

Response to Planning Application Reference SMD/2024/0077

10 August 2025

With respect to the above application, we have fortunately (at the last minute) picked up from the Portal that the application is again out to public consultation following at applicants' submission of two additional documents on 22/07/2025, namely:

- Revised Drawing AL 01 A; and
- Applicants Heritage Statement

Please note that none of the residents have been notified that the application was back out for consultation and no public notice has been put up. On this basis, can we kindly request that a public notice is put up and the public consultation period is restarted?

With regards to the additional documents, the Basford Green Community's position still stands that we vehemently object to having our hamlet ruined with the construction of the proposed 28ft high tower (as below) in the middle of our hamlet.



Future view with the proposed agricultural shed from the listed Lodge Cottages. Note that the much smaller Sneyd Arms Farm shed is completely screened by the existing hedge.



The photograph above is taken from Basford Hall Road and helps to demonstrate that the proposed shed as illustrated, at twice the height of the existing Sneyd Arms Farm shed is clearly overbearing on its surrounds and can clearly be seen from all directions even with the mature trees in full leaf.

The Community's stance remains that with all of the land that the applicant has that has previously been developed and has existing access, why are they being so cruel to their community and subject us to this monstrosity in the centre of our hamlet on previously undeveloped land? Even knowing how strongly we feel about it, it is sickening and extremely hurtful to know that they are still pursuing this application. Does the applicant understand how much stress and upset this application has caused to their community, many of which have lived here most of their lives? What has the Basford Green Community ever done to them to deserve this?

Given that the Basford Green Community has not been notified of this consultation, we have had to quickly pull together the following initial comments from the on the revised plans etc.

The revised plans (see below) include for planting alongside the more recently added compacted stone access track, which the applicants originally said they didn't need.



This plan is extremely misleading and portrays the 'token' planting in a much more mature and filled out state than will be the reality – particularly when read in conjunction with the planting schedule (see below).

Schedule: planting

Botanical Name	Common Name	Abbreviation	Quantity	Size (cm)	Container
<i>Ilex aquifolium</i>	Common Holly	Ia	9	275 / 300	Wire RB
<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>	Scots Pine	Ps	7	18-20 clearstem	Wire RB
<i>Taxus baccata</i>	English Yew	Tb	16	80/100	Wire RB
<i>Castanea sativa</i>	Sweet Chestnut	Cs	5	40/60	Wire RB
<i>Quercus robur</i>	English Oak	Qr	5	200/250	Wire RB

How on earth are **42** newly planted trees and shrubs along a 100m access track through unvegetated grazing land going to screen a **8.5m (28ft)** high 'agricultural' shed from the listed buildings that have direct line of sight? We question whether the above schedule been inserted in error?

Direct comparison can be drawn from the below on Apesford Lane, which has significantly more than 42 trees and shrubs and a shorter access.



The trees and shrubs in the above example have been planted for a few years now and as the photo was only taken a few days ago, are in full leaf. As can be seen, the trees and shrubs have made no difference to screening this building and won't do for decades to come.

With regards to the planting mix proposed in the planting schedule, of the 5 species, 3 of them are some of the slowest growing trees and shrubs in the UK – oak, yew and holly. It would take nearly a century for those trees and shrubs to screen a 28ft high building and get to what has been wrongly indicated on Revised Drawing AL 01 A!

Further to this and on a very much more detailed level but yew is not locally common in Basford Green and is poisonous to livestock – why would the applicant introduce a poisonous species into an agricultural field that is grazed by their tenant farmers' cattle?

With regards to the access itself, are the Council aware that the access itself is unlawful given the below triangle of land was sold to the applicants from the previous owner of Sneyd Arms Farm and the applicant installed the walls and gates without planning permission?



Other initial comments from the Community are as follows.

One of our community members met with the applicant several months ago and he said that he was unaware that his proposed shed would be so visible from all directions and said that he would reduce its overall height and also dig it down into the ground. No further amended plans for this have been submitted.

In the same conversation, when the applicant was asked what he was planning to do with the mountain of illegally felled trees, he said he was going to bring in a huge industrial chipper for 'a few days' to chip them where they are. This is in direct contradiction to previous statements including the applicants 'Agents Additional Supporting Information 02.05.2024'

Noise

There is a clear misunderstanding within the letters of objection in respect of noise. For avoidance of doubt, no processing of trees will occur within the building. The building will be used for the storage of woodchip. Likewise there will be no biomass boiler within the building.

The wood itself will be stacked and then chipped in the woodland (defined as Consall Woods) and therefore will create no noise at the storage shed. This process is nothing new to the estate. The noise impacts associated with the development will therefore be no different to the adjacent agricultural building associated with Sneyd Arms Farm. That adjacent building also lies closer to the manège and neighbouring properties referred to within the objections. We are agreeable to the imposition of a planning condition to preclude the use of the building for the processing of wood / woodchip.

The above comments from the applicant support the Community's objection and comments that this application is misleading and the application has been submitted as the wrong use class, as it will be used as a commercial wood chipping facility to supply and support the applicants' high end gated holiday let development. Note, most of the previous community members that were tenants in the properties on the Basford Hall Estate have been moved out and the redevelopment of the estate is well underway through a parcelised planning strategy.

Whilst not a threat, the applicant should be made aware that the Basford Green Community are unanimous on the prospect that if the applicant chooses to continue to ignore us, we will have no other option only to take a much more adversarial approach. Included in this is to club together and do what Mr Pickford has done along Cheddleton Lane with his dilapidated curtain sider etc.

Whilst we welcome the Council retrospectively including the Conservation Officer as a consultee, we still question why the following consultees listed in our previous objections have still not been included:

Fire Officer – this is important given by the applicants own admission that the material to be stored can self-combust depending on moisture levels and there is a conflict of uses with flammable materials and machinery in the same building. This is particularly important as no fire plan or precautions have been included as part of the application. How does the applicant plan to ensure the moisture levels of every load of woodchip being brought to the proposed store are the correct moisture levels, so that it doesn't self-combust?

Ecologist – over and above the reasons provided in our previous objections as to why the Council Ecologist should be consulted, it is even more important now, as given the amount of time the mountain of felled trees to be chipped has been sat there, it will have inevitably developed its own ecosystem, with nesting birds, hedgehogs, amphibians (incl. the Great Crested Newts we have previously notified) etc.

Tree Officer – again as per our previous objections, the 28ft shed will overbear / pinch the ancient hedgerow. When we spoke with the Tree Officer prior to Planning Committee, he said that he should have been consulted. Further to this, surely the Tree Officer should be consulted on the proposed species mix etc?

In conclusion, the Basford Green Community's previous objections (submitted on 2/4/2024 and 4/11/2024) still stand in their entirety and the submission of the Revised Drawing AL 01 A and Applicants Heritage Statement have done nothing to allay their fears.

The Basford Green Community wholeheartedly asks of the applicant that they reconsider and withdraw this application for everyone's sake.

Kind regards

The Basford Green Community