

**CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS**

Date: 01 May 2014

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:
6.	14/01105/FUL Land Adj Field House	Neighbour

I am really worried about the access for the new houses being built, and about to be built on land adjacent to Field House, Shepherds Lane, Bicton. Three houses are being built, and planning is in for six more, which will mean that access for nine houses, (at least eighteen cars), will enter Shepherds lane, about 50 yards from a major cross roads. This cross roads has been the site of many accidents, including fatalities, the latest accident being just yesterday. One car on its side Police and ambulances called. Many children use this lane, as does the school bus, which picks them up and drops them off each day. As I have said, this junction will just make it worse. Please help.

6.	14/01105/FUL Land Adj Field House	Agent
----	-----------------------------------	-------

I have visited the neighbour Gordon Wallach this morning, and we have agreed to:

1. move plot No.9 a further 1m east away from the Field House annexe extension
2. move plot No.9 a further 1m north from the Field House garden boundary (the shared boundary with plot No.8 and 9)
3. add a further fence of 1.8m high along the boundary with Field House set behind the existing post and rail fence along the shared boundary with plot No.8 and 9

I attach an amended plan showing this detail and I would ask that this is presented to the Planning Committee tomorrow.

I have copied into this email Mr Wallach for his information.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	14/00328/EIA Bank House Poultry, Yockleton	Environment Agency

The Environment Agency confirms that they have removed their objection. Their comments are summarised below.

Odour:

We agree with the modelled results in the odour assessment report which indicate that odour during the crop cycle is unlikely to cause annoyance. This of course assumes the units will be well managed and odour is actually consistent with the emission rates modelled – there is no reason to assume this would not be the case.

The consultant has provided additional clarification on the frequency and duration of clean out. We note that the sheds will be cleaned out in one day and this will take “2 hours per shed”. This will occur “7.6 times per year”. We also note that the proposed sheds will be some 420m from the nearest sensitive receptor, however, for completeness; the installation boundary as identified by the Environmental Permit will also include the existing sheds which are within 400m of the nearest sensitive receptor.

The Odour Assessment Technical Note has used a higher odour emission rate which is considered to be representative of 'end of crop cycle'. This would be considered worst case for odour emissions from the crop cycle. We note that this rate has been used throughout the model and is unlikely to cause annoyance. The report acknowledges the odour could be four times greater during clean out than the normal operational scenario. Based on our present understanding complaints are therefore likely during clean out. However, whilst an options appraisal could better inform the most suitable technical option, we acknowledge clean out occurs infrequently "4 hours for 7.6 times per year", in this instance we have had regard to the distance to the nearest sensitive receptor and the predominate wind direction.

The e-mail from the Consultant does suggest some control measures which could be used to reduce the likelihood of odour annoyance during these essential work periods, which will be secured through the Environmental Permit (EP).

It should be noted the operator will be required to have an Odour Management Plan (OMP), controlled as part of the EP, to reduce odour emissions from the site. However, this still may not necessarily prevent all odours at levels likely to cause annoyance; and the OMP requirement is often a reactive measure where substantiated complaints are encountered. The OMP can reduce the likelihood of odour pollution but is unlikely to prevent odour pollution when residents are in proximity to the units and there is a reliance on air dispersion to dilute odour to an acceptable level.

It is likely that we would be in a position to grant an EP, without prejudice, based on the information provided. This would include an OMP to be implemented and a reactive condition to address any substantiated complaints in the future.

Biomass Boilers:

The proposed biomass boilers would be regulated under the future EP as a source of emission. We understand that two 199kW biomass boilers are proposed. Based on the capacity of the biomass boilers and the proximity of the site to designated sites, we will not require a quantitative assessment of air emissions in this instance. In the context of both of our organisations role as 'competent authority' under the terms of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010), we trust that the above gives you sufficient reassurances in coming to a decision under your role as 'competent authority' in the planning process.

Surface Water Drainage:

We note that the applicant has submitted additional information confirming that the proposed drainage scheme is designed to provide storage for a 1 in 100 year event plus a 20% allowance for climate change. We would leave the detail of this for consideration by the Council's Flood and Water Management team, as the Lead Local Flood Authority.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
8.	14/00743/OUT Land West of Bryn Road, The Mount Shrewsbury	Officer response to letter objecting to procedure

The application was advertised as a Departure in the Shropshire Star on the 22nd April 2014 for a 21 day period expiring on the 13th May 2014. In accordance with the publicity requirements are set out in Section 13 Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010/2184. There is a requirement in Section 28 of the Order to take the representations received into account before the application is determined. A letter of objection has been received claiming that the Council would not be adequately taking any representations into account as the matter has been referred to committee prior to the deadline for receipt of representations. However, the application

will not be determined by the Committee rather a resolution will be granted subject to no new material considerations being raised and this would not breach Section 28 of the Act. Officers would discuss any new material planning objections with the Committee Chair and Vice Chair who in consultation with Officers would confirm whether the application could be determined as a delegated item or would have to be referred back to Members to consider the new material planning objections. However it should be clarified that the application has already been advertised as a Major in a Conservation Area in the Shropshire Star on the 4th March for a 21 day period expiring on the 25th March 2014 in addition to a Site Notice displayed on and expiring on the same day; as such the additional advertisement is to publicise the application as a Departure only.

In addition a letter has been received from The Mount Resident's Group requesting that the application site be considered as Local Green Space. Officers were aware of the request and addressed this within paragraph 6.3.8 of the Committee Report.