

**ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR & MAIDENHEAD  
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**MAIDENHEAD DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL**

20 September 2023

**Item: 1**

<b>Application No.:</b>	21/02963/FULL
<b>Location:</b>	Land West of Switchback Road North And North of Nightingale Lane Maidenhead
<b>Proposal:</b>	New poly tunnels for rearing turkeys with associated feed silos and substantial formation of road chippings to form a network of tracks
<b>Applicant:</b>	Copas
<b>Agent:</b>	Mr Mumtaz Alam
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>	Cookham Parish/Bisham And Cookham
<b>If you have a question about this report, please contact:</b> Dariusz Kusyk on 01628796812 or at <a href="mailto:dariusz.kusyk@rbwm.gov.uk">dariusz.kusyk@rbwm.gov.uk</a>	

**1. SUMMARY**

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of 25 poly tunnels on the site for the rearing of turkeys, with associated feed silos and substantial formation of road chippings to form a network of tracks within the site. The application is part retrospective, with 20 of the poly tunnels and associated works having been carried out on site. The proposed development would constitute a continued agricultural use on the site. There is therefore no change of use of the land, with the application relating to the works within the description of development only
- 1.2 Paragraph 149 (a) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identifies new buildings for agriculture and forestry as an exception from inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The proposed structures provide for the rearing of turkeys, with associated feed silos. The structures are for an agricultural use and the proposals therefore represent appropriate development within the Green Belt. Furthermore, the proposals have an acceptable impact on the appearance of the site given the set back from the road, with further landscaping secured by recommended condition, and the principle of the works are acceptable from a highway safety perspective, subject to recommended condition.
- 1.3 On the basis of the information provided, it has been demonstrated that the risk of pollution to controlled waters in the area is acceptable and that it can be appropriately mitigated. Furthermore, it been demonstrated that the development is acceptable with regard to flood risk and that the proposals would have an acceptable impact on amenity and environmental quality. Subject to recommended conditions, the application therefore complies with relevant development plan policies.
- 1.4 The Local Planning Authority (LPA) has carried out a Screening Opinion under Regulation 6 (1) of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2017 ("the EIA Regulations"), to confirm whether or not there is a requirement for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). The proposed development has been considered in the context of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 and it has been concluded that the proposal would not give rise to significant environmental effects, applying the selection criteria in Schedule

3 of the above Regulations. Accordingly, the decision of the LPA has been to adopt a Screening Opinion that an EIA is not required. As such, the LPA can proceed with the determination of the planning application.

**It is recommended the Committee grants planning permission with the conditions listed in Section 13 of this report.**

## **2. REASON FOR COMMITTEE DETERMINATION**

- The Council's Constitution does not give the Head of Planning delegated powers to determine the application in the way recommended; such decisions can only be made by the Committee as the application has been called in by Cllr Brar irrespective of the recommendation. The reason for the call in is that the development is considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and concerns have been raised with regard to the impact on the water table/soil and highway safety in the surrounding area.

## **3. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS**

- 3.1 The application site is located at Switchback Farm, north of Malders Lane and west of Switchback Road. Access to the site is from Switchback Road through a vehicular gate.
- 3.2 The site is located within the Green Belt and the surrounding area is characterised by sporadic development to the south-east and buildings to the south-west. The site is identified as being within Flood Zone 1, on a Principal aquifer bedrock and Source Protection Zone 2.

## **4. KEY CONSTRAINTS**

- 4.1 The site lies within the designated Green Belt, within Flood Zone 1 (Low risk probability of flooding) and Source Protection Zone 2 (SPZ2). The northern part of the site is partially located within identified contaminated land due to a former sand and clay quarry.

## **5. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 5.1 The application seeks part retrospective planning permission for the erection of 25 poly tunnels on the site for the rearing of turkeys, with associated feed silos and substantial formation of road chippings to form a network of tracks within the site. Amended plans were submitted during the course of the application to provide details of the associated feed silos.
- 5.2 The polytunnels, of which 20 have been constructed to date, are located to the eastern part of the site, accessed from the existing gated access point off Switchback Road. The polytunnels are grouped into five groups. Three groups of which are shown on the submitted plans to measure 80.0m by 42.5m and two groups measuring 40.0m by 42.5m. The application is part retrospective and as built, the polytunnels have a length of 70m and 33m. Each individual polytunnel has a width of 8.5m and a height of approximately 5.0m.
- 5.3 The polytunnels are constructed using a steel structure and tube legs which are staked directly into the ground and covered with polythene. There is no hardstanding below and both ends of the tunnel are open to the elements. Adjacent to each polytunnel are 5.4m

high galvanised steel feeding silos, with road chippings forming a network of tracks between the polytunnels. New landscaping is also shown to the south and west of the site.

- 5.4 The lawful use of the site is for agriculture. The use of the land for a turkey farm is an agricultural use and there is therefore no change of use of the land, with the application relating to the works within the description of development only. The method of production for the turkeys is free range and the birds are free to roam within the allocated paddocks, with each paddock sectioned off for each set of polytunnels. The polytunnels are used for the rearing of turkeys only. The applicant has confirmed that no slaughter or bird processing activities are carried out on site.
- 5.5 Following the serving of a Planning Contravention Notice (PCN) on the 13<sup>th</sup> June 2023, the applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and a Hydrogeological Risk Assessment (HRA) in order to enable the LPA to carry out a Screening Opinion under Regulation 6 of the Town and Country (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 to determine whether an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is required to be undertaken in connection with the proposed development at the site.
- 5.6 The LPA has considered the proposed development in the context of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. Based on the submitted information, and having regard to the site's context, hydrogeology and the ability to control environmental effects by way of conditions on the planning application, the impact of the development is considered to be, and would not constitute, a significant environmental effect and the development is not therefore EIA development. Accordingly, the decision of the LPA was to adopt a Screening Opinion that an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required. As such, the LPA can proceed with the determination of the planning application. The full Screening Opinion is attached as Appendix C.
- 5.7 There is no relevant planning history for the current proposal.

## **6. DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

### **Borough Local Plan**

- 6.1 The main Development Plan policies applying to the site are:

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Policy</b>
Sustainability and Placemaking	QP1
Character and Design of New Development	QP3
Development in Rural Areas and the Green Belt	QP5
Sustainable Transport	IF2
Managing Flood Risk and Waterways	NR1
Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows	NR3
Environmental Protection	EP1
Noise	EP4
Contaminated Land and Water	EP5

## **7. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

### **National Planning Policy Framework Sections (NPPF)**

Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development

Section 4 - Decision-making

Section 9 - Promoting sustainable transport

Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places

Section 13 - Protecting Green Belt land

Section 14- Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Section 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

### **Supplementary Planning Documents**

- Cookham Village Design Statement (VDS)
- Borough Wide Design Guide

### **Other Local Strategies or Publications**

- RBWM Townscape Assessment
- Environment and Climate Strategy

## **8. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT**

### **Comments from interested parties**

Five occupiers were notified directly of the application.

Seven letters were received objecting to the application (including from The Cookham Society), summarised as:

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Where in the report this is considered</b>

1.	Inaccurate plans, excluding feeding silos.	Noted. Updated plans have been submitted during the course of the application.
2.	Environmental impact - light, smell and noise pollution and contamination of water.	See section 9.
3.	Harmful impact on highways (pedestrian and road safety).	See section 9.
4.	Unacceptable impact upon the Green Belt (inappropriate development as the use is not agricultural).	See section 9.
5.	Unacceptable industrial use of the site.	The application relates to the works which form the description of development as set out in detail in section 5.
6.	Concerns with influenza issues.	See section 9.
7.	Other activities carried out on site.	No other activities are included as part of the application.
8.	Neighbouring occupiers impact.	See section 9.
9.	Development is north of Malders Lane and not Nightingale Lane.	Noted. The site location accurately shows the site which is the subject of the application.
10.	Concerns on impact on wildlife.	See section 9.
11.	Harmful year round impact of the proposals.	See section 9.
12.	Site is in the flood plain.	See section 9.
13.	The proposals are retrospective or at least part retrospective.	Noted. This is reflected in the description of the works as set out in detail in section 5.
14.	No weight should be given to the statement that the land is of lower agricultural value and therefore suitable for this type of operation.	The application is considered on its merits at the time of submission, in accordance with relevant development plan policies.
15.	Not clear if the planting is an intrinsic part of the application or what the status of the planting land would be.	The submitted plans show the proposed landscaping of the site. See section 9.
16.	Switchback Road is defined in the Cookham VDS as a 'home coming route'. Do not want to see industrial silos above the hedges.	See section 9.
17.	Harm to heritage views as identified in the Cookham VDS.	See section section 9.

18.	For small permitted development works, livestock should be a minimum of 400m away from a protected building (private dwelling). This should be the case here also.	Planning permission is sought for the proposals. The application is considered on its merits at the time of submission, in accordance with relevant development plan policies.
19.	Application should include an unequivocal, binding commitment to remove all structures if turkey rearing is not undertaken in any year.	The application seeks planning permission for the use. A temporary permission is not sought and such a condition would not meet the relevant tests for imposition.

### Statutory consultees

Consultee	Comment	Where in the report this is considered
Environment Agency (EA)	No objection, subject to condition.  Original objection has been overcome with the submission of additional information as set out in section 5.	See section 9.
Local Lead Flooding Authority (LLFA)	No objection, subject to condition.  Original objection has been overcome with the submission of additional information as set out in section 5.	See section 9.

### Consultees

Consultee	Comment	Where in the report this is considered
RBWM Highways	No objection, subject to condition.	See section 9.
RBWM Environmental Protection	No objection, subject to condition.  Original objection has been overcome with the submission of additional information as set out in section 5.	See section 9.

### Others (e.g. Parish and Amenity Groups)

Group	Comment	Where in the report this is considered
Cookham Parish Council	Concerns raised with regard to:  - Water, air pollution; - Highways impact;	See section 9.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Impact upon the Green Belt and the surrounding area. This is a very specific usage of agricultural land;</li> <li>- Prominent appearance of the structures in views on approach to Cookham, contrary to the Cookham VDS;</li> <li>- Continued delay in determining the application, with the applicant continuing operations;</li> <li>- Absence of satisfactory reports from Environmental Health and Flood Authority; and,</li> <li>- Enforcement action should commence promptly.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

## 9. EXPLANATION OF RECOMMENDATION

9.1 The key issues for consideration are:

- i. Impact on the Green Belt;
- ii. Risk of pollution to groundwater;
- iii. Impact of the development on flood risk;
- iv. Impact on the appearance of the area;
- v. Impact on amenity and environmental quality;
- vi. Highways impact; and,
- vii. Trees and landscaping.

### Green Belt

9.2 The application site is located within the designated Green Belt, where development is restricted to protect the Green Belt's openness and the five purposes for which it is designated. Paragraph 149 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021 sets out that a Local Planning Authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt, albeit with certain exceptions. As set out in paragraph 147 of the NPPF, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

9.3 Paragraph 149 (a) of the NPPF identifies new buildings for agriculture and forestry as an exception from inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The proposed polytunnels house the rearing of turkeys, with associated feed silos, and provide for protection from wind, rain and temperature changes during the rearing season, as well as adequate space for movement and exercise. Given that the works are for the established agricultural use of the site, the proposals represent appropriate development within the Green Belt. As such, the proposals are acceptable in principle as a form of development within the designated Green Belt.

### Pollution risk to groundwater

9.4 The development is located on a site which is on a Principal aquifer bedrock, with no superficial deposits, and within SPZ2. Policy EP5 of the BLP sets out that development proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated that proposals do not cause unacceptable harm to the quality of the groundwater, including Source Protection Zones, and do not have a detrimental effect on the quality of surface water. Development proposals should demonstrate how they will achieve remedial or preventative measures and submit any supporting assessments.

9.5 The location of the site is such that groundwater in the surrounding area is vulnerable and sensitive to potential impacts and as such careful consideration is required as to the impact of the development. Following initial consultation with the EA, it was identified

that the application had not been submitted alongside any detail or information in order to demonstrate how site effluent and surface waters associated with the use would be managed and discharged. Furthermore, greater detail was required with regard to the expected volumes (including increases from storm events), effluent quality and discharge locations and depths, if discharge is to ground) and a HRA to address controlled waters was also required for assessment.

- 9.6 During the course of the application, as part of the EIA Screening Opinion which has been carried out (see Section 5), an FRA and a HRA has been provided. The FRA states that rainwater run off would be dealt with via soakaways that drain towards the nearest river, the White Brook. The HRA states that the turkeys roam free range in the paddocks (with the polytunnels providing shelter) and that no slaughter or processing activities are carried out on site. The main risk to groundwater is identified as nitrogen from turkey droppings, with expected production per turkey of approximately 10g of litter per day on arrival, increasing to approximately 320g per day by the end of their 17 week placement period. The HRA states that the potential impact of this could be reduced by 'good farming practice', including a bedding of hay, regular clearing and applying manure and nitrogen fertilizers when crops are growing. The report acknowledges that if the ground becomes excessively wet through rainfall, water could travel through interstices of soil to the chalk strata carrying nitrates; however, that most of the litter would be collected within the bedding hay and removed from site. Where this is within the paddock, most of the litter would be biologically treated by having to percolate through a 3m deep band of sandy gravel.
- 9.7 The submitted documents have been further reviewed by the EA. The EA has confirmed that based on the submitted documents, it has been demonstrated that the risks posed to groundwater resources by the development can be suitably managed, subject to recommended conditions. Conditions are recommended to control the number of turkeys on the site to no more than 40,000 at any time during one rear season (15<sup>th</sup> August to 31<sup>st</sup> December), in addition to the management of bedding and litter on the site and the immediate removal of any turkeys found to have perished on the site during the rearing season. A condition is also recommended to secure an amended surface water drainage system, including details of all soakaways, climate change adjustment factors and contamination prevention measures. Subject to these recommended conditions, the application complies with paragraphs 174 and 183 of the NPPF and policy EP5 of the BLP.

### **Flood risk**

- 9.8 The application site lies within Flood Zone 1. Policy NR1 of the BLP sets out that within designated Flood Zones 2 and 3, and also in Flood Zone 1 on sites of 1 hectare or more in size and in other circumstances as set out in the NPPF, development proposals will only be supported where an appropriate FRA has been carried out and it has been demonstrated that development is located and designed to ensure that flood risk from all sources of flooding is acceptable in planning terms. As identified above, the site is located within Flood Zone 1 and has an area greater than 1 hectare. A site specific FRA has been submitted as part of the application and demonstrates compliance with BLP policy NR1 and the guidance set out in section 14 of the NPPF.
- 9.9 With regard to surface water flood risk, the site has been identified as having a Medium to High surface water flood risk. Due to the nature of the development, mitigation measures are not required in this instance. The application details that soakaways are proposed in order to discharge into an existing watercourse. The submitted FRA sets out that rainwater from the polytunnels is collected via guttering which is then directed to soakaways. Each polytunnel set has two dedicated soakaways, constructed 5m away



from the north eastern and south eastern corners. The proposed soakaways have been designed in accordance with the relevant standards for larger areas, in this case BS EN 752-4 or “BRE Digest 365 Soakaway Design”. The principle of the proposal is acceptable in this regard and demonstrates that the proposals would have an acceptable impact on surface water flood risk, in accordance with policy NR1 of the BLP. A condition is recommended to ensure that the polytunnels are maintained in a good state of repair during the rearing season.

### **Appearance**

- 9.10 Policy QP3 of the BLP requires new development to contribute towards achieving sustainable high quality design. Policy QP3 is consistent with the objectives of Section 12 of the NPPF (2021) which states that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. The Cookham VDS is also relevant to this application and is consistent with national and local policy in relation to the character and appearance of a development.
- 9.11 The polytunnels, of which planning permission is sought for 25 in total, are grouped in numbers of five and are covered in polythene sheeting, with a height of approximately 5m. Adjacent to each polytunnel are 5.4m high galvanised steel feeding silos. The Cookham VDS highlights the route from Switchback to Cannondown Road and the Maidenhead Road as a ‘homecoming route’, with Guidance G11.1 setting out that any planning proposal which may have an impact on any of the approaches to the village that lie within Cookham parish should be expected to demonstrate that the impact does not detract from, or is a positive enhancement to, the particular approach.
- 9.12 The structures are set back in excess of 80m from Switchback Road. Whilst substantial, this set back, together with proposals for new landscaping to the south and west of the site, would ensure that the proposals, which are associated with an agriculture use on the site and an in keeping form of development for such a use, have an acceptable appearance on views into and out of the surrounding area. With particular regard to the silos and concerns raised regarding their appearance, the applicant has confirmed that these are constructed in galvanised steel and would therefore dull and age over time. Further detail of landscaping for the site to be submitted within one month of the decision is secured by recommended condition to ensure that the level and form of landscaping is appropriate in form and location.

### **Amenity and Environmental Quality**

- 9.13 Local Plan policy QP3 requires new development to have no unacceptable effect on the amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjoining properties in terms of privacy, sunlight and daylight amongst other things. The proposed structures, due to their positioning and scale, together with sufficient separation distances to neighbouring properties, would not cause any unacceptable impact with regard to overlooking, loss of light, increased sense of enclosure or light pollution.
- 9.14 With regard to the proposed use, policy EP1 of the BLP states that development proposals will only be supported where it can be shown that either individually or cumulatively in combination with other schemes, they do not have an unacceptable effect on environmental quality or landscape. Policy EP1 also requires consideration of residential amenity in relation to noise, smell or other nuisance, with policy EP4 specifically relating to levels of noise generation.

- 9.15 The proposed development would constitute a continued agricultural use on the site. However, it differs from the previous operational use at the site and as such detail is required as to how waste is managed, what air handling or climate control is used in the poly tunnels i.e. plant machinery and what odour control procedures are utilised. The nature of the particular use is that the polytunnels are largely open and that the turkeys wander around in a pen, thereby reducing the risk of odour. The applicant has also confirmed that no slaughter of stock is carried out on the site and conditions are recommended to control waste associated with the site. The overall number and time period for turkeys to be present on site is controlled by recommended condition, in addition to a condition to ensure that no external lighting is erected or used to protect the amenities of surrounding residents.
- 9.16 With regard to plant noise, the submission documents set out that turkeys are slow feeders and as such, spend the majority of time outdoor thereby negating the requirement for mechanical ventilation and associated noise disturbance. An informative is attached which advises the applicant that should the business model to change and mechanical ventilation/drying be required, planning permission would be required.
- 9.17 Based on the submission documents, the application demonstrate that the proposals would have an acceptable impact on amenity and environmental quality, in accordance with policies EP1 and EP4 of the BLP.

### **Highways**

- 9.18 The existing access to the site would be retained and based on the submission documents, would attract one or two deliveries a week during the four to four and a half months at the start of the rearing season, rising to three deliveries a week during the latter half of the season. At the end of the season, which falls in late November to early December, and where the activity is at its highest, vehicular activity increases to four loads (eight trips) over four to five days. When taking into account staff movements of which there are four to five employees, the development attracts a minimum of 18 trips per day.
- 9.19 Whilst it is accepted that this trip generation would be increased when taking into account the general public, the existing site access offers clear views in both directions and the existing gates are set back by approximately 17m to allow a vehicle to park in front of the gates without obstructing traffic flows on the public highway. This would ensure that there would be no material harm on highway safety in the surrounding area. Furthermore, a condition is recommended to secure further details of the size of the vehicles associated with the proposed use and a plan showing parking and turning for delivery vehicles, employees and customers if they are permitted access to the site within one month of the date of the decision.

### **Trees and landscape**

- 9.20 Policies QP3 and NR3 of the BLP highlight the importance of trees to the character of an area and the quality of a development. The proposed scheme would not result in any loss or detrimental impact upon the existing landscaping or the surrounding trees. As set out above, additional planting between tunnels and tracks and across the site is proposed. Further detail of landscaping for the site, including native trees, to be submitted within one month of the decision is secured by recommended condition to ensure that the level and form of landscaping is appropriate in form and location.

## **10. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)**

10.1 The development is not CIL liable.

## 11. PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

11.1 Subject to recommended conditions, the development demonstrates compliance with relevant development plan policies and relevant sections of the NPPF. As such, the recommendation is for the approval of the application.

## 12. APPENDICES TO THIS REPORT

- Appendix A – Site layout
- Appendix B – Elevation drawings
- Appendix C – EIA Screening Opinion

## 13. CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED FOR INCLUSION IF PERMISSION IS GRANTED

1 The polytunnels as approved, shall only be used for the rearing of turkeys, with no more than 40,000 turkeys reared on the site at any one time during the rearing season beginning 15th August and ending 31st December in each calendar year.

Reason: To protect groundwater quality. Relevant policies - BLP Policy EP5 and paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2 No more than 25 polytunnels and 15 feed silos shall be present on the land at any one time, in accordance with the size and locations shown on the approved plans, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect groundwater quality. Relevant policies - BLP Policy EP5 and paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

3 Hay or straw bedding shall be placed within the polytunnels prior to any turkeys being brought on to the site and shall be maintained for the duration of the rearing season. The bedding shall be kept dry and friable at all times to allow the birds to dust bathe, be topped up where necessary, maintained to a depth of no less than 5cm and if wet, both replaced and removed from the site immediately. All bedding and litter shall be removed from the site within seven days of the end of the rearing season and no storage of used bedding, litter or manure shall take place on site at any time unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed management of manure does not harm groundwater quality. Relevant policies - BLP Policy EP5, paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Position Statements H6, H7 and H8 of the 'The Environment Agency's approach to groundwater protection'.

4 No mechanical ventilation equipment shall be operated in or around the polytunnels. The use of generators to operate the feed silos shall be used for no more than two hours each day, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of surrounding properties. Relevant policies - BLP Policy QP3.

5 Whilst in use, the polytunnels shall be maintained in a good state of repair and any repairs carried out where necessary to ensure there are no leaks. All guttering shall be kept free from debris to ensure there is no obstruction to flows.

Reason: To protect groundwater quality. Relevant policies - BLP Policy EP5 and paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

6 Any turkeys that are found to have perished during the rearing season shall be removed

from the site with immediate effect.

Reason: To protect groundwater quality. Relevant policies - BLP Policy EP5 and paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 7 No external lighting shall be erected or used in associated with the rearing of turkeys on the site unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of surrounding properties. Relevant policies - BLP Policy QP3.

- 8 Within one month from the date of this decision, an amended surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The surface water drainage scheme shall include:

- i. Locations, depths and detailed designs of all soakaways;
- ii. Climate change adjustment factors in the hydraulic simulation results; and,
- iii. Further information regarding the measures in place to prevent contamination of rainwater from any sources of contamination, including turkey litter.

Thereafter the surface water drainage shall be managed strictly in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect groundwater quality. Relevant policies - BLP Policy EP5 and paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 9 Within one month of the date of the decision, further details of the size of the vehicles to be used for the proposed use and a plan showing parking and turning for delivery vehicles, employees and customers if permitted access to the site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in the surrounding area. Relevant policy - BLP Policy IF2.

- 10 Within one month of the date of the decision, further details of the landscaping for the site, which includes native trees, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscaping shall be planted, in accordance with the approved details within the next planting season.

Reason: To secure appropriate landscaping and an acceptable impact on visual amenities in the surrounding area. Relevant policies - BLP Policy QP3 and NR3.

- 11 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed below.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved particulars and plans.

PL01  
PL02A  
PL03A  
PL04A

### **Informatives**

- 1 The applicant is advised that should the future use of mechanical ventilation be required planning permission would be required for its use and installation.
- 2 The applicant is advised that you must apply to the Environment Agency (EA) for a bespoke environmental permit to rear poultry intensively if there are more than 40,000 places for poultry. Please note, there are currently delays to our permitting service, so

we encourage you to contact the EA as early as possible. The EA will be including the following key areas of potential harm when making an assessment for the Permit:

- i. Management - including general management, accident management, energy efficiency, efficient use of raw materials and waste recovery;
- ii. Operations - including permitted activities and operating techniques (including the use of poultry feed, housing design and management, slurry spreading and manure management planning);
- iii. Emissions - to water, air and land including to groundwater and diffuse emissions, transfers off-site, odour, noise and vibration, monitoring; and,
- iv. Information - records, reporting and notifications.

The EA expect new intensive livestock development to comply with the environmental performance standards in <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/intensive-farming-introduction-and-chapters>. The EA will justify any derogation we allow from these standards in their decisions.

- 3 The Environment Agency (EA) have a regulatory role in issuing legally required consents, permits or licences for various activities. The EA have not assessed whether consent will be required under their regulatory role and therefore in commenting on the application, the EA does not indicate that permission will be given as a regulatory body. The applicant should contact 03708 506 506 or consult the EA's website to establish if consent will be required for the works. Please see <http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/business/topics/permitting/default.aspx>