

Agenda Item	Committee Date	Application Number
A5	30 March 2020	20/00019/FUL

Application Site	Proposal
Lower Addington Farm Birkland Barrow Road Nether Kellet Carnforth	Erection of an agricultural building for free range hens with associated parking

Name of Applicant	Name of Agent
Mr Gott	HPA Chartered Architects

Decision Target Date	Reason For Delay
10 April 2020	None

<b>Case Officer</b>	Mrs Eleanor Fawcett
<b>Departure</b>	No
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Approval subject to outstanding responses from statutory consultees raising no objections to the proposal

## 1.0 The Site and its Surroundings

- 1.1 The site comprises an area of agricultural land located between the settlements of Aughton, Over Kellet and Gressingham and lies between Birkland Barrow Road and Kirkby Lonsdale Road. It forms part of a larger field which rises up from the northwest boundary towards Kirby Lonsdale Road to the southeast. There is an existing access to the edge of the site off Birkland Barrow Road, approximately 280 metres to the northwest, which serves an existing poultry building. This access and building is at a slightly higher level than the lower section of the site. Along the northwest boundary is Swarth Beck, which is a partly culverted watercourse and around this there is potential for surface water flooding (1 in 30 and 1 in 100 years). To the north is land outside the applicant's ownership, part of which comprises a former quarry and contains a wooded area. To the south east of the field is a wooded area adjacent to the highway, approximately 10 and 18 metres in depth, which is covered by a Tree Protection Order (TPO).
- 1.2 The site is located within the Countryside Area, as identified on the Local Plan proposals map and is approximately 10 metres from the boundary of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which lies on the south eastern side of Kirkby Lonsdale Road. There is a high pressure gas pipeline crossing the field within which the development is proposed to be sited and a public footpath approximately 60 metres to the north east of the site boundary, which connects Kirkby Lonsdale Road and Birkland Barrow Road. It also links to a public footpath on the opposite side of Kirkby Lonsdale Road which extends into the AONB. The site is also located in a Mineral Safeguarding Area and an area identified as low risk from coal mining activities.
- 1.3 The nearest residential properties are a small group at Swarthdale, approximately 270 metres to the north and a detached dwelling, Oaken Head Farm, approximately 450 metres to the southwest of the site boundary. At both these locations there are existing equestrian businesses.

## 2.0 The Proposal

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a large agricultural building to house hens for free range egg production. It will be sited towards the northwest boundary of the field. The building is proposed to be 92 metres long, 15.25 metres wide and have a height of 3.6 metres to the eaves and

5.7 metres to the ridge. Vents are proposed in the roof which would project above the ridge height to 6.3 metres above ground level. Two feed silos are proposed towards the centre of the northwest elevation with a width of approximately 3 metres and a height of 7.8 metres. The building would be constructed in steel insulated panels, with the walls clad in vertical larch boarding and the roof, silos and doors finished in moorland green (RAL 100 60 10). The building is proposed to house 16,000 birds in a multi-tier system, with the central section housing plant. There would be pop-holes on the south east side of the building to allow the hens to enter and leave the building during the day.

- 2.2 The development will use the existing access off Birkland Barrow Road which serves one of the poultry buildings under the same ownership. The access will be required to be extended to reach the new development and a new access road and turning and surfacing area will be provided to the northwest of the building. Some works will be required to the land to provide a level area for the building which will include some raising and some lowering of the ground. Landscaping is proposed adjacent to the boundary in addition to along a former field boundary that runs in a north west/south east direction.

### 3.0 Site History

- 3.1 Planning permission was refused in October 2019 by the Planning Regulatory Committee for the erection of a free-range poultry building on the application site. This was contrary to the recommendation within the Committee report. This proposed building was in a similar location to the current proposal, but measured 133.8 in length and was to be constructed of metal panels finished in green. It was refused for the following reason:

*“The development will have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the landscape, including the incongruous and urbanising impact on this rural area. The proposal is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of the Sections 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Saved Policy E4 of the Lancaster District Local Plan, and Policies DM28 and DM35 of the Development Management Development Plan Document.”*

- 3.2 Prior to this, planning permission has also been refused twice for the erection of an agricultural building for free-range hens and creation of a new access point on land to the south east of the current application site, close to Kirkby Lonsdale Road. An appeal was submitted in relation to the second of these applications (16/01351/FUL), and the Planning Inspectorate resolved to dismiss this and not grant planning consent for the proposal. The application was refused for the following reason:

*“By reason of the size, siting and design of the building, the topography of the land, the size, design and location of the proposed access, including the removal of a section of woodland trees, and the associated engineering operations, the development will have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the landscape, including the incongruous and urbanising impact on this rural road and the significant harm to the established woodland belt. As a result of this, the development would also have an adverse impact on the setting of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The proposal is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of the core Planning Principles and Sections 7 and 11 of the National Planning policy Framework, Saved Policies E3 and E4 of the Lancaster District Local Plan, and Policies DM28, DM29 and DM35 of the Development management Development Plan Document.”*

- 3.3 There are also a number of other developments in the vicinity of the site associated with the free-range poultry business. These relate to two agricultural buildings for free-range hens and an agricultural worker’s dwelling. These are all accessed from Birkland Barrow Road. The development closest to the site (09/00554/FUL), which will provide access to the proposed development, has been in operation the longest. The relevant history is set out below

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
19/00746/FUL	Erection of an agricultural building for free range hens with associated landscaping and parking	Refused
18/01287/PRETWO	Pre-application advice in relation to the construction of an Agricultural building for Free-Range Hens	Advice in relation to new building at current application site
16/01351/FUL	Erection of an agricultural building for free-range hens and creation of a new access point	Refused and appeal dismissed

## 4.0 Consultation Responses

4.1 The following responses have been received from statutory and non-statutory consultees:

Consultee	Response
<b>Nether Kellet Parish Council</b>	No comments received within the statutory consultation period.
<b>Over Kellet Parish Council</b>	<b>Object.</b> Raise concerns in relation to: pollution to Swarth Beck and impacts on biodiversity; effects on residents from potential air and watercourse pollution; and potential contamination by agro-chemicals.
<b>Environmental Health</b>	No comments received within the statutory consultation period. However, <b>no objection</b> was raised in response to the previous application - unlikely to be adverse or noticeable noise impacts or significant impacts on air quality or as a result of odour (subject to consultation with the Environment Agency).
<b>County Highways</b>	<b>No objection.</b> The application will have a minimal effect on the generation of additional vehicle movements over surrounding lengths of the public highway network
<b>Lead Local Flood Authority</b>	Comments to be report at the meeting.
<b>County Council Planning</b>	No comments received within the statutory consultation period.
<b>Public Rights of Way Officer</b>	No comments received within the statutory consultation period.
<b>Ramblers Association</b>	No comments received within the statutory consultation period.
<b>Environment Agency (EA)</b>	Comments to be reported at the meeting. However, in relation to the previous application the EA raised <b>no objection in principle</b> , setting out that it would be assumed under the 'aggregation of capacities' rule that the permit relating to the existing poultry units would need to be varied to include the proposed unit. As such the design and management of the unit would have to meet the design and operating standards set out in the Environmental Permitting Regulation (England and Wales) 2016. Recommend installing an oil interceptor to serve any access road or vehicle parking/turnaround area to prevent pollution to Swarth Beck and advised that any wash water generated from within or outside the building must be collected in a sealed wash water/effluent tank.
<b>Natural England</b>	Comments to be reported at the meeting. However, <b>no objection</b> was raised in relation to the previous application.
<b>Cadent Gas/National Grid</b>	Initial holding response, awaiting further detailed comments. However, <b>no objection</b> was raised in relation to the previous application.
<b>Forest of Bowland AONB Partnership</b>	No comments received within the statutory consultation period.
<b>Coal Authority</b>	<b>Comments</b> – Consultation not required as the site does not fall with the defined development High Risk Area. Request that the Coal Authority's standing advice is attached to any consent as advice.
<b>Health and Safety Executive (Padhi Assessment)</b>	<b>Do not advise against development</b>

## 5.0 Neighbour Representations

5.1 20 pieces of correspondence have been received objecting to the proposal and raise the following concerns:

- Detrimental visual impact from building, fencing and associated lorries; utilitarian design of the building which would be prominent and incongruous within the landscape; limited screening and would result in a substantial encroachment into the rolling landscape; cumulative visual impact; location adjacent to the AONB
- Question implementation of proposed screening and impacts from poultry to this surviving/ maturing  
Impact on the avenue of trees on the boundary with the AONB

- Industrialisation of the area
- Noise, odour and airborne pollution and cumulative impact with two other approved poultry buildings, and milling machine at adjacent site, and associated health implications
- Impact on users of public footpath/ Lancashire Way
- Cumulative impact with large feed silos erected at the adjacent building without consent
- Increase in large vehicle movements; impacts on narrow network of roads, including condition; impacts to walkers, runners, cyclists and horse riders
- Pollution, silt and debris to Swarth Beck from runoff and soil erosion, including during construction, and impact on wildlife and health, which could enter Morecambe Bay
- Impact and loss of wildlife including that which uses the adjacent woodland
- Increase flood risk from surface water run-off
- Increase in vermin
- Impact on high pressure gas pipeline from re-profiling of land
- Welfare of the birds
- Will not support the local community
- No evidence of use of renewable or low carbon energy
- No environmental benefits
- Inconsistencies within the submission
- Serviced by diesel tractors and lorries, is energy intensive and therefore contrary to the Council's Climate Emergency policy.
- No engagement with the local community

5.2 Correspondence has been received from County Councillor Phillipa Williamson which raises an objection to the proposal and the following concerns:

- Must consider the effect on local residents and the environment in terms of noise, odour, dust, nitrogen and ammonia on a cumulative basis (i.e. in conjunction with the existing buildings)
- Detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the landscape, incongruous and urbanising impact, lack of screening, substantial encroachment into the rolling landscape and cumulative impact with existing development
- Visual and noise impact of articulated lorries
- Concerns about re-profiling of land to create a new watercourse and potential impact on pipeline
- Visual impact of fencing
- Soil erosion
- Limited benefit to local economy

## **6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies**

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

Paragraphs 83 and 84 – Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
 Paragraph 109 - 110 – Access and Transport  
 Paragraphs 124 and 127 – Achieving well-designed places  
 Paragraph 170 – Protecting valued landscapes  
 Paragraphs 170,175 and 176 – Protecting and enhancing biodiversity

### **6.2 Local Planning Policy Overview – Current Position**

On 15 May 2018, and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended), Lancaster City Council submitted the following documents to the Secretary of State (Planning Inspectorate) for examination:

The Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD; and,  
 (A Review of) The Development Management DPD

The Examination Hearing Sessions took place between the 9 April 2019 and the 1 May 2019. The Council has published the proposed Main Modifications to the Local Plan. An eight-week consultation into the modifications was undertaken and expired on 7 October 2019.

The Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD will replace the remaining policies of the Lancaster District Core Strategy (2008) and the residual 'saved' land allocation policies from the 2004 District Local Plan.

The Review of the Development Management DPD updates the policies that are contained within the current document, which was adopted in December 2014. As it is part of the development plan the current document is already material in terms of decision-making.

Given the current stage of both DPDs, it is considered that some weight can be attributed to the policies contained therein subject to the extent to which there are unresolved objections to the relevant policies and their consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework.

### 6.3 Lancaster District Core Strategy (adopted July 2008)

SC1 – Sustainable Development  
SC5 – Achieving Quality in Design

### 6.4 Lancaster District Local Plan - saved policies (adopted 2004)

E3 – Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty  
E4 – Countryside Area

### 6.5 Development Management Development Plan Document (DM DPD)

DM7 – Economic Development in Rural Areas  
DM20 – Enhancing Accessibility and Transport Linkages  
DM27 – Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity  
DM28 – Development and Landscape Impact  
DM29 – Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland  
DM35 – Key Design Principles  
DM39 – Surface Water Run-Off and Sustainable Drainage

### 6.6 Other Material Considerations

The Forest of Bowland AONB Landscape Character Assessment (2009)  
A Landscape Strategy for Lancashire: Landscape Character Assessment (2000)

## 7.0 **Comment and Analysis**

7.1 The main issues to be considered in the determination of this application are:

- Principle of the development
- Landscape and visual impact
- Impact on residential amenity
- Impact on ecology
- Access and highway impacts
- Surface water drainage
- Impact on National Grid Infrastructure

### 7.2 Principle of the development

7.2.1 The proposal relates to the erection of a large agricultural building to house hens for free-range egg production, and would be operated in association with the existing business which has two similar buildings close to the site. DM7 of the DM DPD sets out that proposals for economic development will be supported where they maintain and enhance rural vitality and character and improve the sustainability of rural communities by bringing local, economic, environmental and community benefits. Other development proposals supported in principle include essential operations for agriculture where there is a proven and justified need. The proposal will support the existing business and does relate to an agricultural enterprise, and is therefore considered to be acceptable in principle in this rural area.

### 7.3 Landscape and visual impact

- 7.3.1 The building is proposed to be sited towards the north west end of a large agricultural field, at almost ninety degrees to an existing poultry building to the northwest. The land slopes gently downwards from Kirkby Lonsdale Road towards the site of the proposed development, and rises slightly beyond this. The site and surrounding landscape are characterised by rolling fields created by glacial activity which have drumlins of varying heights and steepness. There are also scattered areas of mature woodland, in particular around a former quarry to the north of the site and adjacent to Kirkby Lonsdale Road which continues on the opposite side of the highway, within the AONB. The landscape in this location is classified as Drumlin Field, sub-type Docker-Kellet-Lancaster (13c), within the Lancashire Landscape Character Assessment. The landscape character sensitivity is considered to be moderate to high as a result of the pattern of landscape features, including stone walls, hedgerows and pockets of woodland. Overall, the Drumlin Field Landscape Character Type is considered to have limited capacity to accommodate change without compromising key characteristics.
- 7.3.2 The site is predominantly screened from the north and north east by the rising landform and trees. It is most visible to the east, from Kirby Lonsdale Road and a public footpath, across the adjoining fields. To the south and southeast, the site is afforded screening from the mature trees adjacent to the highway. The proposed building would be visible within the landscape from both the highway and the public footpath, although it has been sited towards the lower levels of the field which would limit the impact to some degree. At present the existing agricultural building is visible to varying degrees, depending on the viewpoint, as some screening is provided by the woodland group to the east of this. The development would be partly seen in the context of the existing building, rather than appearing as a wholly isolated structure. However, it is noted that a landscaping scheme has been previously agreed to help mitigate the visual impacts of the existing building within the landscape, with the intention that this would provide screening from the road and footpath.
- 7.3.3 The siting of the building has addressed some of the concerns raised by the previously refused applications for a building located closer to Kirkby Lonsdale Road. The impacts of a new access have been removed by utilising the one serving the existing poultry building. The new building is proposed to be sited closer to this so is more likely to be viewed in association with this, rather than as a wholly isolated structure. It would also be at a lower level of the field, would require less engineering operations reducing the amount of changes to the existing landform. The size of the building was reduced, following some pre-application discussions. It has been further reduced in length by 42 metres following the refusal of a similar proposal on this site. There is a former field boundary running up to Kirkby Lonsdale Road, identified by a relatively low mound. The building would be sited to the southwest of this boundary which would be reinstated with a hedgerow and some trees in order to break up the main views of the building from the main views from the public right of way and Kirkby Lonsdale Road to the east and northeast. This will allow the building to be better visually contained within features typical to this landscape, whilst it is unlikely that it would be wholly screened. Other additional landscaping is also proposed to help screen the building within the landscape and also in relation to the existing poultry building to the northwest.
- 7.3.4 The proposal relates to a large utilitarian building which would occupy part of the open and undulating agricultural field. Therefore, it has the potential to appear quite prominent and incongruous within the landscape, even with its positioning in the lower part of the field. The landform is not sufficient to screen the building and, whilst it would be partly seen in conjunction with the existing building, it is still quite detached from this building, would result in encroachment into the rolling landscape, and would increase the amount of development visible. However, with the reinstatement of the field boundary, the additional landscaping, and the finish of the building in timber cladding with a green roof and silo buildings, it is considered that the landscape and visual impacts can be mitigated to a large degree, although the landscaping will take time to mature. Overall, it is considered that the development would not have a significant adverse landscape and visual impact and will be seen in the context of the existing agricultural development, rather than as a more isolated building.

### 7.4 Impact on residential amenity

- 7.4.1 The nearest residential properties are a small group at Swarthdale, approximately 360 metres to the north of the proposed building. There are some other residential properties in the locality, although these are located at greater distances from the site. Given the distance, existing landform and trees,

there will be no adverse impacts on outlook, daylight or privacy to the residential properties. This building will be a similar distance from these properties than the existing one adjacent to the site.

- 7.4.2 Whilst a response is still awaited from the Environment Agency, in relation to the last proposal on this site, they advised that the two existing poultry buildings in this area are covered by an environment permit. Inspections since the permit was issued have shown compliance with permit conditions. Although the unit itself is below the threshold of 40,000 poultry places required for an environmental permit, it would be assumed under the 'aggregation of capacities' rule that the permit would need to be varied to include this proposed unit. As such the design and management of the unit would have to meet the design and operating standards set out in the Environmental Permitting Regulation (England and Wales) 2016. They raised no objections to the previous proposal which was to accommodate a lower number of birds. As such, it is unlikely that they would raise an objection to the current proposal, however, this will be updated at the Committee meeting.
- 7.4.3 Environmental Health has been consulted in relation to the application, but has not provided a response. However, the response in relation to the previous application is equally relevant to this proposal. During the previous application, it was confirmed that, whilst the existing poultry buildings have been operational, they have received one complaint about fan noise and this was received after the submission of the current application. This complaint was referred to the Environment Agency, as the regulatory authority for any nuisance related complaints for these types of premises. In relation to potential noise impacts to nearby residential properties, Environmental Health has advised that, considering the likely small number of additional vehicular movements to this site, that this is an existing regularly used rural road, accessed by all types of road traffic, including agricultural vehicles, and given separation distances between the site access area and residential properties, it is unlikely that there will be adverse or noticeable noise impacts. Furthermore, vehicle movements would have to increase substantially before resulting in a perceptible difference in sound and therefore unlikely to result in an adverse impact.
- 7.4.4 Noise has been previously considered at the site of the existing buildings by Environmental Health. In relation to the most recent building, not the one immediately adjacent to the site, it has been advised that noise was clearly audible around the perimeter of the site to areas where the fans were located, less audible along the public footpath, and was inaudible along Swarthdale Road. Whilst noise was not assessed within garden locations or from inside properties, given the property locations and separation distances to the noise source, absence of complaints and inaudibility of noise along Swarthdale Road, it is considered unlikely that noise associated with the existing buildings has had an adverse impact to nearby receptors. It was also advised that, from these monitoring locations, fan noise associated with the existing building adjacent to the site was inaudible. Any combined sound associated with the ventilation of these buildings where there is similar sound power level output, will result in insignificant sound contributions, which would be 'just perceptible' to the human ear in near proximity. Therefore it is considered that there would be 'no observed effect levels' in respect of noise associated with the proposed unit.
- 7.4.5 In relation to odour, the Air Quality Officer advised that there was one complaint in September 2017 regarding a chemical smell associated with existing poultry unit at this location, though investigation and further monitoring by the complainant did not identify the cause of this or identify any further issues. The matter was also referred to the Environment Agency (EA) as the regulating body at the time. A further complaint was investigated in August 2019 alleging issues of smoke, dust and feathers arising from existing units. A site visit did not witness the occurrence, although a photograph of a dusty vent to a unit was sent to the Environment Agency. The Environment Agency has been consulted, as set out above, and their response will be reported. However, they did not previously highlight any concerns regarding noise, odour or air quality.
- 7.4.6 The Air Quality Officer advised that for local air quality management purposes, DEFRA's technical guidance TG(16) provides advice on where air quality is likely to be a local air quality management objective exceedance consideration. Guidance indicates that releases of particulate may be a consideration for very large units (units accommodating above 400,000 birds where mechanical ventilation is used) for exposure within 100 metres. The application site, in isolation but also cumulatively with the other units, is significantly below this figure and there does not appear to be any relevant exposure within 100 metres. On this basis it is considered that the development would not lead to an exceedance of an air quality objective standard.

7.4.7 Overall it is considered that the proposal would not have a significant adverse impact to the amenities of nearby residential properties or to air quality. As set out above, the operation would be covered by an environmental permit, which will provide levels and controls for noise, odour and air quality. As set out in paragraph 183 of the NPPF, the focus of planning decisions should be on whether the development is an acceptable use of land rather than the control of processes or emissions where these are subject to separate pollution control regimes.

## 7.5 Impacts on Ecology

7.5.1 In relation to the previous application, Natural England advised that further information was required in order to fully assess any impacts on European and nationally-designated sites in relation to aerial pollutants emitted from this type of development. Additional information was provided and Natural England raised no objections to the proposal. A response is awaited from Natural England. However, as this proposal reduced the number of birds from the previous application, it is not anticipated that there would be significant concerns regarding this.

7.5.2 An ecological appraisal has been submitted with the application. This sets out that the site comprises poor semi-improved grassland with stone walls and fences on its boundary and is enclosed by improved grassland, tall ruderal, marshy grassland and mixed deciduous woodland. The species recorded are all commonly occurring. The poor semi-improved grassland has a very low species diversity and ecological value. Whilst the assemblage of species within it is higher than improved pasture, the species are all indicative of regular grazing and disturbance, and this habitat does not constitute a BAP habitat.

7.5.3 In relation to amphibians, there is no standing water on the site and the core development area is open and exposed so is of low value. The report goes on to say that the development would not result in the permanent loss of or substantial negative effect on waterbodies or foraging areas linked to them. There is one record of badger within 2km of the site. Badger setts do not occur on site and a lack of feeding signs or runs across the site would suggest that they do not occur within 30 metres of site boundaries. The development would not impact on any existing badger runs or setts and the porosity of the surrounding fields to the passage of badgers will not be affected.

7.5.4 In relation to bats, the report sets out that the foraging habitat at the site is very poor, being open and exposed. The poor semi-improved grassland offers negligible foraging opportunities for bats and the stone walls and fences on the boundary are poor in terms of their structure, diversity and interconnectivity. The wall to the boundary does provide some habitat linkage for bats whilst the remainder of it comprises open and exposed pasture. More extensive areas of medium and high quality habitat occur locally, including the woodland and marshy grassland. To confirm that the site is not used by significant numbers of bats, a bat monitor was left on the site for 7 days in May/June 2019. Six species of bat were identified from their calls. The numbers of passes was low with 40 in total recorded over 7 nights monitoring. The report considers that the bat species identified are highly unlikely to rely on the site for feeding but may occur in the local area and roosting will not occur on the site. The poor semi-improved grassland has a low potential for use by nesting birds as the grassland is grazed and as such is usually short and trampling risks are also very high within this area of the site. Species such as Curlew have been recorded feeding on adjacent fields, which are damper. The potential for use of the wider fields by this species will not, however, be compromised by the proposal.

7.5.5 No indication of brown hares was recorded on the site and risk to this species is considered to be low. The report sets out that 100 notable invertebrates have been recorded within 2km of the site. No deadwood or vegetation on site was recorded which would provide an important resource for invertebrates in the local area. It goes on to say that the significance of the site to invertebrates is likely to be limited in the local context although the habitat on site will support invertebrate species. Mitigation can be incorporated into the design and landscaping scheme with the careful selection of plant species. There are no records of otters within 2km of the site and no indication of the presence, or past use of the site, by otter was found. The stream is considered unlikely to support fish and there are no waterbodies in proximity to the site which would be attractive to Amphibians. In relation to reptiles, the majority of the site has a very low value being devoid of significant ground cover and there are no areas of the core development area which would be particularly favourable to reptiles. There are no records of water voles within 2km of the site and no signs, such as droppings, feeding piles or footprints were present on site. The report considers that this species is likely to be absent from the



site. Precautionary mitigation would be appropriate in respect of retaining or recreating soft edges to the stream.

7.5.6 The report recommends precautionary mitigation in relation to several species, some of which is mentioned above. It sets out that the stream could be fenced from the adjacent field to prevent livestock poaching of its banks and this would create a wildlife corridor. The submitted site plan shows a fence in line with the building which would prevent access to the beck which also addresses some comments from the Environment Agency to prevent pollution of the water course. A suitable drainage scheme should also ensure that any pollution to the watercourse is prevented which would include measures to ensure that dust around vents is not washed into the beck. Overall, it is considered that the development would not have an adverse impact on biodiversity and is likely to provide opportunities for improvement with fencing off the land from the watercourse and the additional planting, including hedgerow.

## 7.6 Access and highway impacts

7.6.1 The development will utilise the access serving the existing poultry building adjacent to the site. The submission sets out that the same wagon that currently services this building will service the new unit and, as such, there will be no net increase in HGVs. The building requires infrequent servicing, no more than twice a week by no more than one 40ft articulated vehicle to bring feed and to collect the eggs. There will also be a visit at the start and end of the cycle for re-stocking purposes. Car access will be daily for the member of staff looking after the birds and visitor spaces are provided for cleaning contractors who fumigate the building at the end of the 60 week cycle and for vets. A management plan currently exists which makes HGVs approach from the west, avoiding the village of Over Kellet, and following the established route of the quarry lorries through the northern fringes of Nether Kellet. The Highway Authority has advised that the application will have a minimal effect on the generation of additional vehicle movements over surrounding lengths of the public highway network, and have therefore raised no concerns or objection.

## 7.7 Drainage and pollution

7.7.1 As the proposal relates to a major application, the Lead Local Flood Authority has been consulted, and the response will be reported at the Committee meeting. A drainage scheme has been provided to address an existing flow route across the field, due to the topography. This is not a watercourse but is just an indication of a route that surface water runoff takes provided by surface water flooding maps. The drainage scheme shows the re-profiling of the land to direct surface water around the building and into the beck, with some attenuation. Precise details of this rerouting are required in addition to confirmation that this would not impact on the high pressure gas pipeline. However, a response is required from the LLFA in relation to this approach. The LLFA previously advised that the drainage and water flow could probably be addressed by a filter drain on this side of the building to direct the water away from the building. As such, if the re-profiling required is overly extensive or cannot be achieved due to the pipeline, it is considered that there is likely to be a suitable alternative.

7.7.2 It appears that a small package treatment plant is proposed to serve the development, but the details have not been shown on the plan. Clarification has been sought in relation to this but it is likely to be able to be accommodated. Further information would also be required in relation to capacity, but could be covered by condition.

7.7.3 In addition to the above, the Environment Agency previously gave some recommendations in relation to pollution of the watercourse. They advised that if any yard area, or roof area has the potential to become lightly contaminated, such as the areas under extractor vents, then this drainage needs some form of interception prior to discharge, which might be in the form of a swale or drainage field. They also recommended the installation of an oil interceptor to serve the access road and parking area and any wash water generated within the unit or on any external areas must be collected in a sealed wash tank and removed from the site. Further information has been requested in relation to the drainage of the hardstanding and the building as it is not clear on the plan, although results of percolation tests have been provided in relation to proposed infiltration. In relation to the wash tanks, the agent previously asked if a scheme could be conditioned as there is sufficient space for this to be provided adjacent to the building. This would be an appropriate approach as the precise details are not required before determination. Any further information and the response from the LLFA will be reported at the meeting.

## 7.8 Impact on National Grid Infrastructure

7.8.1 National Grid has sent an initial holding letter, but not an objection. It is understood that someone was to visit the site, but no further response has been provided. This has been chased. They raised no objections to the previous application, following additional information about planting and distances from the pipeline. The only change from this proposal appears to be the alterations to the land levels due to the drainage. A verbal update will be provided at the meeting.

## 8.0 Planning Obligations

8.1 There are no planning obligations to consider as part of this application.

## 9.0 Conclusions

9.1 The proposal will support the existing agricultural business in this location and will therefore have a positive impact on the rural economy. As a result of the reduced scale, siting close to an existing unit and proposed landscaping, it is considered that there would not be a significant adverse impact on landscape or visual amenity, although it is acknowledged that the landscaping will take some time to mature. In addition, the larch cladding should reduce the more industrial appearance of the building. It is considered that there would not be a detrimental impact to residential amenity, highway safety or biodiversity. Responses are awaited from some consultees, but it is likely that the outstanding matters can be adequately overcome. Subject to this, the proposal is considered to be acceptable.

## Recommendation

That Planning Permission **BE GRANTED** subject to the outstanding responses from statutory consultees raising no objections to the proposal and the following conditions:

1. Standard three year timescale
2. Approved plans
3. Surface and foul water drainage schemes, including pollution prevention measures, and management of manure
4. Tree protection
5. Materials: Colour and finish to walls, roof of the building, the vents and the feed silos; all external surfacing materials; details of any boundary treatments, including gates.
6. Landscaping scheme
7. Ecology mitigation
8. Operated in accordance with the delivery access route

## Article 35, Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015

In accordance with the above legislation, Lancaster City Council has made the recommendation in a positive and proactive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development, working proactively with the applicant to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. The recommendation has been made having had regard to the impact of development, and in particular to the relevant policies contained in the Development Plan, as presented in full in the officer report, and to all relevant material planning considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, National Planning Practice Guidance and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents/ Guidance.

## Background Papers

None