



Date: Tuesday, 30 November 2021

Time: 2.00 pm

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

Contact: Tim Ward / Ashley Kendrick, Committee Officer
Tel: 01743 257713 / 01743 250893
Email: tim.ward@shropshire.gov.uk / ashley.kendrick@shropshire.gov.uk

SOUTHERN 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: 30 November 2021 | | |
| 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 | 17/01033/EIA Footbridge Farm | Public objections |
| <p>Twenty three public objections received since publication of the Committee Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Officers are not listening to logic or reason, our planet, the climate emergency, the science, the public, their own policies; not looking beyond what the developer is telling them - Factory farms are the world’s climate culprits, they devastate wildlife habitats and displace local communities, devour fossil fuels to produce fertilisers; releasing 45% of total agricultural emissions to the atmosphere - Will cause forests to be ripped down to plant crops for animal feed, releasing carbon into atmosphere - Shropshire has largest number of poultry units in any county in England - Paragraph 6.6.6 of the report to the planning committee says that there is no evidence to dispute the data provided by the applicant. There is perfectly reasonable (independent) data provided by DEFRA which is evidence to clearly 'dispute the applicant's data' - object to the attempts to play down the impact on the gardens at The Leasowes; the property has a large land area but the majority of this land is let to the adjoining farmer, leaving the area you highlight as a small corner of the Leasowes garden as being the area which we pass through when we walk the dog 4 or 5 times a day. It is not therefore some disused corner, but a part of the garden where we, as a couple, currently actively enjoy our land, which will be impacted should this scheme proceed; assuming that the odour modelling is correct, the likely impact is going to be worse than the 2% of the time that you indicate. - Under your own policies Shropshire Council should be protecting Listed Buildings and their gardens, not chipping away at their usability. - no mitigation for the affects of ammonia on our ancient oak trees, some of which have been around for more than 200 years. - Members are advised to pay heed to: their own policies; the voices of the public; the reservations of climate scientists and impending climate catastrophe; environmental concerns; health implications; - consequences of water and air pollution have been highlighted by the Government; our own MP as Chairman of the Environmental Audit Committee has also raised concerns; sewage going into the rivers has hit the headlines; in the rural areas the results of agriculture are more culpable; madness to add to already high numbers of IPU's in South Shropshire with Avian Flu on the increase; River Corve is of poor quality and the Clun has been threatened by more poultry units; officers are steadfastly driving the application through and imposing it on a community and planet that doesn't want or need it; Shropshire has the largest number of industrial poultry units in any county in England; factory farming is winning while our climate and wildlife suffers - IPU's don't admit to their full carbon footprint of supply chains for feed and fuel, and fail to acknowledge animal welfare issues - National mood is towards a more plant-based diet and consuming less poultry and meat | | |

Tasley Action Group

- A decision to refuse can be supported under adopted and draft policies; little has changed since previous decision; applicant hasn't accounted for 100% of manure; installation of scrubbers shows that the original design was wrong; effectiveness of scrubber technology open to question and is environmentally unsustainable; use highly concentrated sulphuric acid and produce highly toxic waste; Environmental Permit does not cover effects of increased human antibiotic resistance or transfer of highly pathogenic avian influenza viruses from poultry to humans or emissions of deadline PM2.5 particulates, or unacceptable odours and toxic 'dust' outside the site boundary or effects of storing, transporting and disposing of manure; EA's systemic failure to control pollution from permitted intensive farming sites; Shropshire's planning guidance says too many intensive livestock units in the county; would provide minimum employment; would cost Bridgnorth hundreds of jobs relating to tourism, visitors and investors; scrubbers won't reduce odour; untreated emissions will be blasted into atmosphere; views from Listed Building would be lost forever; each shed would be the size of a football pitch; scrubbers would be size of two buses on top of each other; don't know how much manure, its destination or where the digestate will be deposited; would emit 7 tonnes of ammonia every year; scrubbers would not run all the time; don't know where its waste would go

| Item No. | Application No. | Originator: |
|----------|---|-----------------------|
| 6 | 18/02384/FUL Affordable dwelling north of Jays Farm, Hope Bagot | Applicant's Solicitor |

I write in relation to the recommendation to refuse planning permission because of the lack of progress on the section 106 agreement. This application first came before the committee on 18 December 2018 and members resolved to grant planning permission subject to the completion of a section 106 agreement. The decision to grant permission was partly based on the needs of the applicant, who is disabled and who needed to find affordable housing for himself. The applicant and his father, part owner of the wider property known as Jays Farm, have been working with the Council's housing department in this regard.

The wording of section 106 agreement has been agreed with the Council's legal department and the agreement has been executed and sealed. The Council's legal fees have also been paid. The outstanding issues relates to the charges on the property, which are a charge in favour of Lloyds Bank plc dated 11 August 2008 and a second charge dated of 26 May 2008 in favour of Natalie Vivienne Shingler.

The landowners and us, their solicitors, assumed that the charges could be removed from the application site thereby dispensing with the need for the chargees to enter into the section 106 agreement. In respect of 2008 charge, Ms Shingler has signed a property form, DS3, to release the application site from the charge. The signed DS3 has been passed to the Council solicitor. However Shropshire Council requires the land registry title to be updated to reflect this release before the agreement can be completed without the need for Ms Shingler to enter into the agreement.

Our conveyancing solicitors submitted an application to the land registry to update the title on 21 July 2021 but the land registry did not progress the application. On 13 November 2021, after receiving notice of this meeting, they applied for the land registry to expedite the application.

I called the land registry on 29 November 2021 for an update. They confirmed that they started the updating/registration process on 13 November and on the same date wrote to Ms Shingler asking if she had any objections to the updating of the title. They are giving her 15 working days to respond and have advised that, if there are no objections from her, they should be able to update the title in the week of the 6 December. I have sent all relevant documentation in respect of the original application and the application to expedite to the Council solicitor.

In relation to 2004 charge, the landowner had hoped to raise funds to pay Lloyds the underlying loan and redeem the mortgage. The landowner has considered various options including applying for equity releases and selling off other parts of Jays Farm. Since being informed of the officer's intention to recommend refusal of the application at this meeting, the landowner has made us a further application for equity release to for funds to repay the loan to Lloyds Bank.

In the meantime, I have contacted Lloyds Bank and they have agreed to sign the section 106 agreement as long it contains their mortgagee clause. I have sent the clause and the revised draft of the section 106 agreement to the Council solicitor, which includes Lloyds as a party, for approval, subject to the decision of members on 29 November 2021. Apart from the inclusion of Lloyds bank, the draft is identical to the draft which has been approved, executed and sealed.

In light of the above we would respectfully ask the committee to postpone consideration of this item until the next southern planning committee on 11 January 2022 by which date the section 106 agreement should be completed. This is because the issues above are capable of resolution within a relatively short period but it will take a number of weeks to re-engross and circulate the document for execution, sealing and completion, assuming members and the Council solicitor agree this course of action.

In the meantime, the applicant is still living with his parents and is disabled. It is therefore necessary for members to consider carefully the impact of refusing the application on the applicant because of his disability. Re-applying or appealing would cause particular difficulty for the applicant at this time as we are instructed that he has just been diagnosed with a further medical condition and both of his parents are suffering from medical conditions and currently either in and out of hospital as outpatients or inpatients.

Members will appreciate from the information above that the delays have not been caused by the applicant. The delays been due to matters out of the applicant's control including delay from the land registry and the landowner's attempts to resolve financial issues which relate to the wider site.

I have taken instructions regarding the marketing of the application site and I understand that this was due to a misunderstanding between the landowner and the agents. The intention was to market other parts of the site and not the application site.

| | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| Item No. | Application No. | Originator: |
| | | |
| Item No. | Application No. | Originator: |

| | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Item No. | Application No. | Originator: |
| | | |
| | | |
| Item No. | Application No. | Originator: |
| | | |
| | | |
| Item No. | Application No. | Originator: |
| | | |
| | | |
| Item No. | Application No. | Originator: |
| | | |
| | | |

This page is intentionally left blank