[redacted]

From: DevelopmentControl
Sent: 10 January 2025 15:24
To: DevelopmentControl
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 24/02378/AGDET

Categories: [redacted]

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 10/01/2025 3:23 PM from [redacted]

Application Summary

Address:	Land West Of 24 Little Gransden Lane Great Gransden
Proposal:	Erection of 4 bay steel framed agricultural buildng
Case Officer:	Olivia Manton

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	[redacted]
Email:	[redacted]
Address:	24 Little Gransden Lane [redacted]

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	All the objections to the previous proposal (23/02198) for a similar building still apply, especially the inappropriate siting of an industrial unit among listed residential buildings and in natural landscape. The proposal still does not accord with the policies of the Local Plan (see previous Landscape and Biodiversity Report). There would be an increase to the water run-off onto the B1046, which is already quite dangerous in wet weather. The heavy machinery will be used off-site for the rented holding, but also for the applicant's main logging/contracting business, resulting in much more traffic and noise pollution along the footpath than implied in the application. The risk to the heritage Oak tree will also increase.

The application contains obvious errors. The applicant has not owned the land for 'nearly ten years': the previous owner appealed in Nov 2019 against a refusal of permission for a dwelling on the same site (19/02282). The owned land has not been used for grazing in the last 30 years - it is unfenced on the N and E boundaries. In the light of these errors I believe all other unsupported statements in this application should be fully fact-checked.

Kind regards