

**ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT**

**ERECTION OF 3 NO. ADDITIONAL POULTRY BUILDINGS AND  
ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE AT TREESTACKS FARM, OAKLEY  
ROAD, WIX, CO11 2SF**

**HAB POULTRY LTD**

**MAY 2022**

Report Prepared By: Ian Pick BSc (Hons) MRICS  
Ian Pick Associates Limited  
Station Farm Offices  
Wansford Road  
Nafferton  
Driffield  
YO25 8NJ



<b><u>CONTENTS</u></b>		
<b>Chapter</b>		<b>Page No.</b>
1.	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>3</b>
2.	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>4</b>
3.	<b>DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>7</b>
4.	<b>ALTERNATIVE SITES</b>	<b>12</b>
5.	<b>PLANNING AND POLICY FRAMEWORK</b>	<b>13</b>
6.	<b>POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL AFFECTS</b>	<b>15</b>
7.	<b>LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACTS</b>	<b>16</b>
8.	<b>HIGHWAY IMPACTS</b>	<b>19</b>
9.	<b>NOISE, ODOUR AND DUST</b>	<b>21</b>
10.	<b>ECOLOGICAL ISSUES</b>	<b>26</b>
11.	<b>FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE</b>	<b>29</b>
	<b>NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY</b>	<b>31</b>

#### **APPENDICES**

<b>APPENDIX 1</b>	<b>LOCATION PLAN</b>
<b>APPENDIX 2</b>	<b>LVIA</b>
<b>APPENDIX 3</b>	<b>TRANSPORT STATEMENT</b>
<b>APPENDIX 4</b>	<b>NOISE IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>
<b>APPENDIX 5</b>	<b>ODOUR IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>
<b>APPENDIX 6</b>	<b>ECOLOGY SURVEY</b>
<b>APPENDIX 7</b>	<b>AMMONIA IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>
<b>APPENDIX 8</b>	<b>FLOOD RISK AND SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</b>

**CHAPTER 1.**

**1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This Environmental Statement has been commissioned by HAB Poultry Ltd to accompany a planning application for erection of 3 No. additional poultry houses and associated infrastructure at Treestacks Farm, Oakley Road, Wix (Grid Reference: 618023, 228394).
- 1.2 The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 provide for the submission of an Environmental Statement for certain types of development. The regulations prescribe the types of development for which EIA is mandatory (Schedule 1 Development). Regulation 17a provides for mandatory EIA with all proposals which exceed 85,000 birds.
- 1.3 This report has been prepared by Ian Pick. Ian Pick is a specialist agricultural and rural planning consultant. He holds a Bachelor of Science with Honours Degree in Rural Enterprise and Land Management and is a Professional Member of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors, being qualified in the Rural Practice Division of the Institution.
- 1.4 Ian Pick has 24 years' experience specialising in agricultural and rural planning whilst employed by MAFF, ADAS, Acorus and most recently, Ian Pick Associates Limited.
- 1.5 Copies of this Environmental Statement are available from Ian Pick Associates Ltd for the sum of £50 for a paper copy, and £10 for a CD copy.

## **CHAPTER 2.**

### **2. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

#### **Regulatory Context**

- 2.1 The requirements of Environmental Impact Assessment are provided within the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. These are referred to as the EIA regulations within this document. The EIA regulations require that any development which is listed in Schedule 1 be subject to EIA.
- 2.2 The proposed development falls within the definition of Section 17 of Schedule 1, 'Installations for the intensive rearing of poultry or pigs' as it exceeds the threshold of 85,000 broilers as defined in Section 17 part (a).

#### **Screening**

- 2.3 The process of determination whether a proposed development requires an EIA is called 'screening'. The EIA Regulations permit for a developer to request a screening opinion from the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to determine whether the EIA process should be followed. In this instance, EIA is mandatory under Schedule 1 of the 2017 EIA regulations and therefore a screening opinion was not required.

#### **Scoping**

- 2.4 This Environmental Impact Assessment provides the following scope of assessment.
- Landscape and Visual Impact
  - Highways and Transportation
  - Noise, Odour and Dust
  - Ecological Issues
  - Drainage and Flood Risk

#### **Assessment and Reporting Methodology**

- 2.5 Following identification of potential environmental effects through the EIA scoping process, technical assessments were carried out in order to predict potential effects associated with the development and where necessary proposed measures to mitigate the effects. These assessments are contained within the Environmental Statement.

#### **The Environmental Statement**

- 2.6 The Environmental Statement has been prepared to accompany an application for planning permission for the erection of 3 No. additional poultry houses and associated infrastructure at Treestacks Farm, Oakley Road, Wix. The



application has been submitted to Tendring District Council under the terms of the Town and County Planning Act 1990.

- 2.7 The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, Schedule 4, requires that an Environmental Statement should include at least the following information:
- A description of the development including:
    - A description of the location of the development
    - A description of the main characteristics of the whole development and the land use requirements during the construction and operational phases.
    - A description of the main characteristics of the operational phase of the development (any production process)
    - An estimate by type and quantity, of expected residues and emissions.
  - A description of the reasonable alternatives studied by the developer which are relevant to the proposed project and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reason for selecting the chosen option.
  - A description of the current state of the environment (baseline scenario)
  - A description of the factors likely to be significantly affected by the development.
  - A description of the likely significant effects of the development on the environment resulting from
    - The construction and existence of the development
    - The use of natural resources, in particular land, soil, water and biodiversity.
    - The emission of pollutants, noise, vibration, light, heat and radiation, the creation of nuisances, and the disposal and recovery of waste.
    - The risks to human health, cultural heritage or the environment
    - The accumulation of effects with other existing and / or approved projects.
    - The impact of the project on the climate and and vulnerability of the project to climate change
    - The technologies and substances used
  - A description of the forecasting methods or evidence used to identify and assess the significant effects on the environment including any difficulties encountered compiling the required information.
  - A description of the measures envisaged to avoid, prevent, reduce or, if possible, offset any identified significant adverse effects on the environment. That description should explain the extent to which significant adverse effects on the environment are avoided, prevented, reduced or offset, and should cover both the construction and operational phases.
  - A description of the expected significant adverse effects of the development on the environment deriving from the vulnerability of the development to risks of major accidents and / or disasters which are relevant to the project concerned. Where appropriate, this description should include measures envisaged to prevent or mitigate the significant

adverse effects of such events on the environment and details of the preparedness for and proposed response to such emergencies.

- A non-technical summary of the above.

**Contributors to the Environmental Statement**

2.8 The team of consultants involved in the EIA are listed in table 2.1 below. Each was selected for their technical services and expertise in their respective fields.

Table 2.1

<b>Chapter</b>	<b>Consultants</b>
1. Introduction	IPA Ltd
2. EIA Process	IPA Ltd
3. Description of Development	IPA Ltd
4. Choice of Location	IPA Ltd
5. Planning Policy Context	IPA Ltd
6. Potential Environmental Effects	IPA Ltd
7. Landscape and Visual Impact	LVIA Ltd
8. Highway Impacts	David Tucker Associates
9. Noise, Odour and Dust	Matrix Acoustics, AS Modelling and Data, IPA Ltd
10. Ecological Issues	Craig Emms, AS Modelling and Data
11. Drainage and Flood Risk	Lidar-Logic
Non-Technical Summary	IPA Ltd

**CHAPTER 3.**

**3. DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT**

**Background Information**

- 3.1 The applicants, HAB Poultry Limited, propose to expand their existing poultry farm through the erection of 3 No. additional poultry houses.

**Project Description**

- 3.2 The applicants have submitted a planning application to Tendring District Council for the erection of three additional poultry houses and associated infrastructure at Treestacks Farm, Oakley Road, Wix, CO11 2SF. The detailed elements of the proposed development are shown in the table below. The location of the development is shown on the location plan at **Appendix 1**.

**Table 3.1**

Element	Description
Poultry Houses	3 No. 110m x 20.42m poultry houses, with an eaves height of 2.974m and a ridge height of 5.726m.
Integral control rooms and catching canopies.	3 No. attached control rooms and catching canopies on the west elevation of the poultry houses measuring 12.210m x 4m with an eaves height of 2.974m and a ridge height of 5.726m.
Feed blending rooms	2 No. feed blending rooms, measuring 3m x 4m.
Feed bins	6 No. feed bins with a diameter of 3.5m and a height of 8.6m.
Concrete Apron	Extension to existing concrete apron measuring 820 sq m.

- 3.3 The proposed development involves the erection of three additional poultry houses together with associated infrastructure, as described in Table 3.1 above. The poultry buildings are to be used for the rearing of broilers from day old chicks through to finished table weight, with the additional infrastructure required, to facilitate the proposed use.
- 3.4 The proposed poultry buildings are identical to the existing poultry houses on the site and will have pan feeders, non drip nipple drinkers and indirect heating provided by the existing straw burning biomass boiler. Ventilation within the buildings is based on high velocity chimneys with side inlet vents. The ventilation, heating and feeding systems are all fully automated and controlled by a computer system located within the control rooms which are



# IAN PICK ASSOCIATES LTD.

SPECIALIST AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

attached to the west elevation of each proposed poultry house. The systems are alarmed for high and low temperature, feeding system failure and power failure. The alarm system will be linked to an 'auto dial' computer system which alerts personnel via mobile phone to any system failures. The proposed poultry unit will produce standard birds, based on a 51-day growing cycle, including 10 days at the end of each cycle for cleanout and preparation of the buildings for the incoming flock. The unit will operate with 7.2 flocks per annum.

- 3.5 The poultry unit operates with in house hatching, and the chicks are reared within the building for 41 days, following which they are manually caught and transported live to the processors. During the growing cycle temperature is controlled within the buildings. The temperature is controlled by heaters and the ventilation system. The development will operate on an all-in all-out basis, with all five buildings (2 existing and 3 proposed) stocked and de populated at the same time.
- 3.6 At the end of each flock cycle, the buildings are cleaned out and the manure removed using agricultural loaders and removed from the site for disposal via biomass power stations. Following manure removal, the buildings will be washed out with high pressure hoses and prepared for the incoming flock. The inside of the poultry buildings is drained to a sealed dirty water tank which will be emptied following each cleanout of the building by vacuum tanker.
- 3.7 The additional infrastructure proposed on the site is essential to facilitate the proposed use for broiler rearing. The use of the various elements of the development is shown in the table below.

**Table 3.2**

Element	Description
Poultry Houses	To be used for the rearing of broiler chickens from day old chicks to finished table weight.
Integral control rooms and catching canopies.	To house the computer system which controls heating, lighting, feeders, drinkers and ventilation.
Feed blending rooms	For blending of poultry feed.
Feed bins	To provide poultry feed storage.
Concrete Apron	For access and turning of delivery vehicles.



**External Lighting**

- 3.8 The development does not require 24-hour external flood lighting. There are three days over each flock cycle, being days 33, 40 and 41 when nighttime catching operations will be undertaken and lighting on the site will be required in the form of directional flood lighting above the catching doors. Outside of the catching periods, 24-hour flood lighting is not required. Motion sensor trigger lighting will be provided for any staff needing to visit the site during hours of darkness.

***Mitigation within the Project Design***

- 3.9 Mitigation is inherent within the project design. The proposal is for the development of a poultry unit and requires an Environmental Permit in order to operate which is issued by the Environment Agency. The requirements of the EP insist on the site being designed to Best Available Techniques (BAT). This includes the provision of a high velocity roof mounted ventilation system, which is deemed to be BAT for the dispersal of odour and ammonia emitted from the proposed poultry buildings. The proposed buildings are also required by the Environmental Permit to be sealed and drained into a SSAFO certified dirty water containment system which essentially removes any potential for contaminated water escaping from the site. The concrete apron in the centre of the poultry buildings must be fitted with a diverter valve (required by EP) to ensure that during periods where the apron can become contaminated (during cleanout), all contaminated water can be diverted to the sealed dirty water containment system.
- 3.10 The hydrological assessment identifies a requirement for surface water drainage to be attenuated to a greenfield runoff rate, and a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SuDS) is incorporated into the design.

***Climate Change***

- 3.11 Schedule 4 of the 2017 requires at 5(f) requires the ES to include a description of the likely significant effects of the development on climate and the vulnerability of the project to climate change. Mitigation for climate change is factored into the sustainable drainage design of the proposals which includes the appropriate additional capacity for climate change within the designed system.

***Construction Phase***

- 3.12 The construction phase of the proposed development will extend to approximately 30 weeks. This phase involves the following elements.
- Stripping of the topsoil and levelling of the subsoil to create a level development area using a tracked dozer.
  - Importation of stone, levelling and compacting to create a sub-base.
  - Preparation of concrete foundation pads for steelwork
  - Erection of steelwork and cladding

# IAN PICK ASSOCIATES LTD.

SPECIALIST AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

- Concreting of the building floors and concrete aprons.
- Fitting of the buildings and installation of equipment.

3.13 The construction materials will be delivered into the site using HGV vehicles. Stone will be delivered using 8-wheel rigid quarry lorries; Concrete using 6-wheel rigid ready mix concrete lorries; and steel framework and sheeting using articulated lorries with flatbed trailers.

3.14 The proposal is a permanent development, and the estimated design life of the buildings is in excess of 50 years.

### *Characteristics and Production Processes*

3.15 The use of the proposed buildings is for the rearing of hatched broiler chickens through to finished table weight.

### *Expected Residues and Emissions*

3.16 The proposed broiler farm requires a permit under the Environment Agencies Environmental Permitting regime.

3.17 Expected residues and emissions from the site are limited to:

- Airbourn emissions in the form of odour, ammonia and nitrogen
- Noise emission from mechanical plant and transport related activities.
- Production of waste in the form of poultry manure and dirty water.

### *Forecasting Methods*

3.18 The forecasting methods used within this assessment are detailed within the individual chapters and assessments.

- Landscape and Visual Impacts are assessed using GLVIA3.
- The Highways and Transportation impacts of the development as assessed in accordance with paragraph 111 of the NPPF.
- Noise is forecast using BS4142:2014.
- Odour Assessment is forecast based on Environment Agency IPPC permitting guidance for odour modelling - Environment Agency H4 Odour Management Guidance 2011
- Dust is assessed based on DEFRA project AC0104 and DEFRA LAQM TG16.
- Ecology Issues are assessed using the methodology contained within Handbook for Phase 1 habitat survey: a technique for environmental audit (Joint Nature Conservation Committee, 2010) and the current guidance on survey methods from the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal. CIEEM, 2012). The Habitat Suitability Index was calculated following ARG UK advice note 5 (Amphibian and Reptile Groups of the United Kingdom, 2010).
- Ammonia is assessed based on guidance within Environment Agency H1 Risk Assessments.



# IAN PICK ASSOCIATES LTD.

SPECIALIST AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

- The Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment is based on the Guidance within paragraph 167 of the NPPF, and footnote 55.

## *Assessment of Significance of Environmental Effects*

- 3.19 In terms of the potential environmental effects, these have been assessed in accordance with the significance criterion outlined below. The assessment of significance within each subject chapter of the Environmental Statement has been informed corresponding technical assessment within the Appendices.

<b>None</b>	<b>The development will not produce any effects beyond those which may be experienced within the current farming regime.</b>
<b>Low</b>	<b>There will be an effect, however this will be localised and will not impact on environmental and other features to their detriment when relating to existing uses (e.g. distance too far)</b>
<b>Medium</b>	<b>There will be an effect which will impact on environmental features, but not significantly.</b>
<b>High</b>	<b>A significant effect.</b>
<b>Positive</b>	<b>Has a benefit.</b>



**CHAPTER 4.**

**4. CHOICE OF LOCATION / ALTERNATIVE SITES**

- 4.1 The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 require an Environmental Statement to cover alternatives **studied** by the applicants.
  
- 4.2 In this instance, the proposed development is for the expansion of an existing poultry unit, with the development located on an established poultry farm, immediately adjacent to the existing buildings. As the proposal is one of expansion of an existing use, alternative locations have not been considered.

## **CHAPTER 5.**

### **5. PLANNING AND POLICY FRAMEWORK**

#### **Introduction**

- 5.1 This chapter identifies planning policy relevant to the proposed development and the application site, together with an assessment of the development proposal against the planning policy and guidance.
- 5.2 The proposed development has been prepared having regard to national and local policy and guidance.

#### **National Planning Policy Framework**

- 5.3 The National Planning Policy Framework confirms that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development. Paragraph 8 of the NPPF states “There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:
- **an economic role** – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure;
  - **a social role** – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and
  - **an environmental role** – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy”
- 5.4 Paragraph 84 provides support for economic growth in rural areas, providing clear support for the proposed development as farm diversification and sustainable growth and expansion of an existing business in a rural area.
- 5.6 Paragraph 188 refers to developments where a separate Environmental Permit is required in terms of the operation of the site. Essentially, paragraph 188 confirms that if an Environmental Permit is required, the planning system should not focus on issues which are controlled by the permitting process. In this instance, the permit controls all emissions from the site – odour, noise, dust, ammonia, waste disposal, dirty water management etc.

**Local Planning Policy – Tendring District Local Plan**

- 5.7 Policy PP13 seeks to support growth in the rural economy and provides support for buildings that are essential to support agricultural, aquaculture, horticulture and forestry and farm diversification schemes in the countryside outside of defined Settlement Development Boundaries.
- 5.8 Policy PPL 3 confirms that the Council will protect the rural landscape and refuse planning permission for any proposed development which causes overriding harm to its character and appearance.
- 5.9 Policy PPL5 states that all new development must make adequate provision for drainage and sewerage and should include Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) as a means of reducing flood risk, improving water quality, enhancing the Green Infrastructure network and providing amenity and biodiversity benefits.
- 5.10 Policy PPL1 states that all development proposals should include appropriate measures to respond to the risk of flooding on and/or off site. Within the Flood Zone (which includes Flood Zones 2 and 3, as defined by the Environment Agency) shown on the Policies Map and Local Maps, or elsewhere involving sites of 1ha or more, development proposals must be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment.
- 5.11 Policy PPL4 states that all new development should be supported by an appropriate ecological assessment.



## **CHAPTER 6.**

### **6. POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL AFFECTS**

- 6.1 The bird numbers associated with the proposed development exceeds Schedule 1 threshold, and therefore an EIA is mandatory as part of the planning application process.
- 6.2 The scope of the Environmental Statement is detailed below:
- Landscape and Visual Impact
  - Highways and Transportation
  - Noise, Odour and Dust
  - Ecological Issues
  - Drainage and Flood Risk

#### **Scope of the Assessments**

##### **Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment**

- 6.3 Landscape and Visual Impact is assessed in Chapter 7, and the associated LVIA report at **Appendix 2**. The scope of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment was to provide an assessment of the entire development described in Chapter 3, in accordance with the Guidance set out in GLVIA 3.

##### **Highway Impacts**

- 6.4 Highway impacts are assessed in Chapter 8, and the associated Transport Statement at **Appendix 3**. The scope of the Transport Statement was to provide an assessment of the highways and transportation impacts of the entire development described in Chapter 3. The Highways and Transportation impacts of the development as assessed in accordance with paragraph 111 of the NPPF.

##### **Noise, Odour & Dust**

- 6.5 Noise is assessed in Chapter 9, and within the Noise Impact Assessment at **Appendix 4**. The scope of the noise assessment includes all potential noise sources arising from the operation of the proposed development described in Chapter 3, including plant in the form of the mechanical ventilation systems and operational noise in the form of transport related activities. The assessment has been prepared in accordance with BS4142:2014.
- 6.6 Odour is assessed in Chapter 9, and within the Odour Impact Assessment at **Appendix 5**. The odour assessment is based on the impacts of the existing and proposed poultry buildings throughout the duration of the flock cycle, and during the cleanout process. The odour impact assessment has been prepared in accordance with the Environment Agency H4 Odour Management Guidance 2011.

# IAN PICK ASSOCIATES LTD.

SPECIALIST AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

- 6.7 Dust is assessed in Chapter 9 and the assessment is based on the guidance provided within DEFRA Project AC0104 and DEFRA LAQM TG16.

## ***Ecology***

- 6.8 Ecology is assessed within the Chapter 10, and the associated Phase 1 Habitat Survey at **Appendix 6**.
- 6.9 The scope of the ecological assessment relates to the full development described in Chapter 3. The site was surveyed following the methodology contained in the Handbook for Phase 1 habitat survey: a technique for environmental audit (Joint Nature Conservation Committee, 2010) and the current guidance on survey methods from the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal. CIEEM, 2012). The Habitat Suitability Index was calculated following ARG UK advice note 5 (Amphibian and Reptile Groups of the United Kingdom, 2010).

## ***Ammonia Impacts***

- 6.10 Ammonia Impacts are addressed within Chapter 10, and the associated Ammonia Impact Assessment at **Appendix 7**. The ammonia assessment is based on the impacts of the poultry buildings throughout the duration of the flock cycle, and during the cleanout process. The odour impact assessment has been prepared in accordance with the Environment Agency H1 Risk Assessments.

## ***Flood Risk and Drainage***

- 6.11. Flood Risk and Drainage impacts are considered within Chapter 11, and with the Flood Risk and Surface Water Management Report at **Appendix 8**. The Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment is based on the Guidance within paragraph 167 of the NPPF, and footnote 55.



## **CHAPTER 7.**

### **7. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACTS**

#### **Baseline Conditions**

- 7.1 The site is currently part of an arable field and sits immediately adjacent to the existing development of the Treestacks Farm poultry unit and associated ancillary structures.
- 7.2 The proposed development has been subject to a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. The full assessment is shown at **Appendix 2** to this report.

#### **LVIA Summary**

- 7.3 LVIA Ltd were instructed to undertake a landscape and visual impact assessment for two chicken sheds located at Treestacks Farm, Oakley Road, Wix by Ian Pick Associates Ltd. The site and its surrounding landscape were assessed and a total of four viewpoints were selected to represent a variety of receptors in the surrounding area.
- 7.4 The aim of this report is to provide an assessment of the potential landscape and visual effects of a proposed development upon the receiving landscape, in line with current legislation and guidance. It comprises two main assessments, the first for landscape and the second for visual effects.
- 7.5 The assessment has been conducted in line with published best practice guidelines and includes a desk study; (review of local plan policies, published landscape character assessment and production of a computer generated Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV)) and onsite observations.
- 7.6 The site currently forms part of a field in agricultural use that is defined by hedgerows with trees field boundaries. The site sits in a landscape of similar existing buildings in agricultural use and adjacent to existing poultry houses. The site sits in a gently undulating landform on a slight south facing slope.
- 7.7 Due to the existing local area, the proposed scheme would not be out of character with its surroundings when considered as part of the wider landscape.
- 7.8 Mitigation measures have been suggested to aid the schemes visual blending with the existing environs.
- 7.9 Four viewpoints were assessed, and none were considered subject to material visual impacts.
- 7.10 With the implementation of a successful mitigation strategy, the overall impact on the landscape is considered to have a minor/negligible overall effect on the surrounding landscape character and a minor effect on the visual baseline. It



should be considered that this type of development is not out of character within the receiving landscape.

**Summary**

- 7.11 The proposed development has been assessed as having a minor/negligible impact on landscape character and a minor effect on the visual baseline.
- 7.12 The assessment level provided within the LVIA is based on the guidance within GLVIA 3 with a resulting minor / negligible impact on landscape character and minor effect on visual impact. This is a permanent effect as the assessment relates to the presence of the development within the landscape.

**Environmental Impact Assessment Level**

- 7.13 Based on the criteria in paragraph 3.19 on page 11 of this statement, the Environmental Impact Assessment level relating to the landscape and visual impacts of the development is **Low - There will be an effect, however this will be localised and will not impact on environmental and other features to their detriment when relating to existing uses (e.g. distance too far).**

## **CHAPTER 8.**

### **8. HIGHWAY IMPACTS**

#### **Baseline Conditions**

- 8.1 The application site is currently in arable cropping use and located immediately adjacent to the existing poultry unit development at Treestacks Farm. The proposed expansion of the poultry unit will be served by the existing access into Oakley Road.
- 8.2 The proposal has been assessed in the form of a Transport Statement prepared by DTA and the Transport Statement is attached at **Appendix 3**. The Transport Statement outlines the full transportation impacts of the proposed development and is summarised below.

#### **Transport Statement Summary**

- 8.3 DTA was commissioned on behalf of the applicant HAB Poultry Ltd to review the transport implications for Phase 2 of the proposed poultry unit expansion on land northwest of Redhouse Farm, Oakley Road, Wix, Manningtree, Essex.
- 8.4 The proposals include 3 No. broiler sheds to increase the bird capacity to 220,670 birds.
- 8.5 A review of the personal injury collision data has confirmed that there were no recorded collisions in the latest five-year period.
- 8.6 On the busiest days of the flock cycle, days 33, 40, 41 the development will generate an additional 20 two-way HGV movements (10 in, 10 out). The peak movements are during bird removal at the end of each flock cycle.
- 8.7 All traffic associated with Phase 1 will follow the same management traffic plan as the existing operations.
- 8.8 The additional movements are modest and are well within daily variations of traffic flows.
- 8.9 It is considered that the intensification of the site will not result in a detrimental impact on the operation or safety of the existing highway network.

#### **Highway Summary**

- 8.10 The Transport Statement has demonstrated that the development is fully in accordance with both national and local policy and confirms that the impact of the development is not severe. On this basis, it is concluded that there are no grounds for refusal on highway grounds.

# IAN PICK ASSOCIATES LTD.

SPECIALIST AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

## ***Environmental Impact Assessment Level***

- 8.11 Based on the criteria in paragraph 3.19 on page 11 of this statement, the Environmental Impact Assessment level relating to the highways and transportation impacts of the development is **Low - There will be an effect, however this will be localised and will not impact on environmental and other features to their detriment when relating to existing uses (e.g. distance too far).**



## **CHAPTER 9.**

### **9. NOISE, ODOUR & DUST**

#### **Noise**

##### **Scope of the Assessment**

- 9.1 A detailed noise assessment has been prepared by Matrix Acoustic Design Consultants to review plant and operational noise generated from the proposed expanded poultry unit development. The assessment includes the proposed plant and ventilation systems together with transport related noise. The full detailed analysis, which includes the results of a noise survey and acoustic calculations, are provided at **Appendix 4**. The Acoustic Assessment has been undertaken to BS4142:2014.

##### **Baseline Conditions**

- 9.2 A noise survey has been conducted to determine the typical background noise levels at the nearest dwellings to the proposed broiler units.

##### **Assessment Summary**

- 9.3 The noise emissions and BS4142 Rating Levels of the plant (roof extract fans) and transport activities (stock deliveries and HGVs on the access road) as a result of the proposed enlarged poultry development (Figures 1 and 2) have been determined by calculation (Appendix B).
- 9.4 For the assessment the following mitigation measure have been included:
- attenuators fitted to each extract fan (existing and proposed) that meet the insertion losses given in Table 2
  - use of an electric forklift for moving stock
- 9.5 The established aggregate (extract fans + transport activities) Rating Levels during the day and evening in all cases do not exceed the surveyed typical background noise levels of the area. According the BS4142 this indicates a **low** noise impact.
- 9.6 Due to the very low Rating Levels and typical background noise levels during the night the absolute noise emission levels have been assessed to review acceptability; this is in accordance with guidance given in BS4142.
- 9.7 During the night the ambient noise ingress via an open window of both the extract fan and transport activities will be >10dB below BS8233's noise ingress limits for bedrooms (note the limits are applicable to road traffic and continuous operating plant).
- 9.8 The individual maximum noise events generated by the HGVs loading/unloading will result in noise ingress levels via an open window of no

greater than L<sub>Amax,F</sub> 45dB. In accordance with ProPG (2017) this indicates a negligible noise impact with regard to sleep disturbance.

- 9.9 We therefore conclude that during the night the absolute noise levels will result in a **low** noise impact.
- 9.10 Site management with regard to minimising noise emissions has been discussed.
- 9.11 On the basis that the proposed enlarged poultry development, with the implementation of the two identified mitigation measures, will not result in an adverse noise impact at the nearest dwellings, we conclude that on noise grounds it is acceptable.

#### **Noise Summary**

- 9.12 The proposed development will result in a permanent effect, as the noise impacts of the development arise from the operation of plant and transport throughout the lifespan of the development. The noise assessment is based on BS4142: 2014 and the associated rating levels in accordance with BS4142:2014 for plant and transport noise is **low**.

#### **Environmental Impact Assessment Level**

- 9.13 Based on the criteria in paragraph 3.19 on page 11 of this statement, the Environmental Impact Assessment level relating to the noise impacts of the development is **Low - There will be an effect, however this will be localised and will not impact on environmental and other features to their detriment when relating to existing uses (e.g. distance too far)**.

#### **Air Quality Assessment**

##### **Baseline Conditions**

- 9.14 The application site currently comprises a field in agricultural use, located immediately adjacent to the existing poultry unit development at Treestacks Farm. A detailed Odour Impact Assessment has been prepared of the proposed poultry units, in combination with the existing poultry units, and the full assessment is provided at **Appendix 5**.

##### **Scope of the Assessment**

- 9.15 AS Modelling and Data were instructed to undertake an Odour Impact Assessment relating to the proposed poultry unit development described in Chapter 3.
- 9.16 The full Odour Impact Assessment is shown at **Appendix 5** and summarised below.



- 9.17 Odour emission rates from the proposed poultry houses have been assessed and quantified based upon an emissions model that takes into account the internal odour concentrations and ventilation rates of the poultry houses. The odour emission rates so obtained have then been used as inputs to an atmospheric dispersion model which calculates odour exposure levels in the surrounding area.

**Odour Summary**

- 9.18 The modelling predicts that at all nearby residences, the predicted 98<sup>th</sup> percentile odour concentrations would be below the Environment Agency's benchmark for moderately offensive odours, a maximum annual 98<sup>th</sup> percentile hourly mean concentration of 3.0 ou<sub>E</sub>/m. The maximum predicted odour exposure is 2.81 ou<sub>E</sub>/m, at Red House Farm.
- 9.19 The odour impacts of the development relate to its operation for the design life of the project, and therefore represent a permanent effect.

**Environmental Impact Assessment Level**

- 9.20 Based on the criteria in paragraph 3.19 on page 11 of this statement, the Environmental Impact Assessment level relating to the odour impacts of the development is **Low - There will be an effect, however this will be localised and will not impact on environmental and other features to their detriment when relating to existing uses (e.g. distance too far).**

**Dust**

- 9.21 The assessment of dust from poultry farms formed part of a DEFRA research project. DEFRA project AC0104. The summary of the DEFRA research project is shown in the text below.

“This work represents one of the most comprehensive studies to quantify PM emissions from poultry housing to date, comparing a total of eight farms. Large variations between farm management practises, lighting regimes, litter conditions, and meteorology contributed to variability in emissions, even for the same type of farm. However, the measurements undertaken as part of this study were also able to identify differences in concentrations and emissions of particles between different farm types. The broiler installations were associated with the largest indoor air PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations (655 µg m<sup>-3</sup> and 2990 µg m<sup>-3</sup>, respectively) and the highest bacterial fungal counts. Concentrations for particulate matter and bioaerosols were the lowest at battery farms. In general, indoor particle concentrations increased during winter time and light periods, reflecting ventilation rate and bird activity as the dominant influences. On the other hand, emission factors increased slightly during light-time in the summer months, due to the increase in ventilation rate.

Chemical speciation measurements indicated that (i) NH<sub>4</sub>NO<sub>4</sub> was not forming within the shed, (ii) the dominant inorganic species sourced from poultry material are Ca<sup>2+</sup>, K<sup>+</sup> and Mg<sup>2+</sup>, and (iii) the key metals in the poultry sheds



include Al, As, Ba, Cu (light only), Cr, Mn, Rb, Sr and Ti. We here derived, to our knowledge for the first time, poultry emission factors for aerosol chemical components (metals and major inorganic ions) and when compared against the NAEI suggest that between 0.1 – 4% (depending on compound) of the UK metal and inorganic ion emissions are derived from poultry house emissions. Bioaerosol concentrations in the building represent a risk to poultry workers in terms of respiratory allergy or disease, but the levels emitted are sufficiently diluted over a short distance from the building so as not to pose a risk to those living in the vicinity of poultry operations. PM10 particulate levels were reduced to background levels by 100m downwind of even the highest emitting poultry houses, therefore are unlikely to pose a risk to those living in the vicinity of poultry operations.”

- 9.22 The results of the DEFRA research project demonstrated that emissions from poultry units in terms of particulate matter reduced to background levels by 100m downwind of the even the highest emitting poultry houses. The research shows that levels of particulate matter are sufficiently diluted over a short distance so as not to pose a risk to those living in the vicinity of poultry operations. The application site is 240m from the closest residential receptor (Red House Farm) and therefore beyond the distance where dust issues can occur.

**DEFRA LAQM TG16**

- 9.23 Dust impacts of poultry units are well researched by DEFRA. DEFRA Project AC0104 confirms that dust levels reduce to background levels at 100m from the highest emitting poultry houses. DEFRA Local Air Quality Management (LAQM) Technical Guidance 16 (Feb 2018) provides screening criteria of where dust assessment is required for a poultry unit as follows:

*“Poultry farms housing in excess of 400,000 birds (if mechanically ventilated) / 200,000 birds (if naturally ventilated) / 100,000 birds (if turkey unit) - Exposure within 100m from the poultry units”*

- 9.24 The above screening criteria confirms that air quality assessment is required for poultry units, if the development exceeds 400,000 birds and there is a receptor within 100m. In this instance, the development falls well below the threshold for dust assessment.

**Dust Summary**

- 9.25 The application site is located 240m from the closest sensitive receptor. The results of DEFRA project AC0104 confirmed with research that dust was diluted over short distances of 100m to normal background levels and therefore the proposal does not pose a risk of public health issues. The development also falls below the DEFRA screening thresholds for dust assessment.

# IAN PICK ASSOCIATES LTD.

SPECIALIST AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

## *Environmental Impact Assessment Level*

- 9.26 Based on the criteria in paragraph 3.19 on page 11 of this statement, the Environmental Impact Assessment level relating to the dust impacts of the development is **Low - There will be an effect, however this will be localised and will not impact on environmental and other features to their detriment when relating to existing uses (e.g. distance too far).**

## **CHAPTER 10.**

### **10. ECOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT**

#### **Baseline Conditions**

- 10.1 A phase 1 Habitat Survey has been undertaken on the site to determine baseline ecological conditions on the site. The Phase 1 Habitat Survey relates to the full development as described in Chapter 3. The full Phase 1 assessment is contained at **Appendix 6**. The application site is an intensively farmed arable field producing combinable crops and located immediately adjacent to the existing poultry unit.
- 10.2 The site was surveyed following the methodology contained in the Handbook for Phase 1 habitat survey (Joint Nature Conservation Committee. 2010. *Handbook for Phase 1 habitat survey: a technique for environmental audit*. JNCC, Peterborough, UK) and the current guidance on survey methods from the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM. 2012. *Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal*. CIEEM, Winchester, UK). The Habitat Suitability Index for great crested newts was calculated following ARG UK advice note 5 (Amphibian and Reptile Groups of the United Kingdom, 2010).
- 10.3 The Phase 1 Habitat Survey provides evidence that the site is not as a whole of sufficient ecological value to warrant whole-scale protection from the development. The sites habitats which will be affected by the works are common and widespread and are considered to be of low intrinsic biodiversity value.

#### **The Development Proposal**

- 10.4 The development proposal will introduce an intensive poultry farming operation onto the site. The ecological assessment provided at **Appendix 6** confirms that the application site itself is of low intrinsic biodiversity value.
- 10.5 Intensive poultry farming enterprises have the potential to create increased levels of ammonia and nitrogen within the atmosphere in the locality, which can in turn create negative impacts on sites of nature conservation importance, for example, Special Areas of Conservation (SAC's), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Ancient Woodlands and Local Wildlife Sites. A detailed ammonia assessment is provided at **Appendix 7**.
- 10.6 The following protected ecological sites are located within the screening distances.
- Dengewell Wood AW - approximately 1.3 km to the south-west.
  - Broadmeadow Wood AW - approximately 2.0 km to the south-south-west.
  - Soils Wood LWS - approximately 2.0 km to the east.



# IAN PICK ASSOCIATES LTD.

SPECIALIST AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

- Stour & Copperas Woods, Ramsey SSSI - Approximately 2.4 km to the north-north-east - The largest area of woodland in north-east Essex. They have a coppice-with-standards structure and contain the only example in the county where coastal and woodland habitats meet.
- Little Oakley Channel Deposit SSSI - Approximately 4.3 km to the east-north-east - Geological.
- Hamford Water SSSI/SACS/PA/Ramsar - approximately 3.2 km to the south-east at its closest point - A tidal inlet whose mouth is about three miles south of Harwich. It is a large and shallow estuarine basin comprising tidal creeks, intertidal mud and sand flats, saltmarshes, islands, beaches and marsh grasslands. The site is of international importance for breeding Little Terns and wintering Dark-bellied Brent Geese, wildfowl and waders, and of national importance for many other bird species.
- Stour Estuary SSSI/SPA/Ramsar - Approximately 3.4 km to the north-north-east at its closest point - The estuary is nationally important for 13 species of wintering waterfowl and three species on autumn passage and is also of national importance for coastal saltmarsh, sheltered muddy shores, two scarce marine invertebrates and a vascular scarce plant assemblage.
- Orwell Estuary SSSI/SPA/Ramsar - Approximately 9.0 km to the north-east at its closest point - The estuary is of national importance for breeding avocet *Recurvirostra avosetta*, its breeding bird assemblage of open waters and their margins, nine species of wintering waterfowl (including black-tailed godwit *Limosa limosa islandica*), an assemblage of vascular plants, and intertidal mud habitats.
- Weeleyhall Wood SSSI - Approximately 7.4 km to the south-south-west - One of the largest ancient woods in the Tendring peninsula. It contains one of the best examples in Essex of base-poor spring-line alder woodland, a type of woodland which is rare in the county, as well as good examples of lowland hazel-pedunculate oak and some wet ash-maple woodland, and chestnut coppice-with-standards derived from these last two.
- Holland Haven Marshes SSSI - Approximately 8.6 km to the south - An area of reclaimed estuarine saltmarsh and freshwater marsh. The ditch network represents an outstanding example of a freshwater to brackish water transition intimated by the aquatic plant communities, which include a number of nationally and locally scarce species. The adjoining grasslands are of botanical importance in their own right, as well as acting as a buffer zone to the ditch system.
- The Naze SSSI - Approximately 9.7 km to the south-east - Geological.
- Harwich Foreshore SSSI - Approximately 8.6 km to the east-north-east - Geological.
- Freston and Cutler's Woods with Holbrook Park SSSI - Approximately 9.9 km to the north-north-west - One of the largest areas of ancient woodland in Suffolk. They contain a variety of woodland types typical of light, sandy soil and spring-fed valleys.

# IAN PICK ASSOCIATES LTD.

SPECIALIST AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

- 10.7 AS Modelling & Data Ltd. has been instructed by Mr. Ian Pick of Ian Pick Associates Ltd., on behalf of HAB Poultry Ltd, to use computer modelling to assess the impact of ammonia emissions from the proposed broiler chicken rearing houses at Land North of Redhouse Farm, Oakley Road, Wix, Manningtree, Essex. CO11 2SF.
- 10.8 Ammonia emission rates from the proposed poultry houses have been assessed and quantified based upon the Environment Agency's standard ammonia emission factors. The ammonia emission rates have then been used as inputs to an atmospheric dispersion and deposition model which calculates ammonia exposure levels and nitrogen deposition rates in the surrounding area.
- 10.9 The modelling predicts that:
- The process contribution (from the proposed development) to annual mean ammonia concentrations and nitrogen deposition rates would be well below the Environment Agency's lower threshold percentage of the relevant Critical Level and/or Load at all wildlife sites considered.
  - The process contribution (from the proposed development) to annual mean ammonia concentrations would exceed 1% of the Critical Level over southern parts of the Stour & Copperas Woods, Ramsey SSSI, but would be below 4% the Critical Level.
  - The process contribution (from the proposed development) to annual mean ammonia concentrations would be below 1% of the Critical Level at all other statutory wildlife sites considered.

## Summary

- 10.10 The Phase 1 Habitat Survey provides evidence that the site is not as a whole of sufficient ecological value to warrant whole-scale protection from the development. The sites habitats which will be affected by the works are common and widespread and are considered to be of low intrinsic biodiversity value.
- 10.11 The Ammonia screening confirms that the proposal screens out for significant effects.

## Environmental Impact Assessment Level

- 10.12 Based on the criteria in paragraph 3.19 on page 11 of this statement, the Environmental Impact Assessment level relating to the ecological and ammonia impacts of the development are **Low - There will be an effect, however this will be localised and will not impact on environmental and other features to their detriment when relating to existing uses (e.g. distance too far).**



## **CHAPTER 11**

### **11. DRAINAGE AND FLOOD RISK**

#### *Baseline Conditions*

- 11.1 The application site comprises an existing arable field. The site is noted on the Environment Agency flood maps as Flood Zone 1 i.e. outside of the flood plain.
- 11.2 Surface water drainage from the field is therefore currently limited to a greenfield runoff rate. A detailed Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Management Strategy for the proposed development has been provided by Hydro Logic Services and the full report is shown at **Appendix 8** of this statement.

#### *Assessment*

##### *Drainage and Flood Risk*

- 11.3 The surface water management design proposes SuDS that will limit the total site runoff from the proposed development to a greenfield runoff rate. Attenuation is proposed in the form an attenuation pond which is located to the east of the proposed poultry sheds. The attenuation pond outfalls into the drain to the south of the attenuation pond through a restricted orifice which will limit discharge to the appropriate greenfield rate. The purpose of the attenuated system is to store clean water on site during peak rainfall events and release into the drainage system at a normal greenfield runoff rate. The use of this type of system prevents surges during high rainfall and provides benefits in terms of downstream flooding consequences.
- 11.4 The design of the sustainable drainage system includes design provisions for climate change by increasing the design rainfall by 40%.
- 11.5 Foul and surface water drainage on the site will be separated to prevent discharge of dirty water to watercourses. The inside of the proposed building will be sealed and drained to sealed underground dirty water containment tanks. The proposed dirty water tanks will collect contaminated water produced in the washing out process. The concrete aprons have the potential to become contaminated during the manure removal process of the cleanout operate. The concrete apron will be enclosed by a catchment drainage with a switch system. During the cleanout process, the concrete apron will be drained into the dirty water containment system. Outside the cleanout period, when the apron is clean and uncontaminated, the apron will drain into the attenuation pond. The separate drainage systems are a requirement for the Environmental Permit.



**Summary**

- 11.6 The development area is located within Flood Zone 1. The built development is not at risk of flooding. In accordance with the NPPF, mitigation in the form of attenuated surface water drainage has been designed into the scheme through the provision of an attenuation pond. The purpose of the attenuated system is to store clean water on site during peak rainfall events and release into the drainage system at a greenfield runoff rate. The use of this type of system prevents surges during high rainfall and provides benefits in terms of downstream flooding consequences.
- 11.7 The drainage proposals are required for the design lifetime of the development and therefore the impacts should be regarded as permanent.

**Environmental Impact Assessment Level**

- 11.8 Based on the criteria in paragraph 3.19 on page 11 of this statement, the Environmental Impact Assessment level relating to the flood risk and drainage impacts of the development is **Low - There will be an effect, however this will be localised and will not impact on environmental and other features to their detriment when relating to existing uses (e.g. distance too far).**

## NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

- 1.1 This non-technical summary has been produced to summarise the issues, mitigation measures and effects relating to the proposed development of three additional poultry buildings and associated infrastructure at Treestacks Farm, Oakley Road, Wix. The full extent of the proposed development is shown in the table below.

Element	Description
Poultry Houses	3 No. 110m x 20.42m poultry houses, with an eaves height of 2.974m and a ridge height of 5.726m.
Integral control rooms and catching canopies.	3 No. attached control rooms and catching canopies on the west elevation of the poultry houses measuring 12.210m x 4m with an eaves height of 2.974m and a ridge height of 5.726m.
Feed blending rooms	2 No. feed blending rooms, measuring 3m x 4m.
Feed bins	6 No. feed bins with a diameter of 3.5m and a height of 8.6m.
Concrete Apron	Extension to existing concrete apron measuring 820 sq m.

- 1.2 Each proposed poultry building will house 44134 birds, with 132,402 additional birds proposed on the site in total. Post development the total capacity of the whole site will be 220,670 birds.

### *Assessment of Significance of Environmental Effects*

- 1.3 In terms of the potential environmental effects, these have been assessed in accordance with the significance criterion outlined below.

<b>None</b>	<b>The development will not produce any effects beyond those which may be experienced within the current farming regime.</b>
<b>Low</b>	<b>There will be an effect, however this will be localised and will not impact on environmental and other features to their detriment when relating to existing uses (e.g. distance too far)</b>
<b>Medium</b>	<b>There will be an effect which will impact on environmental features, but not significantly.</b>
<b>High</b>	<b>A significant effect.</b>
<b>Positive</b>	<b>Has a benefit.</b>

1.4 The scheme has been designed to take into account the potential environmental effects, with mitigation inherent in the project design. The scope of assessment included within the Environmental Impact Assessment includes the following:

- Landscape and Visual Impact
- Highways and Transportation
- Noise, Odour and Dust
- Ecological Issues
- Drainage and Flood Risk

1.5 The impact relating to these issues is summarised in the following sections.

***Environmental Impact***

Issue	Mitigation Measures	Effect Assuming Mitigation
<b>Landscape and Visual Impact.</b>	<p>Native tree and hedgerow planting to the site boundaries.</p> <p>Management and maintenance of existing surrounding hedgerow and trees;</p> <p>The use of materials for the external envelope of the buildings which minimise potential visual intrusion and follow the local vernacular to aid visual blending, for example green metal sheeting.</p>	<p><b>Low (not significant)</b> The assessment level provided within the LVIA is based on the guidance within GLVIA 3 with a resulting minor/negligible impact on landscape character and minor effect on the visual baseline. This is a permanent effect as the assessment relates to the presence of the development within the landscape.</p>
<b>Highway Impact</b>		<p><b>Low (not significant)</b> The Transport Statement has demonstrated that the development is fully in accordance with both national and local policy and in particular confirms that the impact of the development is not severe.</p>



# IAN PICK ASSOCIATES LTD.

SPECIALIST AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

<b>Noise</b>	Use of fan noise attenuators.	<b>Low (not significant)</b> The noise assessment concludes that the noise impacts of the development are low for plant and transport noise.
<b>Odour</b>	Use of high-speed roof mounted fans.	<b>Low (not significant)</b> The proposal is compliant with Environment Agency odour thresholds
<b>Dust</b>	The site is located 240m from the closest residential neighbour.	<b>Low (not significant)</b> The site is beyond the distance where dust issues occur.
<b>Ecology</b>		<b>Low (not significant)</b> The sites habitats which will be affected by the works are common and widespread and are considered to be of low intrinsic biodiversity value.
<b>Ammonia Deposition</b>	Use of high-speed roof mounted fans.	The proposals have been screened for impacts to sites of nature conservation importance. The proposal has screened out with no significant effects.
<b>Flood Risk and Drainage</b>	Use of an attenuated drainage system.	<b>Low (not significant)</b> The the development area is located within Flood Zone 1. The built development is not at risk of flooding. In accordance with the NPPF, mitigation in the form of attenuated surface water drainage has been designed into the scheme through the provision of an attenuation pond.

# IAN PICK ASSOCIATES LTD.

SPECIALIST AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

- 1.6 In conclusion, the proposed poultry unit expansion at Treestacks Farm will not produce any significant Environmental Impacts. From the information appraised through the Environmental Impact Assessment process, it is clear that the proposed redevelopment will have low impact on the environment taking into account the migration measures proposed.
- 1.7 No technical difficulties were encountered in preparing this Environmental Statement or assessing the impacts of the proposed development. The preparation of the Environmental Assessment has taken into account the results of UK environmental assessments.

**Ian Pick BSc (Hons) MRICS, May 2022.**