



Environmental Statement

Construction of two poultry sheds, feed bins and associated ancillary works

Far Broadway Poultry Farm, Ford Heath,
Shrewsbury, SY5 9NW

October 2023

SA33086_ES

APPLICANT

Broadway Poultry Limited

PROJECT

Construction of two poultry sheds, feed bins and associated ancillary works

SITE

Far Broadway Poultry Farm, Ford Heath, Shrewsbury, SY5 9NW

PREPARED BY

Nick Williams

BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Partner and Chartered Town Planner

REVIEWED BY

Stuart Thomas

BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Partner and Head of Planning

BERRYS

Beech House

Anchorage Avenue

Shrewsbury Business Park

Shrewsbury

SY2 6FG

01743 271697

berrys.uk.com

BERRYS

T: 01743 271697 | E: shrewsbury@berrys.uk.com | berrys.uk.com

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Scoping and Key Issues	5
3. Development Description.....	10
4. Landscape and Visual Amenity	15
5. Cultural Heritage.....	47
6. Ecology.....	63
7. Summary and Conclusions	74

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This Environmental Statement (ES) has been prepared for Broadway Poultry Limited (the 'Applicant') in relation to an application for an extension to their poultry rearing enterprise at Far Broadway Poultry Farm, Ford Heath, Shrewsbury, SY5 9NW.

Summary of the proposal

- 1.2 The proposed development comprises the construction of two poultry sheds to include scrubber units; the addition of a scrubber unit to an existing poultry shed; the construction of 3 feeds bins; the provision of yard space; the creation of a drainage basin; and, associated landscaping works. The proposed development will sit north-west of and opposite the four existing poultry sheds at Far Broadway Poultry Farm.
- 1.3 The existing poultry farm currently has capacity for 192,000 broiler birds across four sheds. The proposed development will increase the capacity to approximately 288,000 bird places. The Applicant has already varied the Environmental Permit (ref: EPR/LP3034YL) for the site allowing for the proposed increase in bird numbers. The Permit ensures appropriate management of the site, effective operation, and controls emissions from the site to ensure no adverse unacceptable on the surrounding environment. The operation of the expanded site will comply with best available techniques (BATs).

Site and surroundings

- 1.4 The application site (the 'Site') sits west and opposite the existing poultry units at Far Broadway Poultry Farm, at Ford Heath, approximately 2 kilometres to the south-west of the village of Ford, and 8 kilometres to the west of Shrewsbury.
- 1.5 The Site extends to 4.2 hectares and comprises the existing poultry site and access, and an area of land down to pasture in agricultural use to the northwest, where the proposed additional poultry sheds will sit.
- 1.6 The surrounding area predominantly comprises agricultural land down to a mix of pasture and arable cropping, interspersed with boundary vegetation and copses of trees. Built form in the surrounding area comprises the properties of Ford Heath and Cardeston, farmsteads, smallholdings, and rural dwellings.

- 1.7 The Site is not allocated in the Shropshire Local Plan but is located partly within a Minerals Safeguarding Area for coal. The site is in a countryside location in planning policy terms. The proposed poultry sheds are located approximately 340 metres east of the grade II listed ‘Heath Farmhouse’, approximately 750 metres to the southeast of the grade II listed ‘Church of St Michael’ in Cardeston, and approximately 820 metres to the north-east of an Ancient Woodland. There are no other designations within a kilometre of the Site.
- 1.8 The Site is accessed via the existing poultry farm access off the passing Class C Yockleton Road. This existing access will serve the development. A public footpath runs through the extreme north of the Site. There are no other public rights of way within 250 metres of the Site.

Requirement for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

- 1.9 The Town & Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017 require that for certain developments an EIA is required. The Regulations set out the types of development where an EIA is mandatory (Schedule 1) and when the need for an EIA will be determined if the development is likely to have significant environmental impacts by reason of factors such as the size, scale, location or other likely impacts (Schedule 2).
- 1.10 The threshold for when a development falls as a Schedule 1 development for installations for the intensive rearing of poultry is 85,000 places for broilers and 60,000 places for hens. On the basis the proposed development will increase the number of birds reared at the site by 96,000, it constitutes EIA Schedule 1 development. As a result, this ES has been provided to accompany the planning application for the extension of the poultry farm.

Objectives and purpose of EIA

- 1.11 The objectives of EIA are as follows:
- To identify the potential environmental impacts of a proposed development, taking into account the characteristics of the development and the local environment, and the views of local authorities and statutory consultees with responsibilities for the environment;
 - To interpret the nature of potential impacts;
 - To identify measures to mitigate adverse impacts; and
 - To report the results of the assessment in an ES for submission to the planning authority.

- 1.12 Planning Practice Guidance (Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 4-002-20140306)¹ confirms the aim of Environmental Impact Assessment is to protect the environment by ensuring that a local planning authority when deciding whether to grant planning permission for a project, does so in the full knowledge of the likely significant effects, and takes this into account in the decision making process.
- 1.13 The EIA process requires the preparation of an ES. The EIA regulations confirm an ES is a statement that includes at least:
- a) a description of the proposed development comprising information on the site, design, size and other relevant features of the development;
 - b) a description of the likely significant effects of the proposed development on the environment;
 - c) a description of any features of the proposed development, or measures envisaged in order to avoid, prevent or reduce and, if possible, offset likely significant adverse effects on the environment;
 - d) a description of the reasonable alternatives studied by the developer, which are relevant to the proposed development and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for the option chosen, taking into account the effects of the development on the environment;
 - e) a non-technical summary of the information referred to in subparagraphs (a) to (d); and
 - f) any additional information specified in Schedule 4 relevant to the specific characteristics of the particular development or type of development and to the environmental features likely to be significantly affected.
- 1.14 The environmental topic areas being covered with this ES are consistent with Schedule 4 of the Regulations and are listed below:
- Landscape and Visual Amenity;
 - Cultural Heritage; and
 - Ecology.
- 1.15 Potential impacts on air quality; highways; population/socio-economics; noise; geology, soils, ground stability and contamination; and water resources have been scoped out of the EIA on the grounds that the proposed poultry farm is unlikely to result in significant effects.

¹ [Environmental Impact Assessment - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/environmental-impact-assessment)

Method Statement and Assessment Criteria

- 1.16 There is no set method statement or assessment criteria for the chapters of the ES. It is considered more appropriate to allow the chapter authors to set their own methodology and criteria so that the information can be portrayed in the easiest way. The methodology used will be stated in each chapter.

Structure of this ES

- 1.17 This ES includes the following chapters:
- Scoping and Key Issues;
 - Development Description;
 - Landscape and Visual Amenity;
 - Cultural Heritage; and
 - Ecology

Authors of this ES

- 1.18 This ES has been prepared by Berrys planning, heritage and conservation, services; with the support of Lingard Farrow Styles for landscape architecture, Salopian Consultancy for ecology, and Ispoleth for ammonia emissions assessment.

2. Scoping and Key Issues

The Scoping Process

- 2.1 Scoping is the process of determining the amount of information on each of the principal subjects and effect types to be presented in an ES. It is regarded as an important first step in the overall EIA process.
- 2.2 The primary aim of EIA scoping is to facilitate the planning of a focused EIA that concentrates on the resolution of substantive environmental issues, whilst giving appropriate reduced emphasis to those of less potential importance and, where appropriate, excluding any non-issues from further consideration. It also allows primary concerns to be identified at an early stage and informs developers of aspects of concern that they may not have been aware of. Surveys and assessment methodologies can also be agreed between all interested parties such that it is less likely that additional information is required after submission of the application.
- 2.3 A Scoping Opinion request was validated by Shropshire Council on 4th August 2021 and a Scoping Opinion was formally issued on 17th November 2021 referenced 21/03807/SCO. A copy of the Scoping Opinion is included at *Appendix 2.1*.

Summary of the Receiving Environment and discussion of the scope of the EIA

Air Quality

- 2.4 The site is not located within any of the designated Air Quality Management Areas across the County.

Landscape

- 2.5 A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) prepared by Lingard Farrow Styles confirms that no landscape designations pertain to the Site or the Study Area as defined by the LVIA. The Site is located within the Enclosed Lowland Heath Landscape Type.
- 2.6 From a visual perspective, the proposed development will be seen in the context of the existing poultry sheds at the farm. The LVIA does however identify a number of visual receptors for assessment, including users of promoted routes; users of Public Rights of Way; road users; nearby residents; and visitors to St. Michael's Church, Cardeston.
- 2.7 The Landscape and visual impact are assessed at Chapter 4 of this ES.

Highways

- 2.8 The Site benefits from having a good access from the strategic road network, which is considered to have sufficient available capacity to accommodate the proposed development traffic. The A458 trunk road is located just over a kilometre to the north of the Site off Yockleton Road. The site has ample access and circulation space for accommodating all anticipated HGV movements and all vehicles can enter and leave the site in a forward gear. Capacity is already available on the Site to accommodate the development traffic.
- 2.9 A Transport Statement has been prepared and forms part of the planning application confirming from a transportation perspective the location is considered to be a sustainable location to accommodate the proposed development.

Population / Socio-Economics

- 2.10 The Site is within the open countryside with the small settlement of Ford Heath to the south-west. The nearest residential property not attached to the farm is located over 210 metres from the nearest proposed poultry shed. There are very few unattached residential properties within 400 metres of the Site.
- 2.11 The Applicant has already varied the Environmental Permit (ref: EPR/LP3034YL) for the farm allowing for the proposed increase in bird numbers. The Permit ensures appropriate management of the site, effective operation, and controls emissions from the site to ensure no adverse unacceptable on the surrounding environment. The operation of the expanded site will comply with best available techniques (BATs).
- 2.12 The poultry farm is within 400 metres of sensitive receptors and as such the Permit includes odour, noise, and dust management plans.
- 2.13 An Odour Impact Assessment has been undertaken and forms part of the planning application which predicts that odour will be perceived the closest sensitive locations, however the proposed development is unlikely to lead to odour impacts at a level which would be regarded by the EA as unacceptable, when operated in accordance with best practice. The assessment shows that the proposed scheme represents a betterment over the existing operation of the farm for the closest sensitive receptors.
- 2.14 The proposal will support the Applicant's poultry rearing enterprise and the local economy, retaining and providing additional employment opportunities.

Noise

- 2.15 There are very few residential properties within 400 metres of the Site that aren't associated with the farm business. The noise environment in the local area is dominated by agricultural traffic plus traffic noise from the nearby roads. Existing agricultural activities (including poultry) are also a noise source at the Site.
- 2.16 Noise emissions from the site are controlled through the Environmental Permit which includes a noise management plan.
- 2.17 A Noise Assessment has been undertaken and forms part of the planning application and confirms it is considered that there are no noise-related issues associated with the proposed poultry farm extension which would prevent the granting of full planning permission.

Geology, Soils, Ground Stability and Contamination

- 2.18 British Geological Survey (BGS) mapping indicates that the site is underlain by the Kinnerton Sandstone Formation, which is identified as a highly productive aquifer. The upper superficial deposit layers are identified as till, Devensian – diamicton, which are varied unsorted glacial deposits of clay, sand, gravel, and boulders which vary widely in size and shape.
- 2.19 Borehole records referenced SJ41SW13, SJ41SW12 and SJ41SW17 are available just to the south-east and north-east of the site area. They show that the ground is underlain by clay. No water was encountered in any of the boreholes which were drilled to a depth of 18 metres below ground level. This is therefore a good indication of the local groundwater level with the aquifer sufficiently below the surface.
- 2.20 The Site is Grade 4 agricultural land according to Natural England's Provisional Agricultural Land Classification.

Water Resources

- 2.21 The Site is not located within the Environment Agency (EA) fluvial flood zones 2 or 3, and EA surface water flood maps show only very small areas of the site as being at risk of surface water flooding.
- 2.22 A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) inclusive of an outline drainage strategy forms part of the planning application and confirms the Site can be adequately drained.

Ecology

- 2.23 No statutory designations of conservation concern are identified within 1km of the Site, nor are any non-statutory designations identified within or adjacent to the Site. Within the wider landscape an area of ancient, replanted woodland is located 790m south-west of the Site.
- 2.24 Ecological receptors sensitive to ammonia emissions from poultry operations include:
- Sites of European interest up to 10km from the Site including Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Ramsar Sites.
 - Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) up to 5km from the Site which are of national importance.
 - 'Natural Assets' up to 2km from the Site which include Local Nature Reserves (LNRs), Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) Priority Habitats and Ancient Woodland (AW).
- 2.25 A number of ecological receptors sensitive to ammonia have been identified within the relevant separation distances from the Site.
- 2.26 Four ponds fall between 100m-500m from the site which score below average in their suitability for Great crested newts. An additional pond located 75m to the west scores average in its suitability for this species. The Site itself supports limited opportunities for species of amphibians given the lack of refuge which is restricted to the boundary hedgerows which will remain intact.
- 2.27 Impact on Ecology is assessed at Chapter 6.

Cultural Heritage

- 2.28 A number of designated and non-designated heritage assets have been identified within 1km of the Site.
- 2.29 The proposed poultry sheds are located approximately 340 metres east of the grade II listed 'Heath Farmhouse', and approximately 750 metres to the south-east of the grade II listed 'Church of St Michael' in Cardeston.
- 2.30 Impact on Cultural Heritage is assessed at Chapter 5.

Summary of the Scoping Exercise

- 2.31 Based on the Scoping Opinion issued by Shropshire Council (ref: 21/03807/SCO), and an assessment of the proposed development and the receiving environment, the following topics are assessed in more detail within the ES: Landscape and Visual Amenity; Cultural Heritage; and Ecology.

Alternatives

- 2.32 There are no alternatives to that which is proposed.
- 2.33 The proposal is for the extension of existing operation as opposed to the creation of an entirely new poultry farm. The necessary infrastructure is already present at the site, meaning it will be more cost effective and sustainable to expand existing operations which can utilise existing services/facilities.
- 2.34 In addition, deliveries/collections already take place at the Site. It would be more efficient in terms of management for operations to take place at a single site rather than in two separate locations.

3. Development Description

3.1 The description of the proposed development is as follows:

“Construction of two poultry sheds, feed bins and associated ancillary works”.

3.2 The proposed site will be developed to include:

- Poultry rearing sheds
- Scrubber units
- Feed bins
- Hardstanding
- Landscape planting
- Drainage detention basin

3.3 Far Broadway Poultry Farm currently operates with a capacity of 192,000 birds across four sheds. The proposed development will increase the capacity to 288,000 bird places. The Applicant has already varied the Environment Agency Permit (ref: EPR/LP3034YL) for the farm allowing for the proposed increase in bird numbers. The Permit ensures appropriate management of the site, effective operation, and controls emissions from the site to ensure no adverse unacceptable on the surrounding environment. The operation of the expanded site will comply with best available techniques (BATs).

3.4 Descriptions of the main buildings and ancillary works, operational arrangements and environmental controls, and the production cycle, are laid out below.

3.5 Drawings of the proposed development can be seen at ***Appendix 3.1***.

Site Layout

Two poultry sheds and control rooms

3.6 The development proposes the erection of two poultry sheds constructed to the north-west of the existing poultry farm. Each of the proposed poultry sheds will measure 105.11 metres in length, 25 metres in width, 2.67 metres to the eaves, and 4.98 metres to the ridge.

3.7 The proposed sheds are constructed with a solid concrete floor, metal portal frame and roof, and side wall cladding. The buildings are fitted with 6 roof extraction fans either side of the ridge line.

- 3.8 The two proposed poultry sheds have control rooms built on to the front of the sheds and a canopy adjoining the control room that is positioned over the main doors of the sheds. Each control room will be approximately half the width of each shed at 12.3 metres in width and extending 2.85 metres out from the front of each shed. The double doors to the sheds are off centre and the canopy will be over these doors; the canopy is 4.83 metres wide and extends out from the shed doors by 2.85 metres.

Scrubber units

- 3.9 The two proposed poultry sheds will be fitted with air scrubber units to the rear of the sheds. The southernmost existing poultry shed will be retrofitted with a scrubber unit to the rear of the shed.
- 3.10 The proposed scrubber units will measure 12.3 metres in width, 7.65 metres in depth, and 4.9 metres in height.

Feed bins

- 3.11 Three feed bins will be positioned on concrete plinths between the proposed poultry sheds. The feed bins will measure 2.15 metres in diameter and 5.63 metres in height.

Hardstanding and turning

- 3.12 A 15.77 metre wide concrete yard area is proposed to the front (south-east) of the proposed poultry sheds. This is to allow for the turning of HGVs and servicing of the sheds.

Surface water drainage

- 3.13 It is proposed that water from the building roofs will be collected via stone-filled filter drains before flowing to a proposed detention basin.
- 3.14 Impermeable areas around the poultry sheds will drain directly into surface water gullies and filter drains and then into the proposed detention basin via a network of pipes.
- 3.15 Surface water from the detention basin will discharge to an existing ditch to the north-west.

Access

- 3.16 The Site is accessed via the existing poultry farm access off the passing Class C Yockleton Road. This existing access will serve the development. The A458 trunk road is located just over a kilometre to the north of the Site off Yockleton Road.

Landscape planting

- 3.17 A landscape mitigation plan (3121-001) has been developed in conjunction with the LVIA process. It has been designed to fit the surrounding landscape character, improve the biodiversity, structure, and connectivity of the vegetation resource, and provide screening/filtering of the proposed development. The landscape mitigation plan includes the following planting and seeding:
- Approximately 2260m² of native screen planting, comprising 7 different species of trees and shrubs; and
 - Approximately 43 linear metres of existing native hedgerow gapped up using 6 species;
 - Grass seeding as required.
- 3.18 The proposed native screen planting is of a nominal depth of approximately 10m and includes 'light standards' (c.2m-2.5m height) which will provide some partial filtering of views immediately. These trees alongside shrub whips, are anticipated to provide a moderately dense screen as they establish over 3-5 years. Growth rates are likely to vary by species and planted size but are anticipated to be in the region of 0.3-1m per year for the species selected. The native screen planting is expected to achieve an overall height of 5-7m by year 5.
- 3.19 The proposed native hedges are anticipated to establish to full height (i.e. c.2m) and density within 3-5 years.

Lighting

- 3.20 Lighting will be directed to where it is needed to avoid unnecessary light spillage. All proposed new lighting will be directed away from any vegetated boundary features to retain dark corridors for commuting bats across the site.
- 3.21 Artificial lighting will be LEDs due to their sharp cut-off, lower intensity, good colour rendition and dimming capability.
- 3.22 External lighting will be of a warm white spectrum, below 2700 kelvin with a peak wavelength higher than 550nm, thus avoiding emitting those wavelengths of light most disturbing to bats. Security lighting will be activated by movement sensors to reduce the amount of time the lights are activated, set on a short timer (maximum of 1 minute), and orientated towards the ground. The use of accessories such as hoods/cowls or shields will help direct light to the required area only.

Management Cycle

- 3.23 The following paragraphs lay out the production process for each broiler crop.
- 3.24 Day old birds are brought to the Far Broadway Poultry Farm from the hatchery and reared for up to 49 days and are then transported to a processing facility.
- 3.25 Prior to the birds arrival the concrete floors will be covered with approximately 20mm of wood shavings. Feed is imported and stored in fully enclosed vermin proof, galvanised steel bins. Water will be provided via cupped nipple drinkers, to reduce spillages. Birds that die during production will be stored in vermin proof, sealed bins prior to collection by a licensed collection agent.
- 3.26 At the end of the growing cycle all birds are removed from the poultry sheds and the used litter from the proposed poultry houses will be taken off site and to a local anaerobic digestion (AD) plant for treatment. The empty houses are then washed and disinfected ready for the next crop. Wash water is channelled to an underground collection tank close to the sheds and subsequently the contents will be emptied and exported to a licensed waste management facility.
- 3.27 The sheds are indirectly heated by biomass boilers.

Environmental Controls

- 3.28 The Applicant has already varied the Environmental Permit (ref: EPR/LP3034YL) for the farm allowing for the proposed increase in bird numbers. The Permit ensures appropriate management of the site, effective operation, and controls emissions from the site to ensure no adverse unacceptable on the surrounding environment. The operation of the expanded site will comply with best available techniques (BATs).
- 3.29 The poultry farm is within 400 metres of sensitive receptors and as such the Permit includes odour, noise, and dust management plans.
- 3.30 The NPPF refers to sites that fall under the Environmental Permitting regime, regulated by the EA, at paragraph 188:

“The focus of planning policies and decisions should be on whether proposed development is an acceptable use of land, rather than the control of processes or emissions (where these are subject to separate pollution control regimes). Planning decisions should assume that these regimes will operate effectively. Equally, where a planning decision has been made on a particular development, the planning issues should not be revisited through the permitting regimes operated by pollution control authorities.”

Construction Phase

- 3.31 It is anticipated that the construction period would last for approximately four months. During that period construction vehicles and machinery would be active on the site including excavators, dump trucks and haulage lorries.
- 3.32 The sequence of works would start with the stripping of soils. Top-soils would be placed in temporary storage bunds for reuse on site. Groundworks would include cut and fill operations as necessary to achieve the required finished levels, including the proposed ground modelling. All required services would need to be connected, including water supply, electricity supply and drainage.
- 3.33 Concrete for floors and foundations would be imported on to site and structural steelwork would be erected. Roofing and wall cladding would be fitted to the framework. Tradesmen required for the construction and fitting out the buildings would be working throughout the construction phase, with the numbers on site varying according to workload.
- 3.34 New screen planting, hedgerow planting, and grass seeding would be completed during the first planting season following occupation of the proposed buildings.

Labour and Hours of Operation

- 3.35 The expanded site will provide additional job opportunities at the farm. There will be additional labour requirement for poultry catchers, shed cleaners and manure removal contractors amounting to the equivalent of approximately a further 1.5 additional full-time workers. Other employment would include feed delivery drivers, poultry collection drivers, poultry processors, construction workers, ground workers, maintenance staff, and landscape contractors.
- 3.36 The development will require continual on-site husbandry provided by existing employees and managers of the poultry farm and hours of operation are therefore continual while the birds are in the sheds. During the night time staff are required to respond to alerts relating to any equipment repair and a system of alarm via operators mobile phones is in place. Twenty four hour support is also provided by equipment suppliers for the climate control system (heating and ventilation).

4. Landscape and Visual Amenity

Introduction

- 4.1 Lingard Farrow Styles were commissioned to undertake a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). The LVIA is intended to identify potential landscape and visual effects of a proposed extension to an existing poultry unit at Far Broadway Farm, Ford Heath, Shropshire. The assessment was undertaken by a Chartered Landscape Architect in January and February 2022.
- 4.2 The full LVIA and Appendices are located at **Appendices 4.1 and 4.2** respectively, where any referenced figures can be found.

The site and study area location

- 4.3 The site and study area are identified on Figure 1. The study area has been informed by the proposed development, a zone of theoretical visibility for the proposed development (ZTV, Figure 5), topography (Figure 2), and a visit to the site and surrounding area in January 2022.

The proposed development

- 4.4 The proposed development is illustrated on the drawings within **Appendix 3.1** of this ES. The buildings and silos of the proposed development have been designed to match the existing poultry unit in terms of scale, height, materials, and colour.

Landscape mitigation plan

- 4.5 A landscape mitigation plan (3121-001) has been developed in conjunction with the LVIA process and can be seen at **Appendix 4.3**. It has been designed to fit the surrounding landscape character, improve the biodiversity, structure, and connectivity of the vegetation resource, and provide screening/filtering of the proposed development. The landscape mitigation plan includes the following planting and seeding:
- c.2260m² of native screen planting, comprising 7 different species of trees and shrubs; and
 - c.43 linear metres of existing native hedgerow gapped up using 6 species;
 - Grass seeding as required.

- 4.6 The proposed native screen planting is of a nominal depth of c.10m and includes ‘light standards’ (c.2m-2.5m height) which will provide some partial filtering of views immediately. These trees alongside shrub whips, are anticipated to provide a moderately dense screen as they establish over 3-5 years. Growth rates are likely to vary by species and planted size but are anticipated to be in the region of 0.3-1m per year for the species selected. The native screen planting is expected to achieve an overall height of 5-7m by year 5.
- 4.7 The proposed native hedges are anticipated to establish to full height (i.e. c.2m) and density within 3-5 years.

Methodology

- 4.8 This Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) assesses the likely effects of the proposed development on the landscape and visual resource of the surrounding area. The methodology applied is described in Appendix 1 of the LVIA and has been informed by the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Assessment, Third Edition (GLVIA3) (2013), published by the Landscape Institute. Reference is also made to Landscape Institute’s technical guidance note 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals (2019).

Description of the Site and Study Area

Description of the site and its immediate environs

- 4.9 The site occupies the southern corner of an open flat field and also extends southwards to cover an existing poultry unit and its existing access track that extends westwards. The open field covers an area of c.4.8ha. The site covers a total area of c.3ha and of this c.1ha is within the open field, with the remainder covering the existing poultry unit and access track. The site is at c.107m AOD.

Access

- 4.10 The site is accessed via an existing access track that connects westwards with Yockleton Road which itself runs from north-west to south-east. The open field of the site is accessed directly from the existing poultry unit although a hedge partly marks the boundary between the two.
- 4.11 A Public Right of Way (0402/15/1) passes through the field of the site, following its north-western boundary, connecting Yockleton Road further west to the A458 to the north. This PRow enters the field of the site via timber stiles, one located at the field’s northernmost corner and another located just south of its north-westernmost corner.

Buildings and residential properties

- 4.12 The site features 4no. existing poultry buildings, occupying its southern part. The buildings are c.24m wide and c.105m long with an eaves height of c.2.6m and a ridge height of c.4.8m. The buildings are parallel with each other, located on an area of hard standing and are aligned north-west to south-east. There are also several feed bins that are c.7.5m in height, and 4no. smaller buildings/shipping container-sized units containing biomass boilers. The existing structures are a dark grey colour.
- 4.13 Immediately east of the existing poultry units is Far Broadway Farm which includes agricultural buildings and a farmhouse. To the south of the existing access track is a residential property called Olderscot and south of this is Holly Cottage, alongside Yockleton Road. West of the site, alongside the opposite side of Yockleton Road is Oaklands. Further north along Yockleton Road is a small cluster of residential properties, including The Orchards on Yockleton Road and further residential properties further west, associated with Heath Farm. The Hamlet of Ford Heath is located south-east of the site. The bungalow of Dukes Wood is located north-east of the site, off a bridleway.

Land cover

- 4.14 The field of the site consists of grass. The majority of the land immediately around the site consists of similar fields with a mix of pasture and arable crops.

Boundaries

- 4.15 The field of the site is bound by native hedgerows, with a number of trees in places. The western hedgerow features a small tree group approximately half way along its length and is mostly dense at c.1.5m high, although it has some notable gaps in places. The hedgerow of the field's northern boundary is dense and c.1.5m in height and there is a small wooded area that may be associated with a former building at its eastern end. The eastern hedgerow is of a similar height and density, and features a number of large mature trees immediately east of the northern part of the site.

Description of the study area

Topography and watercourses

- 4.16 The topography of the study area is indicated on Figure 2. The topography of the study area is mostly gently undulating and much of the central and eastern parts are at around c.100-110m AOD. The northern part of the study area features the shallow valley of Cardeston Brook that descends from c.100m AOD in the western part of the study area to c.70m at the village of Ford in the north-eastern part of the study area. Landform north of the valley is undulating and generally between c.80 and 110m AOD. The western part of the study area features a slightly flatter area at c.95-100m AOD. The southern edge of the study area features a shallow stream valley associated with Westbury Book that flows eastwards, passing the village of Yockleton, descending from c.90m AOD to c.80m AOD within the study area.

Land use and vegetation

- 4.17 The majority of the land-use within the study area is agricultural, being a mix of arable and grassland. The fields are mostly medium sized with some larger fields in the northern and southern edges the study area. Fields tend to have semi-regular boundaries defined by hedgerows. Some smaller fields are located around settlement and in the eastern part of the study area.
- 4.18 The north-eastern and southern parts of the study area feature built form associated with villages as discussed under 'Settlement' below.
- 4.19 Tree cover is a notable feature of the study area with linear belts along watercourses and a railway line, and in small blocks of woodland particularly in the western part of the study area. Mature trees are also a common feature of the many hedgerows in the study area with further concentrations in and around villages and farmsteads.

Settlement

- 4.20 The norther edge of the study area features part of the relatively large village of Ford, north of the A458. The southern part of the study area features the smaller village of Yockleton either side of the B4386. The hamlet of Ford Heath is located south of the site. The hamlet of Cardeston, which includes St Michael's church, is located south of the A458, north-west of the site, as is the nearby Whiston Priory.
- 4.21 Settlement across the remainder of the study area includes a number of small farmsteads, small clusters of housing, and more isolated properties. These properties are slightly more concentrated in the eastern part of the study area.

Road and rail network

- 4.22 Roads within the study area can be seen on Figure 1. The principal road in the study area is the A458 which passes on a broadly east-west alignment through the northern part of the study area.
- 4.23 The B4386 runs parallel to the A458 through the southern part of the study area. These two roads are connected to each other via a network of more minor roads and lanes, including Yockleton Road that passes the western edge of the site and a minor road that extends eastwards from Yockleton Road towards Shoot Hill.
- 4.24 The Cambrian railway line passes through the southern part of the study area and connects Shrewsbury to the east with Welshpool to the west.

PRoW network and open access land

- 4.25 Public rights of way (PRoWs) can be seen in Figure 4. The study area features a number of PRoWs, many of which connect with minor roads to form a moderately dense access network across much of the study area.
- 4.26 One PRoW passes through the northern edge of the field of the Site, namely:
- PRoW 0402/15/1 that passes south-west from near the A458 / Whiston Villa, following Cardeston Brook. The route then turns south, climbing out of the stream valley before turning south-westwards again to pass through northern edge of the field of the site and continuing southwestwards, following a hedgerow to join Yocklet Road to the west of the site.
- 4.27 No areas of open access land have been identified within the study area.

Promoted recreational routes

- 4.28 Two promoted long-distance trails pass through the study area, as identified on Figure 4. These routes are noted below:
- Humphrey Kynaston Way: a long distance bridleway promoted via the Shropshire's Great Outdoors website and broken down into 8 connected routes. Route 4 (Pontesbury to Ford) of the way passes through the eastern part of the study area via public rights of way and minor roads on a broadly north-south alignment. The route passes east of the site via public rights of way 0402/12/3 and 0416/25/1. Approximately 5.1km of the route passes through the study area.

- Shrewsbury Circular: a c.38mile cycle route promoted via the Shropshire’s Great Outdoors website. The route within the study area passes via minor roads between Ford and Yockleton. The route passes south of the site via a minor road that connects Shoot Hill with Yockleton. Approximately 4.9km of the route passes through the study area.

Landscape designations

4.29 No landscape designations pertain to the site or study area.

Landscape Character

The Shropshire Landscape Typology (2006)

4.30 The Shropshire Landscape Typology (2006) by Shropshire Council sets out 27 different landscape types for the county. Those landscape types within the study area are identified on Figure 3 and noted below, along with their key characteristics. It should be noted that the Shropshire Landscape Typology incorporates the results of both the Shropshire Landscape Character Assessment and the Shropshire Historic Landscape Characterisation.

Enclosed Lowland Heath

4.31 This landscape type covers the site and the majority of the study area.

4.32 Key characteristics:

- Undulating lowland
- Impoverished, freely draining soils
- Planned woodland character
- Dispersed settlement pattern

4.33 The character type’s description also notes that it features ‘localised areas of semi-natural heathland vegetation’ but overall features ‘medium to large scale agricultural landscapes’. It also notes that the ‘pattern of tree cover creates a mixture of framed and lightly filtered views’.

4.34 The part of this character type within the study area broadly conforms to the characteristics above.

Wooded Estatelands

4.35 This character type covers north-western parts of the study area and extends to cover a field to the immediate west of the site.

4.36 Key characteristics:

- Rolling landform

- Large blocks of ancient woodland
- Large country houses with associated parklands
- Mixed agricultural land use

4.37 The character type's description also notes that it features 'high intensity mixed farming' and that 'woodlands represent the dominant structural component, creating framed views and medium to large scale landscapes'.

4.38 The part of this character type within the study area broadly conforms to the characteristics above.

Estate Farmlands

4.39 This character type covers the northern edge of the study area.

4.40 Key characteristics:

- Mixed farming land use
- Clustered settlement pattern
- Large country houses with associated parklands
- Planned woodland character
- Medium to large scale landscapes with framed views

4.41 The character type's description also notes that it 'occurs across large areas of Shropshire' and 'include some of the best agricultural land in the county, which has traditionally been associated with mixed farming'. The description indicates that woodland 'tends to create framed views within medium to large landscapes'.

4.42 The parts of this character type within the study area broadly conform to the above characteristics.

Principal Settled Farmlands

4.43 This character type covers southern parts of the study area, and also includes a smaller area at the eastern edge of the study area.

4.44 Key characteristics:

- Mixed farming land use; and
- Varied pattern of sub-regular, hedged fields.

4.45 The character type's description also notes that it is 'prevalent throughout northern Shropshire' and is a 'settled lowland landscape of small villages and hamlets... predominantly utilised for mixed farming'. The description also notes that the character type features '...medium scale landscapes with predominantly filtered views'.

4.46 The part of this character type within the study area broadly conforms to the characteristics above.

Riverside Meadows

4.47 This character type covers a small area at the south-eastern edge of the study area.

4.48 Key characteristics:

- Flat, floodplain topography
- Pastoral land use
- Linear belts of trees along watercourses
- Hedge and ditch field boundaries
- Unsettled.

4.49 The character type's description also notes that these are linear floodplain landscapes that feature seasonal grazing.

ZTV and Visual Baseline

4.50 This section sets out the area in which the proposed development may potentially be visible.

ZTV

4.51 A zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV) for the proposed development is shown in Figure 5. The ZTV approximates theoretical views to the ridge of the roof central to one of the proposed poultry buildings (modelled at 4.5m above existing ground level). The ZTV is based on a 'bare earth' model and does not include any vegetation, built form or any proposed mitigation planting.

4.52 The ZTV shows that the theoretical views to the roof ridges of the proposed poultry buildings are moderately extensive within parts of the study area. An area of theoretical visibility is shown central to the study area while further areas of theoretical visibility are located within the western parts of the study area. Eastern, northern, and southern parts of the study area show only limited areas of theoretical visibility, as do north facing slopes of the shallow valley of Cardestson Brook, due to screening by landform. Neither of the village of Ford or Yockleton are within the ZTV. A visit to the site and study area (January 2022) indicated that views to the proposed development are less extensive than shown on the ZTV due to screening by vegetation and built form in the landscape combining with the undulating landform.

Photographic record

- 4.53 During the visit to the study area a photographic record was made of 12 viewpoints, selected to represent a range of receptors, angles and distances to the site. The locations of the viewpoints can be seen on Figure 5 and the photographs can be seen in Appendix 3 of the LVIA at **Appendix 2** of this ES. The approximate horizontal extent of the site and the proposed poultry buildings are identified on the viewpoint photographs. Viewpoint photography is presented with reference to the Landscape Institute's technical guidance note 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals (2019).

Landscape and Visual Receptors

Landscape receptors

- 4.54 Following a review of the baseline information and a visit to the study area the landscape receptors identified to be taken through to the assessment stage of the LVIA are listed below. These receptors are selected to allow focus on those most likely to sustain significant landscape effects as a result of the proposed development.

4.55 ***Landscape elements***

- Vegetation of the Site and its boundaries
- Landform on which the Site is located

4.56 ***Landscape character (Shropshire Landscape Typology)***

- Enclosed Lowland Heaths
- Wooded Estatelands

- 4.57 Note that the other landscape types within the study area, namely Estate Farmlands, Principal Settled Farmlands, and Riverside Meadows are not taken forward in the assessment due to the extent of the ZTV (Figure 5) indicating that significant effects are unlikely.

Visual receptors

- 4.58 Following a review of the baseline information and a visit to the study area, the visual receptors identified to be taken through to the assessment stage of the LVIA process are listed below. These receptors are selected to allow focus on those most likely to sustain significant visual effects as a result of the proposed development.

4.59 ***Users of promoted routes***

- Users of Humphrey Kynaston Way (includes users of PROWs 0402/12/3); and
- Users of Shrewsbury Circular cycling route

4.60 *Users of Public Rights of Way*

- Users of PRow 0402/15/1 (passing through northern edge of field of site);
- Users of PRow 0402/20A/1 (extending south from Cardeston and passing west of the site);
- Users of PRow 402/12/3 (north-east of site, assessed as part of Humphrey Kynaston Way);
- Users of PRow 0416/25/1 (east of Site, assessed as part of Humphrey Kynaston Way); and
- Users of PRows 0402/16/1 and 0402/16/2 (in the western edge of the study area).

4.61 Note that users of several PRows south-east of the site are not taken forward to the assessment due to the proposed development likely to be mostly screened by the existing poultry buildings on site. These PRows include 0416/26/1, 0438/27Y/1, 0438/65/1, and 0431/63/2.

4.62 *Road and rail users*

- Users of Yockleton Road (west of site);
- Users of minor road extending east from Yockleton Road to Shoot Hill (east of site); and
- Users of A458

4.63 Note that users of the Cambrian Railway Line are not taken forward to the assessment due to the likely absence of notable views to the proposed development, as indicated by the ZTV (Figure 5).

4.64 *Residents*

- Residents of Far Broadway Farm (east of site);
- Residents of Olderscot (Yockleton Road, south of site);
- Residents of Holly Cottage (Yockleton Road, south of site);
- Residents of Oaklands (Yockleton Road, west of site);
- Residents of The Orchards (Yockleton Road, west of site);
- Residents of properties around Heath Farm (Yockleton Road, west of site);
- Residents of Dukes Wood (north-east of site); and
- Residents of Cardeston and Whiston Priory (north-west of site).

4.65 Note that residents of properties south-east of the site are not taken forward to the assessment due to the proposed development likely to be mostly screened by the existing buildings on or near the site. These include residents of some properties of Ford Heath.

4.66 *Other receptors*

- Visitors to St. Michael's Church, Cardeston (north-west of site)

Construction, Completion and Operational Impacts

Construction impacts

- 4.67 Construction impacts are likely to result from the construction of the proposed development. The construction period is anticipated to be in the region of 12 months. Given the short-term and temporary nature of construction effects they will be discussed separately from operational effects only where pertinent.
- 4.68 Construction impacts are likely to include:
- Site clearance including vegetation removal;
 - Stripping of topsoil;
 - Storage for site-won and imported materials;
 - Movement and operation of construction machinery;
 - Temporary fencing; and
 - Ground works

Completion and operational impacts

- 4.69 Completion and operational impacts of the completed development are likely to include the presence of:
- Built structures;
 - Hard standing;
 - Vehicle movements / site operation;
 - Hard landscaping; and
 - Soft landscaping

Cumulative impacts

- 4.70 Cumulative landscape and visual effects may be defined as those that ‘result from additional changes to the landscape or visual amenity caused by the proposed development in conjunction with other developments (associated with or separate to it), or actions that occurred in the past, present or are likely to occur in the foreseeable future’.²
- 4.71 Cumulative effects in this assessment are taken to factor in both existing and proposed (i.e. within the planning system) poultry unit development similar to the proposed development within the study area. Cumulative effects are noted in the assessment where pertinent.
- 4.72 An online search for planning applications (February 2022) within the study area indicated that no other poultry units are proposed or approved within the planning system, other than those already constructed.

² Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Assessment, Third Edition (2013), paragraph 7.2

4.73 A review of existing poultry units using aerial photography, OS mapping and a visit to the study area identified five existing sites of relevance within the study area, namely:

- Far Broadway Farm, within the site
- Leawood, next to Wood End Farm, c.1.7km west of the proposed poultry units
- Lower House, Cardeston, c.800m north-west of the proposed poultry units
- Snod Coppice, c.1.9km north-west of the proposed poultry units
- The Firs, near Long Coppice, c.1.5km south-east of the proposed poultry units

4.74 The above existing developments will be considered in cumulative terms where pertinent.

Landscape Assessment

Landscape Elements

4.75 *Vegetation of the site and its boundaries*

	Level	Rationale summary/narrative
Sensitivity:	Medium	Susceptibility x Value
Susceptibility to change:	Medium	The existing hedgerow and trees within site have good potential to be retained and contribute to a partial continuation of the baseline condition.
Value:	Medium	The improved grassland, hedgerow and hedgerow trees within the site are abundant elements within the study area but contribute to character locally.
Magnitude of landscape effect:	Negligible becoming Low beneficial after c.3-5 years as planting establishes	The proposed development will result in the loss of improved grassland that is abundant within the study area. No vegetation of note on site is likely to be lost as a result of the proposed development. The Landscape Mitgation Plan (ref: 3121-001) includes c.2260m ² of native screen planting, comprising 7 different species of trees and shrubs and gapping up of c.43 linear metres of existing native hedgerow. The proposed planting will represent an improvement to the quantity, quality, diversity, and structure of the vegetation resource of the Site as it establishes.
Nature of effect	Negligible, becoming Slight Beneficial after ~3-5 years as planting establishes	
Significance of effect	Not Significant	

4.76 *Landform on which the site is located*

	Level	Rationale summary/narrative
Sensitivity:	Low	Susceptibility x Value
Susceptibility to change:	Low	The landform of the site is relatively flat within a broader lowland landscape.
Value:	Medium	The landform is not covered by landscape designations but has some value in contributing to local landscape character.
Magnitude of landscape effect:	Negligible	The proposed development is unlikely to notably affect the landform of the site or its legibility.
Nature of effect	Negligible	
Significance of effect	Not Significant	

Landscape Character

4.77 *Enclosed Lowland Heaths*

	Level	Rationale summary/narrative
Sensitivity:	Medium	Susceptibility x Value
Susceptibility to change:	Medium	The site is wholly located within the landscape type. The landscape type is a 'medium to large scale agricultural landscape'.
Value:	Medium	The landscape type within the study area is likely to be valued locally.
Magnitude of landscape effect:	Low	<p>There will be direct and permanent effects on the landscape type as a result of the proposed development. The proposed development is unlikely to notably affect the key characteristics of the character type, namely the undulating lowland (see 'landform on which the site is located' assessed above), the impoverished, freely draining soils, planned woodland character, or the dispersed settlement pattern.</p> <p>There will be permanent loss of part of an agricultural field. The existing field has an area of c.4.8ha, and the proposed development will result in the loss of c.0.8ha of it or approximately one sixth. This loss represents a minor change to an abundant landscape resource and is unlikely to notably affect the landscape type.</p>

		<p>The proposed poultry buildings are large in scale (each building is c.105m x c.24m) although relatively low in height (c.2.6m to eaves, 4.8m to ridge). Although the buildings are large in plan, the landscape character type consists of ‘medium to large in scale agricultural landscapes’ which are more capable of accepting large scale agricultural development such as that proposed without significant adverse effects compared to smaller scale and/or non-agricultural landscapes.</p> <p>It is recognised that the proposed poultry farming process is of high intensity, however, it must similarly be recognised that in landscape and visual terms, the proposed buildings have strong precedent within the landscape due to the adjacent existing poultry units. The form, footprint, height, materials, and colours of the proposed structures have been designed to match those of the existing poultry unit. The proposed development represents an increase of 50% in terms of number of poultry buildings (i.e. two buildings added to the existing four).</p> <p>The planting of the scheme (see Landscape Mitigation Plan 3121-001) is likely to be in keeping with the ‘linear bands of trees’ that are noted in the landscape type’s description (also see ‘Vegetation of the site and its boundaries’, assessed above).</p> <p>Although not key characteristics, framed and lightly filtered views are noted in the landscape type’s description. The proposed development is unlikely to notably affect any notable views of this type.</p> <p>Cumulative effects:</p> <p>A total of four existing poultry units are located within the part of the landscape type within the study area, namely Far Broadway Farm (within the site), Leawood (c.1.7km west of the proposed units), Lower House (c.800m north-west of the proposed units), and The Firs (c.1.5km south-east of the proposed units).</p> <p>The proposed development will result in an intensification of landscape effects when considered in combination with the existing adjacent Far Broadway Farm poultry unit. However, this is unlikely to be sufficient to generate notable cumulative effects due to the similarity between the existing and proposed units and the proposed units being only a c.50% increase in area/buildings.</p> <p>The proposed unit is unlikely to have any notable interaction with other existing poultry units in terms of landscape effects, owing to their separation distances, levels of screening by topography, vegetation, and built form, and their generally low profile.</p>
--	--	---

Nature of effect	Slight adverse
Significance of effect	Not Significant

4.78 *Wooded Estatelands (Shropshire Landscape Typology)*

	Level	Rationale summary/narrative
Sensitivity:	Medium	Susceptibility x Value
Susceptibility to change:	Medium	The site is not located within the landscape type but is adjacent to it. The landscape type features mixed agricultural use.
Value:	Medium	The landscape type within the study area is likely to be valued locally.
Magnitude of landscape effect:	Negligible	<p>There will be no direct landscape effects on the landscape type as a result of the proposed development and therefore the key characteristics of the landscape type will be unaffected directly.</p> <p>The landscape type's key characteristics make no reference to views out of the landscape type. However, the landscape type's description notes framed views created by woodlands. The ZTV (figure 5) indicates theoretical visibility from parts of the character type, both adjacent to the site and, from around Cardeston. A visit to the study area indicates publicly available views from longer distances are unlikely to be notably affected, as indicated by viewpoint 9, where the proposed development would be seen as a low profile element in the context of the existing poultry unit, and partly screened by existing vegetation. The proposed development is unlikely to feature in any notable close distance views framed by woodland. In more general close distance views the development would appear in front of the existing adjacent poultry unit which would provide strong context for any change. The landscape type's key characteristics includes 'mixed agricultural land use' and it's description notes 'high intensity mixed farming', both of which provide further context for the proposed development where it would appear in views.</p> <p>The planting of the scheme (see Landscape Mitigation Plan 3121-001) is likely to further reduce any effects on the landscape type as it establishes.</p> <p>Cumulative effects:</p>

		One existing poultry unit is located within the part of the landscape type within the study area, namely Snod Coppice (c.1.9km north-west of the proposed units). The proposed unit is unlikely to have any notable interaction with other existing poultry units in terms of landscape effects, owing to their separation distances, levels of screening by topography and vegetation and their generally low profile.
Nature of effect	Negligible	
Significance of effect	Not Significant	

Visual Assessment

Users of promoted routes

4.79 *Users of Humphrey Kynaston Way (includes users of PRow 402/12/3 and 0416/25/1) (Viewpoint 7)*

	Level	Rationale summary/narrative
Sensitivity:	High	Susceptibility x Value
Susceptibility to change:	High	Users likely to be actively engaged in landscape appreciation.
Value:	Medium	Locally promoted route with views of countryside.
Magnitude of visual effect:	Negligible	The majority of the c.5.1km section within the study area is unlikely to offer views to the proposed development due to screening by landform, as indicated by the ZTV (Figure 5). However, a section of route that utilises PRow 0402/15/1 will offer some views in the direction of the site. This section is at minimum separation distance of c.700m to the proposed poultry buildings and is c.400m in length (or less than 8% of the route within the study area). The route is lined by hedges and mature trees that screen views in the direction of the site in some places. Nonetheless, users walking the route are likely to obtain some angled partial glimpse views of the proposed structures above the intervening hedges but filtered by intervening trees as indicated by viewpoint 7. Where the proposed structures are glimpsed, they will appear a low-level development in conjunction with the existing poultry unit which will provide context for the change. Given the hedge alongside the route in combination with the angle of view, intervening trees, context of the existing units, and the small proportion of the route affected the magnitude of visual effect is likely to be Negligible.

		<p>The ZTV also indicates visibility from sections of the route further south, however, users at these locations are unlikely to readily discern the proposed development due to additional layers of screening/filtering by hedges, trees and/or built form.</p> <p>Cumulative effects</p> <p>Although users may discern, the existing Far Broadway Farm units and the proposed units in a combined view, cumulative effects are not likely to be particularly notable due to the short section of route affected, separation distance, and filtering by existing vegetation. Users are unlikely to readily discern any of the other poultry units within the study area and therefore there are unlikely to be any notable cumulative effects.</p>
Nature of effect	Slight adverse	
Significance of effect	Not Significant	

4.80 Users of Shrewsbury Circular cycling route (includes Users of minor road extending east from Yockleton Road to Shoot Hill (east of Site) (Viewpoints 5 and 6)

	Level	Rationale summary/narrative
Sensitivity:	Medium	Susceptibility x Value
Susceptibility to change:	Medium	Although cyclists may be travelling at speed and generally concentrating in the road ahead, views to surrounding landscape are likely to add to their experience.
Value:	Medium	Locally promoted route with views of countryside.
Magnitude of visual effect:	Negligible	<p>The majority of the c.4.9km section within the study area is unlikely to offer views to the proposed development due to screening by landform, as indicated by the ZTV (Figure 5).</p> <p>However, a section of minor road of c.700m length between Humphrey Kynaston Way and Yockleton Road is likely to offer some views in the direction of the proposed structures, at a minimum separation distance of c.400m. This minor road is lined by a hedgerow with some mature trees. For approximately half of this length of minor road, the proposed development is likely to be almost entirely screened by the existing intervening poultry unit and built form of Far Broadway Farm, for example see viewpoint 5.</p>

		<p>Nonetheless, c.300m of this route (or c.6% of the route within the study area) will offer users, some angled partial glimpse views of the proposed structures above the intervening hedges but filtered by intervening vegetation as indicated by Viewpoint 6. Where the proposed structures are glimpsed, it will appear a low-level development in conjunction with the existing poultry unit which will provide context for any change. Given the hedge alongside the route in combination with the angle of view, intervening trees and the small proportion of the route affected the magnitude of visual effect is likely to be Negligible.</p> <p>Cumulative effects</p> <p>Although users may discern the existing Far Broadway Farm units and the proposed units in a combined view with the proposed units, cumulative effects are not likely to be particularly notable due to the short section of route affected, separation distance, and filtering by existing vegetation, and built form. Users are unlikely to readily discern any of the other poultry units within the study area and therefore there are unlikely to be any notable cumulative effects.</p>
Nature of effect	Negligible	
Significance of effect	Not Significant	

Users of Public Rights of Way

4.81 *Users of PRow 0402/15/1 (passing through northern edge of field of site) (Viewpoints 1, 2 and 3)*

	Level	Rationale summary/narrative
Sensitivity:	Medium	Susceptibility x Value
Susceptibility to change:	Medium	Although cyclists may be travelling at speed and generally concentrating in the road ahead, views to surrounding landscape are likely to add to their experience.
Value:	Medium	Locally promoted route with views of countryside.
Magnitude of visual effect:	Medium, reducing to Low after c.3-5 years	This PRow is c.1.3km in length. The ZTV (Figure 5) indicates that users may obtain views in the direction of the proposed poultry units for up to c.500m or c.40% of the route, with the remainder of the route being screened by landform (i.e. it is within the valley of Cardeston Brook).

		<p>Users heading from the east are likely to obtain no views to the proposed structures until they cross a stile into the north-east corner of the site, near viewpoint 1. At this point, as users walk across the field over a distance of c.150m to a second stile near viewpoint 2, they will have clear close distance views to the proposed poultry unit. This view already clearly features the existing poultry unit, providing strong context.</p> <p>Users of the PRow to the west of the field of site will be adjacent to an existing boundary hedgerow that will screen views in some places from this c.300m section of the route and provide a strong sense of separation to the proposed development. However, this hedge is relatively low such that users may obtain some views over the top in places, such as at viewpoint 3. In these views the proposed development will appear adjacent to the existing poultry unit, providing strong context, with its lower parts screened by an existing site boundary hedge. The proposed development will not affect the more elevated views to the north-west across the valley of Cardeston Brook.</p> <p>The screen planting of the scheme (see Landscape Mitigation Plan 3121-001) is likely to screen the proposed development for walkers as it establishes reducing the magnitude of visual effect.</p> <p>Cumulative effects</p> <p>Although users will discern the existing Far Broadway Farm units and the proposed units in a combined view with the proposed units, cumulative effects are not likely to be particularly notable due to the proposed buildings appear in front of and in close association with the existing units, screening parts of them. Users are unlikely to clearly discern any of the other poultry units within the study area (including Lower House, which is mostly screened by vegetation) and therefore there are unlikely to be any notable cumulative effects.</p>
<p>Nature of effect</p>	<p>Moderate adverse, reducing to Slight adverse after c.3-5 years as mitigation planting establishes</p>	
<p>Significance of effect</p>	<p>Not Significant</p>	

4.82 *Users of PRow 0402/20A/1 (extending south from Cardeston and passing west of the site)
(Viewpoints 10 and 11)*

	Level	Rationale summary/narrative
Sensitivity:	Medium	Susceptibility x Value
Susceptibility to change:	Medium	Walkers likely to be actively engaged in landscape appreciation, although existing poultry unit provides some context for change.
Value:	Medium	Part of local PRow network
Magnitude of visual effect:	Negligible	<p>The ZTV (Figure 5) indicates that although the majority of the route is unlikely to offer views in the direction of the proposed development due to topography, a number of discrete areas may. However, a visit to route indicated that vegetation is likely to screen or filter the majority of these potential views, such that it is likely to be missed by the casual observer. Walkers heading south from Cardeston are unlikely to readily discern the proposed development as views are screened by vegetation in the valley and then a tall dense hedgerow after they cross the stream. At viewpoint 10, where the tall hedgerow ends, they may obtain partial glimpses to the uppermost parts of the proposed feed silos, however these may be missed by the casual observer as they would appear against taller trees beyond.</p> <p>At around viewpoint 11, walkers may obtain glimpses to the upper parts of the roofs of the proposed buildings and upper parts of feed silos over section of c.70m. However, these views would be filtered by intervening trees, and lower parts screened by intervening hedgerows in a view that contains housing and the existing poultry unit. South of this viewpoint is woodland that would screen views to the proposed development.</p> <p>The planting of the scheme (see Landscape Mitigation Plan 3121-001) is likely to further reduce any visual effects as it provides greater screening and filtering as it establishes.</p>

		<p>Cumulative effects</p> <p>Although users will discern the existing Far Broadway Farm units and the proposed units in a combined view with the proposed units, cumulative effects are not likely to be particularly notable due to most of the existing units being screened from the overwhelming majority of the route. Users will discern a large round tank adjacent to Lower House poultry unit but this is in the opposite direction of the proposed development and the poultry units themselves are well filtered by vegetation and therefore there are unlikely to be any notable cumulative effects.</p>
Nature of effect	Negligible	
Significance of effect	Not Significant	

4.83 *Users of PRowS 0402/16/1 and 0402/16/2 (in the western edge of the study area).
(Viewpoint 12)*

	Level	Rationale summary/narrative
Sensitivity:	Medium	Susceptibility x Value
Susceptibility to change:	Medium	Walkers likely to be actively engaged in landscape appreciation, although existing poultry unit provides some context for change.
Value:	Medium	Part of local PRow network
Magnitude of visual effect:	Negligible	<p>The entirety of this route is within the ZTV (Figure 5). However, as viewpoint 12 (minimum separation distance of c.1.6km to the site) indicates, foreground trees and buildings are likely to partially screen and filter the development. Where it is visible, the upper parts of the proposed development would appear a minor background element, partially visible alongside the existing poultry unit, which would provide strong context. The planting of the scheme (see Landscape Mitigation Plan 3121-001) is likely to further reduce any visual effects as it provides greater screening and filtering as it establishes.</p> <p>Cumulative effects</p> <p>Users will obtain a combined view of the proposed units with both the existing Far Broadway farm units and the existing Lower House units at closer distance, as per viewpoint 12. However, the relatively low profile of existing and proposed units and the separation distance to the proposed units, combined with the level of filtering means that cumulative effects are unlikely to be notable.</p>

Nature of effect	Negligible
Significance of effect	Not Significant

Road users

4.84 *Users of Yockleton Road (west of site) (Viewpoints 4 and 5)*

	Level	Rationale summary/narrative
Sensitivity:	Medium	Susceptibility x Value
Susceptibility to change:	Medium	The road passes to the west of the site. Drivers are likely to be focussed on the road ahead but passengers and slower road users (e.g. pedestrians) are likely to obtain views to surrounding countryside where adjacent vegetation allows.
Value:	Medium	Views to countryside likely to add to experience of users
Magnitude of visual effect:	Medium, reducing to Low after c.3-5 years	<p>The majority of the road is unlikely to offer views to the proposed development due to screening by topography, built form and vegetation (such as at Viewpoint 5). However, some views will be available over a distance of c.330m between Heath Farm and Holly Cottage, where the road is closest to the proposed buildings, at a minimum separation distance of c.200m over a low roadside hedge, such as at Viewpoint 4.</p> <p>In these clearest views the closest proposed building will be clearly visible from the road. It will appear a low-level but large-scale addition to the view. The existing roadside hedgerow will provide a sense of separation, the existing site boundary hedgerow will screen lowermost parts of the development, and the partially visible existing poultry unit will provide context.</p> <p>The screen planting of the scheme (see Landscape Mitigation Plan 3121-001) is likely to screen or heavily filter the proposed development as it establishes, reducing the magnitude of visual effect.</p> <p>Cumulative effects</p> <p>Although users will discern the existing Far Broadway Farm units and the proposed units in a combined view, the views to the existing units are relatively limited due to vegetative screening/filtering such that cumulative effects are unlikely to be notable. Users will pass The Firs poultry unit further east but are unlikely to readily discern it, due to screening by vegetation and built form, such that sequential cumulative effects are unlikely to be notable.</p>

Nature of effect	Moderate adverse reducing to Slight adverse after c.3-5 years as mitigation planting establishes
Significance of effect	Not Significant

4.85 *Users of A458 (Viewpoint 8)*

	Level	Rationale summary/narrative
Sensitivity:	Low	Susceptibility x Value
Susceptibility to change:	Low	This is an A-road and is designated national speed limit for the majority of its route within the study area.
Value:	Medium	Occasional views to countryside likely to add to experience of users
Magnitude of visual effect:	Negligible	The level of screening due to topography, vegetation and landform means that road users are unlikely to readily discern the proposed development.
Nature of effect	Negligible	
Significance of effect	Not Significant	

Residents

4.86 *Residents of Far Broadway Farm (east of site)*

	Level	Rationale summary/narrative
Sensitivity:	Medium	Susceptibility x Value
Susceptibility to change:	Medium	Farmhouse is c.140m from the closest proposed building but existing farm and poultry units provide context.
Value:	Medium	Residents likely to value views of countryside
Magnitude of visual effect:	Low	The rear of the property faces north-west, broadly towards the proposed buildings. Garden hedges are likely to mostly screen views to the proposed development from the ground floor. However, residents may obtain slightly angled views from the upper storeys towards the proposed buildings. In these views the eastern side of the easternmost unit will appear as a more distant extension of the existing poultry units and will be partly screened/filtered by existing vegetation and feed silos. The field that occupies the centre of the view will remain mostly open.

		<p>Cumulative effects</p> <p>Although residents will discern the existing Far Broadway Farm units and the proposed units in a combined view, the proposed units will be partly screened by existing units and more distant such that cumulative effects are unlikely to be notable.</p>
Nature of effect	Slight adverse	
Significance of effect	Not Significant	

4.87 *Residents of Olderscot (Yockleton Road, south of site)*

	Level	Rationale summary/narrative
Sensitivity:	Medium	Susceptibility x Value
Susceptibility to change:	Medium	House offers angled views in direction of proposed buildings. Existing poultry unit and farm provide some context for change.
Value:	Medium	Residents likely to value views of countryside
Magnitude of visual effect:	Low reducing to Negligible after c.3-5 years	<p>This 2/3 storey house features large scale windows and a first-floor terrace that face north-west. The proposed buildings are located to the north of the property at a minimum separation distance of c.210m. Tall existing hedges and trees along the existing poultry unit's boundary are likely to mostly screen or filter views to the existing poultry units, although some glimpses are likely. The proposed buildings will be mostly screened by the existing poultry buildings and tall boundary hedge / trees and further partly filtered by intervening vegetation. However, the north-western side of the western proposed building is likely to be clearly visible in an angled view, peripheral to the principal view to the north-west. It will appear as a low level but extensive structure that is a more distant extension of the existing poultry unit, which will provide strong context for the change.</p> <p>The screen planting of the scheme (see Landscape Mitigation Plan 3121-001) is likely to screen or heavily filter the proposed development as it establishes, reducing the magnitude of visual effect.</p> <p>Cumulative effects</p> <p>Although users will discern the existing Far Broadway Farm units and the proposed units in a combined view, the views to the existing units are relatively limited due to vegetative screening/filtering such that cumulative effects are unlikely to be notable.</p>
Nature of effect	Slight adverse, reducing to Negligible after c.3-5 years as mitigation establishes	

Significance of effect	Not Significant
-------------------------------	------------------------

4.88 *Residents of Holly Cottage (Yockleton Road, south of site)*

	Level	Rationale summary/narrative
Sensitivity:	Medium	Susceptibility x Value
Susceptibility to change:	Medium	House offers angled views in direction of proposed buildings. Existing poultry unit and farm provide some context for change.
Value:	Medium	Residents likely to value views of countryside
Magnitude of visual effect:	Negligible	The proposed buildings are likely to be entirely screened by the existing poultry buildings.
Nature of effect	Negligible	
Significance of effect	Not Significant	

4.89 *Residents of Oaklands (Yockleton Road, west of site) (near viewpoint 4)*

	Level	Rationale summary/narrative
Sensitivity:	Medium	Susceptibility x Value
Susceptibility to change:	Medium	House offers angled views in direction of proposed buildings. Existing poultry unit and farm provide some context for change.
Value:	Medium	Residents likely to value views of countryside
Magnitude of visual effect:	Medium, reducing to Low after c.3-5 years	This two-storey house is located at a minimum separation distance of c.260m from the closest proposed building. The front elevation faces on to Yockleton Road and towards the side elevation of the proposed buildings. Residents are likely to obtain clear views from upper storey windows of proposed buildings and may obtain some partial glimpses of upper parts of the proposed buildings and silos from ground floor windows, although there will be some screening by garden hedges. The proposed buildings will appear beyond Yockleton Road, which will provide some sense of separation, as will the intervening open field and hedges. However, the proposed development will appear as an extensive but low-level, new element central to the view. The existing poultry unit will provide some context for the change. The screen planting of the scheme (see Landscape Mitigation Plan 3121-001) is likely to screen or heavily filter the proposed development as it establishes, reducing the magnitude of visual effect.

		<p>Cumulative effects</p> <p>Although residents will discern the existing Far Broadway Farm units and the proposed units in a combined view, the views to the existing units are relatively limited due to the angle of view and an intervening garage such that cumulative effects are unlikely to be greater than those already identified.</p>
Nature of effect	Moderate adverse, reducing to Slight adverse after c.3-5 years as mitigation planting establishes	
Significance of effect	Not Significant	

4.90 *Residents of The Orchards (Yockleton Road, west of site) (near viewpoint 4)*

	Level	Rationale summary/narrative
Sensitivity:	Medium	Susceptibility x Value
Susceptibility to change:	Medium	Bungalow offers views in direction of proposed buildings, on opposite side of Yockleton Road. Existing poultry unit and farm provide some context for change
Value:	Medium	Residents likely to value views of countryside
Magnitude of visual effect:	Medium, reducing to Low after c.3-5 years	<p>This bungalow house is located at a minimum separation distance of c.280m from the closest proposed building. The front elevation faces on to Yockleton Road and towards the side elevation of the proposed buildings. Residents are likely to obtain some views to upper parts of the proposed development from large ground floor windows, above intervening hedges. The proposed buildings will appear beyond Yockleton Road, which will provide some sense of separation, as will the intervening open field and hedges. However, the proposed development will appear as an extensive but low-level, new element central to the view. The existing poultry unit will provide some context for the change.</p> <p>The screen planting of the scheme (see Landscape Mitigation Plan 3121-001) is likely to screen or heavily filter the proposed development as it establishes, reducing the magnitude of visual effect.</p> <p>Cumulative effects</p> <p>Although residents will discern the existing Far Broadway Farm units and the proposed units in a combined view, the views to the existing units are relatively limited due to the angle of view and intervening vegetation such that cumulative effects are unlikely to be greater than those already identified.</p>
Nature of effect	Moderate adverse, reducing to Slight adverse after c.3-5 years as mitigation planting establishes	

Significance of effect	Not Significant after c.3-5 years as planting establishes
-------------------------------	--

4.91 *Residents of properties around Heath Farm (Yockleton Road, west of site)*

	Level	Rationale summary/narrative
Sensitivity:	Low	Susceptibility x Value
Susceptibility to change:	Low	Clear views in direction of proposed development unlikely.
Value:	Medium	Residents likely to value views of countryside
Magnitude of visual effect:	Negligible	These properties are well screened by intervening vegetation and built form or are oriented such that they are unlikely to offer readily discernible views of the proposed development.
Nature of effect	Negligible	
Significance of effect	Not Significant	

4.92 *Residents of Dukes Wood (north-east of site) (near viewpoint 7)*

	Level	Rationale summary/narrative
Sensitivity:	Medium	Susceptibility x Value
Susceptibility to change:	Medium	Bungalow offers views in direction of proposed buildings, beyond opposite side of bridleway. Existing poultry unit and farm provide some context for change
Value:	Medium	Residents likely to value views of countryside
Magnitude of visual effect:	Negligible	This is a single-storey bungalow, the front elevation of which faces in the direction of the site, although is at a separation distance of c.720m from the closest proposed building. Although this property is located close to viewpoint 7, views from the property to the proposed development are likely to be less clear due to partial screening/ filtering by mature garden vegetation and an intervening hedgerow with mature trees that extends towards the Site and will be broadly central to the view to the proposed buildings. The proposed development will be partially screened/filtered by multiple layers of intervening vegetation and where it is glimpsed will be in the context of the existing poultry unit.

		<p>Cumulative effects</p> <p>Although residents may partially discern the existing Far Broadway Farm units and the proposed units in a combined view, the views to the existing units are relatively limited due to the angle of view and intervening vegetation such that cumulative effects are unlikely to be notable.</p>
Nature of effect	Negligible	
Significance of effect	Not Significant	

4.93 *Residents of Cardeston and Whiston Priory (north-west of site) (similar to viewpoint 9)*

	Level	Rationale summary/narrative
Sensitivity:	Medium	Susceptibility x Value
Susceptibility to change:	Medium	Some more elevated properties have principal elevations that face towards the site. Existing poultry unit provides some context for change
Value:	Medium	Residents likely to value views of countryside
Magnitude of visual effect:	Low, reducing to Negligible after c.3-5 years	<p>Some residents may obtain glimpses in the direction of the site similar to viewpoint 9, particularly from upper storey windows.</p> <p>In these views the proposed development would appear in an elevated position on the opposite side of the Cardeston Brook valley, in front of the existing poultry units at minimum separation distance from the viewers of c.750m. The lower parts of the proposed units are likely to be screened by the intervening hedge of the site's field, but the upper parts of roofs and the feed silos are likely to be visible, appearing against a background of mature trees. The existing poultry units would provide strong context for the proposed development.</p> <p>The screen planting of the scheme (see Landscape Mitigation Plan 3121-001) is likely to screen the proposed development and the existing poultry unit as it establishes, reducing the magnitude of visual effect.</p>

		<p>Cumulative effects</p> <p>Residents may obtain a combined view of the proposed units with the existing Far Broadway farm units, although the proposed units will appear in front of the existing ones and partly screen them such that notable cumulative effects are unlikely. It may be possible that some residents may obtain successional views with both the proposed units and the Lower House poultry units, however, the Lower House poultry units are set low in the landscape and sufficiently separated from the proposed units such that the small change resulting from the proposed units is unlikely to result in notable cumulative effects.</p>
Nature of effect	Slight adverse, reducing to Negligible after c.3-5 years as mitigation planting establishes	
Significance of effect	Not Significant	

Other receptors

4.94 *Visitors to St. Michael's Church, Cardeston (north-west of site) (viewpoint 9)*

	Level	Rationale summary/narrative
Sensitivity:	Medium	Susceptibility x Value
Susceptibility to change:	Medium	Views in direction of proposed development likely from churchyard. Existing poultry unit provides some context for change
Value:	Medium	Visitors likely to value views of countryside
Magnitude of visual effect:	Low, reducing to Negligible after c.3-5 years	<p>Visitors may obtain glimpses in the direction of the site at viewpoint 9, although intervening vegetation screens the majority of potential views.</p> <p>In this view the proposed development would appear in an elevated position on the opposite side of the Cardeston Brook valley, in front of the existing poultry units at minimum separation distance from the viewers of c.750m. The lower parts of the proposed units are likely to be screened by the intervening hedge of the site's field, but the upper parts of roofs and the feed silos are likely to be visible, appearing against a background of mature trees. The existing poultry units would provide strong context for the proposed development.</p> <p>The screen planting of the scheme (see Landscape Mitigation Plan 3121-001) is likely to screen the proposed development and the existing poultry unit (where visible) as it establishes, reducing the magnitude of visual effect.</p>

		<p>Cumulative effects</p> <p>Visitors may obtain a combined view of the proposed units with the existing Far Broadway farm units, although the proposed units will appear in front of the existing ones and partly screen them such that notable cumulative effects are unlikely. Visitors are unlikely to obtain clear successional views to the Lower House poultry units due to partial screening by vegetation and landform such that notable cumulative effects are unlikely.</p>
Nature of effect	Slight adverse, reducing to Negligible after c.3-5 years as mitigation planting establishes	
Significance of effect	Not Significant	

Summary and Conclusion

Landscape effects

4.95 The proposed development will have **no significant effects** on any of the landscape receptors assessed. The results of the LVIA process are summarised in the tables below.

4.96 *Landscape elements*

Landscape element	Nature of effect	Significance
Vegetation of the site and its boundaries	Negligible, becoming Slight Beneficial after c.3-5 years as mitigation planting establishes	Not significant
Landform on which the site is located	Negligible	Not significant

4.97 *Landscape character*

Landscape element	Nature of effect	Significance
Enclosed Lowland Heaths (Shropshire Landscape Typology)	Slight adverse	Not significant
Wooded Estatelands (Shropshire Landscape Typology)	Negligible	Not significant

Visual effects

4.98 The proposed development will have **no significant effects** on any of the visual receptors assessed. The results of the LVIA process are summarised in the table below.

4.99 *Visual receptors*

Visual receptor	Nature of effect	Significance
Users of Humphrey Kynaston Way (includes Users of PRow 402/12/3 and 0416/25/1)	Slight adverse	Not significant
Users of Shrewsbury Circular cycling route(includes users of minor road extending east from Yockleton Road to Shoot Hill (east of site)	Negligible	Not significant
Users of PRow 0402/15/1 (passing through northern edge of field of site)	Moderate adverse, reducing to Slight adverse after c.3-5 years as mitigation planting establishes	Not significant
Users of PRow 0402/20A/1 (extending south from Cardeston and passing west of the site)	Negligible	Not significant
Users of PRow 0402/16/1 and 0402/16/2 (in the western edge of the study area).	Negligible	Not significant
Users of Yockleton Road (west of site)	Moderate adverse reducing to Slight adverse after c.3-5 years as mitigation planting establishes	Not significant
Users of A458	Negligible	Not significant
Residents of Far Broadway Farm	Slight adverse	Not significant
Residents of Olderscot (Yockleton Road, south of site)	Slight adverse, reducing to Negligible after c.3-5 years as mitigation establishes	Not significant
Residents of Holly Cottage (Yockleton Road, south of site)	Negligible	Not significant
Residents of Oaklands	Moderate adverse reducing to Slight adverse after c.3-5 years as mitigation planting establishes	Not significant
Residents of The Orchards	Moderate adverse reducing to Slight adverse after c.3-5 years as mitigation planting establishes	Not significant
Residents of properties around Heath Farm (Yockleton Road, west of site)	Negligible	Not significant
Residents of Dukes Wood (north-east of site)	Negligible	Not significant

Residents of Cardeston and Whiston Priory (north-west and north of site)	Slight adverse, reducing to Negligible after c.3-5 years as mitigation establishes	Not significant
Visitors to St. Michael's Church, Cardeston (north-west of site)	Slight adverse, reducing to Negligible after c.3-5 years as mitigation planting establishes	Not significant

Conclusion

4.100 No significant landscape or visual effects have been identified. No significant cumulative landscape or visual effects have been identified. The proposed development is considered acceptable in terms of its likely landscape and visual effects.

5. Cultural Heritage

Introduction

- 5.1 Berrys have undertaken a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA). The purpose of the HIA is to understand, assess the significance, and to analyse the impact of the proposed development in order to comply with paragraph 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Historic England Advice Note 12.
- 5.2 This HIA should be read in conjunction with the other supporting planning documents and drawings prepared by Berrys and other consultants.
- 5.3 The full HIA and Appendices are located at **Appendix 5.1**, where any referenced figures can be found.

Methodology

- 5.4 The methodology is based upon Historic England's Good Practice Advice in Planning 31 (GPA 3)³ which sets out a staged approach to proportionate decision making when assessing the degree to which setting contributes to the significance of heritage assets.
- 5.5 The assessment has primarily been produced through desktop research, using relevant secondary sources including:
- Historic Environment Records (HER)
 - Historic England National Heritage List England (NHLE)
 - UK Census Records (online resource)
 - National Library of Scotland (online resource)
 - Shropshire Record Office
- 5.6 A site visit was conducted on 13th April 2023, with the purpose of carrying out a character assessment for the Site and the role it plays as setting to heritage assets. Conditions were mostly sunny with intermittent cloud cover. Trees were not yet in full leaf which allowed for greater intervisibility than would typically be experienced during the spring and summer months. This should be factored in when considering the potential impact of the proposal on nearby heritage assets.
- 5.7 The assessment is primarily a desk-based study which has utilised secondary sources derived from a variety of published sources. The assumption has been made that this data is reasonably accurate. The records held by the HER and historic maps are not an infinite record of all heritage assets, but a record of the discovery of historic features.

³ Historic England, 2017. *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition): The Setting of Heritage Assets*

- 5.8 Data has been collated from a 1km radius of the proposed development area (PDA) boundary in accordance with step 1 from Historic England guidance. This is referred to as the Study Area.
- 5.9 The Study Area has been based on professional judgment considering location, topography, and character as well as considered pre-application feedback from Historic England and the Local Planning Authority.
- 5.10 Data from a 1km radius incorporates both designated and non-designated heritage assets including those from the Historic Environment Record and those considered potential non-designated heritage assets from professional judgment.
- 5.11 Not all heritage assets identified were visited and those that were had limited public accessibility.
- 5.12 The PDA does not contain any heritage assets. However, the scale of the proposal constitutes the need to analyse the impact on the setting of nearby heritage assets within a 1km radius.
- 5.13 Furthermore, the designated heritage asset “*Tithe House*” lies just outside the 1km boundary but was considered to warrant including and visiting, due to its grade II listed status.

Identifying Heritage Assets

- 5.14 The NPPF defines a Heritage Asset as:

“A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. It includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).”

- 5.15 The Proposed Development Area (PDA) is an area of open grassland directly north of Broadway Farm, near the village of Cardeston in the county of Shropshire.
- 5.16 Figure 1, Table 4, and Table 5 show the Site within its local context and setting, with nearby heritage assets labelled.
- 5.17 There are no heritage assets found within the PDA, therefore the principal consideration is the impact the proposal will have on nearby designated and non-designated heritage assets.

5.18 Significance results from a combination of any, some, or all of the interests which are defined by the Framework and after the publication of Historic England’s Advice Note 12 (Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets)⁴ the criteria of interest have been described in further detail in Table 2.

Significance	Description
Historic	An interest in past lives and events (including pre-historic). Heritage assets can illustrate or be associated with them. Heritage assets with historic interest not only provide a material record of our nation’s history but can also provide meaning for communities derived from their collective experience of a place and can symbolise wider values such as faith and cultural identity.
Archaeological	There will be archaeological interest in a heritage asset if it holds, or potentially holds, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point.
Architectural and Artistic	These are interests in the design and general aesthetics of a place. They can arise from conscious design or fortuitously from the way the heritage asset has evolved. More specifically, architectural interest is an interest in the art or science of the design, construction, craftsmanship and decoration of buildings and structures of all types. Artistic interest is an interest in other human creative skills, like sculpture.

Table 2 – Criteria of Heritage Interest

5.19 Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas are generally designated for their special architectural and/or historic interest. Scheduling is predominantly, although not exclusively, associated with archaeological interest.

5.20 Significance is defined in the Framework as:

“A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest... significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting...”

5.21 Understanding the nature, extent and level of significance is paramount when assessing any change to heritage assets. In accordance with para. 200 of the Framework, there is a hierarchy of significance set out in Table 3 below.

5.22 It is possible for sites and buildings to have *no* heritage significance.

⁴ Historic England, 2019, *Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets Historic England Advice Note 12*

Significance	Heritage Assets
<i>“...designated heritage assets of the highest significance...”</i>	Grade I, II* Listed Buildings Grade I, II* Registered Parks and Gardens Scheduled Monuments Protected Wreck Sites World Heritage Sites Registered Sites Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest of equivalent significance to SAMs

Table 3 – Heritage Assets of the “highest significance”

5.23 Annex 2 of the Framework defines setting as:

“The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.”

5.24 Therefore, setting can contribute to, affect an appreciation of significance or be neutral with regards to heritage interest. However, setting itself is not a heritage asset or a heritage designation.

5.25 The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) clarifies the levels of harm which can arise from direct physical and indirect impact⁵. If there is no impact on the heritage asset’s significance or the development will enhance its significance, there will be no harm.

- Substantial harm or total loss – this would be harm that would *‘have such a serious impact on the significance of the asset that its significance was either vitiated altogether or very much reduced’*⁶
- Less than substantial harm – harm of a lesser degree than substantial.
- No harm – case law⁷ provides us with the articulation of ‘preserving’ which means doing ‘no harm’ with regards to Section 66(1) Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

5.26 The term ‘preserving’ does not constitute ‘no change’ as Historic England guidance⁸ confirms *‘change to heritage assets is inevitable but it is only harmful when significance is damaged’*. Thus, the concept of change is accepted as part of the evolution of the historic environment. However, it is whether the change is therefore neutral, harmful or beneficial to the significance which is to be determined.

⁵ MHCLG, Planning Practice Guidance, Paragraph: 018 (ID: 18a-039-20190723 Revision date: 23.07.2019)

⁶ EWHC 2847, R DCLG and Nuon UK Ltd v. Bedford Borough Council

⁷ EWHC 1895, R (Forge Field Society, Barraud and Rees) v. Sevenoaks DC, West Kent Housing Association and Viscount De L’Isle

⁸ Historic England, 2017, *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition): The Setting of Heritage Assets*

- 5.27 Setting is not fixed and will change over time; therefore, cumulative change should be taken into consideration. In this instance where the significance of an asset has been compromised *‘consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the significance of the asset.’*
- 5.28 Whilst the statutory duty requires that special regard should be paid to the desirability of not harming the setting of a Listed Building, that cannot mean any harm, however minor, would necessarily require planning permission to be refused as clarified in the Court of Appeal⁹.
- 5.29 These are judgements, and the level of harm are for the decision-maker which should be clearly defined. The PPG states that: *‘it is the harm to the asset’s significance rather than the scale of development that is to be assessed.’*¹⁰

Planning Policy

- 5.30 Planning decisions should be taken in accordance with local plan policy unless material considerations indicate otherwise, Section 38(6) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 refers. This assessment is written in the context of the following legislative, planning policy and guidance:
- National Planning Policy Framework (2021) *‘The Framework’*
 - National Planning Practice Guidance: *Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (2019)*
 - Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (1990)
 - Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979)
 - Conservation Principles: *Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment (2008)*
 - Good Practice Guide 2: *Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (2015)*
 - Good Practice Guide 3: *The Setting of Heritage Assets (2017)*
 - Statements of Heritage Significance: *Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets (2019)*
 - Advice Note 15: *Commercial Renewable Energy Development and the Historic Environment (2021)*

- 5.31 Section 66(1) of the Act (1990) states that when:

⁹ Palmer v Herefordshire Council & Anor [2016] EWCA Civ 1061 (04 November 2016)

¹⁰ MHCLG, Planning Practice Guidance, Paragraph: 018 Reference ID: 18a-018-20190723

‘...considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard for the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.’

5.32 Decision-makers should give “*considerable importance and weight*” to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings when carrying out the balancing exercise¹¹.

5.33 There are no Scheduled Ancient Monuments within the PDA, therefore it is not considered relevant to refer to associated policy.

5.34 Section 16 of the NPPF contains policies for conserving and enhancing the historic environment. All of which are relevant to this application due to the nature and scope of heritage assets potential impact. However, specifically to Paragraph 202:

‘Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.’

5.35 Public benefits do not need to be visible or accessible to the public. They may include:

- Sustaining or enhancing the significance of a heritage asset
- Reducing or removing risks to a heritage asset
- Securing the optimum viable use of a heritage asset

5.36 Non-designated heritage assets are afforded a lower level of protection in the Framework under Para. 203 which states that although the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be considered when determining an application *‘...a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.’*

5.37 The following policies from the Shropshire Local Plan are relevant:

Core Strategy (adopted February 2011)

- CS5: Countryside and Greenbelt
- CS6: Sustainable design and development principles
- CS17: Environmental Networks

SamDev Plan 2006-2026 (adopted December 2015)

- MD2: Sustainable Design

¹¹ Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Limited v East Northants DC, English Heritage, National Trust & SSCLG [2014] EWCA Civ.137.

- MD13 Historic Environment

5.38 It should be noted that Shropshire Council is currently undergoing a review of its Local Plan which will replace the Core Strategy and SAMDev Plan and will cover a plan period of 2016–2038. The review is at an advanced stage and the revised plan has been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for examination on 3rd September 2021. It is anticipated that following the examination the Local Plan will be adopted in 2024. The key policy in the emerging plan which may attract some limited weight in advance of the adoption is:

- DP23 Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

Historical Environment

Area Summary

- 5.39 The PDA is an area of grassland directly northwest of Broadway Farm in a rural part of west Shropshire. The Site is roughly 9km from Shrewsbury, Shropshire’s County town and only 1km from Cardeston, the largest nearby settlement. The PDA is roughly 25 metres by 105 metres. The existing poultry buildings directly south of the PDA are of steel framed construction with the roof and side walls clad with box profile polyester coated steel sheeting. The buildings measure 24.384 metres by 105.462 metres with an eaves height of 2.59 metres and ridge height of 4.77 metres. The associated feed bins are 7.5 metres in height. The four buildings run parallel with a yard area to the front. The poultry site is accessed separately from the original farmstead off Yockleton Road which runs between ‘Five Turnings’ and the A458.
- 5.40 Cardeston was recorded in the Domesday Book as a minor settlement, with the lord in 1066 being Leofnoth. This implies there has been a settlement in the area going back to at least the Anglo-Saxon period.
- 5.41 Tithe records (Figure 2) show the development site has always been in a rural setting, though the boundaries have changed in the intervening years. In 1847, part of the Site was owned by Thomas Harries, but occupied by John Gittins, with the description stating: “*Old House, Leasow*”. Another portion of the Site was owned and occupied by Timotheus Burd with the land described as “*Whistone Priory Mansion, Slang*”. A “*slang*” refers to a narrow strip of farmland, usually of a size that could be managed by a single household.
- 5.42 Map regression shows the character of the Site, and its surroundings has changed little since the mid-19th century. The area consists of open fields or arable farmland with only a few isolated farmsteads dotting the landscape. This is much the same now, with only the A458 providing a major change within this landscape.

Heritage Assets

- 5.43 This report focuses on non-designated and designated heritage assets within a study area of 1km from the centre of the PDA. As mentioned, Tithe House (NHLE: 1308103) falls outside this boundary, however, it is considered to warrant inclusion due to its grade II listed status and its close proximity to the boundary area.
- 5.44 Access was not possible to some heritage assets, due to lack of public access, and therefore assessment was not possible. Assets not accessible were:
- Cowhouse at Coppice House Farm – HER ref. 40390
 - Cowhouse at Coppice House Farm – HER ref. 40389
 - Cartshed at Coppice House Farm – HER ref. 40388
 - Farmhouse at Coppice House Farm – HER ref. 40387
 - Whiston Farm – HER ref. 27854
 - Cardeston Manor – HER ref. 34312
- 5.45 A large number of non-designated heritage assets were agricultural buildings located within a few farmstead sites. In these cases, the impact on the setting of all assets within each farmstead as a whole has been considered, rather than individually. This is due to their significance being mainly derived from their group value within each individual farmstead and therefore collectively their setting has been considered as a whole, unless in exceptional circumstances.
- 5.46 ***Far Broadway Farm:***
- Farmhouse at Far Broadway Farm – HER Ref. 40831
 - Cartshed/Granary at Far Broadway Farm – HER ref. 40832
 - Cartshed and Shelter Shed at Far Broadway Farm – HER ref. 40833
 - Threshing Barn converted to Cowhouse, Far Broadway Farm – HER ref. 40834
- 5.47 The heritage assets at Far Broadway Farm are the closest in proximity to PDA and therefore most likely to be affected by the proposed development. However, it should be noted that none of them are designated heritage assets.
- 5.48 The farmstead as a whole retains its historic courtyard layout, but the buildings themselves have seen a number of modern additions and alterations, as well as the erection of further modern farm buildings within their vicinity.

- 5.49 The farmhouse is constructed from rubble with minor red-brick additions including detailing around two first floor windows as well as two red-brick chimneys. The windows and doors have been replaced with uPVC models which are not in-keeping with the existing character of the farmstead and detract from the historic and architectural interest gained by the retention of historic building materials (Figure 11).
- 5.50 It should be noted that there will be very limited intervisibility between the PDA and Far Broadway Farm, with the existing Broadway Poultry sheds situated in the intervening space between the two.
- 5.51 The barns included within the farmstead have also seen further alterations such as modern brick extensions, replacement of roof which corrugated iron and installation of infrastructure such as oil-fired heating storage. The cart shed with granary (HER ref. 40827) is also constructed from the same stone rubble as the main farmhouse, with some small red-brick additions also. This historic building material being shared between the two heritage assets lends them some additional historic and architectural significance (Figure 12).
- 5.52 In contrast the granary and shelter shed are entirely constructed from red brick with timber window shutters. There is a large amount of material located within the farmstead that detracts from the historic interest of the Site but are required for the active running of the farm (Figure 10).
- 5.53 The farmstead is accessed via an unnamed farm lane to the east. From this approach the PDA will not be visible as the existing poultry sheds and Far Broadway Farmstead obscure this view.
- 5.54 The significance of the barns within Far Broadway Farmstead has seen cumulative harm through modern additions and alterations, as already detailed. Further to this, the erection of modern farming structures within the farmstead site has further undermined the remaining significance. Therefore, it is necessary to consider the extent to which the setting of the farmstead contributes to its remaining significance. In this respect the farmsteads setting is considered to be defined by two key aspects, as specified in Historic England’s Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 – The Setting of Heritage Assets. These two key elements are:
- The surrounding rural landscape
 - Surrounding land in use for mixed agricultural and/or pastoral farming
- 5.55 Setting does contribute to the significance of the farmstead; however, this is considered to be limited to the northern, eastern and southern sides of the farmstead. The western portion of its immediate setting is already dominated by the pre-existing poultry sheds which have fundamentally changed the character of this part of the farmstead’s setting already, limiting the extent to which setting can contribute to significance.

- 5.56 The proposal will change the use of an area of land that is currently an open grassland and not in commercial or industrial use and, in this respect, the proposal will change the setting of the Far Broadway Farmstead site. However, it is argued that this impact is mitigated by cumulative harm already done to the farmstead's setting by elements such as the current poultry sheds south of the PDA and the modern farming structures within the Far Broadway Farmstead (Figure 13). Moreover, the visibility between the farmstead and the PDA is limited, due to the presence of natural screening formed by trees and hedgerows. The pre-existing poultry sheds also limit intervisibility between the PDA and the farmstead. The issue of intervisibility will be further alleviated by the provided Landscape Mitigation Plan, which has been designed to fit the surrounding landscape character, improve the biodiversity, structure, and connectivity of the vegetation resource, and provide screening/filtering of the proposed development. The landscape mitigation plan includes the following planting and seeding:
- c.2260m² of native screen planting, comprising 7 different species of trees and shrubs; and
 - c.43 linear metres of existing native hedgerow gapped up;
 - Grass seeding as required.
- 5.57 When considering the direct or indirect impact of a proposal on a non-designated heritage asset, the NPPF asks us to make a balanced judgement in regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. It is argued that the significance of the Far Broadway Farmstead as a group has already seen its significance harmed due to the cumulative impact of modern farming structures within its curtilage and modern alterations to its heritage assets. Setting does play a factor into the remaining significance of the farm; however, it has been demonstrated that this has already seen fundamental changes due to the pre-existing poultry sheds just south of the PDA. It is therefore concluded that, on balance, the proposal will not fundamentally change the manner in which the heritage assets within the farmstead are appreciated as a group.
- 5.58 ***Near Broadway Farm:***
- Near Broadway Farm – HER ref. 40825
 - Farmhouse at Near Broadway Farm – HER ref. 40826
 - Cartshed with Granary at Near Broadway Farm – HER ref. 40827
 - Cowhouse and Table at Near Broadway Farm – HER ref. 40828
- 5.59 Near Broadway Farm is located 450 metres southeast of the PDA, with Far Broadway Farm in the intervening space. Access was limited to the interior farmstead courtyard, but it is still possible to analyse the potential impact on the setting of the farmstead.

- 5.60 Near Broadway Farm has retained some elements of its historic layout, though this has been harmed by the erection of a large number of modern agricultural sheds.
- 5.61 The Cartshed and Cowhouse at Near Broadway Farm are constructed from stone rubble with red brick used for detailing such as edging around the timber door and shuttered windows. This large amount of retained building material does lend the farm some historic and architectural significance, though this should be noted that some elements are in a state of disrepair which have harmed the Site's significance.
- 5.62 The farmstead's setting is principally defined by the surrounding rural landscape which is mostly in use as agricultural or pastoral farmland and a change from this would constitute harm to the farms setting. However, the potential impact on this setting that could be generated by the proposal is limited by the distance between the PDA and Near Broadway Farm, which also negates any potential intervisibility between the PDA and the farmstead.
- 5.63 The surrounding rural landscape will remain unimpacted. The distance between Near Broadway Farm and the PDA is roughly 450m with open grasslands, buildings, and a country lane all in the intervening space. Therefore, the immediate surrounding rural landscape will remain unimpacted, though there will be a change when looking at the wider context. However, this will be mitigated by the distance from the PDA and the existing poultry sheds at Far Broadway Farm which have already changed this element of the surrounding landscape.
- 5.64 The use of land in the immediate surrounds will not be changed from the use as agriculture/pastoral farming. In respect to these factors, it is considered that the way in which the assets are experienced will not be changed and therefore there will be no harm to the setting to Near Broadway Farm as a non-designated heritage asset.
- 5.65 ***Heath Farm:***
- Heath Farm – HER ref. 22008
 - Heath Farmhouse – NHLE ref. 1052156
 - Open Barn at Heath Farm – HER ref. 21828
- 5.66 Heath Farm is a collection of historic farm buildings which have now been converted to residential use. The central focus of this farmstead is Heath Farmhouse which is a grade II listed building and therefore of higher consideration and significance than the non-designated farm site and barn. The association between the farm and the farmhouse is highlighted by the retention of the historic courtyard layout of the farm, despite these buildings now being in separate ownership and use.

- 5.67 Heath Farmhouse is dated the early 19th century and is chiefly constructed from sandstone rubble with some brick dressings, notably on the chimneystacks (Figure 16). The Farmhouse is surrounded by a stone rubble wall with planted hedgerows forming natural screening. This shields the farmhouse considerably from view. It should be further noted that a modern dwelling has been erected directly in front of the farmhouse, in the intervening space between Heath Farmhouse and the PDA therefore further limiting intervisibility between the farmhouse and the PDA.
- 5.68 The associated barn and farm site are similarly constructed from a mixture of sandstone rubble and red brick as a supplemental building material (Figures 17 and 18). These historic farm buildings are no longer in their original use and have now been converted for residential use. This has resulted in some harm to their significance, due to the required installation of modern materials for items such as doors and windows.
- 5.69 The distance between the Heath Farm and the PDA is over 400m, with Yockleton Road bisecting the intervening space creating a physical division between the PDA and Heath Farm. Furthermore, there are later dwellings and commercial units placed within this area as well which have already impacted the setting of the Farm and caused cumulative harm.
- 5.70 The setting of the Heath Farm would be chiefly defined by the ruralness of the surrounding landscape and views looking north. With the PDA being located east of Heath Farm and the presence of intervening structures and natural screening, it is considered that the proposal will not impact the experience of this. The distance ensures the surrounding rural landscape is unaffected, furthermore, the existing poultry sheds on site at Far Broadway Farm have already resulted in a visual change to the landscape, due to their scale and the further infrastructure installed associated with them. The proposal is considered to do no further harm in regards to this. Views between the PDA and the Heath Farm are restricted by the topography, which is slightly raised before the PDA, and the presence of 20th century dwellings erected in the intervening space. The views out north will be unimpacted as the development will take place directly east of the Heath Farm site.
- 5.71 It is for these reasons that it is concluded that the proposal will do no harm to the grade II listed farmhouse and its associated barns, nor will it impact the setting of any of these heritage assets.

- 5.72 ***Church of St Michael, Cardeston*** – NLHE ref. 1055215: The Church of St Michael in Cardeston is a Grade II listed Anglican church dating to the mid-18th century, though the official listing does indicate there are some older fragments incorporated, dating back to possibly the 12th century. Constructed from Uncoursed Alderbury breccia with sandstone ashlar dressing, the church is a designated heritage asset with a prominent position within the landscape, therefore affording it far-reaching views of the area, making it one of the most important assets to consider when looking at the potential impact of the proposal (Figure 25).
- 5.73 The church and the PDA are separated by over 850m, meaning there is no chance for physical or direct harm. Therefore, the principal consideration is the setting of the church. In this respect, the church’s setting is argued to be chiefly defined by the following characteristics:
- Surrounding landscape
 - Views to and from the asset
 - Visual dominance
- 5.74 The landscape surrounding Cardeston Church is chiefly defined by the agricultural and pastoral farmland which forms its rural setting, but also by the village of Cardeston. The distance between the PDA and the church leads to the conclusion that this element of the church’s setting will not be impacted by the proposal. This element of how the asset is experienced will be changed. The church’s significance is derived from its architectural and historic interest which is enhanced by its prominent location and will not be lost from the proposed development. Its significance can be appreciated from the PDA to some degree, largely due to the scale of the tower and the prominent position the church occupies. However, whilst there is some intervisibility it should be noted that the distance between the PDA and the church does limit this appreciation, as architectural details cannot be discerned from this distance.
- 5.75 The main consideration when considering the impact of this proposal, is the potential harm to views looking out from and towards the church. Despite the distance the PDA is visible, and development will constitute a change in experience. Topographically, Cardeston Church and the PDA are both raised compared to the intervening land between them, which falls into a slight valley. This therefore means views from the church are far reaching. Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposal may result in a change to these views, it is argued that this impact is mitigated by the existing poultry sheds on the Far Broadway Farm site, which have already caused harm to this element of the church’s setting. Furthermore, the PDA is located within the profile of the existing sheds, thereby mitigating the potential impact of development.

- 5.76 Cardeston Church sits in a prominent position within the landscape, due to the topography, as discussed. The PDA is located of sufficient distance from the church to conclude that this visual dominance will remain unaffected. It is concluded that there will be a less than substantial harm to the setting of Cardeston Church, due to the impact on views looking out from the listed building. Whilst there is potential for cumulative harm when factoring in the existing poultry sheds at Far Broadway Farm, it is considered that the provided Landscape Mitigation Plan is sufficient in preventing further harm by restricting intervisibility between the PDA and the church.
- 5.77 **Church Farm, Cardeston** – HER ref. 27857: Church Farm has been included within this report for completeness only. Being a non-designated heritage asset, it holds less weight than the nearby Cardeston Church. It does not command the same views nor position of prominence and is located a large distance from the PDA. Therefore, it is concluded there will be no harm to Church Farm or its setting.
- 5.78 **Cardeston Manor** – HER ref. 34312: Cardeston Manor has been included in this report for completeness and it is concluded that the proposal will do no harm, due to the distance from the PDA.
- 5.79 **The Pound, Cardeston** – HER ref. 14864: The Pound in Cardeston has been included in this report for completeness and it is concluded that the proposal will do no harm, due to the distance from the PDA.
- 5.80 **Primitive Methodist Chapel, Ford Heath** – HER ref. 14288: Former methodist chapel, now converted to a private dwelling. Constructed from red brick with a tiled roof, the chapel retains its ecclesiastical windows and has a decorative brick string course following the roofline on the front elevation. These elements offer the asset some historic and architectural interest (Figure 19).
- 5.81 The chapel is located on the edge of the village of Ford Heath, roughly 500m southeast of the PDA. In this respect it is concluded that the proposal will do no harm to the chapel or its setting. The distance is too great, and the chapel is surrounded by natural screening and other dwellings which mean views towards the PDA are restricted entirely.
- 5.82 **Beechfield Farm** – HER ref. 22009: Beechfield Farm is an isolated farmhouse located around 800m from the PDA. The farmhouse is constructed from brick and has been painted white. Further associated farm buildings are also brick constructions (Figure 21).

- 5.83 The farm is approached via a quiet country lane with no-through road. The lane is highly wooded on either side. This level of foliage continues to the farm site, giving it a sense of privacy and isolation. From this point, views towards the PDA are entirely restricted by the natural screening. Due to this sense of enclosure and the distance between this and the heritage asset, it is concluded that the proposal will result in no indirect harm to Beechfield Farm.
- 5.84 **Tithe House** – NHLE ref. 1308103: Tithe House (Figure 22) is included in this report for completeness only as it is a grade II listed farmhouse located a short way from the PDA assessment area boundary. The farmhouse is located over 1km from the PDA with large areas of natural screening in the intervening space. The PDA will do no harm to Tithe House or its setting.

Conclusion

- 5.85 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), helps to define what constitutes harm and how to assess the impact. It explains that:

“It is the degree of harm to the asset’s significance rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed. The harm may arise from works to the asset or from development within its setting.”

- 5.86 The PDA does not contain within it, any heritage assets, therefore the main consideration for the proposal is its impact on the setting of nearby heritage assets.
- 5.87 It is concluded that the proposal will lead to no harm to the setting of nearby designated heritage assets, with the exception of Cardeston Church, which will experience less than substantial harm, though it has been demonstrated that this harm is limited due to the distance between the church and the PDA and the abating factors of the Landscape Mitigation Plan.
- 5.88 It is further concluded that the proposal, on balance, will not harm the significance of the nearby non-designated heritage assets, with the exception of those assets at Far Broadway Farm, which will see a minor change in their setting. However, it has been shown this setting has already been fundamentally changed already and the significance of the heritage assets at the farm already affected by cumulative harm.
- 5.89 However, evidence has been given to show that the impact in all cases has been mitigated, the most important of these being the pre-existing poultry sheds already on site and the provided Landscape Mitigation Plan, which looks to provide further natural screening around the PDA.

5.90 The minor harm that is concluded to occur in this assessment must therefore be weighed against the potential benefits of the proposal, in this instance benefits to the local rural economy.

6. Ecology

Introduction

- 6.1 Salopian Consultancy have undertaken Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) incorporating an Extended Phase 1 Survey, Preliminary Roost Assessment and Habitat Suitability Index.
- 6.2 The full PEA and Appendices are located at **Appendix 6.1**, where any referenced figures can be found.
- 6.3 The Phase 1 survey was extended to include an assessment of the sites suitability for protected species including a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) of trees and neighbouring structures as well as a Habitat Suitability Index (HSI) of those ponds within 500m of the site. The data obtained from this survey is presented in a Phase 1 habitat map (Plan 2 of the PEA) illustrating habitats recorded, with targets notes used to highlight features of interest. Further details on the methodology adopted during the Extended Phase 1 survey and desk study are included in Appendix 1 of the PEA.
- 6.4 The survey was performed on the 14th February 2022 by Douglas Williams, Salopian Consultancy Ltd.'s Principal Ecologist. Doug is an experienced Ecologist/Arboriculturist who holds an MSc in Biological Recording, protected species licences for both bats and Great crested newts, and memberships with the Royal Society of Biology, the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management and the Arboricultural Association.
- 6.5 In addition to the PEA, Isopleth have undertaken an Ammonia Emissions Impact Assessment (AEIA). An assessment of ammonia impacts against critical levels and critical loads for nutrient nitrogen has been completed:
- Critical levels are a quantitative estimate of exposure to one or more airborne pollutants in gaseous form, below which significant harmful effects on sensitive elements of the environment do not occur, according to present knowledge.
 - Critical loads are a quantitative estimate of exposure to deposition of one or more pollutants, below which significant harmful effects on sensitive elements of the environment do not occur, according to present knowledge.
- 6.6 The type, source and significance of potential impacts have been identified and detailed modelling undertaken in line with:

Shropshire Council Interim Guidance Note GN2 (Version 1, April 2018). Assessing the impact of ammonia and nitrogen on designated sites and Natural Assets from new and expanding livestock units (LSUs).

- 6.7 Predicted ground level concentrations of ammonia and nutrient nitrogen are compared with relevant air quality standards and guidelines for the protection of sensitive habitats.
- 6.8 The full AEIA and Appendices are located at **Appendix 6.2**, where any referenced figures can be found.

Site location and context of development

- 6.9 The site is located to the north-west of Ford Heath and sits within the curtilage of Broadway Farm access from a farm track which leads from Yockleton Road. The application area sits within a sub compartment of a field of sheep grazed pasture, directly to the north of four existing poultry units.
- 6.10 An initial assessment of the proposal identifies that planning permission is sought for the construction of two further poultry units.

Scope of the study

- 6.11 The primary focus of the study is to:
- Meet the validation requirements of Shropshire Council by presenting the findings of an Extended Phase 1 Survey in a clear and concise manner.
 - Include the content set by the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) guidelines, for ecological appraisals.
 - Classify and map those habitat types within and immediately adjacent to the application area.
 - Identify both habitats and species constraints pertinent to the development proposal.
 - Detail European Protected Species Mitigation licensing (EPSML) requirements, Reasonable Avoidance Measures (RAMS) and mitigation measures where required.
 - Identify opportunities for the proposal to provide enhancements to the ecological resource on site.

Planning Policy & Statutory Controls

Statutory legislation

- 6.12 A range of EU and UK legislation offers statutory protection to species and habitats which Local Planning Authorities have a duty to consider whilst determining planning applications. The following EU directives are relevant to protected species, habitats, and designated sites:
- The EC Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC)

- The Birds Directive (79/409/EEC) and
 - EU Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC)
- 6.13 Much of the EU legislation is transposed into domestic legislation with respect to protected species and habitats, including:
- The Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) (as amended)
 - The Protection of Badgers Act (1992)
 - The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006)
 - The Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000)
- 6.14 The Association of Local Government Ecologist (ALGE) provides a summary of the criteria and thresholds to determine when an Ecological survey should be performed. Many Local Planning Authorities have adopted this guidance to ensure that the correct information is presented when considering the impacts upon biodiversity during the planning process.

National and local planning policy

- 6.15 Natural habitats and the species they support provide a range of ecosystem services that have considerable financial, cultural, and recreational benefits. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) highlights the importance of natural habitats, the species they support and the requirements of development to maintain, promote and enhance the natural environment. The requirements of new development to provide a net gain in biodiversity and establishing ecological networks are clearly set out in para 174, 179 and 180.
- 6.16 Para 175 makes specific reference to ‘irreplaceable habitats’ which states that *“development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists”*.
- 6.17 Natural England and the Forestry Commission standing advice is that minimum buffer of 15m should be kept from ancient woodland. There may be instances where this buffer is increased to negate impact associated with air pollution and other non-direct impacts. Individual Ancient or veteran trees require a buffer area of 15 times the tree diameter or 5m greater than the edge of the tree canopy, whichever is greater to avoid significant impacts.
- 6.18 Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, places a duty on all public authorities in England and Wales to have regard, in the exercise of their functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. A key purpose of this duty is to embed consideration of biodiversity as an integral part of policy and decision making throughout the public sector.

- 6.19 Shropshire Council's Core Strategy CS6 and CS17 encourages development 'which conserves, enhances, connects, restores, or recreates natural assets'. These policies support proposals which contribute positively to the 'special character or local distinctiveness' where development affects biodiversity at a landscape scale.

Survey Findings

Desk study

- 6.20 The desk study summarised in Appendix 1 of the PEA forms an important part of the ecological assessment. It provides contextual information, such as the site's proximity to designated sites and the location of historical protected species records. This information is used when assessing the site's suitability for protected species.
- 6.21 A review of OS maps and online mapping resources was undertaken to identify designations of conservation concern within 1km of the site and waterbodies within 500m.

Environmental Networks

- 6.22 SEN is defined into a hierarchy of components discussed in Shropshire Councils Guidance Note 11: Environmental Networks. These components form areas of high biodiversity value (core areas depicted in red) and areas that act as connective 'corridors and stepping stones' between them (illustrated as green) which includes non-statutory designations. The term connectivity refers to the movement of species between areas thereby aiding geneflow, recolonisation of habitats and bolstering of populations during fluctuations, which is a key aspect of meta population dynamics.

Statutory/ non-Statutory Designation within 1km

- 6.23 No statutory designations of conservation concern were identified during the desk study within 1km of the site, nor were any non-statutory designations identified within or adjacent to the site. The site does not fall within a core area, or corridor component of the SEN. Within the wider landscape an area of ancient, replanted woodland is located 790m south west of the site.

Ecological Receptors beyond 1km

- 6.24 The AEIA identifies a number of ecological receptors beyond 1km of the Site where the impact of emissions has been assessed.
- 6.25 Ecological receptors sensitive to ammonia emissions include:

- Sites of European interest up to 10km from the Site including Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Ramsar Sites.
- Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) up to 5km from the Site which are of national importance.
- 'Natural Assets' up to 2km from the Site which include Local Nature Reserves (LNRs), Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) Priority Habitats and Ancient Woodland (AW).

6.26 The River Severn at Montford SSSI is not sensitive to ammonia or nutrient nitrogen and as a result has not been assessed. The ecological sites of interest are shown at Appendix B of the AEIA and are:

- Bomere, Shomere And Betton Pools SSSI
- Hencott Pool SSSI
- Stiperstones SAC & SSSI
- Shrawardine Pool SSSI
- Earl's Hill & Habberley Valley SSSI
- Minsterley Meadows SSSI
- Old River Bed, Shrewsbury SSSI
- Lin Can Moss SSSI
- Snod Coppice AW
- Firlands AW
- Long Coppice AW
- Horton Lane Coppice AW
- An unnamed replanted AW
- Broxton

Species records

6.27 During the desk study, a total of 54 species records were obtained within a 1km search radius of the site which are relatively evenly split between Arthropod records (butterfly and damselfly) and avian records recorded in the Cardeston area, indicating a strong recording effort for and interest in these taxonomic groups.

6.28 No records of amphibians or reptiles were returned within 1km of the site. The nearest account of Great crested newts is located 1.4km east of the site within the ground of Cartref Carvan and camping site.

Habitat Suitability Index

6.29 A desk-based assessment identified four waterbodies located within 500m from the site illustrated in Figure 2 of the PEA. An additional water body referred to as Pond 5 was identified during the Phase 1 survey located 100m of the site.

- 6.30 An assessment of each water body was undertaken using a HSI to determine their potential to support breeding populations of amphibians detailed in Table 2 of the PEA. Ponds 1 and 3 scored 'average suitability' and ponds 2, 4, and 5 scored 'below average suitability'.

Preliminary roost assessment – structures/trees

- 6.31 A ground-based assessment of those trees located upon the eastern boundary of the site did not identify any features capable of supporting roosting bats. The existing poultry sheds located to the south of the site comprises of a steel framed structures with corrugated panel side and roofing sheets. These building are in good condition with no obvious cracks or crevices and are not deemed suitable for roosting bats.

Phase 1 survey

- 6.32 The application area encompasses a sub section of improved pasture grazed by sheep. A mature established field hedgerow forms the western boundary which contains a mix of Holly (*Ilex aquifolium*), Hawthorn (*Crataegus monogyna*), Elder (*Sambucus nigra*), Blackthorn (*Prunus spinosa*) and Dog rose (*Rosa canina*). The northern section of this hedgerow has become sparse and defunct in sections.
- 6.33 Within the field margins common flowering species tolerant of agricultural practices were noted including Cleavers (*Galium aparine*), Nettle (*Urtica dioica*), Spear thistle (*Cirsium vulgare*), and Broad leaved dock (*Rumex obtusifolius*).
- 6.34 Two early mature Pedunculate Oak (*Quercus robur*) trees were noted situated within the eastern field boundary hedgerow.

Evaluation of ecological constraints and opportunities

Designations

- 6.35 The site does not fall within or adjacent to any statutory or non-statutory sites of conservation concern, nor does it fall within components of the SEN, therefore no impacts are envisaged upon the functionality of the SEN/designated sites or the species they support.

Impact of ammonia emissions on Ecological Receptors

- 6.36 The AEIA assesses the impact of the ammonia emissions from the proposed development. The new poultry sheds are to be fitted with air scrubbers and the southernmost existing poultry shed at the Site is to be retrofitted with an air scrubber.

- 6.37 Table 5.3 of the AEIA shows the critical level dispersion modelling results for the proposed development. This includes emissions from the (scrubbed) 2 new sheds as well as the existing 4 sheds (1 of which is scrubbed).
- 6.38 Impacts from the proposed development are below 1% of the relevant critical level at all European sites and SSSI with the exception of:
- Hencott Pool SSSI; and
 - Earl's Hill & Habberley Valley SSSI
- 6.39 Impacts at the AW and CWS (i.e. 'Natural Assets') are above 1%. All impacts are lower for the proposed scheme than for the existing operational site.
- 6.40 Table 5.4 of the AEIA shows the nutrient nitrogen critical load results of the proposed development. The impacts on all European sites and SSSI are below 1% of the relevant N critical load when considering emissions from the proposed sheds, with the exception of Shrawardine Pool SSSI. Impacts at the AW and CWS (i.e. 'Natural Assets') are above 1% but below 100%. All impacts are lower for the proposed scheme than for the existing operational site.
- 6.41 The proposed scheme represents a betterment over the existing operational poultry farm. No further mitigation is therefore required beyond the installation of the scrubbing units, as described in the AEIA.

Habitats

- 6.42 Those habitats on site are restricted to intensively sheep grazed pasture, bound by mixed species hedgerow which contains occasional trees. The primary habitat is considered to be of limited ecological merit given the low species diversity and intensive management of the grassland such that it's loss and modification is not considered to be a constraint to development. Consideration should be given to the impacts upon trees/tree roots particularly those associated with the eastern boundary which could be achieved by performing a BS5837:2012 compliant tree survey and Arboricultural Impacts Assessment.

Protected species

- 6.43 The boundary hedgerow and trees set within provide nesting opportunities for a range of common passerine. All wild birds, their nests and eggs are protected under Section 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), this makes it an offence to:
- Intentionally kill, injure or take any wild bird;
 - Take, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while it is in use or being built;
 - Take, damage or destroy the egg of any wild bird; or

- To have in one's possession, or control, any wild bird (dead or alive) or egg or any part of a wild bird or egg.
- 6.44 It is understood that these features will remain as part of the proposal. If any tree/hedgerow removal or pruning is required as part of the ongoing maintenance and management of the site such works must be timed to fall between September and February outside of the bird nesting season to avoid contravening the legislation above, or immediately after a pre-commencement check by suitably qualified personnel.
- 6.45 The PRA confirmed that the site does not support suitable buildings or trees capable of supporting roosting bats.
- 6.46 No evidence or fields signs of badger (such as setts or scraps) were identified within 30m of the site boundaries. Given the mobile and dynamic nature of badgers, if any excavation is discovered prior or during works an update survey should be completed by a competent ecologist should to confirm the cause of the excavation before works continue.
- 6.47 Five waterbodies were identified within 500m of the sites boundaries. These waterbodies scored 'below average' in their suitability for Great crested newts with the exception of Pond 1 and Pond 3 which provide an 'average' suitability. The HSI scoring for Ponds 2-4 are largely attributable to the water quality, low macrophyte cover which is essential as an egg laying substrate for breeding newts and limited suitable terrestrial habitat beyond the pond margins.
- 6.48 Conversely Pond 5 does provide a variety of aquatic vegetation but was noted to be ephemeral/season in its nature, whilst Pond 1 scored higher than the other ponds due to not having the same limitations of shade, permeance and lesser impacts from the presence of water fowl.
- 6.49 No historic records of Great crested newts were returned within 1km of the search area. It is understood that Phase 2 presence absence surveys for great crested newts were undertaken in 2010 in relation to the planning application 10/02963/FUL for four poultry sheds to the south. The surveys showed that at the time of the study these ponds did not support any evidence or signs of great crested newts.
- 6.50 Great crested newt are listed as an EPS on Schedule 2 of the Conservation Regulations (Annex IV(a) to the Habitats Directive), affording it protection under the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019, It is an offence to:
- Deliberately capture, injure or kill a wild animal of an EPS;

- Deliberately disturb wild animals of an EPS wherever they are occurring, in particular any disturbance which is likely to impair their ability to survive, to breed or reproduce, or in the case of hibernating or migratory species, to hibernate or migrate; or to affect significantly the local distribution or abundance of the species to which they belong;
- Deliberately take or destroy the eggs of a wild animal of an EPS; or
- Damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place of a wild animal of an EPS.

6.51 Mindful of the below average scores of the ponds (with the exception of Pond 1 and Pond 3) and that the previous Phase 2 surveys did not show any evidence of this species it is deemed highly unlikely that Great crested newt would be encountered during the proposed works. This position is considered even more relevant when taking into account the poor suitability of the terrestrial habitat within the construction area (intensively grazed pasture), in combination with the distance from known historic records of this species are >1.4km.

6.52 Acknowledging that the previous 2010 study are now considered out of date, and that it is possible for great crested newts to travel considerable distances over subsequent years/decades where connectivity allows recolonisation as part of metapopulation dynamics; it is advised that the proposed works are undertaken in line with the Method Statement detailed in Appendix 3 of the PEA. As long as these provisions are adhered to, the need for further Phase 2 surveys to inform an EPS license is not anticipated on the basis that:

- The risk of inadvertently injuring or killing Great crested newt(s) during works is further minimised through precautionary working methods.
- No net loss of suitable Great crested newt habitat (aquatic or terrestrial) is lost as a result of the proposed works.

6.53 The same position has been agreed during the neighbouring application 17/00407/FUL which fell within 500m of a pond with confirmed presence of Great crested newts.

6.54 No field signs or habitats considered suitable to support other protected species such as dormice (*Muscardinus avellanarius*) or water vole (*Arvicola amphibious*) were identified on the site or highlighted during the desk study.

Artificial Lighting

6.55 All new Artificial lighting will need take into account those measures recommended in the 'Bat Conservation Trusts Guidance Note 08/18 Bats and artificial lighting in the UK to ensure dark corridors remain for nocturnal commuting/foraging wildlife.

- 6.56 Lighting should be directed to where it is needed to avoid unnecessary light spillage. All proposed new lighting should be directed away from any vegetated boundary features to retain dark corridors for commuting bats across the site.
- 6.57 Artificial lighting should lack UV element the use of LEDs is advised due to their sharp cut-off, lower intensity, good colour rendition and dimming capability. Metal halide, fluorescent sources should not be used.
- 6.58 Lighting should adopt a warm white spectrum, ideally below 2700 kelvin with a peak wavelength higher than 550nm, thus avoiding emitting those wavelengths of light most disturbing to bats⁶ (Stone 2012). Security lighting should be activated by movement sensors to reduce the amount of time the lights are activated, set on a short timer (maximum of 1 minute), and orientated towards the ground. The use of accessories such as hoods/cowls or shields is advised to help direct light to the required area only.

Biodiversity enhancements

- 6.59 It is recommended that enhancements to the site for bats are provided through the erection of a 2F Schwegler bat box upon one of the mature oak trees upon the eastern boundary. In addition similar provision for nesting birds can be achieved through the erection of Schwegler 1B Nest Boxes with a 32mm entrance hole upon those remaining trees on site. This bird box is designed to attract Great tit (*Parus major*), Blue tit (*Cyanistes caeruleus*), Marsh tit (*Poecile palustris*), Coal tit (*Periparus ater*), Crested Tit (*Lophophanes cristatus*), Redstart (*Phoenicurus phoenicurus*), Nuthatch (*Sitta europaea*), Collared flycatcher (*Ficedula albicollis*) Pied Flycatcher (*Ficedula hypoleuca*), Wryneck (*Jynx torquilla*), Tree Sparrow (*Passer montanus*) and House Sparrow (*Passer domesticus*).
- 6.60 In addition to roosting provisions for bat and birds there is the opportunity to incorporate new hedgerow and tree planting to increase the level of biodiversity across the site. New planting such should include a minimum 60% of native species with a focus of those known to be beneficial to pollinators as described in RHS plant for pollinators guidance.
- 6.61 All Tree and hedgerow planting should meet the requirements of BS8545: 2014 Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape. Recommendations with specific reference to the procurement of new trees, species selection, aftercare and maintenance. This could be achieved via planning condition through a formal Tree Planting Scheme.

Conclusion

- 6.62 The application area comprises exclusively of improved grassland which is intensively grazed by sheep bound by and established mixed species hedgerow.
- 6.63 Four ponds fall between 100m-500m from the site which score below average in their suitability for Great crested newts. An additional pond located 75m to the west scores average in its suitability for this species. The site itself supports limited opportunities for species of amphibians given the lack of refuge which is restricted to the boundary hedgerows which will remain intact.
- 6.64 The likelihood of encountering Great crested newts on site is considered very low given the distance from the ponds and poor suitability of terrestrial habitat. This position is supported by the previous 2010 Phase 2 studies which concluded the absence of Great crested newt within these pools. However, given the age of this historic study which is now considered out of date, and that it is possible for local populations to colonise ponds through metapopulation dynamics, there is a small risk newt could be present within these pools. The risk of encountering great crested newt (if present) can be further reduced to an acceptable level by implementing the Method Statement and timing of works detailed in Appendix 3 of the PEA. This position has been agreed for similar applications within the local area.
- 6.65 No evidence of other protected species were identified during the course of the study, therefore the proposal is not considered to be limited by any other ecological constraints.
- 6.66 The AEIA shows that the proposed scheme represents a betterment in terms of the impact of ammonia emissions on identified ecological receptors over the existing operational poultry farm. Like the existing sheds, the impacts at some sites are above 1% of the relevant N critical level and 1% of the relevant N critical load. Impacts resulting from the extension of the poultry farm are not predicted to be above 100% at any local sites or ancient woodland.
- 6.67 The proposal has the potential to provide significant enhancements to the site as an ecological asset through the incorporation of both bird and bat boxes into the built form and new hedgerow planting.
- 6.68 Subject to the implementation of those recommendations set out within Section 4 and Appendix 3 of the PEA, no significant impacts upon protected species are considered likely to arise. In the event of a protected species being encountered during works; all works will halt, and further advice shall be sought from Salopian Consultancy.

7. Summary and Conclusions

7.1 The following table summarises and concludes the previous technical assessment chapters with regards to the proposed poultry site extension at Far Broadway Poultry Farm. A non-technical summary of the ES is also provided.

Chapter	Potential Impact	Principal Mitigation	Significance
Landscape and Visual Amenity	Landscape effects	Appropriate siting and landscape mitigation proposals	Not significant
	Visual effects	Appropriate siting and landscape mitigation proposals	Not significant
Cultural Heritage	Impact on setting of designated heritage assets	Appropriate siting and landscape mitigation proposals	Not significant
	Impact on setting of non-designated heritage assets	Appropriate siting and landscape mitigation proposals	Not significant
Ecology	Designated sites	Appropriate siting; use of scrubbers; use of BATs	Not significant
	Habitats	Appropriate siting; site design; landscape mitigation measures	Not significant
	Protected species	Appropriate siting; following Method Statements; lighting design; bat and bird boxes	Not significant