



Acorus Addlepool Business Centre Woodbury Road Clyst St George Exeter Devon EX3 ONR DIRECT LINE: 01392 873900



PREPARED BY:

James Whilding

Managing Director

MRICS FBIAC

EMAIL:

planning@acorus.co.uk

1 Introduction

This non-technical summary document has been produced to summarise the issues, mitigation measures and effects relating to the provision of 12no. poultry buildings and associated infrastructure on land at 532615,317390, Grid Ref TF32611738, Pear Tree Hill Road, Whaplode Drove, Spalding.

In terms of effects, these have been graded as follows:

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



2 Brief Description of Unit

The application site is located north of Pear Tree Cottage and south of Jekils Bank and is located within the open countryside but outside of any landscape designation. The site is approximately 2.4 km to the east-south-east of the village of Moulton Chapel in Lincolnshire, at an altitude of around 3 m on level drained fenland.

The site comprises agricultural land extending to an area of 9.2 hectares (circa 23 acres) and is surrounded by other agricultural land.

Planning permission is sought for provision of 12 poultry houses each measuring 80ft x 360ft (28,800sqft or 2,675sqm). The total footprint of the buildings extends to 345,600sqft (32,100sqm). Built to Best Available Technique, the new structures will be fit for purpose and provide 50 years+ of production space. In addition to the growing area, the following will also be provided as part of a future planning application:

- New field access
- Vehicle parking and turning
- Hardstanding for generator
- Substation
- Gas tanks
- Dead bird building
- Attenuation basin as part of SuDS scheme

The proposed housing will comply with Best Available Technique (BAT) as defined in the Intensive Farming BAT conclusion document dated 20/02/2017.

An application for an Environmental Permit is currently with the Environment Agency for consideration.



3 Environmental Impact

The main impacts of the development are as summarised as follows:-

3.1 Farm waste and Clean/Dirty Water

Issue	Mitigation Measures	Effect Assuming Mitigation
Farm waste	Spread on third party land or to	None – All spent litter will be taken from
	AD for green energy.	site by sheeted trailers and is
		transported and spread to third party
		land/AD. Material spread in accordance
		with the NVZ legislation (where
		applicable) and the Code of Good
		Agricultural Practice (COGAP).
		Further mitigation measures not
		required.
Pollution from dirty	Captured and directed into new	<u>Low</u> – To be applied on third party land -
water run off	compliant dirty water tank then	not classified as a waste so no spreading
	removed by registered contractor	restrictions.
	for water treatment.	Further mitigation measures not
		required.
Clean water disposal	Clean runoff from roof and yard	Low - An effective method for clean
	discharged to a new filtration	water disposal is proposed.
	basin.	Further mitigation measures are not
		required.

3.2 **Odours, Dust and Noise**

Issue	Mitigation Measures	Effect Assuming Mitigation
Odour	Proposed buildings constructed	Low - odour exposure would be below
	to highest modern standards and	the Environment Agency's benchmark
	Best Available Techniques (BAT).	for moderately offensive odours at non-
		farm related receptors.
	Good management practices and	
	modern building design (efficient	
	ventilation and insulation) will	
	reduce odour generation.	
Noise	Use of modern ventilation fans	<u>Low</u> - Noise impact of the modern
	which are quiet and offer	extractor fans is much improved.
	increased efficiency.	



	No other specific noise reduction measures except to keep usage to minimum without compromising bird welfare.	Low - Electric forklift to be used on the concrete apron for the movement of stock and the loading/unloading of HGVs. 2m high noise barrier between 5 – 15m south of the poultry units (close-boarded timber fence, masonry wall or earth bund) to block the noise path between the gable end fans and the receptor. Note only seasonal high temperature use of gable fans.
Dust	Use of suitable litter materials and feed delivered in sealed systems, litter will be tipped into trailers from minimal height and trailers will be covered when full. Ventilation systems will ensure good dispersal of air from the houses. Cyclone dust equipment fitted to bin exhaust pipe to collect dust during filling. Minimal dust through high speed ventilation ensures effective dispersal. No other specific dust reduction measures other than observance of BAT.	Low – Dust levels low given BAT and scale of operation. Further mitigation measures are not required.

3.3 **<u>Ecology</u>**

Issue	Mitigation Measures	Effect Assuming Mitigation
Land use/ecology	Observance of recommendations	<u>Low</u> - only minor adverse impact on
	made by specialist wildlife	ecology and biodiversity given arable
	consultants.	use of land.
	Mitigation measures to be	
	implemented before, during and	Some precautionary mitigation only
	after construction.	recommended.
	arter construction.	recommended.
Ammonia	Observance of Best Available	Low/Medium - Based on predicted
	Techniques and implementation	modelling.
	and monitoring of management	
	practices.	



The process contributions will result in a
small exceedance of 1% of the lower
bound of the Critical Load over a small
part of Winmarleigh Moss SSSI, but
otherwise impacts are below necessary
thresholds.

3.4 **Landscape**

Issue	Mitigation Measures	Effect Assuming Mitigation
Visual impact of	Boundary planting and visual	Medium – A change from green field
buildings	barrier elements to minimise the	site to buildings will create a degree of
	potential impact of the built form	harm however the site and its character
	once established.	ids agricultural, as is the proposal. The
		visual effects are assessed as being
	Additional trees and native	subject to a major adverse change (i.e. a
	hedgerow species will be planted	significant change. With mitigation, the
	along the field boundary to	impact will be reduced from all
	strengthen the existing	viewpoints.
	vegetation and create additional	
	green infrastructure features.	

3.5 <u>Historic Environment</u>

Issue	Mitigation Measures	Effect Assuming Mitigation
Impact of new	No listed buildings or heritage	– Overall, the site is considered to be of
buildings and	interests in the immediate vicinity	low historic and archaeological
infrastructure	of the site.	importance.
		Further mitigation measures are not
		required.

3.6 <u>Highways</u>

Issue	Mitigation Measures	Effect Assuming Mitigation
Volume of traffic in	Traffic generated as a result of	Low – HGV movements are very low on
relation to road	the new development.	a daily/weekly basis and depends on the
network		crop stage as to intensity.
		Further mitigation measures are not
		required.



Access point	New access onto public highway	None – New access provides 215m
	which is suitable to meet the type	visibility in either direction to meet
	and number of vehicles.	Manual for Streets, therefore no
		detrimental impact on the operation or
		safety of the highway network.
		Further mitigation measures are not
		required.

3.7 Other Potential Impacts

Issue	Mitigation Measures	Effect Assuming Mitigation
Flooding	Runoff from the development will	<u>Low</u> - development is located within
	be attenuated within an	Flood Zones 1-3 however the South East
	attenuation channel and	Lincolnshire Level 1 and Level 2 Strategic
	discharged at greenfield runoff	Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)
	rates to the watercourse to the	demonstrates the site is not at risk
	north of the site.	during the 1% fluvial or 0.5% tidal event.
		The site therefore has a low probability
		of flooding and is considered to pass the
		Sequential Test.
Flies and Vermin	Manure removed at the end of	<u>Low</u> - Flies are not a problem on a well-
	each crop.	managed site and where manure is
		regularly removed.
	Pest control measures to be	<u>Low</u> - Pests create problems to farming
	implemented using an approved	operations and therefore it is in the
	specialist contractor with weekly	interest of the unit operator to control
	inspections to meet farm	vermin.
	assurance.	
		Further mitigation measures are not
		required.
External lighting	Use of switched low energy	Low – Switched on as appropriate during
external lighting	Use of switched low energy lighting.	the normal operation to provide low
	lighting.	output light sufficient to allow for safe
		access around the vicinity during times of
		poor natural light.
		poor fluturur figite.
		Further mitigation measures are not
		required.



The term 'environmental impact assessment' (EIA) describes a procedure that must be followed for certain types of project before they can be given 'development consent'. The procedure is a means of drawing together, in a systematic way, an assessment of a project's likely significant environmental effects. This helps to ensure that the importance of the predicted effects, and the scope for reducing them, are properly understood by the public and the relevant competent authority before it makes its decision.

From the information appraised through the Environmental Statement and, taking into account the mitigation measures proposed, it is clear from this non-technical summary that the proposed development will have a *LOW/MEDIUM* impact on the environmental features identified. Noting an element of medium impact, there will be an effect to some extent which will impact on the environmental features, however such an impact will not be significant.



