

Addendum

LA01/2016/1037/F

Full Planning Permission

Update

Number of Sheep (section 4.2)

The Committee Report advised in section 4.2 that the applicant purchased 10 sheep in June 2016 and a further 5 sheep in March 2017. The agent has since advised that the applicant now owns 35 ewes.

Ownership of Land (section 8.10)

The Committee Report in section 8.10 refers to an email from the applicant's solicitor dated 26.07.2017 which advised that the applicant was in the process of purchasing fields 2, 4 and 5/A. Another email from the applicant's solicitor has been received and it confirms the purchase of such fields took place on 10.08.2017.

Representations

The Council has received one further letter of objection from a MLA. The letter seeks clarification of land ownership which has been provided by the agent – see above section 8.10. The letter comments on the retrospective nature of the proposal ie. It was built prior to the applicants registering a farm business. It also raises concern regarding the compatibility of uses within the sheds ie. Drying of wood chip and housing of sheep. Other matters were raised. However these are not considered material to the processing of this planning application.

The Council has received one further letter of support from a MP. The support is on the understanding that the proposal is intended to store hay, straw and farm machinery.

The Council has also received additional representations, x5 in support and x2 objecting to the application. These letters do not raise any new material considerations which have not previously been considered.

Rebuttal from Grainger Acoustics

A letter from Grainger Acoustics has been received in relation to the interpretation of the previously submitted noise report. Environmental

Health as the competent authority has been consulted on the contents of the letter.

The following comments were received from Environmental Health:

Mr Grainger's initial acoustic report focussed on planning permission being sought for two sheds which were to be used for the purpose of drying woodchip at the applicants farm.

Report point 8.27

The background measurements were taken whilst the fan and dryers were operational though Mr Grainger has stated that these were inaudible at the measurement site. It is common practice to ensure that background levels are taken when equipment is not operating to ensure that operational noise does not affect background readings. It should have been possible to have the plant turned off to allow a background measurement to be taken. Background levels may well be commonly in and around the values stated, though it would have been better if no plant/equipment was running whilst these measurements were being undertaken.

With regard to internal noise levels within the shed no indication has been made as to level the dryers were operating ie were they at full power or on a lower setting. Full power would represent the worst case scenario.

Mr Grainger indicates that the noise levels used for the noise modelling were for a larger telehandler than the one on site. This was not stated in his initial report. Most noise reports would indicate if noisier equipment was being modelled and if conservatism was being built into the assessment. Mr Grainger has indicated that its use is intermittent, information he obtained from the applicant. Deliveries of woodchip are only stated as being once every three months. This is disputed by the objector(s) who allege its use is more frequent and often at night. He infers that limited use should have a lessening noise impact. It is now apparent that additional use is being made of the facility by others (for example the drying of potato seed/harvested potatoes) and as a result it is not unfair to assume that the telehandlers use may have increased.

The consultant did not feel at the time that transportation noise on site should be considered whilst undertaking the noise impact assessment. The noise assessment sought to consider only those activities associated with the drying operations only. It would appear that others are currently using or intend availing of the facility in the future (for the drying of potato seeds and harvested potatoes, grains etc). This will

introduce additional traffic to and from the yard for delivery and despatch over and above the current deliveries to the site and increase the use of machinery such as the telehandler.

The Council's position on amenity as set out in section 8.28 of the Committee Report remains.

Recommendation

That the Committee notes the content of this addendum and agrees with the recommendation to refuse as set out in paragraph 9.1 of the Planning Committee Report.