

Updates for DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
– 5th April 2023

Item	Updates	Page No
1. 2022/1803	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further EHO consultation response received: No objections raised to review of Air Quality Assessment and the revised Light Impact Assessment (subject to the changes / improvements to the existing site which would reduce the risk of obtrusive light). <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further comments received from Hemphall Parish Council (from both Cllr Andy Driver and Cllr David Hook), which has already been sent to Committee members as lobbying material. General comments made (size, light and noise pollution, wildlife / biodiversity, traffic increase, impact to public footpaths, industrial scale development, visual impact, drainage / irrigation, Caravan numbers, habitat impact) which re-iterate previous representation. <p>Officer response:</p> <p>No specific comments necessary as matters raised have been considered in the report.</p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further lobbying material from neighbour at Meadow Farm (listed dwelling to the north of the site). General comments made which generally re-iterate previous representation. <p>Neighbour also queries why so many outstanding points (such as landscaping, biodiversity, lighting,</p>	18

	<p>forklifts / machinery operation, biomass boiler) are dealt with by condition.</p> <p>Suggestion that the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVIA) is incorrect, and a full new assessment should be undertaken. As it refers to the existing reservoir.</p> <p>Suggestion that none of the commercial or social benefits will be realised locally.</p> <p>Suggestion that the hedgerows and existing landscaping to Meadow Farm is not sufficient in its relationship to the proposal. Disagree with conclusions of the Heritage Appraisal. Suggestion that LVIA should have taken views from the garden of Meadow House looking south rather than from Silver Green.</p> <p>Screening is suggested to destroy existing views enjoyed from the Public Footpath through and adjacent to the site.</p> <p>If approved, requested that hours of operation and lighting must be conditioned to respect the local community.</p> <p>Refuted that the increased size will not see an increase in vehicle movements on the highway. Again, if approved condition requested to keep movements at / below existing levels.</p> <p>Officer response:</p> <p>The points raised are already referenced in the report.</p> <p>The LVIA does clearly refer to this as the 'Greenhouse scheme'. Admittedly it was noted that the mapping used on p2 did show the earlier reservoir plan, however the blue line showed the site extent and it was clearly a minor cartographic anomaly where</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>amendment of the mapping was not deemed necessary.</p> <p>The landscaping on the southern boundary of Meadow Farm is one of a number of sections of landscaping running across this site. It is still considered that this landscaping, assessed also from the site looking north too, is sufficient to adequately screen the site.</p> <p>Impacts upon views of the Public Footpaths are considered in the report. It is considered that the greening of the routes will add some interest.</p> <p>Conditions on matters of lighting for instance are already included for recommendation.</p> <p>It is considered unreasonable and inappropriate to restrict movements of traffic further to the Highways consultation. Similarly, hours of operation given the existing site operation and nature of the work undertaken. Additionally, conditions have been recommended on aspects of amenity (machinery / forklift controls) where necessary.</p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further lobbying material received from District Councillor Michael Edney, who can't attend the Committee meeting but wishes to raise additional comment. <p>Wishes to highlight objection points again in so far as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic - Drainage - Loss of green fields - Constant noise - Constant light - Destruction of habitat for flora and fauna <p>He further states this is an industrial sized development affecting residents.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Noise and plant movements a concern increased threefold. Forklift truck a concern as is that of helicopter movements into the site by the owner.</p> <p>Considers the site is currently over-developed. Foul water and drainage pressures exist locally. Offers no local employment. Offers no local employment, operated by EU workforce housed in caravans. If approved, workforce would need to be increased and subsequently more parties at weekends would occur.</p> <p>The area has dark skies but would be permanently lit by greenhouses.</p> <p>Strawberries are not grown in the ground and thus the operation should be elsewhere where better roads and water pressure exist.</p> <p>To summarise, the application will choke the roads, destroy verges, damage flora and fauna, fill sky with light, blight residents with industrial scale noise, with good agricultural land wasted to manufacture strawberries.</p> <p>He asks the Committee to not approve the application.</p> <p>Officer response:</p> <p>The points raised are already referenced in the report.</p> <p>Additionally it is irritated that the irrigation will not be drawn from water company but instead is undertaken via the reservoir as feed through harvested rainwater and the other existing lagoons on site.</p>	
2. 2022/0835	No updates	43

3. 2022/1890	No updates	51
4. 2022/1995	No updates	61
5. 2022/2388	<p>Letter from Richard Bacon MP:</p> <p>Further letter of support.</p> <p>Mr Furness has made serious efforts to address the concerns raised by the committee in respect of his previous application 222/1548 and I continue to take the view that this small scale building by local people is precisely the type of development we need to see ore of.</p>	77