FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST – 1020/18

Dear Sir/Madam

Your request for information has now been considered and the information requested is provided below.

Request:

Please supply any and all communication or representation made or implied pertaining to the Planning Application 2018/0259/FUL whether written / verbal / or electronically communicated.

Response:

Please find attached the following:

“APP Docs 2018-0259-FUL-redacted”
“Email redacted”
“Shires school response 2018-0259-FUL”
“Stretton Parish Council response 2018-0259-FUL”

If you are dissatisfied with the handling of your request please contact the Data Protection Officer, Rutland County Council, Catmose, Oakham, Rutland LE15 6HP
You can also complain to the Information Commissioner at:

The Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House, Water lane
Wilmslow, Cheshire
SK9 5AF
Tel: 01625 545700

Yours faithfully

FOI Administrator
Business Support Team
Rutland County Council
Good Afternoon Andrew.

Just a short email to say that having the shed in the field actually decreases traffic flow as the machinery will stay up there.

Kind regards

Kevin Hawkes

Sent from my iPhone
Thank you, any further information you have in order for me to make an informed recommendation is always appreciated, therefore if you have further information regarding previously development then by all means include it. I haven’t received any representations from the Parish or School, though if any are received they’ll appear on the website.

With regard to the superseded drawing, I believe this is because those plans show the red line/ black pen around the school and/or indicated the application site as including the school, thereby causing confusion about the extent of the application/land ownership.

Regards,

Andrew Waskett-Burt | Planning Officer
Rutland County Council
Catmose, Oakham, Rutland LE15 6HP
t: 01572 758 346 |
e: awaskett-burt@rutland.gov.uk
www.rutland.gov.uk

-----Original Message-----
From:
Sent: 17 May 2018 09:15
To: Andrew Waskett-Burt
Subject: Shires field application 2018/0259/FUL

Dear Andrew.

Further to our telephone conversation / my response.

The access into my property is through a car park not part of the School, which has been in my opinion overly developed for that purpose.

I’m also wondering why I was told to remove the part of the drawing I supplied initially which showed my access rights by the planning support team and why you now consider it an issue.

I would like to ask if any representation have been put forward and by who as at the Parish council meeting on Tuesday it was resolved not to object to the Application and I have also been contacted by the Shires office for a “chat” and they also gave no indication of a problem, and I haven’t seen any responses on the RCC website.

The field has been previously developed with a very substantial garage/store. I have photos and other supporting evidence of this if you require it.

I suppose the application description is a bit lacking as maybe it should indicate and “other agricultural machinery for the purpose of land management”.

Yours S&F

Kevin Hawkes
Sent from my iPhone
Andrew, Waskett-Burt

From: conservation
Sent: 17 May 2018 14:16
To: Andrew Waskett-Burt
Subject: RE: Proposed Agricultural Building at rear of The Shires, Stretton.

Andrew,

You are correct, the harm to the Conservation Area argument would be difficult to sustain in view of the earlier decision.

Ian W.

From: Andrew Waskett-Burt [mailto:AWaskett-Burt@rutland.gov.uk]
Sent: 17 May 2018 11:16
To: IAN WRIGHT; conservation
Subject: RE: Proposed Agricultural Building at rear of The Shires, Stretton.

Thanks Ian,

I’ve spoken to the applicant and one of his arguments is Suzanne’s app from earlier in the year for a building on the adjacent field. While that’s a larger site with more justification, the design/size/materials are broadly the same (see attached for reference, and below comments for that one). I’m happy that the proposed building have a detrimental impact upon the setting of the listed building, but given Suzanne’s app, can we run the same argument for the conservation area?

Ref: 2018/0035

Suzanne,

Proposal: Steel framed tractor shed.
Location: Highland Farm, Rookery Lane, Stretton.

The site proposed for the agricultural building is located in the Stretton Conservation Area and in a position which could potentially impact on the setting of the Grade II Listed former Rectory that is now occupied as a school.

The building is shown to be of a portal frame construction and clad with Juniper Green Plastisol sheeting.

It would be positioned in the north-west corner of a field, against a boundary that is defined by mature trees and shrubs.

In this location, a building of the size and with the colour of cladding proposed would not have an adverse impact on the character or appearance of this part of the Conservation Area nor would it affect the setting of the listed building that is some 200m to the south and largely screened from view from the north by mature trees.

Ian Wright
Conservation Advisor

Thanks,
From: IAN WRIGHT  
Sent: 17 May 2018 10:39  
To: Andrew Waskell-Burt  
Subject: Proposed Agricultural Building at rear of The Shires, Stretton.

Andrew,

I forgot to make reference in my comments on this one that the building would neither preserve nor enhance the Conservation Area and nor would it have a neutral impact.

Ian W.
Andrew Waskett-Burt

From: Ian Wright
Sent: 16 May 2018 14:24
To: Andrew Waskett-Burt
Subject: 2018/0259/FUL - Conservation comments

Ref: 2018/0259/FUL

Andrew,

Proposal: Erection of steel framed tractor shed
Location: Land east of Shires Lane, Stretton, Rutland

Although the paddock in which the proposed building is to be located is enclosed on three sides by mature vegetation the southern side is exposed to view from The Shires, a grade II Listed early nineteenth Rectory. The paddock forms part of the setting to the Listed Building.

The site is also adjacent to the boundary of the Stretton Conservation Area and is therefore part of the setting to the designated area.

I would suggest that the proposed location of a building of the design and proportions proposed would cause harm to the setting of both designated heritage assets by reason of its location, non-traditional design and materials of which it would be constructed.

Whilst the degree of harm is less than substantial, I can see no public benefits that would outweigh this harm.

Ian Wright
Principal Conservation Officer
Dear Andrew.

Further to our telephone conversation / my response.

The access into my property is through a car park not part of the School, which has been in my opinion overly developed for that purpose.

I'm also wondering why I was told to remove the part of the drawing I supplied initially which showed my access rights by the planning support team and why you now consider it an issue.

I would like to ask if any representation have been put forward and by who as at the Parish council meeting on Tuesday it was resolved not to object to the Application and I have also been contacted by the Shires office for a "chat" and they also gave no indication of a problem, and I haven't seen any responses on the RCC website.

The field has been previously developed with a very substantial garage/store. I have photos and other supporting evidence of this if you require it.

I suppose the application description is a bit lacking as maybe it should indicate and "other agricultural machinery for the purpose of land management".

Yours S&F

Kevin Hawkes

Sent from my iPhone
Dear Andrew

Many thanks for taking my call just now.

I can only reiterate what I said during that call.

The field in question is one of Two. The other is at Stocken. I shall supply LT No if requested.

My purpose is to put the fields back in order so they can be used for herb growing as my Wife is a medical Herbalist (Holistic Health Centre. Main Street. Cottesmore )and where possible topping for animal feed.

In order to ask local farmers to do the cuts I need to maintain the perimeter. As you have seen it is largely overgrown and much in need of sorting. I can’t take the risk of bringing equipment to the site as it would most probably disappear down the A1 one evening given that the crime rate is on the increase.

As for the impact on the Shires school I’m not precious about the location and if you recommend a more suitable place within the field I’m more than happy to accommodate your recommendation.

The access is by right so way and is uninterrupted 24/07/365. I have always been a good neighbor to the Shires School and obviously have no plans to do work on the site or move machinery between sites in unsociable hrs.

I hope this clarifies most if not all your concerns and of course stand ready to offer further details if I am able.

Kind regards

Kevin Hawkes.

Sent from my iPhone

On 16 May 2018, at 14:39, Andrew Waskett-Burt <AWaskett-Burt@rutland.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Mr Hawkes,

2018/0259/FUL – Land to the East of Shires Lane, Stretton – Erection of steel framed tractor shed

Thank you for your application, which is currently in its consultation period. I am the case officer dealing with it. I’ve had the opportunity to visit the site, and can offer the following comments.

Following my site visit, I have some questions, set out below, in order for me to better understand the proposal.

There would appear to be very information provided in support of the application. It would appear from the location plan that it is only the paddock itself within your ownership, with the surrounding fields in separate ownership? However the proposed building is large in relation to the size of the site, and there is no justification provided with the application for this.
I note the description of development is for a tractor shed, however there is no information provided as to how the building relates to the land; i.e. what the tractor(s) are used for, how the building would be used, what the previous land use was (I understand that historically it was part of the Shires site back when it was a country club), and what the current lawful land use is (to establish whether the proposal could trigger a change of use in the land).

Is the building intended for use solely to manage the paddock, or other sites? (if so, where?). If intended for other sites, are these more suitable locations than the application site? There is also no information regarding how the site would be used in relation to the proposed building, or any intensification of vehicle movement (especially given that the access is through a school).

The building appears to be sited directly adjacent to a large tree, and has the potential to adversely affect its roots through compaction of the soil – there is no detail provided to show how this could be overcome.

In addition to this, the Shires is a Grade II listed building, and the proposed building would be sited within its setting. However there is no heritage impact assessment submitted with the application in support of the proposal.

Without prejudice to any further information you may wish to provide, I would advise that in its current form the proposal would be likely to have a detrimental impact upon the setting of the listed building, and that it would also appear to be an unjustified building in the open countryside.

If you wish to provide any further information in support of the proposal to clarify the above points, then please can you provide this by 30/05/18 so that I can manage the application.

Please note that the above comments are offered without prejudice to any formal decision the local planning authority may make.

Andrew Waskett-Burt | Planning Officer
Rutland County Council
Catmose, Oakham, Rutland LE15 6HP
t: 01572 758 346 | e: awaskett-burt@rutland.gov.uk
www.rutland.gov.uk

Rutland County Council
Customer Service Centre: 01572 722 577

Email Enquiries: enquiries@rutland.gov.uk
Council Website: http://www.rutland.gov.uk
Visiting Rutland? http://www.discover-rutland.co.uk

The views expressed in this email are those of the author and may not be official policy. Internet email should not be treated as a secure form of communication. Please notify the sender if received in error.
Hi Andrew,

as you can see the garage / store was still up till the day before we completed on the field, it was demolished and the materials sold by the partner of the owner pre the School Ann bowman i believe.

i have included the Defra complaint file FYI

I have also spoken again with the School Mr M Ellis who has said his only concern would be movement/ work at unsociable hours, I have also assured him I wouldn’t be doing anything unsocial and I believe he will make a representation to that effect.

Kind Regards

Kevin
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11th June 2014
Our Ref: W100-0113

Mr Kevin Hawkes
KCH Engineering Limited
1 Rectory Farm Cottages
Rookery Lane
Stretton
Rutland
LE15 7RA

Dear Mr Hawkes,

WEEDS ACT 1959 COMPLAINT
Land at Rookery Lane, Stretton

As you will be aware an Inspector from the Rural Payments Agency visited the land described above on 4th June 2014. He has confirmed that an Enforcement Notice was not issued during the inspection because little to no Common Ragwort was found. It was also noted that any future risk to neighbouring land would be considered as low risk due to the natural barriers in place.

In view of this no further action will be taken and the complaint will be closed.

Yours sincerely,

‘Martin O’Loughlin
Customer Services
Injurious Weeds Section
Mr. Kevin Hawkes  
KCH Engineering Limited  
1 Rectory Farm Cottages  
Rookery Lane  
Stretton  
Rutland  
LE15 7RA

Ref: W100-0113  
Date: 20th May 2014

WEEDS ACT 1959 COMPLAINT – Land on the East Side of the Great North Road, Stretton

Further to the letter you were sent by Natural England on 15th May 2014 I am writing to confirm the arrangements to inspect the above land under the Weeds Act 1959.

I am therefore giving you formal notice that an official authorised by The Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs for the purposes of carrying the Weeds Act 1959 into effect proposes to enter on the land specified above on **10:30am Wednesday 4th June** and inspect the land to see whether any of the weeds covered by the Weeds Act 1959 are growing on the land and, if so whether action is required to prevent their spread.

Please be aware if you are claiming Single Payment this inspection carried out under the Weeds Act may take into account other issues relating to Cross Compliance under that scheme.

You should note that the obstruction of any person entering on to the land with the Secretary of State’s authority to take action under the Weeds Act 1959 is an offence which, on summary conviction, can result in a fine of up to £1,000.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Richard Wainwright  
Tel: 01228 640233
Dear Mr Hawkes

WEEDS ACT 1959 – COMPLAINT W100-0113

I am writing to inform you that we have received a complaint under the Weeds Act 1959 concerning the possible spread of Common Ragwort on land alongside the A1. We understand that you are the owner of this land hatched on the enclosed map.

I am bringing this matter to your attention as you may not be aware that Common Ragwort is classified as an Injurious Weed under section 1(2) of the Weeds Act 1959. Under the Act, Defra has powers to serve a formal notice requiring an occupier of land to take action to prevent injurious weeds from spreading. Defra has delegated these powers to Natural England. This letter is not a formal notice under the Weeds Act. However, I would be grateful if you would take appropriate action to prevent the weeds growing on your land from spreading and confirm the action that you have taken by completing Section 2 of the enclosed form. If you do not consider control action is required you should complete Section 3 of the form. The form should be returned to me by 16th May 2014.

The enclosed copy of [the ‘Defra Code of Practice on how to prevent the spread of Ragwort’ PB 9840, ‘Guidance on the disposal options for common ragwort’ PB 11050 and / or ‘Guidance note on the methods that can be used to control harmful weeds’ PB 7190] will help you determine what action should be taken to prevent the weeds from spreading. If the land is designated as set-aside, a Site of Special Scientific Interest or has some other designation you should refer to the relevant sections of the Code of Practice. You should also contact the local Natural England Area Team immediately to obtain advice on the most appropriate control method. If you are not certain whether the weeds growing on your land are covered by the Weeds Act a colour leaflet that enables easier identification is available on the Defra website at http://www.defra.gov.uk/farm/wildlife/weeds/index.htm. Alternatively a copy is available from this office on request. You should note that [the ‘Code of Practice’ PB 9840 / ‘Guidance on disposal options’ PB 11050 / ‘Guidance note’ PB 7190] gives general advice on control methods only. Specific advice
Dear Mr Hawkes

Further to our telephone conversation regarding the above planning application.

I have discussed this matter with the case officer and we will amend the address to ‘Land to the East of Shires Lane, Stretton, Rutland’, I will amend your application accordingly and send you a revised acknowledgement letter.

As requested please find attached a copy of the map which detailed ‘Rectory Farm Cottage’, I have passed this query onto the street naming and numbering department.

You can access this mapping system via our website but this is the direct link http://spectrumweb.rutland.gov.uk/connect/analyst/mobile/#/main

I trust this is to your satisfaction.

Kind regards
Hi Jason

Please can you add the above address point as per the attached plan. You may note a previous address point was created for this as ‘land to the South of Rectory Farm Cottage’, however I have been advised that Rectory Farm Cottage doesn’t exist any longer, this may be something which needs to be looked into.

Thanks
Dear Mr Hawkes,

Thank you for sending the revised plan. We can accept this as a combined location/block plan as it is now to scale, however it does need to show a north arrow. To fulfil this I have added one based on the previous plan provided, in order that I can validate the application. I trust this is acceptable to you.

Kind regards,

[Signature]

---

From: kevin [mailto:kevin@kchengineering.co.uk]
Sent: 19 April 2018 17:50
To: Planning
Subject: 2018/0259/FUL
Dear Mr Hawkes,

The Plan you have provided is not to the specified scale at the size you have sent it (A4). Please send through a to scale plan (hard copy or email) or advise of the correct size the plan should be printed at, at which the scale can be used.

Kind regards,
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
PROPOSAL: Erection of steel framed tractor shed
Land to the South of Rectory Farm Cottage, Shires Lane, Stretton, Rutland

Thank you for the above planning application that you have recently submitted. Unfortunately, we are unable to proceed, as it is incomplete. In order to ensure that your application meets the statutory minimum standards, please can you undertake the following:

The location plan provided is not acceptable because the application site boundary is not made clear. Please provide an amended plan with the application site clearly outlined in red and any other land in your ownership (if applicable) outlined in blue. The annotation showing a proposed track next to the Shires school building should also be removed if this is not part of the application.

The proposed tractor shed shown on the block plan has not been drawn to the correct scale. Please amend this accordingly.

Full details of national and local requirements for documents and plans to be submitted with applications can be found on our website at: https://www.rutland.gov.uk/my-services/planning-and-building-control/planning/apply-for-planning-permission/

Please note that if we do not hear from you in writing within 28 days from the date of this letter it will be assumed that you do not wish to proceed with your proposals and your application will be treated as DISPOSED OF.

All correspondence should be clearly marked with your application reference number: 2018/0259/FUL. If you would like any further information about the information you need to supply, please visit our website, https://www.rutland.gov.uk/my-services/planning-and-building-control/planning/apply-for-planning-permission/ or contact us on the telephone number above.

Yours sincerely

Development Control Services
Good Morning Nick,

"The adjacent building was demonstrated to serve a large agricultural area of several fields.”

I don’t know what the Planning officer was told but Halls do not own several fields they own one and its 7 acres. The Majority of what can be seen from the Halls new building is owned by Paul and Corrinne Casseppi my next door neighbours.

The responses to AWB are below and of course I don’t have transcript of telephone calls during which I obviously considered I had made good my point that just because my land total is only 5 acres it doesn’t need less equipment to do the same task as a 7 acre field which is all the Halls have, boundary wise i have more , as i mentioned before if Andrew had come for a site visit with me I could have pushed that point and he would have seen it for himself, I offered the LT for the other field.

"The adjacent building is located on the other side of a mature hedge thereby having no adverse impact on the Listed Building through the screening it provides.”

Which would be all well and true if the Halls owned that Mature hedge, but they don’t. What if I decide to cut the Hedge back to 2 metres high.

What happened to working with people, As I stated in one of my replies Im not precious about the shed location as in which field or location in that field and if Andrew thought it too big or in the wrong field why didn’t he ask for a meeting to work with me, its all or nothing with RCC. There is no consistency in the planning Dept at RCC its like a lucky dip.

Kevin

On 22 Jun 2018, at 09:47, Nick Begy <NBegy@rutland.gov.uk> wrote:

Kevin

See response below from Sylvia Bland who is out interim head of planning, and from South Kesteven, so no long term link to RCC.
Maybe you can respond to them with the information or let me know when it was supplied and I can follow this up?

Nick

Begin forwarded message:

From: Sylvia Bland <SBl@rutland.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: As discussed 2018/0259
Date: 21 June 2018 at 17:04:43 BST
To: Nick Begy <NBegy@rutland.gov.uk>
Cc: Andrew Waskett-Burt <AWaskett-Burt@rutland.gov.uk>

Hi Nick

The officer’s report is now on the Council’s website via the following link: https://publicaccess.rutland.gov.uk/online-applications/files/11C3CBE32E87F053D0A8C3CF725B3/pdf/2018_0259_FUL-DELEGATED_OFFICER_REPORT-1002604.pdf

There are significant differences between the proposals by Mr Hawkes (2018/0259) and the one submitted by Mrs Hall, Highfields Farm (2018/0035) which was approved on 23 March 2018. Therefore, it is not reasonable to compare the two schemes as if they were like for like.

The reasons for the refusal are set out in full in the officer’s report but in summary these are:

- The proposed building would harm the setting of a listed building, The Shires. This is based on the advice of the Council’s consultant Conservation Officer. The adjacent building is located on the other side of a mature hedge thereby having no adverse impact on the Listed Building through the screening it provides.
- It would not comply with DPD policy SP7 as insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate how the size of the building is essential for agricultural or horticultural purposes, nor that the amount of new build has been kept to a minimum. The adjacent building was demonstrated to serve a large agricultural area of several fields.

I understand that the case officer raised these concerns with Mr Hawkes on 16 May 2018 by email and this was followed up in a number of telephone conversations therefore he was fully aware of the issues that ultimately led to the planning decision. The case officer offered Mr Hawkes the opportunity to provide further information to address these concerns before making a decision but although he supplied other information to support his application, he did not further address the points which led to the refusal of permission.

I hope that this helps in your discussion.

Regards
Sylvia

Sylvia Bland MRTPI | Development Control Manager
Rutland County Council
Catmose, Oakham, Rutland LE15 6HP
t: 01572 720950
e-mail: sbland@rutland.gov.uk
www.rutland.gov.uk
From: Nick Begy
Sent: 19 June 2018 11:07
To: Sylvia Bland <SBland@rutland.gov.uk>
Subject: As discussed

Hi

See email attached.

N

Begin forwarded message:

From:
Subject: Re: My field maintenance equipment shed
Date: 18 June 2018 at 11:46:31 BST
To: Nick Begy <NBegy@rutland.gov.uk>

Just had this through the post

<image001.jpg>

What an absolute contradiction. You could think you were dealing with two completely different planning depts in different areas.

Check out the decision on this one below. Mine is on the other side of the fence. And I told the planning officer I was open to talking about location, size etc but he didn’t even ask for a site visit.

<image002.png>

Sent from my iPhone

On 18 Jun 2018, at 11:15, Nick Begy <NBegy@rutland.gov.uk> wrote:

Thanks, it wasn’t just me, I couldn’t find it either

On 18 Jun 2018, at 11:12, Kevin wrote:

Hi Nick

Just an update. I have contacted planning support and asked for confirmation that the application has indeed been refused. As there isn’t anything coming up on the website and work on the systems is ongoing. So it may be a glitch. We’ll see
I have also found the planning inspectorate online. It looks like James Brockenshire is the Minister And Sarah Richards the Agency Exec.

K

Sent from my iPhone

On 18 Jun 2018, at 09:36, Nick Begy <NBegy@rutland.gov.uk> wrote:

Good morning

Sorry for the late reply, I will endeavour to find this info for you today

N

On 16 Jun 2018, at 08:25, Kevin

wrote:

Good morning
Nick.

I’m absolutely disgusted with this decision. Do you possibly have any details about who to make a complaint to in the planning inspectorate. I have had enough of the being singled out and bullied by RCC planning officers.

Regards

Kevin

<IMG_0647.PNG
>

Sent from my iPhone
Begin forwarded message:

From: Nick Begy <NBegy@rutland.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: My field maintenance equipment shed
Date: 18 June 2018 at 12:03:40 BST
To: Nick Begy <NBegy@rutland.gov.uk>

Just nipped out for pictures of the other application. Which can be seen from the road and is within the section 4 conversation area. Which mine isn’t.

And that’s the precious Grade 2 listed building in the background

<image003.jpg>

Sent from my iPhone

On 18 Jun 2018, at 11:55, Nick Begy <NBegy@rutland.gov.uk> wrote:

Thanks

I’ll have a word

Sent from my iPhone

On 18 Jun 2018, at 11:46, Kevin wrote:

Just had this through the post

<image1.jpeg>

What an absolute contradiction. You could think you were dealing with two completely different planning depts in different areas.

Check out the decision on this one below. Mine is on the other side of the fence. And I told the
planning officer I was open to talking about location, size etc but he didn’t even ask for a site visit.

On 18 Jun 2018, at 11:15, Nick Begy
<NBegy@rutland.gov.uk> wrote:

Thanks, it wasn’t just me, I couldn’t find it either

On 18 Jun 2018, at 11:12, Kevin wrote:

Hi Nick

Just an update. I have contacted planning support and asked for confirmation that the application has indeed been refused. As there isn’t anything coming up on the website and work on the systems is ongoing. So it may be a glitch. We’ll see

I have also found the planning inspectorate online. It looks like James Brockenshire is the Minister And Sarah Richards the Agency Exec.

K

Sent from my iPhone
On 18 Jun 2018, at 09:36, Nick Begy <NBegy@rutland.gov.uk> wrote:

Good morning

Sorry for the late reply, I will endeavour to find this info for you today

N

On 16 Jun 2018, at 08:25,  wrote:

Good morning Nick.

I’m absolutely disgusted with this decision. Do you possibly have any details about who to make a complaint to in the planning inspectorate. I have had enough of the being singled out and bullied by RCC planning officers.

Regards

Kevin

<IMG_0647.PNG>

Sent from my iPhone
Hello

I represent the Shires at Stretton Residential School which sits immediately adjacent to the location of the planned development.

Whilst we have no specific objections to the plans, we would appreciate consideration be given to restrictions on the timings of any likely vehicle movements on and off the site – both at development stage and for ongoing general usage. As our site is residential, the young people who reside generally settle for the night from 8pm and rise at approximately 7am.

Due to the autistic nature of many of our young people, disturbance of regular sleep is extremely unsettling and would likely prove difficult to manage and distressing.

As such, we would request that restrictions on all vehicle movements are made between the hours of 8pm and 7am.

Kind regards
2018/0259/FUL

Rec’d 16-May-2018

From: Stretton Parish Council

Comments:

Stretton Parish Council has no objection to this planning application.