

SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE**SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS****Date: 14 March 2023**

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. 8	Application No. 22/05221/FUL	Originator: MD
	<p>Tong PC – Objects to the application and lack of information available to them. (This relates to personal circumstances and cannot be divulge due to data protection). The PC have have requested determination of the application be deferred as they consider that they have been given insufficient time to consider the report and seek professional advice from publication.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Site is Green Belt and development is inappropriate and contrary to NPPF and Local Plan Policy, personal circumstances should not outweigh this.• Concerned at 12 month temporary consent as not logical decision• The PC then lists a number of questions it feels need to be addressed before the application can be determined. These are as follows:<ol style="list-style-type: none">i. The names, ages and gypsy status of all those persons who are intended to be accommodated in the proposed caravans. The proposal is for four static and four touring vans and it would appear that the children and the family member who is in need of medical assistance will be leaving the site to travel at various times in the year.ii. The current addresses of all the persons who will occupy the caravans, how long they have resided there and a brief explanation of why that accommodation is unsuitable for their future needs. The Parish Council does not know any of this detail, but is aware that, when the applicant purchased the application site, she had addresses at two brick-built addresses, one in Hatfield and one in Sutton Coldfield.iii. What steps the Council Officers have taken to verify the claims made by the applicant. For instance:	

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>a. The ages of the children and how long they expect to remain at the Primary School in Shifnal and their attendance record.</p> <p>b. What medical assistance is required by the family member(s) concerned and why such assistance can be better provided in an isolated rural location rather than in say Telford where assistance is readily available. This might help explain why four dual-caravan pitches are required.</p> <p>iv. Why the Council would feel it appropriate to attempt to limit the period of occupation of the proposed caravans to twelve months, on the basis of the personal circumstances provided, when that will mean the applicant and/or the family members purchasing the caravans and providing drainage etc. and moving the member who is in need of medical assistance from his/her current accommodation only to be uprooted again in just 12 months' time.</p> <p>v. What steps the Council has taken to verify the applicant's claims that there are no other sites available to them. The application does not provide a list of sites that might be suitable that have been surveyed which are publicly and privately owned or sites which might be suitable but which perhaps do not at present enjoy planning permission- the application site does not have permission but seems to be regarded as suitable. It is highly unlikely that there are no other such sites in the County or in Telford and Wrekin Council's area that are not located in the Green Belt. This information might have been supplied along with the personal information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The PC then go on to express concern around proposed conditions in particular the temporary and personal restrictions. They also express concern about the landscaping requirement. However, it needs to be remembered that this is a retrospective application, so the development has already taken place, so the objective of the conditions is to mitigate and control. | |
|--|---|--|

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that ownership certificate maybe incorrect as it includes the restricted byway. • The PC have pointed out that the site is covered by a restrictive covenant but have provided no details of what this relates too. <p>Cllr Ed Bird – Has reiterated his objection and his support for the views expressed by the Parish Council.</p> <p>Cllr Kevin Turley – Wishes to express his support for the application. I see a family trying to do their best for the children. The children are in Shifnal Primary school and are getting a education. As a council Shropshire I feel doesn't have enough travellers' sites and feel we need to look greater at trying to do more. Please think for the children and give them a chance of an education.</p>	
Item No.	Application No. 22/01816/FUL	Originator: RE
5	<p>Nick Barber – Infraland (Supports) Submission of the adopted Highway Plan confirming the extent</p> <p>M Brooks – Objection The openness and landscape will be severely affected; the developer has submitted plans to totally screen the land off from all view as a mitigation measure. The proposal would be at odds with one of the purposes of the Green Belt, it would erode its openness and harm the Green belt. The applicant states the proposal is temporary development for 40 years. 40 years is classed as long-term harm according to previous decisions by the secretary of state on similar proposals, limited weight should be given to the temporary nature. The creation of 9 acres of fruit trees and sheep grazing cannot outweigh the loss of BMV land in the planning balance. There are no new jobs or economic benefit been created with this project. The proposal does not support the rural local economy.</p> <p>Sarah Dakin – Objection Requested to Speak</p> <p>Evidence Submitted within appendices of :</p>	

	<p>Extent of Highway</p> <p>Map Detailing Wildwood Alapca Farm</p> <p>Battery Energy Storage Systems BESS Using Li-ion Batteries</p> <p>Ian Lines, Atkins Ltd of Harazard Assessment of Battery Energy Storage Systems</p> <p>Dr Edmund Fordham MA PhD CPhys CEng FInstP Hazardous Substances potentially generated in loss of control incidents in Li-ion Battery Energy Storage Systems – requirements for HSC at capacities up to 50Mwh</p> <p>Mrs Y Rowe – objects Impact on GB and impact on access to Wildwood Alpacas</p> <p>Miss M Ball – objects Impact on Wildwood Alpacas, concerns over highway impact and HGVs on County Lane.</p>	
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	22/04625/FUL	Member of public (Mrs Janette Moss)
<p>In response to Mr Matthew Middleton's comment of Wed 15 Feb 2023: I would like the planning committee to be aware that Mr Middleton's comments do not reflect the content of the boundary agreement and its attached plan (including very clear legend), which shows in detail that the area of land, "which encompasses the current hedge, plus two existing oak trees" including its minimum height and width is within the title boundary of the Grove and as such is the sole responsibility of its owners. As such, our solicitor has been in touch with Mr Middleton as clearly this is a civil disagreement. However, we would like the planning committee to be aware of this.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	22/02441/FUL	SC Highways
<p>SC Highways do not raise an objection. The applicant has demonstrated that a satisfactory access can be provided. Recommend a Construction Management and Decommissioning plan to include detail of routing of vehicles and a further condition relating to the means of access.</p>		