

[REDACTED]

Sent: 08 June 2026 20:00
To: Planning Admin
Subject: Planning Application 20260243

[REDACTED]

Caution: This email was sent from outside of the organisation. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender.

FTAO

Lisa Fisher Planning Officer

I wish to submit three material planning issues which go directly to whether this application can be properly and lawfully determined.

1. Absence of an Air Quality Impact Assessment (AQMA)

The application site lies within a designated Air Quality Management Area despite this, the application has been submitted without any air quality impact assessment.

In the absence of such evidence:

The council is not in a position to properly assess air quality impacts.

It is not possible to determine whether the development complies with national policy.

A key material planning consideration remains unaddressed.

This is particularly significant given the likely increase in traffic associated with a delivery-focused operation in close proximity to residential properties, a park and school.

1. Conflict with National Planning Policy (NPPF Paragraph 97 Paragraph 97 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should refuse applications for hot food takeaways and fastfood

outlets within walking distance of schools and other places where children and young people congregate, unless located within a designated town centre.

The proposed development clearly engages this policy:

Directly adjacent to Woodlands park.

Within walking distance of St George's school 400 metres to school gates.

Not located within a designated town centre

This policy was introduced by government in response to concerns around childhood obesity and public health, and to give councils clearer authority to resist fast food developments in sensitive locations.

Accordingly, the proposal gives rise to a clear conflict with national policy and presumption against development.

1. Biodiversity Net Gain information not capable of proper scrutiny.

A biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) metric has been submitted as part of the application; however, it appears illegible and effectively unreadable, meaning it cannot be viewed by the public.

This raises a procedural concern, as;

Supporting documents must be accessible, transparent, and capable of meaningful scrutiny.

Proper consideration of biodiversity impacts is not possible if the information cannot be assessed at present, this represents an incomplete evidential basis for decision making.

Conclusion

This proposal conflicts with national planning policy (NPPF paragraph 97)

Has been submitted without essential air quality advice in an AQMA and includes supporting information that cannot be viewed.

Kindest regards,

