

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL – DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

Committee:	Planning
Date:	19 July 2022
Site Location:	Astmans Farm Poultry Unit, Maisemore, Gloucester
Application No:	22/00167/FUL
Ward:	Highnam With Haw Bridge
Parish:	Maisemore
Proposal:	Erection of 2 No. additional poultry houses with air scrubbing units and associated infrastructure on established poultry farm (resubmission of 21/00870/FUL)
Report by:	Bob Ristic
Appendices:	Site location plan Site layout plan Floor Plans Elevations
Recommendation:	Permit
Reason for referral to committee:	The application is brought before members as the development is connected to a serving member of the Council.

1.0	SITE DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSAL
1.1	The application site is located to the east of the A417, approximately 700 metres north west of the Settlement Boundary to Maisemore and 300 metres south east of Overton Farm. The site comprises a broadly rectangular parcel of land within the northern part of a larger field parcel.
1.2	The site slopes down to the south east and lies within Flood Zone 1. A public footpath EMA11 runs along the southern part of the site and footpath EMA 25 runs along the eastern boundary of the site, adjacent to a watercourse.
1.3	The site presently comprises two poultry units and associated infrastructure, which were permitted under application no.18/01162/FUL and are sited to the northeaster part of the site. Each of these units each accommodate 47,000 birds with 94,000 birds presently on the site in total.
1.4	This proposal seeks to expand the existing poultry operation with the erection of 2 No. additional poultry sheds, which would be located to the west of the existing units. The proposed buildings would be similar in design and size to the existing and would each hold 47,000 birds, doubling the capacity of the site to 188,000 birds.

1.5	In addition to the poultry sheds the application also proposes ancillary development including, 4 no. feed bins, 1 no feed blending room and an extension to the concrete apron.
1.6	This application is a resubmission of a previously withdrawn application, the principle difference being the inclusion of 'air scrubber' units attached to the northern elevations of the proposed poultry sheds, in order to control dust and odour associated with the proposed use.
1.7	<p>Due to the size of the enterprise, the development falls under Schedule 1 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 which requires that all proposals for units in excess of 85,000 broilers must be the subject of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). The application as submitted was accompanied by an Environmental Statement which includes sections covering the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Description of Development - Alternative Sites - Landscape and Visual Impacts - Highway Impacts - Noise, Odour and Dust Impacts - Ecological Issues - Flood Risk and Drainage
1.8	An Environmental Permit for the existing development was issued by the Environment Agency on 2nd November 2017. This is now subject to a variation which would need to be secured from The Environment Agency in order to allow the current proposed development to operate and subject to planning permission being granted.
1.9	The applicant sets out that the Government has highlighted the need to promote home food production and there is pressure to produce more food at a price the consumer can afford to pay and that the proposal would increase the supply of nationally produced poultry meat, in an effective manner and reducing the need for imports and transport and environmental costs, and that the extension of this existing poultry rearing enterprise would help achieve this.
2.0	RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Application Number	Proposal	Decision	Decision Date
18/01162/FUL	Erection of 2 No. agricultural buildings for poultry rearing with associated infrastructure and new highway access.	PER	19.06.2019
21/00870/FUL	Erection of 2 No. additional poultry houses and associated infrastructure on existing poultry farm.	WDN	11.02.2022

3.0	RELEVANT POLICY
	The following planning guidance and policies are relevant to the consideration of this application:
3.1	National guidance
	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)
3.2	Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy (JCS) – Adopted 11 December 2017
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Policy SD1 Employment Except Retail Development – Policy SD6 Landscape – Policy SD8 Historic Environment – Policy SD9 Biodiversity and Geodiversity – Policy SD14 Health and Environmental Quality – Policy INF1 Transport Network – Policy INF2 Flood Risk Management – Policy INF3 Green Infrastructure
3.3	Tewkesbury Borough Plan 2011-2031 (June 2022)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Policy AGR1 Agricultural development – Policy AGR2 Agricultural Diversification – Policy LAN2 Landscape Character – Policy NAT1 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Important Natural Features – Policy NAT2 The Water Environment – Policy ENV2 Flood Risk and Water Management – TRAC9 Parking Provision
3.5	Neighbourhood Plan
	None

3.6	Other relevant policies/legislation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Human Rights Act 1998 – Article 8 (Right to Respect for Private and Family Life) – The First Protocol - Article 1 (Protection of Property)
4.0	CONSULTATIONS
	Full copies of all the consultation responses are available online at https://publicaccess.tewkesbury.gov.uk/online-applications/ .
4.1	<p>Maisemore Parish Council – Object to the application for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Problems with existing construction/development - Hardly differs from withdrawn application - Not an agricultural operation but a factory - Industrial facility in the wrong place - Causes annoyance and distress to many local people - Failings of existing operation must be rectified before considering an expansion - No pre-application consultation with Parish Council or village residents - Errors in documents/form - Same plan numbers as previous application/errors - Cut and fill residue may need to be removed from site - No soft landscaping proposal - No Environmental permit for the extension - Would generate significant traffic through village - Would generate more noise - New sheds would be larger than existing - Would increase impermeable area - Fans not operational for noise survey - Odour report is theoretical - Does not reflect resident's experiences - Residents concerned with the existing smell which will only increase - Smells permeate gardens and houses - Affects health and wellbeing - Light and noise pollution - Little faith in Environment Agency or Council to monitor the development
4.2	Environment Agency – Proposal will require a variation of the existing Environmental Permit.
4.3	Lead Local Flood Authority – No objections
4.4	Borough Conservation Officer – No objections
4.5	Environmental Health Officer – No objections
4.6	Gloucestershire Highways – No objections
4.7	Natural England – No objections
4.8	Public Rights of Way Officer – No objections

4.9	County Archaeologist – No objections
5.0	PUBLICITY AND REPRESENTATIONS
	Full copies of all the representation responses are available online at https://publicaccess.tewkesbury.gov.uk/online-applications/ .
5.1	<p>The application has been publicised through the posting of a site notice for a period of 21 days. Seven letters of representation have been received in response. The comments raised are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing chicken houses have a detrimental impact on residents and area - Odour permeates whole community - Nothing done to resolve existing problem - Original units don't have scrubbers - Scrubbers should be retrofitted to see if they work - Scrubbers not guaranteed to work - Waste spread in fields which elongates odour for days and weeks - Sensitive receptors missed off assessments - Doubling the size of this factory farm - Will only intensify problems - Discharge to watercourse is a hazard - Wellbeing of walkers - Existing light and noise pollution - Effect on house sales - Original landscaping not implemented - Would double operation and impacts - Vehicles arrive day and night and on Sundays - New homes built/being built closer to site - Large number of objections to previous application - Insufficient monitoring - Maisemore susceptible to flooding - Impact from traffic using other routes - Does not meet NPPF tests - No economic benefit - Not high quality or reflective of local need - Does not support health and social cultural wellbeing - Does not enhance or protect natural environment - Committee disregarded odour consultant's advice - Application contains errors - Ward Councillor's family would benefit from development
6.0	POLICY CONTEXT
6.1	Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Section 70 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provides that the Local Planning Authority shall have regard to the provisions of the Development Plan, so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations.

6.2	The Development Plan currently comprises the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) (2017), the Tewkesbury Borough Plan 2011-2031 (TBP) and a number of 'made' Neighbourhood Development Plans.
6.3	The relevant policies are set out in the appropriate sections of this report.
6.4	Other material policy considerations include national planning guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 and its associated Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), the National Design Guide (NDG) and National Model Design Code.
7.0	ANALYSIS
7.1	The matters for consideration in the determination of this application are the principle of the development, landscape impact, residential amenity, drainage, biodiversity, transportation and highways, and impact on heritage assets.
	<i>Principle of Development</i>
7.2	The definition of agriculture provided by section 336 of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act, includes 'breeding and keeping of livestock (including any creature kept for the production of food)'. The application does not include the processing of meat at the site and therefore it is considered that the proposal falls under the definition of an agricultural activity and should be assessed against agricultural policies in the development plan.
7.3	Paragraph 81 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development. In respect to the rural economy paragraph 84 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should, inter alia, enable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings; b) the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses
7.4	Policy SD1 of the JCS sets out that employment related development will be supported where it is located within or adjacent to a settlement or existing employment area and is of an appropriate scale and character; and farm diversification projects which are of an appropriate scale and use. Policy AGR1 of the Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan (TBP) sets out that new agricultural development including intensive and industrial scale agricultural operations will be permitted provided that the development is reasonably necessary, is well sited in relation to existing structures and landscaping, is sympathetic in design and there are no adverse impacts on amenity, biodiversity, the highway network and that waste is appropriately controlled. Furthermore, policy AGR2 supports agricultural diversification.
7.5	It is considered that broad principle of the proposal is acceptable, particularly as the proposal would extend an existing established poultry operation at the site and subject to other material planning considerations discussed below.

	<i>Landscape impact</i>
7.6	<p>Paragraph 174 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by, inter alia:</p> <p>a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan)</p> <p>b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services - including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland.</p>
7.7	The application site is not identified as a 'valued' landscape in the development plan.
7.8	Policy SD6 of the JCS states that development will seek to protect landscape character for its own intrinsic beauty and for its benefit to economic, environmental and social well-being. Proposals will have regard to local distinctiveness and historic character of different landscapes and proposals are required to demonstrate how the development will protect landscape character and avoid detrimental effects on types, patterns and features which make a significant contribution to the character, history and setting of a settlement area.
7.9	Policy AGR1 of the Local Plan requires that proposals for the erection of agricultural buildings should be well sited in relation to existing buildings, ancillary structures and works and landscape features in order to minimise adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality. Furthermore, that the proposed development should be sympathetically designed in terms of height, mass materials, colour and landscaping where appropriate.
7.10	The application site is a sloping field in agricultural use, set within an undulating landscape which is defined by hedgerow field boundaries and the A417 is a dominant feature in the surrounding landscape. The site falls within Landscape Character Type 'Vale Hillocks' within the Gloucestershire Landscape Character Assessment (2006) and is further subdivided to 'Woolridge Hill' which is characterised by an elevated ridge of land rising from the adjacent flat low-lying landscape. Within the Joint Core Strategy Landscape Characterisation Assessment and Sensitivity Analysis (2011), the site falls within area G2: Maisemore Ridge which is identified as having a medium-low sensitivity.
7.11	The site is presently occupied by two purpose-built poultry units and this proposal would add two further buildings to this operation. Each poultry house would be 114 metres long, 20.4 metres wide with an overall ridge height of 7.14 metres, which would be finished in 'olive green' coloured profile sheeting to match the existing buildings at the site.
7.12	In addition to the main buildings the application proposes four feed bins which would be 8.6 metres high and a feed blending room which would have an overall height of 2.95 metres and would also be coloured green to match.

7.13	The existing site would be re-graded and the buildings would be set at a lower level than the adjoining land, with a finished floor level of 40.3m AOD, which is approximately 0.4 metres higher than the existing units and 7.6 metres lower than the adjoining highway. The application also proposes the formation of a landscaped bund between the highway and proposed units. The implementation and detail of the landscaping could be secured by condition.
7.14	The application is accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), which in turn informs the Environmental Statement. The submitted LVIA has been prepared using appropriate guidance from the Landscape Institute and has been reviewed and issued by a suitably qualified person.
7.15	The LVIA assess the landscape impact of the proposal from different viewpoints from adjacent footpaths and along the A417. The viewpoints are at varying distances and topography from the site and have been selected to represent potential views seen by the most sensitive receptors around the site. The viewpoints includes Over Old Road to the east of the site where there are a number of residential properties.
7.16	The report concludes that the visual impacts would be limited given the presence of established vegetation and existing buildings at the site and that further mitigation could be achieved by additional planting.
7.17	It is evident that further development at the site will have a landscape impact, particularly when viewed from the A417 however and subject to compliance with conditions in respect of levels and landscaping it is considered that effective mitigation could be achieved to minimise the impacts of the development to an acceptable level.
7.18	While harm to the landscape is a factor that weighs against the proposal in the overall planning balance, it is noted that the application site is not identified as a 'valued' landscape and any impact could be tempered by an appropriate mitigation
<i>Pollution Control and Residential Amenity</i>	
7.19	Paragraph 185 of the NPPF sets out that planning decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to the impacts that could arise from the development. Paragraph 187 sets out that when determining applications, local planning authorities should focus on whether the development itself is an acceptable use of the land, and the impact of the use, rather than the control of processes or emissions themselves where these are subject to approval under pollution control regimes. Local planning authorities 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.
7.20	Policy SD14 of the JCS states that development must cause no unacceptable harm to local amenity including the amenity of neighbouring residents and result in no unacceptable levels of air, noise, water, light or soil pollution or odour either alone, or cumulatively, with respect to relevant national and EU limit values.

7.21	<p>Article 8 of the Human Rights Act gives the right to respect for private and family life and First Protocol Article 1 allows for the peaceful enjoyment of possessions. These have to be balanced against the rights and freedoms of others and the orderly development of the Country in the interests of the Community. First Protocol Article 1 requires that the desires of landowners must be balanced against the impact on residents. The potential for cumulative impacts arising from the proposed development upon the local area, including residents and all users of the highway and public rights of way network, is a key factor.</p>
7.22	<p>In order to operate, the proposed poultry units require an Environmental Permit as regulated by the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations (EPR) 2016. The Environment Agency has issued an Environmental Permit for the existing development and a variation to that permit to allow for the operation of the proposed units is presently being considered by The Environment Agency. The Permit would consider emissions to water, air and land including odour, noise, bio-aerosols and dust and relate to emissions that are generated from within the installation boundary.</p>
7.23	<p>The application is accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment in support of the application and the local authority is duty bound to robustly consider the applicant's submission which includes an assessment of odour, noise and dust arising from the proposal. The planning and permitting processes are separate from each other and are properly operated independently of each other. The permitting regime is concerned with the operation of facilities; the planning system looks at whether a proposed facility is acceptable in land use planning terms, including whether there are acceptable impacts, in planning terms, on the living conditions of the local community.</p>
7.24	<p>It is acknowledged that the existing poultry unit operating at the site has been subject to adverse impacts to nearby residents. The Environment Agency are aware of these matters and public concerns and as the permitting authority are responsible for ensuring the development operates in accordance with the permit. The previous application for 2 additional units at the site, was withdrawn following concerns raised and to allow the applicant to consider measures to minimise any adverse effects of the development. This has resulted in the submission of the current application which incorporates 'air scrubbers' to the buildings (which are not present at the existing sheds at the site) in order to reduce impacts of dust and odour.</p>
7.25	<p>There have been a number of objections to the proposal including on the grounds of odour, air quality emissions and noise. The application site is in a rural location and there are number of residential dwellings and commercial properties in the area surrounding the site of the proposed poultry units. The closest residences area at: Upper Hyde, approximately 310 metres to the north-north-east; Overton Cottage, approximately 300 metres to the west; Overton Farm, approximately 370 metres to the west-north-west, Woodcroft Cottage, approximately 450 metres to the north-west, Hill View, approximately 300 metres to the south-east; Parva Dene, approximately 340 metres to the south-east; Dorothy Cottage, approximately 300 metres to the south-east; Haze Field, approximately 410 metres to the south-east and School House and School Cottage which are approximately 490 metres to the south-east. There is also a new residential development to the south of the site which is approximately 500 metres from the proposed units.</p>
7.26	<p>The application is further supported by ammonia dispersion modelling, odour dispersion modelling, and noise impact assessment, in addition to an assessment of the cumulative effects of the development.</p>

7.27	These details have been assessed by the Council's Environmental Health adviser who has raised no objections to the development, setting out that the submitted odour assessment is satisfactory in terms of the methodology used and the conclusions reached. The assessment predicts that the cumulative odour concentrations (existing plus the proposed additional poultry houses) at the nearest sensitive receptor(s) would be below the Environment Agency 's (EA) benchmark for moderately offensive odours.
7.28	However, this does not mean that during some periods odour concentrations would not exceed these levels. The control of odour from the site would be a condition of the EA site permit requiring the operator to apply Best Available Techniques (BAT) to control odour emissions.
7.29	The officer has discussed the current odour complaint situation with the EA and they have advised that the current odour levels impacting local residents are not at a level at which they would consider requiring additional odour mitigation measures to be employed for the existing poultry houses though this would be subject to review.
7.30	Furthermore, it is considered that the inclusion of the air scrubber units for the additional poultry houses will reduce odour from these buildings though the overall odour emissions from the site will increase. However the submitted odour assessment predicts 'acceptable' odour concentrations at the nearest sensitive receptors and on this basis a refusal of planning permission could not be sustained.
7.31	In terms of noise, the submitted assessment is considered to be satisfactory in terms of the methodology used and the conclusions reached. The assessment predicts that the cumulative noise levels (existing plus the proposed poultry houses) should not, considering the context of the various noise sources, adversely impact the nearest noise sensitive receptors. Additionally the control of noise from the site would be a condition of the EA site permit requiring the operator to apply Best Available Techniques (BAT) to control noise emissions.
7.32	The proposal would result in some increase in emissions and this weighs against the proposal.
	<i>Drainage and flood risk</i>
7.33	Policy INF2 of the JCS seeks to prevent development that would be at risk of flooding. Proposals must avoid areas at risk of flooding and must not increase the level of risk to the safety of occupiers of a site and that the risk of flooding should be minimised by providing resilience and taking into account climate change. For sites of strategic scale, the cumulative impact of the proposed development on flood risk in relation to existing settlements, communities or allocated sites must be assessed and effectively mitigated. It also requires new development to incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) where appropriate to manage surface water drainage. This is reflected in Policy ENV2 of the TBP.
7.34	The application sets out how surface water would be captured in the existing attenuation basin at the site which would allow for a controlled discharge to the adjacent watercourse, the details of which were approved as part of the existing development at the site. The drainage proposals have been assessed by the Lead Local Flood Authority who have raised no objections to the proposal.

7.35	In terms of wastewater the submitted details set out that this would be captured and stored on site in tanks which would be pumped out as required.
7.36	The proposal would not result in an increased risk of flooding within the site or elsewhere and proposed measures would prevent contamination of waters. Accordingly this would be a neutral matter in the planning balance.
	<i>Biodiversity</i>
7.37	The NPPF sets out, inter alia, that when determining planning applications, Local Planning Authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by encouraging opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments, especially where this can secure measurable gains for biodiversity. Policy SD9 of the JCS seeks to protect and, wherever possible enhance biodiversity, including wildlife and habitats. Policy NAT1 of the TBP states that development proposals that will conserve, and where possible restore and/or enhance, biodiversity will be permitted.
7.38	The application has been accompanied by a preliminary ecological assessment and the Environmental Statement also provides a phase 1 habitat survey which assesses impacts of then development on Special Areas of Conservation, Sites of Special Scientific interest, ancient woodland and local wildlife sites in the wider area. The report advises that the ammonia emission rates and nitrogen deposition rates would not exceed Environment Agency Lower threshold percentages of receptors located at wildlife sites or exceed natural England's advisory criteria for statutory designated sites.
7.39	The submitted details have been reviewed by Natural England who advise that the submitted details demonstrate that the development will not have likely significant effects on the Walmore Common Special Protection Area and would not damage or destroy the interest features of numerous Local Sites of Special Scientific Interest. Accordingly the proposal will have a neutral effect in ecology and biodiversity.
	<i>Heritage assets</i>
7.40	The Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special consideration to be given to the desirability of protecting and enhancing the setting of listed buildings. The NPPF sets out that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting.
7.41	There are no designated heritage assets within the site. However there are a number of assets in the wider area including the Grade II* St Giles Church and Grade II* Maisemore Court Farm which lie approximately 750 metres to the south. The tower of the church can be seen from higher parts of the site field, but the proposal would lie on lower ground, and be nestled into the landscape.
7.42	The Council's Conservation Officer has been advised that he is satisfied that the development would not impact the setting of heritage assets therefore considered that the development would not harm the setting of the listed buildings and this is neutral factor in the overall planning balance.

	<i>Transport</i>
7.43	Policy INF1 of the JCS requires developers to provide safe and accessible connections to the transport network and all proposals should provide for safe and efficient access to the highway network.
7.44	The proposed development would be accessed via the existing site access located to the southwest of the existing development. The County Highways officer has reviewed the proposal and while the extension to the site would result in an increase in vehicular movements either end of the 'flock cycle', the officer is satisfied that this would not have a severe impact on the operation of the highway network and would not give rise to highway safety issues.
8.0	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION
	<i>Benefits</i>
8.1	The NPPF is supportive of development which promotes a strong rural economy and encourages policies which support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, and which promote the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural business. The supporting information submitted with the application sets out the need for a poultry enterprises to meet national need. Although the proposal would not directly employ a large number of people, it would undoubtedly provide economic benefits to the area and the UK economy through the wider food processing chain. This lends weight in favour of the social and economic dimensions of sustainability as defined in the NPPF.
	<i>Harms</i>
8.2	<p>There would be some harm to the landscape arising from the proposal and this is a factor that weighs against the proposal in the overall planning balance, but the landscape impact is tempered by the design approach, landscape mitigation and by virtue that the application site is not identified as a 'valued' landscape in the development plan.</p> <p>There is the potential for loss of amenity at residential receptors as a result of on-site and off-site operations. This is a matter which weighs against the proposal. However, it is considered that this would be mitigated to an acceptable impact through the inclusion of air scrubbers to the buildings and the Environmental Permitting Regime and the imposition of planning conditions.</p>
8.3	<p>There would also be a detrimental impact on peace, tranquillity and amenity including through odour, noise and dust for users of parts of the PROW network. This is a matter which weighs against the proposal. However, it is considered that the extent of the cumulative impact would be minimal within the overall context of the PROW network in the vicinity of the application site and the environmental impact will be mitigated to an acceptable impact through the Environmental Permitting Regime and conditions.</p> <p>The perception from within the community of the impact of the use on local amenity as a consequence of the environmental effects of the development (either alone or in combination) is also a consideration which weighs against the development in the planning balance.</p>

	<i>Neutral</i>
8.4	There would be no undue impact in terms of the heritage assets, local highway network, ecology, archaeology and flooding.
	<i>Overall conclusion</i>
8.5	Overall, it is concluded that the proposed development is generally supported in principle by the NPPF and local plan policies. Whilst the site is not adjacent to a settlement it is however locate adjacent to existing buildings and existing field boundaries. Whilst there would be some impacts on the area as identified above, it is considered that the economic benefits of the proposal outweigh the harm in this case. It is therefore recommended that this application is PERMITTED subject to the following conditions.

CONDITIONS:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

- Elevation and Plan A1
- Ste Plan A1
- Existing and proposed Site Sections
- Location Plan

Reason: To define the terms of this permission.

3. The materials to be used on the external fabric of the buildings shall match the existing buildings in terms of material, profile and colour and shall eb similarly maintained thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of the visual amenity of the area.

4. The finished floor levels and finished ground levels after the completion of the development shall accord with the approved details on drawings nos.

Reason: In the interest of the visual amenity of the area.

5. No above ground development shall take place until precise details of the landscaping to development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Landscaping shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details no later than the first planting season following the completion of the development. The landscaping shall thereafter be maintained for a period of 5 years. If during this time any trees, shrubs or other plants are removed, die, or are seriously diseased these shall be replaced during the next planting season with others of similar size and species unless the local planning authority gives written consent to any variation. If any plants fail more than once they shall continue to be replaced on an annual basis until the end of the 5 year maintenance period.

Reason: Interest of the visual amenity of the area.

6. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the 'air scrubber' units have been installed and be fully operational. The scrubber units shall thereafter be operated and maintained in accordance with manufacturers specifications for the duration of the use.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

7. Except for the purpose of bird collection, no lorry movements to or from the site are permitted outside the period 07.00 to 19.00 on Mondays to Saturdays and no movements on Sundays.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

8. No external lighting shall be installed unless it is in accordance with details which have previously been submitted to and agreed in lighting by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include location, height, direction of light sources and intensity of illumination. Any lighting which is so installed shall not thereafter be altered without the prior consent in writing of the Local Planning Authority other than for routine maintenance which does not change its details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and biodiversity.

INFORMATIVES:

1. In accordance with the requirements of the NPPF the Local Planning Authority has sought to determine the application in a positive and proactive manner by offering pre-application advice, publishing guidance to assist the applicant, and publishing the to the Council's website relevant information received during the consideration of the application thus enabling the applicant to be kept informed as to how the case was proceeding.