



Date: Tuesday, 17 February 2015

Time: 2.00 pm

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

Contact: Emily Marshall, Committee Officer
Tel: 01743 252726
Email: emily.marshall@shropshire.gov.uk

NORTH 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

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS

Date: 17th February 2015

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	14/02730/MAW	Public Objections

Five further objections have been received since the application was reported at the 24th October 2014 North Planning Committee, on the following grounds:

- possible damage to the environment and to people should chemicals leak and contaminate the water table; this would be a public health disaster
- argument that the proposal for a borehole should be considered on its own and the development of a gas extraction well should be considered at a later date is a weak argument; if application for a methane extraction plant is considered in stages then at each stage the Council is in a weaker position to argue against further development
- Royal Society has advised that the extraction of methane gas from shale beds is viable subject to certain controls, including design of well being checked by a specialist independent expert; well integrity testing. No mention of this in the planning application
- Question of contamination of aquifer has not been addressed
- Long term integrity of the borehole should be considered: query what would happen if there was an earthquake nearby, or when natural settlement of the ground occurs
- The following queries are asked of Members: how do you clean an aquifer once it is contaminated? How do you de-methane the ozone layer? How do you take radon or uranium out of fracked water? How do you take water back once it has been fracked? How can you condone turning millions of gallons of clean drinking water into toxic waste? How can condone creating millions of gallons of toxic waste to be disposed of? How can you stop toxic waste from blowing over communities close to the fracking sites? How can you stop leaking pipes? How can you stop cement well failure? How can you stop spills? How can you stop criminality? How can you stop cutting corners on safety or disposal? How would you tell a mother it will be safe and you can put a rig close to a school or home? How do you know it will not come up a fault or fissure? How can you stop the disasters here when we are allowing the same shortcuts and mistakes that are the same ones as the USA? How confident are you our regulators know more than the USA where they have been doing it for over fifteen years and still wells fail and communities suffer?
- Having researched the subject thoroughly, my wife and I oppose any fracking anywhere, absolutely and unequivocally. We would also wish to suggest to our Parliamentary parties that if they wish, as they now seem to be saying that they do, to promote the UK as environmentally friendly then they should refuse to have any involvement in fracking on our shores
- There is obviously some derogation of duty by council members not to have come to a conclusion but it is terribly important that the decisions are made locally so I would urge that this matter is referred back to Shropshire for a definitive answer
- The comments from Natural England were inadequate and showed bias in favour of the project. Natural England have failed in their duty and should have been more supportive to the Councillors and helped them come to a conclusion. Natural England elsewhere have had strong opinions about other energy generation in rural areas with much less actual impact and this smacks of a biased executive at Natural England. I am aware that Councillors in the North of the county are split 50/50 on the pro's and con's but still they should have been more supported and should have voted

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	14/02078/FUL (Brookmill stables & maneage)	Officer
<p data-bbox="81 176 1449 286">Site visit to land at Brookmill, Hampton Wood, Penley, Shropshire On 12 February 2015 By Alan Bloor Of Reading Agricultural Consultants Ltd Beechwood Court Long Toll Woodcote, Reading RG8 0RR Reading Agricultural Consultants</p> <p data-bbox="81 322 256 360">13/02/2015</p> <p data-bbox="81 360 264 398">Introduction</p> <ol data-bbox="81 398 1449 1128" style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alan Bloor of Reading Agricultural Consultants Ltd (RAC) was instructed by Shropshire Council on 21st January to carry out a site visit on the land at Brookmill. The site visit was not carried out until 12 February due to holiday commitments. 2. RAC provided a desk-top report (dated 9th December 2014) to the Council which appraised the application (14/02078/FUL). 3. The desk-top report concluded that: "Overall, I consider this application does meet the requirements of the NPPF and local plan policies for the change of use from agricultural to equestrian, construction of a new stable block, manège and temporary siting of a mobile home". 4. Alan Bloor is an independent consultant in agriculture and rural land use, and an Associate Member of RAC. He holds a BSc Honours Degree from the University of Newcastle on Tyne and has been involved with agriculture for over thirty five years, and in private practice for fifteen years; he is a Member of the British Institute of Agricultural Consultants. He has a wealth of experience in managing agricultural livestock units and has been engaged by livestock farmers and local planning authorities to appraise a wide range of enterprises in the context of planning applications for new agricultural and horticultural, equestrian and other rural workers' dwellings; the change of use of agricultural buildings; diversification of farming enterprises; and the removal of agricultural occupancy conditions. He has expertise at appeals and in providing expert reports and as an expert witness. <p data-bbox="81 1128 512 1167">Comments following site visit</p> <ol data-bbox="81 1167 1449 2114" style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The number of horses on site at Brookmill totalled 18. These included 8 American Paint Brood Mares (in-foal due 2015), 1 stallion and 11 various youngsters and ponies. The applicant has nine other horses located of site on rented land and buildings at Stryt Llyden Farm. These include 4 thoroughbred brood mares (registered with Wetherbys) which are to be put in foal this year (to foal 2016) and covered by the applicant's American Paint Stallion. The applicant therefore has a total of 27 horses of which there are 12 brood mares. This is an increase in that reported in the RAC report (December 2014) which stated 6 brood mares. 6. The land at Brookmill is divided into a number of grazing paddocks. On inspection these totalled 24 paddocks. I would note that 4 of these paddocks were severely poached and would need to be rested, rolled and fertilised in the spring. This in my view represents approximately 17% of the site. The remaining paddocks were in varying conditions from being poached in the immediate area where the horses were fed and watered (in my view quite a natural occurrence) to being bare but others with varying degrees of grass growth and being ready for rolling and fertilising when weather conditions dictate. 7. On my inspection of the current drainage system it was clear that the applicant was taking steps to improve and reinstate the existing land drainage system over the land. Chambers were being located from the drainage map and cleaned and jet washed. I could only manually inspect one but was shown the location of two others. It is my understanding that further field drains are in the process of being incorporated into the existing system and that the two ditches to the north and south that border the application site are to be dug out. All these are land management issues and not a planning matter. There is no agricultural land classification that deems livestock cannot be kept on any land. There is a planning issue that relates to change of use from agriculture to equestrian which forms part of this application. 		

8. All the horses on site appeared to be fit and healthy. I understand from the applicant that she has had inspections from DEFRA, RSPCA and various equine veterinary surgeons and I am not aware of any adverse or negative comments or reports relating to the welfare of horses or conditions under which they are managed.

9. The applicant has a number of ponies which will be sold this spring and summer. It is my understanding that the applicant has two clients (one in Italy and one in Ireland) who are the likely buyers of these ponies. It is my understanding that these are likely to sell for between £2,500 and £3,500 each. These form part of the sales contained within the applicant's business plan. The applicant will be breeding from 12 brood mares. As I have previously stated the sustainability of the business and whether the business plan is sound can only be tested over a three year temporary three year period if planning permission is approved.

10 The manège and stable block will provide the exercise and stabling for 10 horses through the winter period. There are 24 paddocks on site which with rotation can sustain the other horses. It is my understanding the manège although being in a flood zone (on my site visit I would confirm is the wettest part of the site) would be considered appropriate development within all flood zones. The applicant has access to other grazing rented land and buildings which will provide additional accommodation and grazing land if and when required.

11. Following my site my overall view has not changed with regard to the planning application in that " I consider this application does meet the requirements of the NPPF and local plan policies for the change of use from agricultural to equestrian, construction of a new stable block, manège and temporary siting of a mobile home".

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
9	14/03995/OUT (Land off A49, Hadnall)	Cllr Simon Jones

I feel as the Parish Council are so strongly against the application for the planning reasons they have given, I must request that if you are recommending approval this application should not be a delegated decision but should go before the Committee for a decision.

I would hope that if the decision is to approve that consideration would be given to the Parish request that traffic lights be provided at the Station Road/A49 junction as a condition, in addition to the traffic calming and pedestrian crossing on the A49 currently being provided by Highways.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
10	14/03428/OUT (Aston Road, Wem)	Wem Rural Parish Council

The reference to the Parish Council in paragraphs 6.3.3 and 6.4.5 should refer to comments from the Town Council.

The Parish Council's response to this application was based solely on the impact it would have on the wellbeing of residents and local infrastructure of Wem Rural Parish.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
10	14/03428/OUT (Aston Road, Wem)	Council Archaeologist

The Council Archaeologist has confirmed that the applicant has now submitted any archaeological Desk Based Assessment. It is advised that the Desk Based Archaeological Assessment by Richard K Morriss and Associates that has now been submitted as part of the application provides a satisfactory level of information about the archaeological interest of the site in relation to Paragraph 128 of the NPPF. In line with Paragraph 141 of the NPPF and the recommendations contained within the Assessment, it is therefore advised that a phased programme of archaeological work should be a condition of any planning permission for the proposed development. This should comprise an initial pre-commencement programme of field walking, together with a watching brief within those parts of the sites where significance ground disturbance will occur (i.e. on access/estate roads and housing areas). An

appropriate condition would be:

No development approved by this permission shall commence until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a phased programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation (WSI). This written scheme shall be approved in writing by the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of works. Reason: The site is known to hold archaeological interest.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
10	14/03428/OUT (Aston Road, Wem)	Officer

7.3 of the conclusion should also seek a financial contribution towards changes to traffic management in the area of the railway crossing as detailed in the recommendation at the start of the report.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
11	14/04558/OUT (Wem Road, Shawbury)	Agent

The agent has confirmed that the additional noise survey is being undertaken week commencing 16th February

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
12	14/03957/FUL (Twemlows)	Applicant's agent

Further to the reference in para. 6.6.3 of the Committee report the applicant's agent has confirmed that the Skydive Tilstock Safety and Training Committee met on 5th February 2015, and unanimously agreed the following (summary):

The triangular shape and size of the area proposed as a change to the parachute landing area (PLA) is commensurate with that of the current PLA. However, the orientation has been rotated through 180°. The proposed PLA contained some minor hazards in the form of low wooden fences, and a small copse that runs part way down the Eastern side. The Chief Operating Officer had inspected the PLA and found it suitable for all categories of parachutists subject to provisos. These include the need to review the operation on a regular basis due to the proximity of the solar array.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
12	14/03957/FUL (Twemlows)	Agent

The applicant has emailed a letter dated 13th February 2015 to all Members of the North Planning Committee providing an update on the situation between the landowners and the Tilstock Parachute Club. A further copy is appended below.

13th February 2015

Solar farm at Twemlows Stud Farm (ref 14/03957/FUL)

We write in reference to the proposed solar farm at Twemlows Stud Farm being considered by the Planning Committee next week, to provide an update on the situation between the landowners and the Tilstock Parachute Club.

Concerns were raised some months ago with regards to the future operation of the Parachute Club should the solar farm be developed, and this was also the subject of a recent newspaper article. This note addresses this concern and clarifies the situation.

The landowners have a long-standing relationship with the Parachute Club and have supported the Club for many years. They have also provided financial support to the club during this time, allowing the continued use of the site largely based upon good faith.

Since the first initiations of the solar farm proposal, the landowners have been working with the Parachute Club to keep them informed at every stage of the process, and have made a continuous effort to accommodate them by offering alternative drop zones.

These drop zones have also been discussed with the British Parachute Association, who have deemed the suggested drop zone viable for tandem jumping, qualified jumpers and student jumpers; with the only restriction being that there may be only one student drop at a time. This will mean that **there will be no material restriction on the types of jumps carried out at the site, allowing the solar farm and the Parachute Club to coexist side by side without curtailing jumping activities.**

In addition to this, vogt solar Ltd has offered to make a financial contribution to the Parachute Club from the solar farm community benefit fund in order to help repair the hard-surfaced runway. This will reduce the overall costs for the Club.

Members of the Parachute Club have been informed by the Club owner about the plans to implement an alternative drop zone and that the Club no longer objects to the solar farm application. We understand that the recent newspaper article references concerns that were raised in autumn 2014, which no longer apply. Following the publication of this article, the owner of the Parachute Club telephoned the landowners to confirm that the article was out-dated and does not reflect the current views of the Club.

The landowners will continue to work with the Parachute Club to ensure both the solar farm and the Club are successful. We look forward to supporting them with this.

I hope this is a useful update. If you have any questions prior to the Planning Committee meeting, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours faithfully,

Paul Homes—Ling and James Stone

| vogt solar Ltd

| 01273 615273

This page is intentionally left blank