

From: Christine Bates [<mailto:Ccom>]
Sent: 17 October 2013 09:09
To: Brace, Carl
Cc: Price, Philip (Cllr)
Subject: FW: Kesri Smolas Objections to P.C. report following site visit
Importance: High

Please add the response to the email Mrs Smolas sent

Following the email from Mrs.Smolas, Clifford Parish Council offer a further explanation of our comments following the site visit.

1. The argument that Llanerch y Coed is basically a working farm seeking additional income was not convincing given the intention to convert the site to six dwellings and five geodomes with not a single remaining agricultural building. This seems far from the definition of a farm.

2. The P.C. analysed the vehicle situation at length with Mr.Smolas while standing in a group on the common. We added together all the cars which might be present at a busy period e.g. Hay Festival. Taking the likely number of vehicles for each dwelling, the owner's vehicles and the staff and service vehicles we soon reached 17. Anyone used to accommodating festival goers knows that they commonly come and go to the festival site to different events at different times. Two visits plus per day is not uncommon. This equals 4 journeys each i.e. in excess of 60 vehicle movements per day. We were not convinced by the claim that some trips 'don't count'. In our view all journeys count if we are to have an accurate picture of the potential traffic along a single track road with no passing places.

In addition, if this development is to inject one million pounds per annum into the local economy this should be fully explained in detail rather than referred to in passing.

3. As Mrs. Smolas accepts that there is a fire risk to the hay meadow housing the geodomes during hot weather, there should be a detailed description of the preventive measures that they will be legally required to put in place.

4. On the subject of lights, it was Mr.Smolas who explained that the existing yard lights were rarely turned on, whilst we discussed the matter in the yard. This was not hearsay.

5. We were told by Hereford Council that the previous application had failed on ecological grounds. This was not a 'vague statement'.

6. Mr. Smolas stated during our visit that many sparrows used the martin boxes. He was asked to indicate which the martins had nested in but was unable to do so. There were no intact natural martin's nests present. It is widely understood that swallows and martins are reluctant to use artificial nests.

I hope this clarifies the comments we made following our visit.

[Question](#)

Mr. Brace, if this application were successful would it be possible for the owners to sell off the converted buildings separately over time. If not, how would this be prevented in perpetuity? This was a query raised at the site meeting.

Christine