

**From:** Planning  
**Sent:** 02 September 2021 14:57  
**To:** Planning Consultations  
**Subject:** FW: \*RESPONSE\* - Planning Application 21/02839/PLF Objection (RESPONSE NOT SHOWING )

**Importance:** High

---

**From:** Sue Green [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 01 September 2021 13:22  
**To:** Planning <planning@eastriding.gov.uk>  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Planning Application 21/02839/PLF Objection  
**Importance:** High

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

**[CAUTION]** This email was sent from **outside of your organisation**. Do not click any links, preview or open attachments, or provide any log-in details unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

To Planning,

We have been informed that our objection to planning application 21/02839/PLF has been received via your website (submitted 31/08) but the objection is not showing on the comments section. Can you confirm receipt of this email and when our comments will be loaded to the site. Here is our objection again.

We strongly object to this application. Whilst we may be the only objection this cannot reduce the weight of impact it will have on us when material considerations are viewed.

A possible reason you may only receive 1 objection could be due in part to the purposeful lack of and positioning of the *single* site notice which is positioned at the bottom of Low Field Lane where few are likely to see it.

Previous planning site history, noise & disturbance resulting from use are 2 of the more pertinent considerations & factors in refusing this further site expansion. East Riding Local Plan acknowledges farms require larger buildings for storage & 'industrial' process (Key Spatial Issues 2.26). Growth of such an enterprise must be considered within the area & its proximity to neighbours & impact on their residential amenity. Our home was here *before* the development, our residential amenity & human rights under law should not be further breached.

#### **Background & Proposed Development**

There are already areas for maintenance & there is already a workshop & a new unit will only add to the overall drainage issues (drainage from last application not yet installed, still pooling water at the side of our home) on the site by creating more covered areas. There is no clear argument to suggest an improvement in efficiency within the Farm by the addition of this latest extension & as such the application should be refused.

**Use** The size of the proposed unit is insufficient for maintenance work & to house all the machinery. The application will impact the use of other areas within an already limited site

**Layout** The area identified for the new unit on site plan ( drawing No IP/MW/02) has been the site & main storage for the 1,800+ large crates. These images can be seen on various aerial photo sites, <https://eservices.l&registry.gov.uk/eservices/FindAProperty/view/MapEnquiryInit.do> & show the true history of the use of this land rather than the pre-application view created in recently moving these boxes adjacent to our home. The noise involved in moving these boxes throughout the year has been horrific & had a huge impact on our enjoyment, use of our home & mental wellbeing. If the building of this new unit means these boxes will be a



permanent feature at the side of our home, then planning permission must be refused as it will be in breach of our human rights. The location of these boxes must form part of the of this application as relates to the use of the site. We have already complained regarding the noise & use of the land at the side of our home & are currently taking further action on this. A defence of 'best practicable means' would be inadmissible should this further unit be built on land which then renders the only available storage & operational land meters away from my home. Therefore under 'Layout' the application should be refused.

#### **Landscaping**

The operation needs to be assessed as a whole, this includes adequate space for the distribution, sales operation & visiting huge lorries. The development of this site from green field to the industrial nature it now represents is in breach of our Human Rights under article 8 & due consideration needs to be applied to the residential amenity now over & above the desires of this application – refusal of this application will not impact the production of the farm. Therefore the application under Landscaping should be refused.

#### **Access**

The Access route to the proposed unit is only possible if all the potato boxes are moved to the side of our home, a material consideration , factor in *how* the site is used. The uneven, sloping strip of scrubland at the side of our home has started to be used as access to the back of the sheds & new location (this is not an approved access route and can never be). Huge vehicles travelling within inches of our home, clearly a noise & privacy issue as well as a real concern to our building & foundations. Further development of the site will only cement the use of this land, the site is now too small for the operation if we are to be impacted by the use of this unsuitable land.

#### **Sustainable Development**

Whilst National Planning Policy Framework provides support for economic growth & development of agricultural Businesses in paragraph 83 the NPPF & Noise Policy Statement for England offer considerations to noise nuisance & the impact of the change I have clearly demonstrated in my previous comments. These are covered in the relevant policies under **Paragraph 91, Clause 109 & Clause 111**

In conclusion I have evidenced the impact of this development to our residential amenity, detailed the material factors that are to be considered & outlined the guidance the NPPF gives on factors when considering applications such as this. The impact of this application will be in further breach of our Human Rights under article 8, this is supported by NPPF & Noise Policy for England therefore this application should be refused.