

Amendment Sheet

---

**10/2006/017**

Withdrawn.

---

**19/2006/020**

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY raises no objection and recommends that condition be imposed regarding visibility splay.

11 LETTERS OF SUPPORT have been received on grounds of modest development on brownfield site that fits in.

The existing access is used for the new dwelling. The splay requirements would require significant hedgerow loss. Proposal considered acceptable as submitted.

Additional condition re no additional vehicular access to highway.

Additional notes re culvert and watercourse and Wessex Water sewer,

---

**20/2006/017**

Withdrawn

---

## **25/2006/012**

As amended by letter dated 11th August, 2006 with accompanying drawing No. CP-11/02.

DRAINAGE OFFICER whilst happy in principle with the outline details provided regarding land drainage matters, the following need to be resolved at an early stage. Details are required showing where boundaries of responsibility and maintenance matters lie for the proposed surface water attenuation system and should be clearly defined. With regards to the proposed attenuation ponds and swales within public open space areas, commuted sums will be required for any on-going maintenance regime.

Following the receipt of the Environment Agency's consultation response, the applicants consultants have had further discussions to address their comments. Amended plans propose a reinforced earth embankment rather than gabions to provide a 'softer' solution. Consultants confirm that the play area will be located above the agreed flood level. The commercial balancing pond will be maintained by a private management company. It is likely that the applicants will be seeking that TDBC become responsible for the northern balancing pond as public open space. Consultants have explained that it is not possible to remove the length of culvert immediately north of the railway as this is required for access to the ecological area and the communications mast. This has been agreed with the Environment Agency.

The consultants confirm that the slope separating the play area from the Back Stream open space is an existing embankment that will be landscaped, but not substantially altered in profile or position (grade approximately 1:3). They confirm that proper consideration will be given to protection at the top of this embankment during the detailed design of the play area to the neighbouring residential property, and the nature of any boundary treatment proposed, will need to be given careful consideration.

---

## **38/2006/237**

As amended by letter and plan No. 1406/2B received 7th August, 2006.

Amend description to 11 flats.

Amended description:- Subject to no representations raising new issues by 23rd August, and subject to a Section 106 Agreement ... (as printed).

---

**38/2006/274**

As amended by plan No. 1023-01A received 8th August, 2006.

2 No. velux omitted from north elevation and replaced with 1 No. second floor window in the western gable.

Correction:- 1st paragraph of report should read Gladstone Street.

---

**41/2006/007**

Agricultural consultants report commissioned on behalf of Tolland residents attached to this report.

COUNTY ARCHAEOLOGIST (further response) – previous response sent out in error. The proposal is very likely to impact on an archaeological site recognised through aerial photographs as a series of crop mark enclosures. Following PPG16 and local plan policy, advises that there should be proper recording of any remains affected by the development. Recommend that the applicant be required to provide archaeological monitoring of the development and a report on any discoveries made. This should be secured by the use of model condition 55.

5 FURTHER LETTERS OF OBJECTION have been received raising the following issues:- no difference to the previous proposal that was rejected, other than it will make the visual impact from the Brompton Ralph direction much worse; will be a mega excrescence on a beautiful landscape; this is an industrial proposal, not a farming one – it is a proposal to build a factory in the heart of what remains of the countryside; bound to be a precursor of repeated proposals for expansion on the grounds of ‘minimum economic size’; question whether will be free-range; size of the proposed buildings; plans do not show the position of the necessary 6 m high feed silos; widened access will open up unrestricted views of buildings; submitted cross-sections misrepresent the true impact of the proposal; inappropriate roof materials; the cumulative impact of methods proposed in the landscaping scheme will make the buildings more prominent and more unacceptable in the landscape - alien treatment of the natural countryside; deciduous trees will have no effect towards screening for 6 months of the year; question Landscape Officer’s conclusions; application does not shown all of the applicant’s landownership; little doubt that proposed activities will create highly toxic effluents finding their way into

a pond/water collection area in the corner of the field – Environment Agency should be consulted on this aspect of the proposal; existing chicken farm at Brodgets Farm already causes smells to villages; query re fee paid for applicants and question grade classification of agricultural land; application should not be considered by the Planning Committee in view of the inaccuracy of the drawings and missing significant information; contrary to TDLC Policies EN3 EN5, EN6, EN12, EN22, EN25 and EN26; proximity to the County Wildlife Sites with protected species, yet there is no Environmental Impact Assessment; loss of ancient hedgerow; encroachment into a County archaeological site – will destroy the crops enclosures; excavation will irrevocably change the water environment and water resource quality; the buildings are poorly designed; requests for meeting with the Landscape Officer.

LETTER FROM WARD COUNCILLOR e-mailed direct to Members.

Additional condition re no development to take place until the implementation of a programme of archaeological work has been secured in accordance with a scheme of investigation submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Amended recommendation:- Subject to the views of the Environment Agency and the Drainage Officer the Development Control Manager in consultation with the Chair/Vice Chair be authorised to determine and permission be GRANTED ... (as printed)

---

#### **41/2006/008**

Agricultural consultants report commissioned on behalf of Tolland residents attached to this report.

COUNTY ARCHAEOLOGIST (further response) – previous response sent out in error. The proposal is very likely to impact on an archaeological site recognised through aerial photographs as a series of crop mark enclosures. Following PPG16 and local plan policy, advises that there should be proper recording of any remains affected by the development. Recommend that the applicant be required to provide archaeological monitoring of the development and a report on any discoveries made. This should be secured by the use of model condition 55.

5 FURTHER LETTERS OF OBJECTION have been received raising the following issues:- no difference to the previous proposal that was rejected, other than it will make the visual impact from the Brompton Ralph direction much worse; will be a mega excrescence on a beautiful landscape; this is an industrial proposal, not a farming one – it is a proposal to build a factory in the heart of what remains of the

countryside; bound to be a precursor of repeated proposals for expansion on the grounds of 'minimum economic size'; question whether will be free-range; size of the proposed buildings; plans do not show the position of the necessary 6 m high feed silos; widened access will open up unrestricted views of buildings; submitted cross-sections misrepresent the true impact of the proposal; inappropriate roof materials; the cumulative impact of methods proposed in the landscaping scheme will make the buildings more prominent and more unacceptable in the landscape - alien treatment of the natural countryside; deciduous trees will have no effect towards screening for 6 months of the year; question Landscape Officer's conclusions; application does not shown all of the applicant's landownership; little doubt that proposed activities will create highly toxic effluents finding their way into a pond/water collection area in the corner of the field – Environment Agency should be consulted on this aspect of the proposal; existing chicken farm at Brodgets Farm already causes smells to villages; query re fee paid for applicants and question grade classification of agricultural land; application should not be considered by the Planning Committee in view of the inaccuracy of the drawings and missing significant information; contrary to TDLC Policies EN3 EN5, EN6, EN12, EN22, EN25 and EN26; proximity to the County Wildlife Sites with protected species, yet there is no Environmental Impact Assessment; loss of ancient hedgerow; encroachment into a County archaeological site – will destroy the crops enclosures; excavation will irrevocably change the water environment and water resource quality; the buildings are poorly designed; requests for meeting with the Landscape Officer.

LETTER FROM WARD COUNCILLOR e-mailed direct to Members.

Additional condition re no development to take place until the implementation of a programme of archaeological work has been secured in accordance with a scheme of investigation submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Amended recommendation:- Subject to the views of the Environment Agency and the Drainage Officer the Development Control Manager in consultation with the Chair/Vice Chair be authorised to determine and permission be GRANTED ... (as printed)

---

**42/2006/017**

As amended by letter and plan received 4th August, 2006.

Dormer window omitted from southern elevation.

---

Copies to:  
CHAIR/NTN/TB/JM/CDW/AG/DA/JH/KM/JLH/IC/TAB/CJW/HM/H&L/RWF/  
Planning Reception/JJ/RB/17 Committee Members/15 Public