to our community and cannot be shown to have an economic benefit (to the community) either. On this basis, therefore, the application is unacceptable within the terms of Policy CS5.

6. Adverse environmental impacts

Special Sites

There are Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Ancient Woodlands (with trees over 300 years old) in close proximity to the proposed development. One of the two SSSIs (Wolverton Wood And Alcaston Coppice) is already at 150% of its Nitrogen Critical Load (i.e. 50% over the maximum permitted). This information comes from the Air Pollution Information System (APIS) the definitive source of air pollution information in the UK. The Planning Department considers this is not a problem because the proposed development will make it only "slightly worse". A responsible approach would be to make the development ammonia emission neutral (see next section) in order not to make the situation worse.

Furthermore, the applicant has ignored the statutory requirement to consider the effect on veteran trees in the registered parkland of Millichope Park, which at its closest is 1km from the site, and representations to the Planning Department on this issue have been met with indifference.

Ammonia Pollution


The government has a national policy to reduce the amount of ammonia pollution, 88% of which it says comes from farming, and there is a bill going through parliament which will enshrine in law the human right to breath clean air. Shropshire Council has taken a lead on reducing Ammonia pollution by producing a Guidance Note (GN2) giving tighter standards for developments such as this one. One of the ways it does this is to require all such new developments to be ammonia emission neutral and this can be achieved by technical means (ammonia recovery technology) and mitigation (reducing the amount of ammonia emissions elsewhere).

However, whilst the applicant acknowledges the need for the development being ammonia emission neutral, the chosen means is only mitigation, thus avoiding the expense of ammonia recovery technology. We have shown (full details on the planning portal) that the mitigation measures are flawed, some even increase the emissions, and the development will not be ammonia emission neutral. When we brought this issue to the attention of the planning department our concerns were summarily brushed aside. The response identified in section 6.3.16 of the committee report does not relate to the non-compliance issue but merely points to the weaker national standards.

That Shropshire has stricter pollution standards is good (even if it is necessitated by having a problem with pollution) but only if the standards are enforced and not ignored. In the public interest the application should not be accepted in its current form due to the added pollution it will cause, and this at a time when there is such emphasis on pollution reduction.

Earthworks

In order to achieve a level area for the construction of the poultry units it will be



into the bedrock.

The plans submitted (extract above) show that the net spoil removed (cut minus bund) will be about 5,000 cubic metres. To put this figure into context 5,000 cubic metres is the volume of about 150 large detached houses or over 2,000 lorry loads.

There is no information in the application to indicate where this spoil will be taken but this number of lorry movements will have a considerable impact on the surrounding community for the duration of the earth works.

The development will result in a scar on the landscape that will be handed down to future generations.

7. Economic Impact

The Economic Growth Vision for Shropshire states “Our countryside offers a diverse and widely celebrated range of landscapes, and offers a rich array of historic villages and farms, country houses, ancient monuments, parks and gardens, canals, rivers and wildlife sites. Their sustainable economic future is important, not least to the many businesses which trade off this offer.” And those “many businesses” rely on the character of the area being maintained.

To quote Professor Charles Edwards, chair of the Grow Cook Learn charity

“The Shropshire Hills Discovery Centre, located just 6 miles from the proposed unit, employs over 20 local people in jobs equating to over 11 FTEs. These jobs are directly related to the attractiveness of the Shropshire Hills as a visitor destination. And for us the character and attractions of Corvedale are important. This proposed unit by Aston Munslow is where there are already fourteen such units within a 10km radius. The whole real farming landscape of the area is being degraded by an industrialisation producing outputs which have nothing to do with the location, soil or climate of Corvedale except in so far that they add visual, air and water pollution damage to the very landscape that draws people here.”

This proposed development does not maintain the character of the area and should be considered therefore unacceptable in terms of the Economic Growth Vision.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	17/05026/EIA – Aston Munslow poultry unit	Local objector
<p>I am a resident of Aston Munslow and one that has connections to several farming communities, so I quite understand that farmers have to diversify to effectively and efficiently utilise their assets to turn a profit. However, being aware of the Planning Officer's recent report, I still feel minded to comment upon the proposal of building an industrial sized 76,000 pullet unit just off the B4368 and directly between the 2 ancient Domesday recorded villages of Munslow parish i.e. Munslow and Aston Munslow.</p> <p>I strongly disagree with the proposal in the Planning Officer's recent report that building another industrial sized poultry unit along the B4368 and so close to the Corve River is in the public interest because it produces high volumes of food. The UK is a net exporter of</p>		

chicken. We have enough to satisfy our own needs. Vegetarianism/Veganism is on the rise. We have approx. 16 million farm raised chickens in Shropshire already. We have too many of these units in Shropshire generally and the Corvedale in particular, so I wonder how it is in the interest of the many residents/tourists/ local businesses/ our special ancient landscape/fauna and flora, all road and river users etc. for another such industrial unit to be built within 3 miles of two others already operating along the B4368.

This proposed factory, together with the two already operating, will undoubtedly increase the pollution of clean air (the Clean Air Act is already being discussed in Parliament), land and watercourses, flora and fauna as well as impacting upon human health e.g. bronchial problems linked to rises in atmospheric ammonia. Once construction has started, our ancient landscape of outstanding natural beauty, which is recognised by national and international organisations, will be changed irrevocably. Will our many visiting walkers, holiday makers, road/river users, new families etc. want to see, hear and smell such a building whose only purpose is to produce more factory reared chickens when we have enough already? In the bigger picture, is passing this planning application really in the public interest?

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7.	18/03091/FUL	Cllr Tindall

EMAIL RECEIVED 11.01.2019

In my capacity as the local ward member (for Brown Clee Division) I was made aware (by planning.alert@shropshire.gov.uk) of the original application to which Chetton Parish Council and I objected.

I attended a meeting of Chetton Parish Council held on Tuesday 8th January at which a revised scheme for this application was considered (I don't think I was sent a planning alert for this resubmission, but perhaps the system only alerts us when the initial application is submitted?).

Although the Clerk to Chetton Parish Council will be responding separately and independently with the views of the Parish Councillors, I would like to set out the reasons for my continued objection to this application.

1. Whilst unreservedly recognising that "modern" architectural styles are often stunning and entirely appropriate in certain circumstances I do not consider the Johnson Design Partnership's approach to the design of this new dwelling respects the historic setting of its location particularly with St Giles' Church on the boundary of the site.

2. The use of modern materials in this case, for example: aluminium glazing, zinc cladding, and cast aluminium guttering, does not respect the traditional and vernacular materials used in neighbouring properties.

3. The actual design of ridge and eaves details are not in keeping- for example the ridge of the roof that joins at right angles to the principal roof should be subservient in height. There is little or no overhang of the eaves giving a cut off look which again is not seem locally.

4. The windows and doors are mostly single panes- I believe that they would be more in harmony if transoms and mullions were introduced to soften the effect of the large expanses of glazing.

At the risk of repeating myself I do not believe for one moment that modern architecture

has no place, far from it, but this traditional core of the village is not such a place where this modern design would be compatible.

If it is proposed to approve this application I would like it to be brought to the South Planning Committee for a site visit and thence decision.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7.	18/03091/FUL	Chetton Parish Council
<p>Planning Application 18/03091/FUL Replacement of existing bungalow with 1.5 / 2 storey three-bedroom dwelling with integrated garage and associated landscaping - The Old Post Office Chetton Bridgnorth Shropshire WV16 6UF</p> <p>Councillors have thoroughly discussed this application. They have noted that some amendments have been made to the original but are still of the opinion that the design is completely out of character with its surroundings.</p> <p>The premises now known as The Old Post Office was built prior to 1820 when it opened as a National School on land donated by the Church and used by local children until The Down School was built in 1884 when all pupils were transferred. The building then became the local post office and has been used as a private residence until it was recently placed on the market.</p> <p>St.Giles' church, which was mentioned in the Domesday Book, is a Grade 11* building with many signs of the 13th century still visible. It is said to have been founded by Lady Godiva whose husband was Earl of the Manor. In the churchyard stands the base of what is thought to be a mediaeval Preaching Cross, there are also two Holy wells and a mass burial pit in the close vicinity.</p> <p>Although Councillors agree that the Old Post Office is urgently in need of restoration work they consider that, due to its history and position in the village, it should be sympathetically restored as a bungalow, appropriate for modern day living, using traditional materials throughout. They therefore object to the proposals.</p> <p>Eileen Reynolds Clerk to Chetton Parish Council</p>		

This page is intentionally left blank