SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS

Date: 1st August 2017

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:
7	17/01360/REM	Case officer

Since this application states that it seeks approval of landscaping, alongside the other reserved matters, an amended block plan which includes landscaping details has now been submitted for consideration (drawing No. 48083/17/02 Rev. C). This shows the retention and repair of an existing post-and-wire fence along the roadside (west) boundary, the erection of similar fences to the south and east, and a new timber gate between post-and-rail fencing to enclose the north end of the plot. It also shows the removal of three existing trees at the north end, which are poor specimens covered in ivy. Although no replacement or supplementary planting is proposed, officers agree with the applicant's agent that the site's mature woodland backdrop is sufficient to soften the outline of the development, and that specimen trees would not take well on the site itself as it is mainly of hardstanding below the surface vegetation.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
9	17/01387/FUL	Case Officer

Correction to description. The description of development should read:

'Erection of five bungalows for social housing (Amended Description)'

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
10	17/03071/TEL	Diddlebury Parish Council

Diddlebury Parish Council considered this application at its meeting last night and now comments as follows.

In drafting this response the Parish Council has considered the objections and concerns raised by Diddlebury residents and has considered the Development Management Report drafted by planning officer Mr. Tim Rogers, which will form the basis of the Southern Planning Committee's decision at its consideration of this application on Tuesday 1st August 2017. We note his recommendation is that permission should be granted as Prior Approval is Not Required due to government legislation (which is set out in his report) and on the financial implications of refusing permission.

In his report Mr Rogers fairly sets out the views of the Parish Council when it considered this matter as a pre-planning application on 17th May 2017 and he sets out at length the concerns of the headmaster and teachers of Corvedale Primary School, which is located 240 metres from the proposed mast. He also sets out the concerns and scientific data put forward by local residents, particularly those of The Moors who will be living – with some 25 children in total – within 80 metres of this proposed mast.
Despite the very evident health and safety concerns of the inhabitants of Diddlebury, Mr Rogers has been constrained in his decision by government policy which he sets out at paragraph 6.3.2 of his Report, vis:

"Local planning authorities must determine applications on planning grounds. They should not seek to prevent competition between different operators, question the need for the telecommunications systems or determine health safeguards if the proposal meets International Commission guidelines for public exposure."

It is evident that the government requires planning authorities to completely disregard human health factors and the genuine concerns of the electorate, in stark contrast to the protection it will afford to reptiles, amphibians, hedgehogs, newts and bats (see Appendix 1 of the report).

DPC strongly oppose this application based on the grounds of overwhelming public concern despite the approved health acceptance rating and the consequences that this concern could have on the future viability of the local primary school and feeling of wellbeing for the residence of the village, especially those living in the affordable housing in The Moors, due to their proximity to the proposed mast. This is compounded by the fact that no real alternative sites have been explored where the above fears and concerns could be alleviated despite the existence of these sites and in one case the apparent willingness of the landowner to accept a mast.

A second strand of opposition is based on the negative impact that the visibility of the mast will have in an area renowned for its scenic attraction to visitors.

DPC strongly supports the principle of the erection of a mast to improve reception but feel that its placement should fit in with the wishes of the local community. It would urge Shropshire Council to look beyond the principle of permitted development and prior approval not being needed, to support the local community in this.

Item No.	**Application No.**	**Originator:**
10	17/03071/TEL	Third Party Objector

Additional comments to be added to previous objection regarding the SC Conservation (Historic Environment): -

- Trees would only partially screen the mast and only in the summer/early autumn.
- Telegraph poles are 5m high the mast would be 15m high.
- The photomontages are unclear and taken with wide angle lens settings – would challenge the authenticity of the images as they don't provide a realistic impression of the impact.
- Who provides the Conservation document – Did they visit the site.
- The mast is under the canopy of the mature oak tree, has the development been considered in accordance with British Standard BS5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations, and details of this submitted to the Local Planning Authority with the planning application.'

Item No.	**Application No.**	**Originator:**
10	17/03071/TEL	Third Party Objectors

4 further objections received reiterating previous objectors points, in particular

- The siting near the school and housing is wrong.
- There are many fields away from housing where it could be situation.
- Already have enough traffic on the estate due to the water station at the end.

- Cars already get hit by lorries when attending the water plant.
- There are many children and babies on the estate and this will put them at risk.
- Out of keeping with the village, conservation area and surrounding countryside.
- Do not know the long term effects on health and if a mast is required there must be a more suitable location in Diddlebury Parish.
- The 800MHz frequency band used is the most highly penetrative of the cell-net range – not good news for those with young bones and developing neurological systems.
- The Council in allowing residents and a school 24 hour exposure to microwave radiation are inviting unlimited litigation and individual prosecution.

Item No.	**Application No.**	**Originator:**
10	17/03071/TEL	Case Officer

Correction to section 2 (Site Location/Description) sub paragraph 2.1 first sentence – The size of the compound should read 49sqm not 14sqm.