



















## Heritage

The submitted report in the ES on heritage assets establishes that there is potential for archaeological remains from agricultural activity from the post-medieval period to the 19th century, and a moderate potential for agricultural remains from Saxon and Medieval periods. A later kiln and brickfield are also identified on early mapping. The report does however note that it would be difficult to establish how much the construction of the war time airfield may have truncated any of these remains.

Furthermore, the foundations of the proposed buildings would have the potential to impact on any subsurface remains but they would be shallow and the likelihood for significant unrecorded archaeological features to be impacted is considered to be low. The report concludes that the need for, scale, scope and nature of any further archaeological work should be agreed with the Principal Archaeologist for Staffordshire.

The study also identified 2 grade II\* listed buildings and 11 grade II listed buildings within it terms of reference but none within the application site area. The nearest grade II\* listed building is St Chad`s Church at Seighford which is about 900m to the east of the site. The nearest grade II listed buildings are Seighford Hall which is about 480m north-west of the application site, and Clanford Hall which is about 575m to the south. There are also no visible remains of the former WWII airfield within the application site.

### Officer assessment

The Conservation Officer notes that the Historic Environment Record flags the site as part of the former Seighford Hall landscaped park. However, she does not consider that the development would have an impact on any designated heritage asset as, with the military airfield construction, archaeological evidence of this part of the landscaped park was most likely lost. She therefore raises no objection in historic building terms in relation to the settings of the listed buildings. Historic England also raise no objections.

The County Council Principle Archaeologist has not commented on the application. Paragraph 189 of the NPPF does however state that where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment, (which has been submitted) and, where necessary, a field evaluation. Paragraph 199 also states that local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible.

It is therefore considered that a condition requiring further archaeological field investigation and evaluation should be added to a planning permission.

On this basis, there would be no apparent harm to the listed buildings or their settings, and any impact on archaeological remains can be suitably assessed and managed.

## Policies and Guidance:-

National Planning Policy Framework  
Paragraphs 189, 190, 193, 194, 197, 199.

The Plan for Stafford Borough  
Policy N8 Landscape Character  
Policy N9 Historic Environment

## Ecology

A Phase 1 Ecological Habitat Assessment has been submitted as part of the ES. The Assessment confirms that there are no obvious adverse ecological indicators to the proposed development. The site is not within any designated area, and the habitats present are predominantly arable fields, improved grassland and species poor hedgerows. Nothing was found on the site that would be impacted by the proposed development owing to spatial separation, the limited quantum of development, and with no proposed impacts on nearby special sites in terms of visitor pressures.

The submitted air quality assessment also concludes that:

*“the predicted contribution from the development to ammonia concentrations and nitrogen and acid deposition was below the relevant criteria at all ecological receptor locations [which includes Cannock Chase SAC]...resultant impacts were classified as not significant in accordance to stated criteria”*

The application site falls below the designated site selection and is thus not important at a local or national level for birds.

It is concluded that the arable and pasture land is of low ecological value and the development is assessed as being of low impact. Providing the reasonable mitigation measures are followed, it is not anticipated that there would be any impact on protected species that may be present within the wider landscape. No further surveys are required but, as a precautionary approach, a pre-commencement site walk over should be undertaken to minimise any potential risk for ground nesting birds if development commences during the breeding bird season.

Measures to mitigate for impacts are as follows:-

- Mitigation for skylark and yellow wagtail will be implemented onsite. This would involve:-
  - a) Retention of a section of field for ground nesting skylark, yellow wagtail and meadow pipit;
  - b) Infill planting of hedgerow gap using mixed native species including fruit trees to provide a seasonal resource for both resident and migrant birds, particularly thrushes (redwing, fieldfare, song thrush, mistle thrush); and
  - c) Management of any new hedgerows must be favourable to birds and in particular the song thrush as this species was observed nesting within the application site. Management must follow guidance given by the RSPB. Hedgerows must be

managed only during January or February, after the berry crop has been eaten; trimmed only once every 2-3 years; trimmed on a rotation of one side only per cut; and management techniques used that maintain a thick base to the hedgerow.

- d) To offset the impacts on skylark, mitigation for loss of habitat should be sought, and this could include 'skylark plots' and weedy areas for overwintering species; a compensatory scheme of habitat management could be secured via a planning condition.
- Construction activities including ground clearance will be undertaken outside of the breeding season for ground nesting birds;
  - Infill planting to the existing hedgerow with native species;
  - Wildflower margins could be incorporated within the boundaries of the field; and
  - A log pile could be created along the boundary.

The Assessment concludes that along with recommendations for enhancement of the site's ecological value by planting up the hedgerows with native species, implementing the recommendations would ensure that there are no significant impacts upon protected species and that the proposals will be in conformity with relevant legislation and policy and involve some biodiversity enhancements.

#### Officer assessment

Paragraph 170 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- 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); ...
- d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, ...
- e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality...

Paragraph 175 states that, when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:

- a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused; and
- b) development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in combination with other developments), should not normally be permitted...

SP7 of PfSB states that development in the countryside will only be supported where, among others:-

- iii) It does not conflict with the environmental protection and nature conservation policies of the Plan; and

iv) Provision is made for any necessary mitigating or compensatory measures to address any harmful implications.

Policy N4 requires that the Borough's natural environment will be protected and improved and biodiversity will be enhanced.

Policy N5 in relation to European, National and Local Nature Conservation Importance and Policy N6 Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation set criteria for development that may affect these designations. Generally, the special sites should not be harmed. However, if the harm is minor and can be mitigated, development can be acceptable.

The application site is within the Impact Risk Zone of the Doxey Marshes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) 2km to the east and the 15 km zone of influence of the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation (SAC) about 11km to the south-east. Cannock Chase, Milford Quarry and Aqualate Mere SSSI's are also relevant. However, no adverse impacts are identified and Natural England is not raising any objections to the findings of the submitted studies.

The Biodiversity Officer is also satisfied with the scope of the ecological report and its recommendations. He highlights the need to design external lighting to avoid light spill affecting bats; to erect bird nesting boxes; and specific management requirements for the habitats identified in the ES. These would be incorporated into conditions. However, his request for a condition to clarify construction methods within the bird nesting season is considered to be suitably covered by other, wildlife legislation.

The submitted Air Quality Assessment is of particular relevance to the above SAC. There are errors and omissions but despite these, sufficient information has been provided by the applicant and obtained from other sources to determine that the development proposed is very unlikely to cause harm to Cannock Chase SAC due to increased atmospheric deposition of either nitrogen dioxide or ammonia. The Cannock Chase SAC Project Officer and Natural England concur with this conclusion. Natural England also concurs with Stafford Borough Council's Appropriate Assessment under the Habitat Regulations that there would be no likely significant impact on the SAC from the sources described in the application.

The main ecological report recommends that exterior artificial lighting is avoided within the proposed development to avoid disturbing bats which forage and navigate over the hedges of the site. However, if lighting is essential it should be on timers that reduce periods that light is emitted. Light spill should be minimised and lights not be directed onto boundary vegetation or ditches. LED-type lighting with no UV component should be installed, and with a low lux level to reduce light pollution. A condition on a planning permission would secure the appropriate details.

The overall conclusion of the submission is that there would be low ecological impact on the site to which relevant technical consultees agree. Nevertheless, other conditions would secure proportionate mitigation for this impact in the form of an Ecological Management Plan for the site; appropriate landscaping; and the implementation of the biodiversity enhancement measures and recommendations in the ES. It is therefore considered that there would be no conflict with paragraphs 170 and 175 of the NPPF, nor with SP7 and policies N4 and N5 of PfSB.

## Policies and Guidance:-

National Planning Policy Framework  
Paragraphs 170, 175

The Plan for Stafford Borough  
SP7 Supporting the Location of New Development  
Policy N4 The Natural Environment and Green Infrastructure  
Policy N5 Sites of European, National and Local Nature Conservation Importance

## Drainage

The ES includes a Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Management Strategy to control surface water flows. The latter would use sustainable drainage systems (SuDS). The proposed development would have a total of 7,582 sq m of impermeable surface areas but the site lies within Flood Zone 1, the zone of least flood risk, and it would be at low risk of flooding from all sources. However, infiltration testing has been carried out and results confirmed that soils were poorly permeable. A surface water management plan based around an attenuation basin located at the south end of the building with flow control and discharge to an existing drain has therefore been designed. Results showed that the attenuation system would be capable of managing runoff from the whole impermeable area.

## Officer Assessment

Paragraph 163 of the NPPF states that when determining any planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Where appropriate, applications should be supported by a site-specific flood-risk assessment. Development should only be allowed in areas at risk of flooding where, in the light of this assessment ...it can be demonstrated that:

- a) within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location;
- b) the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient;
- c) it incorporates sustainable drainage systems, unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate;
- d) any residual risk can be safely managed; and
- e) safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate, as part of an agreed emergency plan.

Criteria a) to d) above have been met with the submission of the drainage information.

Policy N2 of PfSB states that all new development will be expected to incorporate sustainable drainage systems as in this case. The systems should:

1. Discharge clean roof water to ground via infiltration techniques such as soakaways, unless demonstrated by an infiltration test that, due to ground conditions or underlying contamination, this is not possible;
2. Limit surface water discharge to the greenfield run-off rate...
3. Improve the water quality of run-off by ensuring that foul and surface water run-off are separated;

4. Protect and enhance wildlife habitats, existing open spaces/playing fields, heritage assets, amenity and landscape value of the site, as well as being sympathetically designed to meet the needs of the local community, based on the scale and location of the new development.

All of the above would be achieved on the site with the addition of braked outflow rates below the greenfield runoff rates. The Lead Local Flood Authority is satisfied with the drainage strategy subject to approving details of the surface drainage system. This would be secured by a condition on a planning permission. It is not therefore considered that there would be significant risks from flooding.

Policies and Guidance:-

National Planning Policy Framework  
Paragraph 163

The Plan for Stafford Borough  
Policy N2 Climate Change

### **Public amenity and potential nuisance**

#### Odour management

The ES explains that the design of the unit incorporates tiered perches over manure belts. The manure belts are cleaned twice per week to prevent build up of manure within the building and the twice weekly removal of manure from the site ensures that there is no volume of manure onsite which could create an odour. This is standard practice on most large scale units across the UK.

The ES further states that impacts at sensitive receptors were quantified and the results compared with environmental quality standards and against Environment Agency (EA) criteria. Predicted annual mean ammonia deposition indicators, and annual acid and nitrogen deposition indicators were below the EA criteria at receptors. As such, predicted impacts are considered to be not significant.

#### Noise management

A survey in the ES was conducted to determine the typical background noise levels at the nearest noise sensitive receptors. The extractor fan, transport activities (loading/unloading & feed delivery) and internal noise breakout (livestock, conveyor belt & jet washer cleaning) as a result of the proposed development was assessed.

A summary of the results is provided below:

i. Extractor fans:

With gable end and roof fans operating: marginal

With just roof fans operating: negligible

ii. Transport activities:

HGVs loading/unloading within the concrete aprons: low

Feed silos being filled: low

iii. Noise breakout:

Shed cleaning (jet wash): very low

Livestock/conveyor belts: negligible

The marginal noise impact of all the gable end and roof extractor fans operating would occur infrequently as they would only be required during periods of very hot weather. The absolute noise levels also would not be high, being below the ambient noise environment and equal to the typical background noise level.

The absolute extractor fan and livestock noise levels have been assessed in accordance with the guidance given in BS4142. At the nearest dwellings, the noise ingress via an open window during the night for both the extractor fans and livestock would be inaudible, whilst at the nearby public right of way, the resultant noise emissions would be significantly below the existing background noise environment. It is therefore concluded that during the night the extractor fan would result in a negligible noise impact.

The calculated 1 hour ambient noise emissions of HGVs travelling along the access road would be significantly below the existing environmental ambient and background noise levels during the day. The report concludes that their noise impact would be very low. Overall, the report concludes that the proposed development would not result in an adverse noise impact at the nearest noise sensitive receptors.

Site waste management

In terms of disease precautions the ES states that storage and spreading manure on the proposed site would be prohibited. Manure will be removed from the building twice weekly and taken from the site to be spread on arable land elsewhere in the Staffordshire area. The trailers will be sheeted when the manure is removed from the site and all farms accepting the manure will be third parties.

i) Flies

Where manure belts are used and as the manure is removed from the site, there is no potential for fly breeding to take place. Similarly, as dead birds will be frozen before removal no flies/larvae will be created.

ii) Rodents

From an animal welfare perspective the units will be professionally bated and regularly inspected. Rodent manure can taint eggs and lead to a rejection of them at the retail level. This is therefore an aspect that is as important to the farming operation as it is to the local area.

iii) Foxes and other wildlife

The poultry would be secured in the poultry units at night which prevents problems with foxes, badgers, feral cats, etc.

iv) Fallen stock

Dead birds will be collected daily, stored in a freezer and then disposed of through a licenced fallen stock contractor. This is a Regulation for all fallen stock and is good practice.

## Officer assessment

Paragraph 170 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by (e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality...

Paragraph 180 states that planning policies and decisions should also 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 impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should:

- a) mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life; and
- c) limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.

SP7 of PfSB states that development in the countryside will only be supported where, among others:-

- iii) It does not conflict with the environmental protection ...policies of the Plan; and
- iv) Provision is made for any necessary mitigating or compensatory measures to address any harmful implications.

Policy N1 (e) of PfSB states that to secure enhancements to design quality, development must, at a minimum, meet the following principles:

- Require the design and layout to take account of noise and light implications, together with the amenity of adjacent residential areas or operations of existing activities.

In terms of amenity, there are no residential properties within 450m of the site of the proposed buildings. The Environmental Health Officer considers that the egg production unit should operate satisfactorily, including with regard to noise, if this is in accordance with the Environment Agency permit it has received and the provisions of the ES. The Environmental Health Officer also seeks conditions to restrict hours of construction and related deliveries, burning during construction and to secure the damping down of dust, which would also be added to a planning permission. The Environmental Health Officer does however make no observations on odour management specifically as this would be controlled in the Environment Agency permit.

No details of external lighting have been submitted with the application but the ecological sensitivity of the site to artificial lighting with the presence of foraging bats has already been noted above and a planning condition is proposed. The reason for it would be extended to cover amenity.

It is therefore considered that any impact on amenity would be minimal and that there would be no conflict with the above planning policies with the safeguards highlighted above.



## Policies and Guidance:-

National Planning Policy Framework  
Paragraphs 170, 180

The Plan for Stafford Borough  
Policy N1 Design

## Transport

The ES includes a Transport Assessment which points out that the access to Clanford Road would have good visibility with straight lines of sight and a very wide track lying between the main road and the hedge boundary. The proposals would generate 7 movements (14 one-way movements) per day, 7 days a week; are likely to take place over a 12 hour period per day; and would comprise of HGVs, tractor and trailer and car movements.

Given the nature of the operations, movements are concentrated around a cycle of activities; birds will be delivered during a one week period at the beginning of the cycle and collected during a one week period at the end of the cycle. Manure will be collected twice a week by a tractor and trailer. At the end of the cycle, buildings will be cleaned out ready for the next delivery of birds. These additional movements would have a negligible impact on the local highway network.

The Transport Assessment concludes that it demonstrates that the traffic impacts would be minimal and would not result in material harm to the local highway network in the context of paragraph 109 of the NPPF.

### Officer assessment

Paragraph 109 of the NPPF states that:- Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

Paragraph 108 also states that in assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:

- b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; and
- c) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.

Policy T1 of PFSB states that a sustainable transport system will be achieved through:

- b. Requiring new developments to produce Transport Assessments ... as well as facilitating the provision of safe and well integrated off-street parking;
- c. Working with ... developers to improve road safety;
- d. Encouraging walking and cycling, through links to existing routes, and the provision of facilities such as secure, accessible and sheltered bicycle parking with changing facilities on site...

- g. Seeking to reduce the impact of traffic from new development on the road networks by ensuring that the generation of traffic is minimised through sustainable transport measures. Ensuring that all developments that generate significant traffic flows, including commercial traffic must be located in close proximity to the primary road network, do not have a negative impact on the network or at junctions, air quality, and nearby communities, and should have adequate capacity to accommodate the development or can be improved or mitigated as part of the development;
- h. Proposals that generate significant levels of traffic, which cannot be accommodated in terms of capacity, road safety and load, will not be permitted.

Policy T2 states that to ensure adequate parking is provided all new development must:

- “a. Have safe and adequate means of access, egress and internal circulation / turning arrangements for all modes of transport relevant to the proposal;*
- b. Not materially impair highway safety or traffic movement;*
- c. Not detract or conflict with the transport function of the road;*
- d. Make provision for parking in accordance with the parking standards as set out in Appendix B.”*

It is clear that the Highway Authority concurs with the conclusion of the Transport Assessment that the traffic impact would be minimal and finds no conflict with the above policies given that it raises no objection subject to conditions.

Appendix B of PfSB does not have a specific parking standard for this type of development, but the Transport Assessment includes a plan showing an area of 294 square metres of hardstanding for vehicle parking and turning to which the Highway Authority also has not objected.

It is therefore considered that there would not be a significant impact on the highway network and highway safety would not be prejudiced with the inclusion of the highway conditions on a planning permission.

Policies and Guidance:-

National Planning Policy Framework  
Paragraphs 108 and 109.

Plan for Stafford Borough  
Policy T1 Transport;  
Policy T2 Parking and Manoeuvring Requirements

### **3. Integrated conclusion and the planning balance**

Steps (c) (integrate that conclusion into the decision as to whether planning permission... is to be granted) and (d) (if planning permission ... is to be granted, consider whether it is appropriate to impose monitoring measures) of Regulation 26(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 are carried out below:-

In terms of step (c) the proposed buildings would be long but relatively low structures visible in the landscape, and the four feed silos would appear as utilitarian but not unusual features on farmland, as would the concrete hardstanding and access track. The site and surrounding area has no special landscape designation and large buildings are already locally present at the Ladfordfields industrial estate to the north.

The proposals would also not have a significant impact on heritage interests, subject to further archaeological investigation, and would have a low ecological impact subject to mitigation measures being implemented. Flood risk would be minimised by an on-site sustainable drainage system. The means to suitably manage and control noise, odours and other potential public nuisance to render adverse impact on amenity a low probability have been provided. Transport impacts have also been found to be not prejudicial to the local road network or to highway safety.

Given the social and economic benefits that would accrue from the proposals in terms of rural business development; the creation of rural employment; and the biodiversity enhancements, it is not considered that the impact of the buildings on the landscape would be sufficiently harmful in the visual context of the site and its surroundings to warrant refusal of planning permission providing that the proposed mitigation measures are carried out and maintained. Planning permission should therefore be granted subject to the conditions outlined above.

Regarding step (d) it is not considered that there are any processes or uses involved in the development that would require further monitoring beyond that in relation to the compliance with planning conditions on a planning permission.

## **Consultations**

### **Highway Authority:**

No objection subject to conditions to secure the construction and surfacing of the access, parking, servicing and turning areas, and the construction of the visibility splays shown on the plans.

### **Environment Agency:**

18 December 2019:

No objections. The proposed activities will require a permit and any pollution prevention measures would be enforced via this permit.

26 September 2019.

No reply received.

### **Natural England:**

1 January 2020:

Natural England notes that your authority, as competent authority, has undertaken a HRA Screening Assessment. Your authority has concluded that there would be no likely significant impact on the SAC from the sources described by the applicant. Having considered the assessment Natural England advises that we concur with the assessment conclusions.

13 December 2019:

No objection. Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on designated sites:

- Cannock Chase SAC & SSSI
- Doxey and Tillington Marshes SSSI
- Aqualate Mere SSSI
- Baswich Meadows SSSI
- Cop Mere SSSI

#### European sites – Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation

No objection - In considering the European site interest, Natural England advises that you, as a competent authority under the provisions of the Habitats Regulations, should have regard for any potential impacts that a plan or project may have. The Conservation objectives for each European site explain how the site should be restored and/or maintained and may be helpful in assessing what, if any, potential impacts a plan or project may have.

The consultation documents provided by your authority do not include information to demonstrate that the requirements of Regulations 63 and 64 of the Habitats Regulations have been considered by your authority, i.e. the consultation does not include a Habitats Regulations Assessment.

In advising your authority on the requirements relating to Habitats Regulations Assessment, it is Natural England's advice that the proposal is not necessary for the management of the European site. On the basis of the information provided, in order to assist your authority in screening for the likelihood of significant effects, it is Natural England's advice that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on any European site, and can therefore be screened out from any requirement for further assessment. It is recommended that the following information is used to record your conclusions with regard to the likelihood of significant effects:

As indicated in the Ecological Air Quality Assessment dated 15 April 2019 the process contribution (PC) for all pollutants at all sites will be <4% of the relevant critical level or load for the most sensitive habitat at each site.

#### Cannock Chase, Doxey and Tillington Marshes, Aqualate Mere, Baswich Meadows and Cop Mere Sites of Special Scientific Interest

Based on the Ecological Air Quality Assessment submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not damage or destroy the interest features for which the site has been notified and has no objection.

26 September 2019.

No reply received

#### **Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation Project Officer:**

The application will not have a negative impact on the Cannock Chase SAC

**Lead Local Flood Authority:**

23 October 2019:

We are now satisfied with the principles of the proposed surface water drainage strategy, including the runoff rates and attenuation volumes specified in the latest report. In addition, we are satisfied with the principles of the point of discharge, although it will still need to be demonstrated that the watercourse has the capacity to accept the proposed discharge.

We will want to see the full details of the proposed surface water drainage scheme prior to work commencing on site, and therefore we recommend that a condition is attached to a planning permission.

**Environmental Health Officer:**

I have concerns relating to noise and odour adversely affecting nearby residents; however, I note that the development has received a permit from the Environment Agency and that the receipt of this permit implies best practise will be employed by the operator covering these issues.

Therefore I have no objection subject to conditions to restrict the hours of construction work, prohibit burning during construction, and to secure the damping down of dust and road sweeping during construction.

In order to protect the local amenity the development shall be operated in accordance with the recommendations/requirements contained within the following documents:

- Environment Agency Permit 'Seighford Airfield Poultry Unit' Permit Number EPR/LP3233JN,
- Environmental Statement for Seighford Settled Estate' – dated July 2019

**Conservation Officer:**

The site was used during World War II as part of a military airfield, although much of it has now since returned to agricultural land with the exception of the runway to the south of the site which is now used as a Drive Me driving experience centre. The site is identified in the Historic Environment Record for its former use as a WWII airfield and also as part of the former Seighford Hall Landscape Park. The site is not within a designated conservation area and the nearest listed building is Seighford Hall approximately 650m to the North West of the application site.

The proposed free range egg production unit and its associated infrastructure would not have any impact on any designated heritage assets. With the site being historically used as a military airfield - a former brownfield site, any archaeological evidence of this part of the Seighford Landscape Park was most likely lost during the Second World War. As such there is no conservation objection to the proposed development.

**Historic England:**

11 December 2019:

No comment response

12 September 2019:

No comment response

**Design Advisor:**

26 September 2019:  
No reply received.

**Tree Officer:**

6 January 2020:

Having reviewed the application I can confirm that the development will not result in damage to, or the loss of, any tree of significant value.

The trees which will be effected by the visibility splay requirement are not high amenity specimens and do not warrant consideration as a material constraint to development.

Therefore I have no objections, nor any requirement for tree related conditions.

Surgery 25 September 2019.  
No objection.

**Biodiversity Officer:**

2 January 2020:

The surveys did not find evidence of European Protected Species but does make general recommendations for precautionary measures and habitat mitigation.

**Bats**

External lighting designed to avoid light spill on bat boxes and commuting areas.

**Nesting birds**

All wild birds, their nests and eggs are protected under Section 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. This means that works should not be undertaken in the nesting season (March to August), unless it can be demonstrated by the developer that breeding birds will not be affected. This can be done by requesting a method statement for protection / avoidance of nesting birds as a condition – this may include timing of work, pre-work checks, avoiding nesting areas etc,

4x Schwegler 1B bird boxes should be installed in suitable locations around the site.

**Habitats**

Management of habitats should include the northern hedgerow being gapped up with locally native species of tree. Hedgerows should be managed on a 3 year rotation. Skylark plots should be mown each year along with retention of areas for Yellow wagtail.

The EIA report recommends enhancements for biodiversity to include:

- Wildflower grassland margins around the large field.
- A large log pile for invertebrates should be made on the north western boundary.
- 2x Schwegler 2F bat boxes should be installed in appropriate locations.

A five- year management plan should be submitted to indicate all the habitat creation works above and how the site will be managed to maintain these features.

30 September 2019:

I am satisfied with the findings of the submitted ecology report and its recommendations.

**Rights of Way Officer:**

The application recognises Public Footpath no. 0.1593 Seighford Parish which runs across the application site. The applicant therefore proposes to divert the public footpath to a new route to run adjacent to Clanford Lane.

This proposal will have to be actioned under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, Section 257 and will need to be consulted on in the usual way including Staffordshire County Council.

**Ramblers Association:**

13 December 2019:

The new information does not impact on previous comments.

14 September 2019:

The applicants detail the footpath which runs diagonally across this proposed site and state that it will need to be diverted. However they make no suggestion as to where the proposed new route of the path may be. It is therefore difficult to comment in a meaningful way until this information is available.

**Staffordshire County Council (archaeology; landscape):**

5 October 2019.

No reply received.

**Secretary of State (Planning Casework Unit):**

No comments on environmental statement

**Parish Council:**

10 December 2019:

No objections

13 September 2019:

No reply received.

**Neighbours:**

10 notified; 7 replies/representations received from 6 addresses.

6 object and 1 qualified "no objection". The material issues raised are summarised below:

- Excessive traffic and reduced highway safety
- Noise, dust and odours
- Drainage inadequate
- No screening of the building shown
- Road needs widening
- Tree planting should be provided
- Harm to wildlife

Site Notices:

Expiry dates 13 September 2019

Adverts:

Expiry dates 18 September 2019

## Relevant Planning History

### Part of site and adjacent land

12/17759/EXTF – Extension of time on permission 08/10971/FUL – approved 19 December 2012.

12/17567/FUL – Variation of condition 16 of appeal decision APP/Y3425/C/08/2089858 (application below) to allow retention of portable buildings for a further 3 years – approved 31 July 2013.

08/10971/FUL - Driver experience, training and demonstration centre – not determined – permission granted on appeal 1 December 2009.

## Recommendation

Approve, subject to the following conditions:

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which this permission is granted.
2. The development shall be carried in accordance with the approved plans listed below except as required by other conditions of this consent.

Plan No. 1 - Location Plan  
 Plan No. 2 - Block Plan  
 Seighford Elevations Rev 3  
 Seighford plan (floor plans)  
 Bulk Bin Elevations  
 21001-01 Proposed Site Access

Plan No. 2 - Seighford Poultry Unit - Fencing and the Seighford Poultry Fencing A4 elevation are not approved.

3. No above ground construction works shall commence until samples of the external materials for the walls and roofs of the buildings and details of the finishes to the feed silos have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter, only the approved external materials and finishes shall be used unless alternatives have first been approved in writing by the local planning authority.
4. Notwithstanding any information in the application, the development shall not be brought into use unless and until a detailed landscaping scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.



The landscaping scheme shall be informed by the native deciduous hedge and tree planting proposals and the ecological mitigation measures included in the submitted Environmental Statement; by Plan No.1 - Tree Planting (Appendix 1 of Planning Statement); and by the observations of the Council's Biodiversity Officer, and shall include a schedule of landscape maintenance for a minimum period of 5 years.

Thereafter, the approved scheme shall be carried out within 8 months of the development first being brought into use and it shall be maintained in accordance with the approved schedule.

Any plants or trees that are removed or die or become seriously damaged or diseased within a period of 5 years from the date of planting shall be replaced with others of similar size and species in the next planting season unless the local planning authority gives written consent to any variation.

5. No development shall commence unless and until further archaeological field investigation of the site has been undertaken and an evaluation report of the findings of this investigation and its conclusions on the need for any further archaeological site works or recording has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter, any specified works or recording shall be carried out in accordance with the approved report.
6. No above ground construction shall commence unless and until details of the location, design, light spread and light intensity of any external means of illumination has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter, only the approved means of external illumination shall be constructed. No other external illumination shall be constructed at any time.
7. The development shall not be brought into use unless and until an Ecological Management Plan for the site, which shall be informed by the submitted Environmental Statement and the observations of the Council's Biodiversity Officer and include a programme for its implementation, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter, the development shall only be used in conjunction with the implementation of the approved Ecological Management Plan in accordance with the approved programme.
8. The use of the buildings shall only be carried out in conjunction with the implementation of the recommendations for environmental mitigation in Section 7 of the Ecological Impact Assessment submitted as part of the Environmental Statement.
9. No development shall take place unless and until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed. The scheme to be submitted shall demonstrate:

- Provision of surface water attenuation storage and the restriction of peak discharge in accordance with the principles outlined in the SWMP & FRA report L0225 Rep.1 (Rev.2) October 2019.
  - The unnamed tributary of the Clanford Brook shall be surveyed to assess whether its capacity is sufficient to carry the anticipated flows.  
If the pipe does not have the required capacity, then this will need to be adequately resolved.
  - Detailed design (plans, network details and calculations) in support of any surface water drainage scheme, including details on any attenuation system, and the outfall arrangements. Calculations shall demonstrate the performance of the designed system for a range of return periods and storm durations inclusive of the 1 in 1 year, 1 in 2 year, 1 in 30 year, 1 in 100 year and 1 in 100 year plus climate change return periods.
  - Plans illustrating flooded areas and flow paths in the event of exceedance of the drainage system.
  - Provision of an acceptable management and maintenance plan for surface water drainage to ensure that surface water drainage systems shall be maintained and managed for the lifetime of the development.
10. The use of the development shall only be carried out in compliance with the requirements/recommendations of the 'Environmental Statement for Seighford Settled Estate' - dated July 2019.
  11. All construction works including related deliveries shall only take place between the hours of 8.00 am and 6.00pm Monday to Friday; 8.00am to 2.00pm Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or bank holidays.
  12. There shall be no burning on site during construction works
  13. During construction works facilities shall be provided at the site and used for damping down dust.
  14. During construction works road sweeping shall be carried out, both on the site and on the access highway to prevent dust.
  15. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the access to the site within the limits of the public highway has been completed.
  16. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the access drive rear of the public highway has been surfaced and thereafter maintained in a bound and porous material for a minimum distance of 15m back from the site boundary.
  17. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the access, parking, servicing and turning areas have been provided in accordance with the approved plans.

18. The development shall not be brought into use unless and until the visibility splays shown on plan 21001-01 have been provided. The visibility splays shall thereafter be kept free of all obstructions to visibility over a height of 600 mm above the adjacent carriageway level.
19. Notwithstanding any details in the application, the development shall not be brought into use unless and until details of the location, design and finishes of proposed fencing or other means of enclosure to the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter, the development shall not be brought into use unless and until the approved fencing has been constructed and it shall be retained. No other means of enclosure shall be constructed without the written permission of the local planning authority.

The reasons for the Council's decision to approve the development subject to the above conditions are:

1. To comply with the requirements of Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. To define the permission.
3. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development (Policies N1 g and h of The Plan for Stafford Borough).
4. To safeguard the character and appearance of the area (Policy N1h of The Plan for Stafford Borough).
5. In order to afford proper archaeological investigation recording and protection. (Policy N9 of The Plan for Stafford Borough).
6. To safeguard the character of the area and to support and enhance biodiversity (Policies N1 and N4 of The Plan for Stafford Borough)
7. To enhance biodiversity (Policy N4 of The Plan for Stafford Borough)
8. To enhance biodiversity (Policy N4 of The Plan for Stafford Borough)
9. To minimise flood risk (Policy N2 of The Plan for Stafford Borough)
10. To safeguard the amenities of the area (Policy N1e of The Plan for Stafford Borough).
11. To safeguard the amenities of the area (Policy N1e of The Plan for Stafford Borough).
12. To safeguard the area from fumes, smoke and smells (Policy N1e of The Plan for Stafford Borough).
13. To safeguard the amenities of the area (Policy N1e of The Plan for Stafford Borough).

14. To safeguard the amenities of the area (Policy N1e of The Plan for Stafford Borough).
15. In the interests of the safety and convenience of users of the highway. (Policy T1c of The Plan for Stafford Borough).
16. In the interests of the safety and convenience of users of the highway. (Policy T1c of The Plan for Stafford Borough).
17. In the interests of the safety and convenience of users of the highway. (Policy T1c of The Plan for Stafford Borough).
18. In the interests of the safety and convenience of users of the highway. (Policy T1c of The Plan for Stafford Borough).
19. To safeguard the character and appearance of the area (Policy N1h of The Plan for Stafford Borough).

#### Informative(s)

- 1 The Local Planning Authority consider the proposal to be a sustainable form of development and therefore it complies with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The attention of the applicant is drawn to the observations of the Highway Authority, Natural England, the Council's Biodiversity Officer and the Environment Agency on this application. All comments received can be viewed online through the planning public access pages of the Council's website:  
<http://www.staffordbc.gov.uk/planning-public-access>
- 3 This permission does not grant or imply consent to stop up, obstruct or divert the public right of way that crosses the site.

**19/31030/FUL**  
**Land North Of Seighford Airfield**  
**Clanford Road**  
**Seighford**  
**Stafford**

