

## **NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 29 SEPTEMBER 2010**

### **UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION NO:** 10/02729M

**LOCATION** Land at Ullard Hall Lane, Plumley

**UPDATE PREPARED** 27 September 2010

### **APPLICANTS SUBMISSION**

A letter from the applicant has been sent to all Members of the Committee and copied into officers. The letter provides a background to the applicant and to the application.

### **REPRESENTATIONS**

Information has also been sent to Members from Mr Steve Wade, one of the objectors to the proposal. The submitted information relates to the viability of the proposed business and to the submitted business plan. Additionally a number of articles regarding egg production have also been provided. Most of the information has already been submitted to the Council and was considered at the time of writing the original report, with the exception of some of the attached articles.

### **CONSULTATIONS**

The views of the Council's tree officer are still awaited and will be reported to Members as a verbal update at Committee.

### **OFFICER APPRAISAL**

It is not considered that any of the newly submitted information raises any new issues that have not been considered within the original report. As stated in the original report, the erection of new agricultural buildings in the Green Belt is considered acceptable in principle and is permitted by PPG2 and Local Plan policy GC1. The Council has appointed an independent agricultural consultant to assess the proposal and he has concluded that the building proposed is not excessive for the needs of the business and that the enterprise is expected to be profitable at a level which gives appropriate remuneration to its principals and a return on investment. Therefore, notwithstanding the submitted views of third parties, it is not considered that objections can be raised on the basis that what is proposed would not be viable.

Whilst in the opinion of the independent agricultural consultant, the siting of the proposed building is not in the optimal position in terms of operational

efficiency, it is considered to be in the optimal position in order to minimise its visual impact on the landscape. It is a relatively large building, but as stated it is considered designed for and fit for purpose. It will have an impact on openness due to its size and its isolated position. However, in this case, this is not considered to be a determinative factor given that the building is not inappropriate and given that it is proposed to condition the colour and materials of the building and associated structures (silos) and given that the proposal is accompanied by an extensive landscaping scheme which proposes 300m of new hedgerow and 500 new trees. The Council's landscape officer considers that the building proposed could be accommodated without appearing excessively large or intrusive.

As outlined in the original report, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in all other regards and it would not adversely impact on residential amenity, highway safety, ecological issues or on nearby public rights of way. Therefore subject to the views of the Council's tree officer, a recommendation of approval subject to conditions remains.

## **OTHER MATTERS**

Concern has been raised that there is some confusion as to which parish the site is located within given that the address indicates that it is located in Plumley. For the avoidance of doubt, the application site lies wholly in the parish of Lower Peover and is adjacent to the parish of Plumley.

## **NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 29 SEPTEMBER 2010**

### **UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION NO:** 10/02744M

**LOCATION** Land at Ullard Hall Lane, Plumley

**UPDATE PREPARED** 27 September 2010

### **APPLICANTS SUBMISSION**

A letter from the applicant has been sent to all Members of the Committee and copied into officers. The letter provides a background to the applicant and to the application.

### **CONSULTATIONS**

The views of the Council's tree officer are still awaited and will be reported to Members as a verbal update at Committee.

### **OFFICER APPRAISAL**

No new information has been received that raises any new issues not already considered in the original committee report. The original recommendation of approval subject to conditions therefore remains.

As stated in the original report, it is considered that the proposal meets the required functional and financial tests as set out in Annex A of PPS7 and in Local Plan policy DC24.

### **OTHER MATTERS**

Concern has been raised that there is some confusion as to which parish the site is located within given that the address indicates that it is located in Plumley. For the avoidance of doubt, the application site lies wholly in the parish of Lower Peover and is adjacent to the parish of Plumley.

## **NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 29 SEPTEMBER 2010**

### **UPDATE TO AGENDA**

APPLICATION NO: 10/3116M

**LOCATION: THE CARAVAN SITE, ELM BEDS FARM, ELM BEDS ROAD, POYNTON, SK12 1TG**

**PROPOSAL: REMOVAL / VARIATION OF CONDITIONS ATTACHED TO APPLICATION 5/5/5116 SITE FOR CARAVANS AT ELM BEDS FARM POYNTON APPROVED 20.06.61 TO EXTEND THE OPENING PERIOD TO 10.5 MONTHS EACH YEAR**

**UPDATE PREPARED: 27 SEPTEMBER 2010**

### **REPRESENTATIONS**

4 No. additional letters of objection have been received since the preparation of the updated Committee Report; bringing the total number of letters received to 14.

The additional letters re-iterate concerns already raised, which have been summarised within the body of the committee report. Other concerns raised are in respect of the following:

- The monitoring of the caravan park by Environmental Health is insufficient. The 24 hours notice gives the “residents” sufficient time to vacate the site
- The site is being used for residential use
- Drainage problems
- Generation of additional noise & pollution
- The field at the rear has tents in it – this is a change of use
- Utilities in the area are poor such as the electricity supply, this proposal will overload the system leading to power cuts
- There is no demand for tourist accommodation in Winter months

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The principle of the development has been discussed within the Committee Report. The additional representations are noted. Members will need to carefully consider the additional objections raised.

There is no change to the recommendation of refusal.