

# Public Document Pack



**Simon W. Baker** B.Ed MBA MISPAL  
Chief Executive

## **PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE SUPPLEMENT AGENDA**

**Date:** Thursday, 30 May 2019

**Time:** 2.00 pm

**Venue:** Council Chamber, Moorlands House, Stockwell Street, Leek, ST13 6HQ

Please find below an additional report which was unavailable when the agenda was published.

### **PART 1**

13. NOTE - A Late Representations Report will be circulated prior to the meeting i.e. any representations received since this agenda was published.

**SIMON BAKER**  
**CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

This page is intentionally left blank

## PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

### Late Representations – 30 May 2019

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
SMD/2019/0143	<p><b><u>Land adjacent to no. 10 Ox Pasture, Cheddleton</u></b></p> <p><u>Neighbour Representations</u></p> <p>Four additional representations have been received which are detailed as follows:</p> <p><b>Neighbour comment on application publicity:</b></p> <p><i>“We would like to understand if anyone has informed the Secretary of State about application 2019/0143 as it effects the setting of a Conservation Asset (Grade II* Listed Church of St Edward the Confessor). In the conservation report it states: The Heritage Statement notes that there will be an impact on the setting of the Church. In the report pack point 7.14 states; The Officer concludes that the scheme would result in a ‘less than substantial harm’ (at the lower end of the spectrum) to the setting of Grade II* Church of St Edward the Confessor. Again in 7.50 the protection of the setting is mentioned: The impact on the setting of Grade II* Church of St Edward the Confessor, can be addressed by a sensitive layout of the site. As there is a clear impact of the setting as mentioned above, in accordance with Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (Chapter 9 section 67) Publicity for applications affecting setting of listed buildings it states: The Secretary of State may prescribe requirements as to publicity for applications for planning permission in cases where the local planning authority think that the development of land would affect the setting of a listed building”.</i></p> <p><u>Officer Response:</u></p> <p>The Secretary of State prescribes publicity requirements via secondary legislation not on a case by case basis. Accordingly, the Council has carried out correct publicity in accordance with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Regulations 1990) as amended which is the relevant secondary legislation, for applications affecting the setting of a listed building(s) with reference to the posting of the site notice at the proposed site access and press notice for a period of 21 days.</p> <p><b>Neighbour comment on drainage matters:</b></p> <p>The applicant proposes to bring drainage pipes down to Fold Terrace. Fold Terrace holds the rights on the land in question, which is covered by a Conveyance by the Governors of the bounty of Queen Anne. We have in the past prevented a right through this land by both the church and the County Council and more recently</p>	

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE**

**Late Representations – 30 May 2019**

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>Western Power. So I will not allow anything to do with the houses to cross this land.</p> <p><u>Officer Response:</u></p> <p>The strategic drainage plans show foul and storm drain to be connected into the existing storm and foul water sewers if required. The Lead Local Flood Authority have advised that a condition preventing development until a satisfactory surface water scheme and similarly foul sewage as per STW comments have been agreed with the Council. The Council therefore considers that a Grampian style negatively worded condition would be acceptable in these circumstances. Matters of access rights over private land are considered to be a civil matter between the landowners.</p> <p><b>Neighbour comment on the Council’s Conservation Officer Consultation response:</b></p> <p><i>This doesn’t mention the resident’s assessment, an attitude that is dismissive and disrespectful. The Heritage Statement does not: “Explore ways to maximise enhancement and avoid or minimise harm”.</i></p> <p><i>Piecemeal development of Fold Court in the Conservation Area has compromised the significance of the asset. The proposed development adjacent to it will further detract from the significance.</i></p> <p><i>Historic England GPA3 advises: “Where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past by unsympathetic development affecting its setting, to accord with NPPF policies consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the significance of the asset. “</i></p> <p><i>The ownership is a remaining part of the rural setting to the south, it is farmed. The whole ownership, not just the site, would be used for this development; this full site is immediately adjacent to the Conservation Area.</i></p> <p><i>Physical attachment of a setting to an asset is not necessarily required; further into this document it is acknowledged that the site forms part of the setting of the physically detached church.</i></p> <p><i>The views are from the wide southern end of the site, the tapering does not affect the breadth of the view from that end. The church roof and scale of the church are seen, not just the tower (see Fig 13 of the resident’s report). Views of the most significant, designated feature of the historic core (the church) is obviously a view of part of the historic core, and establishes a visual connection between the</i></p>	

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE**

**Late Representations – 30 May 2019**

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p><i>southern setting, the asset and the wider rural setting.</i></p> <p><i>“The fields to the east have a much greater affinity with the setting of the Conservation Area”. The last sentence is irrelevant to this application.</i></p> <p><i>Any houses on the site will be a few feet from the footpath and be visible through and above the hedge. Historic England GPA3 advises: “The impact of seasonal and day/night changes on a view or views needs to be considered, including other changes that may mean that a view at a particular point in time may not be representative of the experience over longer periods. Does summer foliage hide an asset that is visible in winter?”</i></p> <p><i>The history of the viewing point (not the setting itself) is not relevant. Historic England GPA3 advises:</i></p> <p><i>“The contribution of setting to the significance of a heritage asset is often expressed by reference to views, a purely visual impression of an asset or place which can be static or dynamic, long, short or of lateral spread, and include a variety of views of, from, across, or including that asset.”</i></p> <p><i>“Views which contribute more to understanding the significance of a heritage asset include: ... those where town- or village-scape reveals views with unplanned or unintended beauty“.</i></p> <p><i>“Views may be identified and protected by local planning policies and guidance for the part they play in shaping our appreciation and understanding of England’s historic environment, whether in rural or urban areas and whether designed to be seen as a unity or as the cumulative result of a long process of development.”</i></p> <p><u>Officer Response:</u></p> <p>The Conservation Officer has responded as follows:</p> <p><i>“I am satisfied that the applicant’s heritage statement is adequate and proportionate to the asset’s importance as required by the NPPF. I do not consider that the development will impact on the setting of the Conservation Area (for the reasons stated in my consultation) and the further comments made largely repeat those made by the resident’s heritage representative do not change this position.</i></p> <p><i>It is accepted that there will be some harm to the setting of the Listed Church. The less than substantial ‘spectrum’ referred to is used in planning appeals by Inspectors to more closely quantify the level of</i></p>	

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE**

**Late Representations – 30 May 2019**

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p><i>harm within the 'less than substantial range'</i></p> <p><i>The Council is aware of the statutory obligations under Section 66(1) which creates a strong presumption in favour of the preservation of Listed buildings and their setting and that considerable weight should be given to the desirability of preservation. It has been accepted that there is less than substantial harm to the setting of the Listed church but that this harm is at the lower end of the scale (spectrum) and harm can be mitigated at Reserved Matters stage. The NPPF is very clear that where there is less than substantial harm this should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal (Para.196). The planning officer will examine the justification for the harm and will carry out the balancing exercise”.</i></p> <p><b>Neighbour comments on the Council's Ecology Officer's Consultation response:</b></p> <p><i>As the following information demonstrates, Absolute Ecology's (AE) letter of 15th May contains several inaccuracies, assumptions and is defamatory to Elite Ecology (EE). Would you please consider amending your recent submission in light of the new information we have supplied below. We also provide dates of grass snake sightings in properties adjoining or close to the site, which have been recorded on the SER, as requested. We had a full data search done by the SER on 8th April 2019 and our consultant had access to this data when preparing his report.</i></p> <p><i>Errors in AE's letter:</i></p> <p><i>EE did access the site through a gate in on of the gardens in Ostlers Lane. The former owner of the site gave permission for residents to access the field for informal dog walking and several properties in Ostlers Lane have garden gates which give them direct access to the site.</i></p> <p><i>Obviously the presence of bat roosts in properties adjacent to the site (recorded on the SER and with photographic evidence) confirms the presence of bats. If a foraging and commuting area (the site) is removed it will impact those bats.</i></p> <p><i>AE cast doubt on the word of tens of residents by not accepting that bats regularly forage over the site. This can currently be observed on appropriate evenings and we have video evidence of bats flying in a garden in Ostlers Lane adjacent to the site which is also one of their overwintering roosts.</i></p> <p><i>EEs report is based on our own SER search of 8th April and is not "solely anecdotal". Our SER search shows the GCN, grass snake</i></p>	

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE**

**Late Representations – 30 May 2019**

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.																
	<p><i>and bat roost records. Photographic evidence was submitted with these records.</i></p> <p><i>EEs report is thorough, up to date and valid. Its level of detail is proportionate to a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, which is more than can be said of the first AE appraisal.</i></p> <p><i>The AE letter will be the subject of a complaint to the CIEEM.</i></p> <p><i>The GCN survey done by AE is inadequate. Again it refers to anecdotal evidence and their out of date SER search. They only contacted residents immediately adjacent to the ownership plus two shown in EEs report. They did not consider one of the locations in the EE report. They did not survey to the required 500m radius. Professional advice we have received suggests that 250m would be reasonable.</i></p> <p><i>AE were not been refused permission to access the pond at 19 Ox Pasture a known GCN site. Permission was given by the owner on 14th May and AE visited on 15th and 16th May but did for some unaccountable reason did not take a pond water sample for DNA analysis on those visits. It was only on their last visit on 20th May that the pond water sample was taken. This site has photographic evidence of a GCN so it seems odd that the pond water was not sampled on their first visit as with the other ponds they surveyed. The only access into the recorded GCN site is via Ox Pasture towards the site, The route to the site across Ox Pasture and through the gardens is known to be used by other amphibians.</i></p> <p><i>The sightings of grass snakes in properties either adjoining the site or within 100 m of the site (with some supporting photographic evidence) were submitted to the SER and I detail below an extract of our SER search detailing the sightings.</i></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Grass Snake</td> <td>Ostlers Lane*</td> <td>SJ9702352096</td> <td>01/06/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grass Snake</td> <td>Ostlers Lane</td> <td>SJ9703052143</td> <td>July 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grass Snake</td> <td>Langdale Gardens*</td> <td>SJ9719252108</td> <td>01/04/2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grass Snake</td> <td>Langdale Gardens*</td> <td>SJ9719252108</td> <td>2015</td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Officer Response:</u></p> <p>The Council's Ecologist has considered the applicant's ecologist submitted reports and the Cheddleton residents' ecologist report and raised no objection to the scheme subject to those recommended conditions. The comments above have been brought to the attention of the Councils' Ecologist. His comments are awaited, however, it is not expected that his view will change – but it is recommended that</p>	Grass Snake	Ostlers Lane*	SJ9702352096	01/06/2016	Grass Snake	Ostlers Lane	SJ9703052143	July 2018	Grass Snake	Langdale Gardens*	SJ9719252108	01/04/2014	Grass Snake	Langdale Gardens*	SJ9719252108	2015	
Grass Snake	Ostlers Lane*	SJ9702352096	01/06/2016															
Grass Snake	Ostlers Lane	SJ9703052143	July 2018															
Grass Snake	Langdale Gardens*	SJ9719252108	01/04/2014															
Grass Snake	Langdale Gardens*	SJ9719252108	2015															

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE**

**Late Representations – 30 May 2019**

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	Committee grants delegated authority to Officers and the Chair to approve the application subject to no objection being raised.	
SMD/2018/0400	<p><b><u>Sytch Road, Brown Edge</u></b></p> <p>No update.</p>	
SMD/2018/0674	<p><b><u>Eaton House, Buxton Road, Leek</u></b></p> <p>No update.</p>	
SMD/2018/0788	<p><b><u>Land Adjacent to Prospect House</u></b></p> <p><u>Erratum</u></p> <p>The Applicant's are Mr and Mrs McDermott and not Mr and Mrs Carter as stated. Secondly, the height of the proposed dwelling reaches approximately 4.0m to eaves level with the overall ridge height reaching approximately 7.7m, not 8.6m (eaves level) and 15m (overall ridge height) as described at Paragraph 3.3</p> <p><u>Neighbour Representations</u></p> <p>A suite of documentation has been received from the current occupier of the neighbouring property Wishwood has been received which is made up of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Letter from Mr Day to SMDC dated 22<sup>nd</sup> May</li> <li>- HM Land Registry Title dated 13<sup>th</sup> December 1995</li> <li>- Letter from Bowcock &amp; Pursaill Solicitors to the current occupiers of the neighbouring property 'Portree' dated 18<sup>th</sup> February 2019</li> <li>- Email from applicant to Mr Day dated 4<sup>th</sup> March 2019</li> <li>- Copy of initial consultation response from SMDC Environmental Services dated 21<sup>st</sup> January 2019</li> <li>- Letter from Mr Day to SMDC dated 28<sup>th</sup> May 2019</li> </ul> <p>A summary of the main points raised within the letter to SMDC 22<sup>nd</sup> May are as follows:</p> <p>1. Adverse impacts exist in that the proposed development, would by virtue of a combination of its height, two storey form and siting close to the road directly opposite our property, would lead to a visually intrusive and overbearing form of development when viewed from our windows, front facing balcony and garden, significantly harming our residential visual amenity, and trespass immensely on our privacy; contrary to Policies H1 and DC1 of both the Core Strategy</p>	

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE**

**Late Representations – 30 May 2019**

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>and Emerging Local Plan, and Chapter 12 of the NPPF</p> <p>2. The distance between the eastern boundary wall of the site and the boundary wall at Wishwood measures 15m, and therefore the proposed dwelling fails to meet the minimum requirements set out within the Space About Dwellings SPD; thereby resulting in adverse impacts to privacy and a right to light. Equally, the neighbouring property Portree would also be adversely affected as its frontage faces southwards towards the site.</p> <p>3. The consultation responses from the Environmental Services and Environmental Health departments at SMDC which summarise our position. The issues are for the most part unresolved with regard to the proposed position of the build. It is now shown that the footprint of the proposal does not sit over the existing pipes. However, this is disputed on the grounds that no proof has been put forward to the actual position of these drains; the accuracy of the plans is also disputed. Having inspected the pipe between the FIC situated at Portree and the development site, we can confirm that the drain actually runs at a 90 degree angle as opposed to what the Architectural drawing shows. This implies that the pipe could quite possibly be under the footprint of the new proposed position of the development.</p> <p>The drain serving Wishwood would be under the proposed driveway and if not crushed by groundworks, then still risk collapse from regular vehicle activity post build, not to mention diminished access to maintain these drains as a result of boundary treatment. This could potentially lead to court action to allow us to gain access in future – reference to Dead of Easement.</p> <p>4. This application has caused stress, upset and frustration. We have had to throw money at solicitors whilst the applicants (who have changed over time) and made false declarations as to ownership and certification, have ignored letters from our solicitors and have not done so based on Sammons advice.</p> <p>5. We have lost count of the number of revisions to this application and it seems the applicant can keep going on and on as they wish. The letter then goes on to describe in detail the communication (by letter and face to face) between local residents and the applicant relating to the legal implications of access and state of the drainage infrastructure.</p> <p>6. We believed that the applicants were to submit an alternative position of the proposed build to move the development back to avoid existing drains. However, on inspecting the planning portal</p>	

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE**

**Late Representations – 30 May 2019**

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>they have in fact moved the position in entirely the opposite direction towards the road frontage. This position does not resolve the issues with existing pipework, and more so access rights and load bearing capabilities. Finding this revision out via the Planning Portal offers us little time to assess the implications of this proposed build position.</p> <p>7. We now feel we need to get our own inspection report done to have a better understanding of any suggested problems and actual pipe run position in relation to the proposed footprint of the new plan.</p> <p>8. We were quite surprised to find that this new plan could be put forward as a continuation process given that changes apply. Local residents for the most part would be unaware that the plan had changed dramatically without being notified in a more direct manner.</p> <p>The main points raised within the letter to SMDC dated 28<sup>th</sup> May are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Irregularities in report relating to the applicant's names. The applicant's are not Mr and Mrs Carter but Mr and Mrs McDermott. The land is owned by Diane Brookes of Prospect House Farm.</li> <li>2. Irregularities in paragraph 3.3 relating to the description of the proposal; dimensions of the dwelling being set back 2m from the road frontage and depth being 7.3m.</li> <li>3. A distance of 8.2m exists between the drystone boundary wall and the position of the pipe as it exists under the boundary wall of Portree onto and under the existing site. Given that the proposed dwelling is some 2m from the frontage and allowing for a depth of 7.3m, this gives a total of 9.3m. The build will either be over the drain or so close that future excavation work would be impossible without risk to the foundation and structural integrity of the proposed build. Equally the same situation exists with Wishwood's drain and its close proximity with the footprint of the build – no proof being put forward as to the actual position of all existing drains.</li> </ol> <p>What happens if planning were to be granted, and these drains should be discovered to be under the footprint during foundation/excavation works?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The whole situation has a direct impact on our right to enjoy freely the benefits of these easement agreements without hindrance or material interference. My understanding of the planning regulations are that an area of 3m of unobstructed ground is required over a drain area, being 1.5m either side of the run of the drain to allow for</li> </ol>	

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE**

**Late Representations – 30 May 2019**

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>access and maintenance requirements.</p> <p>Can the agent/applicant therefore confirm that this requirement will be met and adhered to in relation to all existing drains indefinitely, as this needs to be addressed.</p> <p>5. It has been stated several times that this is a civil issue and not a planning issue, however this does not alter the fact that the drains are there and have been for a very long time, and are not going anywhere.</p> <p>6. Our house, Wishwood, has its living room along with dining room and three bedrooms all overlooking this proposal in a very direct manner, this outlook being our only outlook as mentioned in our previous letter. The Planning Officer suggests that the minimum distance between properties should be 21m and so the proposal falls outside of this guidance. No account has been taken of the fact that Wishwood and the proposed dwelling would sit at different elevation levels, where this would increase the required distance between them for every half metre. Why has this not been taken into account?</p> <p>7. To say that applying obscure glazing to a bedroom window is adequate to allow consent to be granted is quite frankly mind numbing. Equally, there is a playroom, study, and snug that have windows overlooking us; all habitable windows but no mention of frosting these windows.</p> <p>8. The Floorplan and height being some 15m represents a very large development. The Ecology report suggested this site would be appropriate for a modest bungalow; this is anything but a modest bungalow.</p> <p>9. Longsdon Parish Council objected to this application. This objection referred to the original position of the proposal. Longsdon Parish Council, along with residents, have not commented on its current position, the footprint having been moved from its central location. Therefore there was no provision for residents to comment.</p> <p>10. The Civicance (Building Control) response has not been available via the Planning Portal at any time. Does this application relate to the application in its current form or previous central location? No information is available to understand the response from Building Control against the consultation request. These drains belong to Wishwood and Portree and yet recommendations are being made by Building Control with regards to FIC additions without our knowledge. This may be all well and good but include us in the discussion.</p>	

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE**

**Late Representations – 30 May 2019**

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>10. Presence of post and rail fence within the site in ownership of the Harris family (Portree).</p> <p>11. Planning Policy in place is damaging to our semi-rural street scene with its pockets of open green space being a welcome part of the overall appeal and sense of wellbeing where we live. This is an opportunistic development that the residents of Sutherland Road do not want and do not deserve. It will certainly not enhance or sit well within our existing street scene.</p> <p><u>Longsdon Parish Council</u></p> <p>It has come to my attention that application SMD/2018/0788 is due to be decided tomorrow ( 30<sup>th</sup> May 2019).</p> <p>It seems that the plan to be decided upon now contains a dwelling which is very much closer to Sutherland Road than the plan that Longsdon Parish Council were asked to comment on.</p> <p>As chair of the Parish Council I would ask that Longsdon Parish Council are given the opportunity to comment before the decision is taken.</p> <p>With such a significant change to the plan I would have hoped that Longsdon Parish Council would have been consulted as a matter of procedure but clearly were not.</p> <p>The Parish Council were opposed to both the initial application SMD/2018/0231 and the plan that it was asked to comment on SMD/2018/0788 version dated December 2018.</p> <p>The comment made by the Parish Council was that this application is for a dwelling in the Green Belt and yet exhibits no special reasons for development. Personally, I would hope that the protection offered by the Green Belt will not be ignored when the decision is made and that the serious issues of drainage in an area without main sewer are given due consideration.</p> <p><u>OFFICER COMMENTS</u></p> <p>Errors within the report relating to the name of the Applicant and the height of the dwelling are acknowledged and have been clarified. The appropriate notice has been served to the owner of the land under Certificate B of the Application Form.</p> <p>With regards to the principle of development and the matter of Green Belt policy, it has already been determined by the Committee following Officer recommendation that one dwelling on this site</p>	

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE**

**Late Representations – 30 May 2019**

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p>comprises a limited form of infill within a village, thereby meeting the rigorous policy test set out within the NPPF, and as such resulting in the principle of development for one dwelling on this Green Belt site being acceptable.</p> <p>Potential impacts of the proposed development in its final revised form have been addressed within the Committee Report at paragraphs 7.26 – 7.33. The rooms shown on the revised internal layout at ground floor level are not habitable rooms and are therefore not subject to the 21m separation distance set out within the Space About Dwellings SPD. The sole window serving a habitable room in the front elevation is the first floor bedroom window, which should be obscure glazed.</p> <p>The change in levels is minimal and as stated within the report, any impacts with regards to sunlight are not considered to be present given the separation distance and height of the dwelling (7.7m).</p> <p>The Ecology Report was originally prepared for the Outline application in April 2018 and does refer to the proposal as a single dwelling (bungalow). This report has been re-submitted without any modifications as part of this application. It is acknowledged that the Report does refer to a bungalow. However, the description of development should be taken from the Application Form and not from accompanying reports; the description of development refers to “<i>erection of a single dwelling and detached garage</i>”. The report has been accepted with regards to impacts relating to Ecology.</p> <p>The issues relating to the Drainage network are addressed within the report at paragraphs 7.40 – 7.43.</p> <p>With regards to the accuracy of the drainage layout as shown on the submitted plans, the application has to be determined on the information as submitted. The agent has been asked to clarify the source of information for producing the plan showing the existing drainage layout.</p> <p>The agent has responded to the issues raised in the late letter stating the following:</p> <p><i>“I am not sure how they have measured the drain position exactly on the boundary without exposing it, but having said that if we take this dimension as being correct the existing drain is slightly closer to the proposed dwelling but still outside of the footprint. The foundations will be taken deeper than the drain and so if any future maintenance is required this will not affect the dwelling in way shape or form. The drain will be protected during construction with any close work being undertaken by hand.</i>”</p>	

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE**

**Late Representations – 30 May 2019**

FILE REF.	SITE AND DETAILS	PAGE NO.
	<p><i>We trust this assists.”</i></p> <p>If further information comes to light in relation to the drainage system that requires amendments to be made, further planning applications may be required which would be judged on its own merits. No information has been submitted which would cause the Local Planning Authority to question the integrity of the submitted plans.</p> <p>Revisions have been submitted with this application which the applicant's are perfectly entitled to do to address outstanding planning related issues, especially given that the principle of development has previously been established under the previously approved Outline application (SMD/2018/0231).</p> <p>Given that the height, scale and footprint of the revised scheme had not significantly altered comparable to the original plans submitted, and following an assessment of the revised proposal against relevant planning policies, it was considered that further re-consultation would not be appropriate, as objections raised by the initial consultation responses had been adequately addressed.</p>	
<b>SMD/2019/0144</b>	<b><u>Round Meadows Farm</u></b>  No update.	
<b>SMD/2019/0101</b>	<b><u>Breach Road Brown Edge</u></b>  Application withdrawn by the applicant.	