

---

# Committee Update

---

Erection of a pullet rearing unit  
at land at Old Impton Farm,  
Norton, Presteigne

---

Prepared for R Wilding

---



land & property  
professionals

Roger Parry & Partners LLP  
[www.rogerparry.net](http://www.rogerparry.net)  
[welshpool@rogerparry.net](mailto:welshpool@rogerparry.net)  
**Tel: 01938 554499**

---

## Committee Update

The above proposal is on the agenda for committee determination on the 4<sup>th</sup> of July. Following the officer's report being made public, CPRW and a third-party representation decided to make additional comments.

In light of their late response and the comments raised, we didn't have a choice but to address these comments as part of an update to committee.

### CPRW

1. **EIA Screening** – The Local Planning Authority have screened the proposal and have quite rightly come to the conclusion that this is not EIA development. The development is well below the indicative thresholds within the EIA regulations, and the assessments carried out illustrate that all matters are considered to be acceptable, without an environmental statement required.
2. **The application** – The red line boundary is on the location plan; we are unsure with the comment 'to correspond to the planning fee' as the planning fee is based on the floor area of the development not the site area or red line boundary. There is a blue line that illustrates the extent of the land under the ownership of the applicant on the location plan.
3. **Insufficient and inconsistent information** – The number of birds specified in the documentation has specified approximately 37,000 or 36,600. These figures are within 400 birds of one another, and typically a flock is 36,600. The number of cycles per year, depends on the contract and the firm's requirement of birds. The sheds can be empty from 10 days for wash out, up to 28 days. Hence the number of cycles per year vary. The rule of thumb is about 2.3 cycles per year.

Waterbodies are indicated on plan and the manure maps are shown in relation to the nearby residences, and a buffer has been provided to those residences.

The manure management maps illustrate the existing residences in relation to the manure spreading. All the land identified of being spread on, has been spread with poultry manure for decades by importing poultry manure. No more poultry manure will be spread on these fields than what is being done currently, and therefore this proposal will have no more impact than what is currently being spread on.

4. **Hydrology** – The proposal is for a self-contained pullet rearing unit, with limited or no alteration to the character of the ground and surface water features, similar to any agricultural building. The character of the drinking water aquifer will remain unchanged, given that no dirty water will go into the ground (SSAFO compliant dirty water tank). If the hydrology factor is raised due to manure spreading, this will remain unchanged, as the land has had poultry manure spread on it for decades.

**Water Quality** – Full consultation has been carried out with the environmental health officer who has raised no concern regarding potential pollution. The water quality will not change due to this proposal, as the ground or manure spreading will not change.

**Water Quantity** – The water quantity should not be considered a material factor, as the shed will utilise the existing borehole on site, which is constantly operational. The 2,500 litres per day for 37,000 birds is an average of their 16 weeks in house, and therefore will

vary from low consumption when they are young and then higher consumption when they are set to leave the house. The rate is well below the 20,000 litres per day required for an abstraction licence from NRW.

5. **Manure Management** – All the figures used within the manure management plan is DEFRA guidance. The applicant has nearly 3 times the land required for the manure produced by the proposal and therefore the comment about the housing of existing stock is irrelevant, as the amount of manure produced by the current stock is negligible in comparison to the land available.

The location of the manure storage has been identified as being in the existing farm buildings on the farm and the fields to be spread on has been identified.

The high court judgement did not stipulate that potential dust and odour impact need to be modelled, it only considered that the consultees need to assess the impacts.

DEFRA Guidance (Local Air Quality Management Technical Guidance (TG16) April 2016) again stipulates that a screening assessment of a poultry unit installation only occurs when the proposed number of birds is over 400k AND a sensitive receptor is under 100m away.

6. **Living Conditions** – Again please refer to DEFRA's technical guidance on air quality management and not depend on a newspaper article.

We are content in a condition being placed on the permission limiting the maximum noise emission from the fans and the number of fans to be restricted to a maximum of 10.

7. **The Natural Environment** – Again, CPRW question the content of some information supplied in the application, but use newspaper articles as 'evidence'?

As the Cllr's are fully aware training has been provided by NRW regarding ammonia and nitrogen pollution. NRW have reduced their acceptability thresholds for new units to 1% or under on national sensitive sites, which is a big step. The modelling carried out for this development is under 1% and therefore the impact on nationally sensitive sites is acceptable even within the new restrictive threshold.

The ammonia and nitrogen modelling has been assessed by a professional air quality assessor and reviewed by professional and competent bodies in NRW and Powys Ecology and everybody has come to the conclusion that the proposal will not give rise to unacceptable impacts on the natural environment.

8. **Cumulative Impacts** – The planning department and consultees has taken into account the potential cumulative impact. They have confirmed that this proposal being a small-scale pullet rearing unit is acceptable on an individual basis and cumulatively as well.

9. **Well Being of Future Generations Act** – This is covered within the officers report.

## **Third Party Representation**

### **Document inconsistency**

The documentation submitted is to a very high standard and limited copy and paste is used, only on items that are identical such as information on bird welfare or processes within copy and paste is used, comments like these without examples being provided or where they feel the application is 'poor' cannot be addressed.

### **Red line application boundary**

The red line boundary is illustrated fully within the location plan.

The site area where works are carried out will be a different site area of the red area. Landscaping proposals are not required to be in the red area, as it can be conditioned if it's within the ownership of the applicant.

The number of birds will be approximately 37,000, but normally they only bring in 36,600-day old chicks. We thought of rounding up the figure to 37,000 as we try and use the precautionary approach when dealing with these type of developments.

The number of cycles vary to firms and each cycle, depends on the timings and demand of the point of lay hens. The period of which the hens are there for, again depending where they go, and when an egg laying unit is ready for them.

### **Vehicle movements**

The vehicle movements associated with a pullet rearing unit is negligible in comparison to the forestry movements, agricultural movements and residential movements of Mynd Road. The HGV movements are only the collection and delivery of birds and on average 2 feed movements a month. All other movements are vans or cars.

### **Site Constraints**

The footpath has been indicated on plan, and full consultation has been undertaken with the rights of way officers regarding this element and discussions have taken place outside the planning process.

### **Ecology**

Powys Ecology and NRW have fully considered the proposal on a number of occasions and have come back on each occasion with no objection.

### **Highway Safety**

The very fact that Mynd Road is busy and is utilised by a number of vehicles including HGV's as specified in the 3<sup>rd</sup> party response, illustrates that the proposed movements of this proposal will be negligible in comparison to the existing uses and therefore not raise any highway safety issue.

### **Residential Amenity**

#### **Noise**

The professional environmental health officer has confirmed no objection in respect of noise, the nearest sensitive receptor is over 440m away. Noise assessments have been carried out in the past

on units that are 85m from a sensitive receptor and considered acceptable, and therefore 440m away, there will be no detrimental noise impact.

We are happy to have a condition attached, limiting the decibel levels to be exceeded at residential properties.

### **Dust**

The 3<sup>rd</sup> party should refer to Defra's technical guidance when considering impacts of dust on residences.

### **Private Water supplies**

The proposal will utilise an existing borehole that is currently operational, no new borehole will need to be created. The usage of water of this proposal is well below the 20,000-litre daily amount that requires an abstraction licence, and the usage of water by chickens is significantly less than cattle of which the applicant could house in the existing buildings.

There is no evidence or complaints received about water supplies in the area, and water quantity issues from private water supplies is not relevant to the planning process.