

## Memorandum

<b>From</b>	Fintan Coffey Assistant Planner	<b>To</b>	Nicholas O'Kane Senior Planner <i>LO 3/8/21</i>
-------------	------------------------------------	-----------	---

---

**Date** 20<sup>th</sup> August 2021

**Planning Reg. No:** 21/123  
**Applicant:** Morgan & Kenneth Hall  
**Type of Application:** Permission  
**Development Description:** To construct 1 No. Poultry house (to include meal storage bin(s) and soiled water tank(s)) and all associated site works arising from the above proposed development. An Environmental Impact Assessment Report (E.I.A.R.) will be submitted with this application. This application relates to a development, which is for the purposes of an activity requiring a Licence under part IV of the Environmental Protection Agency (Licensing) Regulations 1994 to 2013.  
**Municipal District:** Bailieborough/Cootehill

### Site location

The application site is situated approximately 3kms north of Bailieborough town centre in the direction of Shercock. The site, which is in the townlands of Corglass and Lisgar, is accessed from the Local Road L3515-0. See location map overleaf.

A yellow site notice was erected on the date of the site inspection, and was clearly visible and legible from the public road.



### **Development Plan**

The proposed site is located in a rural area outside the development envelope of any designated town or village. The following agricultural policy and objectives of the Cavan County Development Plan 2014–2020 therefore apply:

**Policy EDP3:** To promote sustainable agricultural development whilst ensuring that development does not have an undue negative impact on the visual amenity of the countryside.

**Objective EDO1:** To promote the continued development and expansion of the Agri-Food Sector.

**Objective EDO4:** To ensure that all agricultural activities comply with legislation on water quality, such as the Phosphorous Regulations, Water Framework Directive and Nitrates Directive.

**Objective EDO5:** To encourage the development of environmentally sustainable agricultural practices, to ensure that development does not impinge on the visual amenity of the countryside and that watercourses, wildlife habitats and areas of ecological importance are protected from the threat of pollution.

**Objective EDO6:** To recognise and support the role of farmers as custodians of the natural resources of the countryside and of rural landscapes which are valuable to existing and future generations. Ensure that development does not have an undue negative impact on the visual and scenic amenity of the countryside. Protect soil,

groundwater, wildlife habitats, conservation areas, rural amenities and scenic views from adverse environmental impacts as a result of agricultural practices.

**Objective ED07:** To support agricultural development as a contributory means of maintaining the population in the rural area and sustaining the rural economy, whilst maintaining and enhancing the standing of the rural environment and through application of the Water Framework and Habitats Directive.

### Planning History

#### This site:

20/416 - Morgan & Kenneth Hall got permission for 1 no. Poultry house (to include meal storage bin(s) and soiled water tank(s)) and all associated site works (to include new/upgraded site entrance) arising from the above proposed development. This permission was for 39,500 free range broilers, and no EIA was required. Permission was issued with 29 planning conditions. The steel frame for this building has been erected on site.

#### Elsewhere on landholding (outlined in blue):

No planning history.

#### Adjacent areas:

*Residential site c.180 metres W-SW of proposed poultry shed:*

01/563 — Mr Raymond & Kathleen Cadden got permission for dormer house. Built.

#### Pre-application consultation

None.

#### Submissions

None received.

#### Representations

None received.

## Internal Reports

### Environment Section

Report dated 8/4/2021 states:

This application is to construct 1 No. Poultry house (to include meal storage bin(s) and soiled water tank(s)) and all associated site works arising from the above proposed development at Lisgar and Corglass, Bailieborough, Co.Cavan. An Environmental Impact Assessment Report (E.I.A.R.) will be submitted with this application.

This application relates to a development, which is for the purposes of an activity requiring a Licence under part IV of the Environmental Protection Agency (Licensing) Regulations 1994 to 2013

According to the GSI ground water maps for Co. Cavan, the proposed development is located within an area classified as a Poor Aquifer - Bedrock which is generally unproductive except for local zones with extreme vulnerability.

The proposed development is located in the Blackwater (Kells)\_030. This water body currently which is classified as Poor ecological status. This status must achieve a Good Ecological Status in accordance with the requirements of the Water Framework Directive.

It is proposed that the water supply source for the proposed development will be from a new connection to Drumkeery Group Water Scheme. A letter of confirmation has been submitted with application.

The surface water disposal according to the application form will discharge to a watercourse. The point of discharge to the watercourse have been noted on the site layout plan.

It is estimated that there will be approximately 160-200m<sup>3</sup> of soiled water generated per annum. It is proposed that this soiled water will be collected and stored in a



dedicated soiled water tank located at the end of the proposed development, the proposed tank is an underground tank 140m<sup>3</sup> approx. It is proposed that the soiled water is then spread onto a family members land holding, Mr. Neville Hall, which will increase the Mr Neville Hall's Nitrogen loading from the existing 32 Kg/N/Ha to c. 48.5 Kg/N/Ha which is within the statutory 170Kg/N/Ha. Furthermore Mr. Neville Hall also proposes to accommodate an additional 200m<sup>3</sup> from Mr. Kenneth Hall / Mag World Ltd farm at Drumeague thus increasing the Organic N from 48.5Kg/N/Ha to 65Kg/N/Ha which is within the statutory 170 Kg/N/Ha.

An Environmental Impact Assessment Report has been submitted with this application.

This farm currently operates without an EPA Licence as 39,500 broilers is below the threshold for an EPA IED Licence. However, it is proposed to increase the stock numbers to 100,000 Broilers. Therefore, an EPA licence is needed. Having reviewed documentation available on the EPA website relating to this facility I noted as follows:

- On the 12<sup>th</sup> of March 2021 M.A.G World Ltd (Morgan and Kenneth Hall) applied to the EPA for an IPC licence for the farm, which is located at Lisgar and Corglass, Bailieborough, Co. Cavan.
- This EPA Licence Number P1148-01 is still being reviewed by the EPA.

Poultry Manure will be moved off site from the proposed development by existing Registered Contractor McCartney Contractors Ltd. All organic fertiliser exported in line with the requirements of S.I. 605 of 2017, as amended.

A letter has been submitted from College Proteins to show that they will collect Poultry casualties and carcasses from the proposed development, and it also indicates that they collect for Mr. Kenneth Hall as an existing customer.

No letter was submitted from a poultry veterinarian in terms of disease control for the proposed development. However, a letter was previously submitted from a poultry veterinarian in relation to application reference number 20/416. This application was for the poultry house that has already received planning permission at the farm site.

A statement of screening for the Appropriate Assessment (Stage 1) of the Proposed Development at Lagan, Belturbet, Co.Cavan by Noreen McLoughlin Consultant Ecologist in January 2021 was submitted in the documents supplied for Planning Application for the above Agricultural Developments. The report identifies 3 Natura 2000 sites between 15km and 20km away from the proposed development site with the Kilconny Bog SAC being the closest approx. 16.4km away. The report concludes that there are no significant impacts on the Natura 2000 sites.

#### **IE Licensing Requirement**

This class of activity at this location has applied for an IE Licence from the Environmental Protection Agency.

#### **Implications of IE Licensing**

Section 256 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 provides for an amendment to Section 98 of the EPA Act 1992 as follows:

"(1) Notwithstanding section 34 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, or any other provision of that Act, where a licence or revised licence under this Part has been granted or is or will be required in relation to an activity, a planning authority or An Bord Pleanala shall not, where it decides to grant a permission under section 34 of that Act in respect of an development comprising the activity or for the purposes of the activity, subject the permission to conditions which are for the purposes of—

- (a) *controlling emissions from the operation of the activity, including the prevention, limitation, elimination, abatement or reduction of those emissions, or*
- (b) *controlling emissions related to or following the cessation of the operation of the activity.*

(1A) *Where a licence or revised licence under this Part has been granted or is or will be required in relation to an activity, a planning authority or An Bord Pleanala may, in respect of any development comprising the activity or for the purposes of the activity, decide to refuse a grant of permission under section 34 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, where the authority or An Bord Pleanala considers that the*

development, notwithstanding the licensing of the activity under this Part, is unacceptable on environmental grounds, having regard to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area in which the development is or will be situated."

**Section 34 (c) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 states: -**

"(c) Subject to section 98 (as amended by section 256 of this Act) of the Environmental Protection Agency Act, 1992, and section 54 (as amended by section 257 of this Act) of the Waste Management Act, 1996, where an application under this section relates to development which comprises or is for the purposes of an activity for which an integrated pollution control licence or a waste licence is required, a planning authority shall take into consideration that the control of emissions arising from the activity is a function of the Environmental Protection Agency."

**Section 4 of the 1992 Act defines 'environmental pollution' as: -**

**"air pollution for the purposes of the Air Pollution Act, 1987"**

- "the condition of waters after the entry of polluting matter within the meaning of the Local Government (Water Pollution) Act, 1977"
- "the disposal of waste in a manner which would endanger human health or harm the environment and, in particular:
  - create a risk to waters, the atmosphere, land, soil, plants or animals,
  - cause a nuisance through noise or odours, or
  - adversely affect the countryside or places of special interest"
- "noise which is a nuisance or would endanger human health or damage property or harm the environment"

The position is therefore as follows:-

- The planning authority in granting permission for a development requiring a licence from the EPA may not impose conditions in relation to the environmental emissions from this activity.
- The planning authority may decide to refuse a grant of permission in respect of a development requiring a licence from the EPA on the grounds that the development would have a detrimental effect on the surrounding environment.



- The protection of visual amenity, archaeological sites, natural heritage areas and other special protection areas, etc., remain the responsibility of the planning authority in so far as these relate to the actual on-site development (as distinct from the waste disposal operation).
- The planning authority retains responsibility for access, transportation and road safety.

#### **Recommendation**

- Insofar as the Council can make judgement on the environmental issues of the proposed development at this existing IE licensed facility, I recommend unconditionally.
- I recommend that the EPA should be notified regarding the details of this application.

#### **MD Engineer**

No report received. I note the report for the previous permission on the site, 20/416.

For inspection purposes only.  
Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.



## Planning Assessment

### Proposed development

The proposed development, which is for a second poultry house on this site, is to increase the broiler population from 39,500 broilers as approved under 20/416 to a total of 100,000. The first poultry house was permitted under 20/416 and is now under construction. The addition of the second poultry house would bring the site over the mandatory threshold for EIA.

The application also relates to a development which is for the purposes of an activity requiring a licence under Part IV of the Environmental Protection Agency Acts 1994 to 2013.

### Application details:

- Site area 3.19 ha.
- Proposed poultry house No. 2 = 3,290.15 sqm, to allow the site capacity to reach 100,000 broilers non-free range (or 85,000 free range).
- Poultry House No. 1 permitted under planning ref. 20/416 and under construction was permitted on the basis of accommodating 39,500 free range broilers.
- A shared concrete apron with 15 metre HGV turning circle.
- 138.24 cubic metre wastewater tank.
- 2 no. feed silos each 9.1m high.
- Integrated general purpose storage area.

The following are the key points of the permitted and proposed developments on this site:

	Poultry house 1 under construction (Planning Ref. 20/416)	Proposed house 2 (Planning Ref. 21/123)
<b>Broiler capacity</b>	39,500 free range broilers	Poultry houses 1 and 2 to have a maximum collective total of 100,000 broilers non-free range (or

		85,000 free range)
<b>Gross internal floor area (sqm)</b>	3,174.15	3,290.15
<b>External dimensions (mm)</b>	L: 147,041 H: 7,371 W: 23,380	L: 140,641 H: 6,468 W: 23,900
<b>Roof slope (degrees)</b>	21.5	17
<b>2 meal bins</b>	Each 9,100mm high	Each 9,100mm high

#### **Physical context of the site**

The site is on the local road system north of Baileborough and 1.5kms from the R178 Baileborough to Shercock Road. The area is relatively sparsely populated compared to other rural areas of the county and has relatively marginal farming land. The site itself is relatively low-lying, but within the site there are variations in ground levels as shown on the site layout plan. From one end of the proposed shed to the opposite end the ground changes by 4.75 metres. It would not be a prominent site and would only be locally visible.

The site benefits from an existing access onto the L3515-0, close to a junction with a private farm lane. The nearest building line of the proposed shed would be set back 165 metres from the public road. A road has been constructed into the site to facilitate the construction of Poultry House No. 1 which is now under construction (Planning Ref. 20/416).

Previously, this was a greenfield agricultural site situated on a small part of the applicant's landholding at this location (a holding measuring just over 13 hectares and outlined in blue on the submitted site location plan). It was traditionally a bovine farm, which is now diversifying into the poultry sector.

#### **Key operational aspects of the proposed development**

The poultry operation, once developed, would supply Manor Farms based in Shercock (8kms north). The site is conveniently situated a short distance (1.5kms) from the R178 Shercock Road. The site would be serviced by Kolbe Feeds, also based in Shercock.

Similar to 20/416, the proposed development would connect to the Drumkeery Group Water Scheme.

All chicken manure would be exported off the site by McCartney Contractors Ltd., a regulated contractor, in accordance with S.I. 605 of 2017. Supporting documentation is enclosed.

Soiled water would be collected in slurry storage tank before application to applicants' brother's land in accordance with S.I. 605 of 2017. Maps are enclosed in the EIAR of the relevant land parcels for spreading.

Carcasses would be collected by College Proteins, which operates under EPA Licence. A supporting letter is enclosed with the application.

The site would be accessed by an existing field gate onto the L3515-0 and the construction of an internal road of circa 200 metres long permitted under 20/416. Operational traffic to the site would be limited 5.1 deliveries / collections per week.

Surface water is proposed to a local watercourse. MD Engineer previously recommends approval on this site subject to conditions relating to surface water and the access onto the public road. Similarly, the design of the entrance onto the public road in terms of setback, entrance radii and sightlines was resolved in the determination of 20/416. The proposed development would share the same turning circle (15m radius) as approved for Poultry House No. 1.

## Screening for EIA

EIA is required under Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001-2015 where:

### Part 1

17. Installations for the intensive rearing of poultry with more than 85,000 places for broilers or 60,000 places for hens.

### Part 2

1. (e) (i) Installations for intensive rearing of poultry not included in Part 1 of this Schedule which would have more than 40,000 places for poultry.

By definition the proposed development comes within Part 1 of Schedule 5 above, and as it proposes a maximum holding capacity of 100,000 broilers on the site, it exceeds its threshold of 85,000 broilers for mandatory EIA. On this basis, EIA is mandatory, and an EIAR is submitted with this application.

For inspection purposes only.  
Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.



## **Environmental Impact Assessment**

Section 172 of Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended, requires planning authorities to carry out an Environmental Impact Assessment in relevant cases. Section 171A set out in detail, what the assessment must comprise. The assessment must include an examination, analysis and evaluation and it must identify, describe and assess in an appropriate manner, in light of each individual case and in accordance with Articles 4 to 11 of EIA Directive, the direct and indirect effects of a proposed development on the following:

- a) Population and human health
- b) Biodiversity, with particular attention to species and habitats protected under Directive 92/43/EEC and Directive 2009/147/EC
- c) Land, soil, water, air and climate
- d) Materials assets, cultural heritage and the landscape
- e) The interaction between the factors mentioned in points (a) to (d)

## **Summary of submitted EIAR**

### **Identification of the Likely Significant Impacts**

A scoping exercise was carried out in the preparation of the EIAR using current EPA Advice Notes for Preparing Environmental Impact Statements (Draft 2015) which includes specific guidance in relation to poultry operations. Issues surrounding waste handling and odours are identified as the principle causes for concern. A Habitats Directive Screening report has also been submitted with this planning application.

### **Baseline Information**

To assess the direct and indirect significant effects of the proposed development, baseline information has been gathered in the EIAR for the environmental factors required by the EIA Directive. Information from various bodies and organisations was sought in the preparation of the EIAR. 11 information sources are listed. No limitations or deficiencies in the data have been identified, and evidence was also used from the many similar poultry operations in the county.

### **Description of the Effects - definitions**

Section 2.2.2 of the EIAR sets out the definitions of impacts (effects) as contained in the Draft EPA Guidelines 2017. The type, quality, significance, magnitude, probability duration of effects are all categorised and defined as per the Draft EPA Guidelines.

#### Alternative Considerations – Site Selection

The site was selected for a number of reasons:

- Proximity to poultry shed already permitted by 20/416.
- Capacity and physical attributes of the site to accommodate a shed of this size, as required by the poultry industry for size of operation.
- Applicant's other site at Drumeague also has development potential but he also has plans to develop that site.
- Proximity to his other site at Drumeague, yet biosecurity is still retained.
- Distance from sensitive receptors.
- Availability of access onto public road.
- Existing access point, and sight lines / visibility splays can be achieved.
- No impact on any Natura 2000 site.
- The site is not visible from any scenic routes, ecological designation or areas of secondary amenity value.

#### Alternative Considerations – Site Layout, Design, Size

Development has been designed according to BAT requirements for the intensive rearing of poultry. The design and layout facilitates economy of scale for a development of this nature, which has typically been operated by individual farmers. The capacity for circa 100,000 broilers on this site is identified as a quantity typically managed by individual farmers and allows for economies of scale for the applicant whilst meeting the requirements of the processor.

The proposed development construction would involve a steel or timber frame structure built on a steel reinforced concrete foundation, timber clad wall panels and a dark coloured corrugated metal roof. This is the same as Poultry House No. 1 on the same site. This design is standard for many poultry house developments in the county and integrates into the Cavan landscape effectively.

I would accept the general arguments presented in the EIAR as regards site location, design and alternatives.

#### Alternative Management of Byproduct

The management of poultry manure and soiled water would comply with the Nitrates Directive. In this instance, soiled water would be spread on the applicant's own land. Manure will be exported off site by a registered contractor. I consider this to be acceptable and in line with good agricultural practice.

#### Impact on Environmental Factors

##### Soils and Geology

The site is located outside the Ribbed Moraines or any other such geological features as detailed in the Geological Site Map included as Fig. 17 of the EIAR. There is no geological heritage associated with this site.

The EIAR highlights limited nature and extent of the proposed development as having a low impact on soil and geology. It further highlights the low landscape impact of the proposed development and that this site would be a managed greenfield site.

I would posit that the proposed development would have some local impacts (not significant impacts) on soil within the site, in terms of the reconouring required to fit the proposed development into the site given the topography. This is not fully addressed. Some management or mitigation requirements may be necessary to avoid any leaching into adjacent waterbodies.

##### Hydrogeology

All of the site is underlain by Silurian Metasediments and Volcanics. SE of the site is underlain by Dinantian Limestones comprising mixed sandstones, shales and limestones. Under the site, the bedrock aquifer is described as PI – Poor Aquifer – bedroom which is generally unproductive except for Local Zones.

The aquifer classification of this area is described as the Geological Survey of Ireland as Poor Aquifer(P) – Bedrock which is Generally Unproductive except for Local Zones, with

a vulnerability rating of Extreme / Outcrop (E/X) vulnerability. As the proposed development would operate on a dry manure basis, whereby the manure would be removed from the site after each batch, there is considered a minimal risk to groundwater.

The potential impact of the proposed development has been assessed against the different ratings of magnitude as set out in Chapter 2 (page 21) of the EIAR. During the construction phase and operation phases, activities on site are considered not to pose a significant risk providing that protocols are in place to avoid fuel or oil spillages by ensuring correct storage and handling of these substances. A series of mitigation measures are set out in the EIAR.

During the operation phase, potential impacts if left unmitigated would relate to accidental spillage of fuels or hydraulic oils from site machinery leading to contamination of the underlying aquifer, and the over-application of organic manure and oiled water to farm lands leading to eutrophication and contamination.

It is estimated that 160-200 cubic metres of soiled water would be generated on the entire site (existing, permitted and proposed developments) depending on free range or non-free range operations proceed. This would be applied to the spreadlands included in the EIAR. Calculations are presented to show that this is below the statutory limit of nitrogen loading and is therefore in compliance with the Nitrates Directive.

#### Hydrology

An analysis of the predicted effects of the proposed/existing poultry development on hydrology during the construction and operational phases is presented in the EIAR. Local watercourses have been identified as having poor ecological status. Adverse impacts on surface water are predicted to be nil as there would be no process discharge to surface water and there is only minimal risk of accidental spillage / leakage. However, in order to avoid and reductions in water quality in the area mitigation measures are included in the EIAR.



### Ecology

There are no protected flora identified within or in close proximity to the site, however six protected mammal species are noted to be present in the same one kilometre square according to National Biodiversity Data Centre records. A custom polygon generated for the application reveals that these records do not pertain to within the application site itself. The application site is located within the buffer zone of River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC and is 17.6 kms north of the SAC measured by the shortest linear distance. No European Sites are situated within 15kms of the site.

The site lies within the Boyne Hydrometric Area and Catchment, and the Blackwater (Kells) Sub-catchment/Sub-Basin. There is a stream flowing along the western boundary of the application site, which flows south entering Castle Lough approximately 500 metres downstream. The Blackwater emerges from Castle Lough. The EPA has defined the ecological status of the watercourses the site as poor, changing to moderate status further downstream. The status of Castle Lough has not been defined. This status must be maintained. Under the Water Framework Directive, good status must be achieved on all waterbodies within a specified timeframe.

It is not envisaged that the construction or operational phases of the proposed development would pose a significant ecological risk. Manure, soiled water and uncontaminated surface water would be managed differently on site, avoiding contamination and operating within the limits set under the Nitrates Directive. Manure and soiled water would be exported from the site to receiving farmers / clients as detailed.

Similarly, during the operational phase it is not envisaged that any activities on site would pose a significant risk. However, if mitigation measures are not in place, several effects could occur. These effects relate to the impact of rodents/pests on animal welfare, or contamination of waterbodies with subsequent effects on aquatic life as a consequence of silt, hydrocarbon or nutrient pollution. A series of mitigation measures are outlined in the EIAR in relation to the protection of ecology.

Overall, no significant adverse ecological impacts are anticipated for the construction and operational phases of the proposed development.

### Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

The closest archaeological site is a ringfort (Ref. No. CV028-004) situated c.235 metres east of the application site. A second ringfort is located c.400 metres west of the site. Their descriptions are set out in the EIAR.

Given the distance to the nearest archaeological heritage site it is not envisaged that there would be any impact on it arising from the proposed development. No buffer zones for cultural or archaeological structures are located within the boundary of the application site. Figure 8.0 of the EIAR shows the location of the nearest cultural and heritage sites.

The impact of the proposed development on cultural heritage would be imperceptible.

### Air, Climate and Noise

For air and climate, predicted impacts include vehicle emissions and CO<sub>2</sub> from both construction and operational traffic. Comparisons are made between poultry farming and other agriculture types in terms of greenhouse gas emissions. Poultry farming is compared favourably.

Odour emissions during operational phase would be limited to times of manure disposal and envisaged to be brief and limited to times of manure removal from the premises. The nearest sensitive receptor, a dwelling, is 218 metres from the proposed development SW of the application site (i.e. not in the prevailing downwind direction). No sensitive receptors are identified within 200 metres.

Mitigating measures and management procedures are set out in the EIAR to minimise odour and noise and it is noted that the same applicant is an experienced poultry farmer.

EPA conditions stipulate operating noise levels that should not be exceeded at any noise sensitive location outside the site. The daytime and nighttime legal noise limits would be highly unlikely to be exceeded at those locations. Mitigating measures are also included to minimise this.

During the development phase it is not envisaged that the proposed development would cause a nuisance or exceed the legal limit outside the site boundary. At operational stage, the principle noise sources are vehicle movements and the operation of power equipment. These are not envisaged to reach a nuisance level or exceed the EIA limits outside the site boundary.

### Landscape and Visual Impact

The site is described as being situated within the Highlands of East Cavan in accordance with the Landscape Character Assessment of County Cavan. This area is characterised by drumlins and highlands, centred in the Bailieborough and Kingscourt areas. A more detailed visual or landscape visual impact assessment is not included in the EIAR however it is stated that the proposed development would visually integrate with the area, and would not require significant excavation or development works.

While I would not envisage any significant landscape impact from the proposed development which I would describe as a significant environmental effect, I do have concerns about the configuration of the proposed development on the landscape, namely its splayed angle to the permitted poultry house No. 1 which in my opinion would have a locally severe impact.

### Material Assets

In the EIAR the effects of the proposed development on the following material assets were considered:

- Built services and utilities
- Natural resources
- Roads and traffic
- Waste management
- Surrounding properties, and
- Surrounding agricultural holdings

The construction phase would take approximately 3 months, and based on other developments in the county, the proposed development could be regarded as average sized. A limited quality of natural resources would be required, however it is not



envisaged to have a negative impact. Given the scale of the development and duration of the construction process there would be no adverse impact on the local road infrastructure as the site is well serviced by the local road network.

As construction would be confined to the site, there would not be any impact to third parties, properties or land holdings.

It is considered that the following impacts could have an effect on the surrounding material assets if left unmitigated during the construction phase:

- Inappropriate sourcing of construction materials.
- Mismanagement of construction and demolition waste generated. This may lead to water or soil contamination with subsequent ecological or human health impacts. Improper disposal may also lead to landscape visual impacts.

Similarly, at the operational phase site activities would be confined to the site and would not negatively impact on surrounding property or land.

Operational traffic would increase from that already permitted on the site (Planning Ref. 20/416) to transport additional feed, manure, gas, wood shavings, birds (in and out), and mortalities. The cumulative traffic volume for the proposed development (i.e. permitted plus proposed) would average at c.5 vehicular trips to the site per week, or 265 per year. It is predicted that this would not cause an adverse impact on the local road infrastructure.

Organic waste arising from the proposed development (manure and soiled water) would be handled in accordance with the Nitrates Directive. Spent fluorescent light tubes, a potential source of hazardous waste, would be disposed of in accordance with the WEEE Directive.

Energy requirements including gas heating for the proposed development would be minimised by the use of BAT. Water and electricity services are currently in place at the site. The poultry meal-based diet is considered as a renewable natural resource. The



proposed development in the operational phase would not result in a negative impact on natural resources.

Mitigation measures are included in the EIA/R regarding waste disposal, traffic to the site, and for the minimisation of energy consumption on site.

### Population and Human Health

The 2017 EIA/R Draft Guidelines outline typical headings under which the environmental factor 'population and human health' could be addressed. These include employment, human health and amenity.

The predicted impacts on population include additional employment benefits and job security, including economic benefits to the wider economy (suppliers, services, contractors to the farm etc.). A number of potential impacts on human health and population have been identified in previous sections of the EIA/R which include:

- Impact of contamination of drinking water at construction or operational phases.
- Odour and noise nuisance during operational phase.
- Managing / preventing Class A disease.

The EIA/R describes the management procedures involved in preventing the above impacts. Department requirements would be fully adhered to in the management of disease. Mitigation measures are also set out to prevent hydrogeological contamination, noise and odour emissions from the site, all of which have a bearing on human health.

The application site is away from any centres of population or concentrated groups of sensitive receptors. While the 6 nearest dwellings are between 220 and 400 metres away, proper site management in accordance with the mitigation measures and management practices on site would ensure that no undue impacts are experienced beyond the site boundary. Any potential impacts would be local and not significant.

### Inter-relationships and Cumulative Effects

Soils and Geology

Soil contamination during construction or operation phases has the potential to cause adverse impacts on surrounding hydrogeology, hydrology and ecology, but if the proposed mitigation measures are implemented this would not occur and therefore a neutral impact on the environment would result.

➤ Hydrogeology

Contamination/enrichment to the underlying aquifer during construction or operation phases has the potential to cause adverse impacts on surrounding hydrology via baseflow and subsequent indirect alteration to aquatic ecology. Also, contamination of groundwater has the potential to impact on human health should the boreholes/ wells in the vicinity of the site become contaminated. However, the EIAR points out that if the proposed mitigation measures are implemented this would not occur and therefore a neutral impact would result.

➤ Hydrology

Contamination/enrichment during construction or operation phases has the potential to cause adverse impacts on aquatic ecology. Algal blooms caused by eutrophication can also adversely impact on the landscape. However, the EIAR again points out that if the proposed mitigation measures are implemented this would not occur and therefore a neutral impact would result.

➤ Ecology

The inter-relationships between ecology and the other environmental factors have been described under previous headings.

➤ Archaeological / Cultural Heritage

No inter-relationships between archaeological / cultural heritage and the other environmental factors have been identified.

➤ Air, Noise & Climate

Odour emissions during the operational phase, should they occur, have the potential to cause an adverse impact on population and human health. However, if the proposed mitigation measures are implemented this would not occur and therefore a neutral impact would result.

➤ **Landscape and Visual Impact**

The inter-relationships between the landscape and hydrology/ecology have been described under previous headings. Also, improper waste disposal (i.e. material assets) can impact on the landscape. However, if the proposed mitigation measures are implemented this would not occur and therefore a neutral impact would result.

➤ **Material Assets**

Improper disposal of C&D waste during construction, or the mishandling of organic waste during the operational phase, have the potential to cause an adverse impact on the soil, hydrogeology, hydrology, landscape and air quality, with subsequent indirect impacts on ecology and human health.

➤ **Population and Human Health**

The inter-relationships between population / human health and the other environmental factors have been described under previous sections of the EIAR.

**In summary:**

A matrix is included in the EIAR indicating the inter-relationships between the EIA factors.

- It is not anticipated that the proposed development will, when combined with other projects, result in a cumulative impact that is collectively significant.
- The do-nothing scenario would not result in any change to hydrogeology, hydrology, air quality, noise, climate, landscape, and cultural heritage.
- The main impact on human beings is that if the proposal does not proceed there would be a the loss of potential direct and indirect employment. Local environmental impacts to human beings can be managed or avoided.
- The production of poultry manure and application to farmlands as an organic fertiliser represents a slight positive impact on soils.

**Overall conclusion of the EIAR**

No significant adverse residual effects are likely to occur though in-combination and/or cumulative impacts. Any effects identified can be mitigated by management of the

construction and operational processes by adherence to the mitigation measures set out in the EIAR.

### **Planning Authority Assessment**

The EIAR concludes that there no significant adverse residual effects are likely to occur from the proposed development either individually or in combination with other development. On the evidence submitted, I concur with this. Any effects identified can be mitigated by management of the construction and operational processes by adherence to the mitigation measures set out in the EIAR.

The EIAR has identified mitigation measures to substantially reduce any impacts on human health and local residential amenities, all of which are well established by best practice. The proposed development is not likely to give rise to significant noise or odour emissions outside the boundary of the application site.

My assessment is that the general location of the proposed development on the same site as a similar permitted development is a rational planning response in this case. It can be justified in terms of the assessment of alternatives presented in the EIAR. It would also optimise efficiency in terms of managing the environment, traffic and disease prevention, and ultimately human health.

Operational controls to reduce the risk of disease outbreak include temperature control, ventilation checks and control, regular inspection of feedlines and drinkers, regular inspection of appearance of birds, regular inspection of litter condition, strict visitor control and a rodent control programme.

Below I have assessed the proposed development in relation to the environmental factors outlined in the EIAR:

#### **(a) Population & Human Health**

The most significant impact on population and human health include noise emissions, disease control, air quality, waste management, traffic, landscape and material assets.



During construction a certain amount of noise will be generated by transport and site traffic. The construction noise will be temporary in nature and it will be carried out during normal working hours avoiding early morning or late evening work. Operational noise will include transport of feed, bird deliveries/collections, waste and manure collection. Mitigation measures will involve operating during normal working hours and to keep poultry doors closed when possible.

This is a low population density rural area, but there are 6 residential 'one-off' houses within 400 metres of the site. It is contended that there would be no material impacts beyond the bounds of the application site. From my desktop assessment, these dwellings vary from 218 to 400 metres from the proposed development (respective building lines) and four of those dwellings are upwind of the prevailing southwesterly winds. The nearest downwind dwelling is 400 metres east, and a sixth house is situated 367 metres NW, neither of which would potentially receive odour impacts unless the prevailing wind direction changed.

In common with all such facilities, strict disease control procedures would be applied to the proposed development. These will be carried out according to procedures set out by the Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine in consultation with the National Expert Epidemiological Group.

The principal sources of waste during construction and operation phases of the proposed development are anticipated to be:

- Clean water to be discharged to local watercourse via discharge points.
- Solid wastes to be removed from site by an experienced contractor.
- Soiled water to be allocated to farmland in accordance with best practice and current regulations.
- Bird fatalities to be collected by sealed leak proof container to an authorised facility, in line with EPA and County Council requirements.

I concur with the EIAR which concludes that, in terms of wastes generated by the development, the associated environmental burden is expected to be minimal.

The proposed development will generate additional operational traffic including feed delivery, transport of manure off site, delivery of livestock, and waste collection. Traffic would increase by an average of 5.1 traffic trips into the site each week, using an existing access into the site. Construction traffic will comprise a variety of plant such as excavators, lifting equipment, and dumper trucks. There would be vehicular movements to and from the site during this phase. This level of traffic can be accommodated without generating a significant environmental effect.

Early in the process, potential odour issues were identified as a key issue for developments of this nature. The EIAR outlines a number of management practices that should be implemented to minimise potential odour emissions including, storage regimes and procedures around the removal of dead birds, cleaning and hygiene routines, the transport of manure off site in covered trailers, controlled stocking rates within the houses, proper management of temperature and humidity.

The EIAR concludes that the proposal is unlikely to have any adverse impacts, and if impacts do occur they would be imperceptible by human population. The EIAR has identified mitigation measures to substantially reduce any impacts on human health, which I consider to be well established by best practice, and reasonable.

#### (b) Biodiversity

A Screening Exercise for Appropriate Assessment has already been carried out on this site, and included as Appendix 18 in the EIAR. The report notes the main habitat surrounding the site is improved agricultural grassland. Other habitats represented locally include neutral and wet grassland, mixed woodland and scrub, hedgerows, tree lines and watercourses.

Records show 6 rpo notable species from within the relevant 1km grid square (N6799) of the application site.

The site lies within the Boyne Hydrometric Area and Catchment, and the Blackwater (Kells) Sub-catchment/Sub-Basin. There is a stream flowing along the western boundary of the application site, which flows south entering Castle Lough approximately 500 metres downstream. The Blackwater emerges from Castle Lough. The EPA has

defined the ecological status of the watercourses the site as poor, changing to moderate status further downstream. The status of Castle Lough has not been defined. This status must be maintained. Under the Water Framework Directive, good status must be achieved on all waterbodies within a specified timeframe.

There are no Natura 2000 sites identified within a distance of 15km from the application site, but there are three such sites within 20km. These are:

- Killyconny Bog SAC – located 16.4km south. Qualifying Interests: Active raised bogs [7110], Degraded raised bogs still capable of natural regeneration [7120].
- River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC - located 17.5km south. Qualifying Interests: Alkaline fens [7230], Alluvial forests with *Alnus glutinosa* and *Fraxinus excelsior* (*Alno-Padion*, *Alnion incanae*, *Salicion albae*) [91E0], *Lampetra fluviatilis* (River Lamprey) [1099], *Salmo salar* (Salmon) [1106] and *Lutra lutra* (Otter) [1355].
- River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA - located 17.5km south. Qualifying Interests: Kingfisher (*Alcedo atthis*) [A229].

The Stage 1 Assessment concludes that there would be no impacts upon the integrity of the site structure or function of the designated European Sites in light of their conservation objectives as a result of the proposed development, including from any associated activities such as the spreading of poultry manure on the spreadland maps identified. Therefore, there would be no impacts on designated habitats or species arising from emissions from the proposed facility. Cumulative impacts with other developments have also been taken into account in the screening exercise.

I concur with the above findings of the Stage 1 report. My assessment conclusion is based on the physical context of the proposed development and surrounding area in conservation terms, and the statements within the scoping report that demonstrate no adverse impacts would arise from the proposed development.



**(c) Land, soil, water, air and climate**

The combination of mitigation measures, the relative benign impact of poultry farming when compared to cattle and sheep farming in terms of greenhouse gases, and its more limited requirement for land compared to other farming practices, has environmental benefits for land, soil, water, air and climate.

The watercourse system in the vicinity of the site is of poor ecological status, but the proposed development, which involves the removal of manure off site, and the controlled spreading of soiled water onto spreadlands in accordance with the Nitrates Objective, and mitigation measures to avoid contamination, would ensure that this ecological status is not further deteriorated. The plans provide for an underground effluent storage tank, and a separate treatment of uncontaminated surface water. Silt traps are also incorporated prior to discharge to the local watercourse. The proposed development would also be subject to an EPA Licence.

In terms of operational waste, dry litter is routinely used within poultry units, which is engineered to reduce phosphate and nitrate levels within the excreta produced by the flocks being reared to reduce the nutrients contained within the waste to be disposed.

It is anticipated that noise outside the site boundary would be within the legal limits and would not represent a disamenity to adjacent residential amenities. I concur with this on the basis of similar facilities in the county which operate successfully with closer proximity to residents. I concur with the EIAR conclusions that the proposal would have no adverse impact on any noise sensitive receptors. The EIAR also sets out noise mitigation measures, some of which are physical such as insulation and ventilation systems, and others which are related to management practices on site.

The EIAR states that odour from the proposed development would be brief and limited to periods when manure is being cleared and transported from the site. However, with the mitigation measures set out in the EIAR, these emissions can be effectively controlled and minimised.

I also note the recommendations of the Environment Section of Cavan County Council which has examined the planning application documents. It recommends an



unconditional grant of permission insofar as it can assess the environmental issues raised in this application.

**(d) Materials assets, cultural heritage and the landscape**

The EIAR has identified two ringforts in the area but these are sufficiently separated from the application site so as to be unaffected. There are no sensitive landscape designations or areas of special amenity value close to the site. There are no heritage designations applicable to the site.

Regarding the visual impact of the proposed development I would not fully concur with the conclusion of the EIAR that the proposed development would integrate with the landscape. The physical relationship of both sheds to each other (permitted and proposed) would be, in my opinion, incongruous when splayed at the angle shown on the site layout plan. This configuration appears to have resulted from the extent of the applicant's landholding, whereas a more sensitive site layout would be to have two poultry sheds running parallel. Also, additional cut into the site's topography is required in the current layout than would otherwise be necessary.

The cumulative traffic impact to the site (permitted and proposed developments) would average at 5.1 operational lorry trips per week for collections / deliveries. This would not give rise to any significant environmental impact subject to adherence to the mitigation measures outlined in the EIAR.

In terms of design, the proposed shed is similar in external finishes of the poultry shed permitted under Planning Ref. 20/416 although it would be lower by 903mm. The overall length and width are practically equal to that permitted for the adjacent shed, meaning that the roof pitch would be 4.5 degrees lower than it. This is not an issue in the current layout, however if it should be repositioned to a parallel position, then the proposed roof pitch needs to be examined again to attain visual cohesion with 20/416.

**(e) The interaction between the factors above**

The inter-relationships of the ten EIA factors in this EIAR are potentially under-stated, but would not necessarily have changed the outcome of this assessment. For example, the interaction between air quality and biodiversity is that vegetation can act as a purifier

for air in absorbing CO<sub>2</sub> and giving out oxygen. Dust could affect fauna during the construction phase. Air and soils are also interrelated. Dust from exposed soils during construction could cause deterioration of air quality in the immediate vicinity of the development. In relation to air and climate if local heating of air in the poultry houses this could cause microclimate change in those areas.

## **Conclusion of Environmental Impact Assessment**

### ***Submitted EIAR Conclusion***

The EIAR concludes that the proposed development will make a positive contribution to the rural economy, and that no significant environmental effects would arise. The proposal accords with the provisions of the County Development Plan 2014-2020.

### ***Planning Authority EIA Conclusion***

I concur that there are no significant adverse impacts during the construction or operational phases of the proposed development. Where real impacts are identified, mitigation measures are proposed to be put in place to reduce their effects insofar as possible. Also, given that a poultry shed has already been permitted alongside and is under construction, it is considered that the development of the additional unit would have comparatively less impact than if a wholly new 'greenfield' site was selected.

### **Summary of Planning Assessment**

I am satisfied from an environmental, public safety, landscape and amenity perspective that the proposed development is acceptable in principle at this location, and that no significant impacts are likely to arise. I also note the recommendation of Environment Section to approve the development. The engineering issues i.e. sightlines and site entrance have been addressed in the first poultry shed on this site (Planning Ref. 20/416). My only concern relates to the physical location of the proposed shed within the site which in my opinion would be incongruous against the permitted shed location. The 'V' shape layout may not be the most effective layout in terms of minimising landscape impact. A parallel configuration of the two sheds would have less visual impact and would avoid unnecessary 'cut' across contours.

It appears that the V-shape layout has been determined by ownership boundaries rather than by the most fitting position from a landscape integration perspective. Given the scale and potentially severe local visual impact of this, I recommend further information on this aspect of the development. This may involve moving the red line or negotiation with an adjoining landowner in order to accommodate the proposed development more satisfactorily. Further information recommended. I also recommend clarity on the finished floor levels which differ from those in 20/416.

### **Request for Further Information**

On 27/4/2021 the Planning Authority requested the following further information from the applicant:

The Planning Authority has carried out an assessment of the proposed development and the Environmental Impact Assessment Report included with the planning application.

While the authority has no objection in principle to the proposed second poultry on the site, it is concerned that the V-shape layout would be visually unacceptable as it would be likely to have a locally severe visual impact. It would also involve some unnecessary undercutting into higher land at the northeast side. A shed position that is parallel to that permitted under 20/416 would be given more favourable consideration by the Planning Authority. In so doing, you are also advised to raise the roof pitch in order to match the first shed under construction.

In addition, clarify the finished floor levels in this planning application which differ from that of the preceding planning application 20/416 (Shed No. 1).

### **Further Information Response**

On 9/7/2021 the Planning Authority received the applicant's response to the above. This was not deemed significant under Article 35 of the Regulations and comprised:

- Response letter from CLW Environmental Planners Ltd. outlining the rationale for the development layout as proposed. The applicant is unable to alter the configuration of the proposed development as recommended in the FI Request.



- Revised site layout plan, Drawing No, PL02 dated 8/7/2021, which includes:
  - Additional landscaping
  - Clarification of the proposed finished floor level of the proposed development against the poultry house no. 1 commenced alongside (planning ref. 20/416).

### Internal Reports on FI Response

No referrals made on the FI Response.

### Planning Assessment of FI Response

#### Development Layout

The further information request questioned the rationale for the layout of the proposed development, which together with the poultry house no. 1 under construction (planning ref. 20/416), would form a V-configuration on the landscape. Ordinarily, poultry sheds, particularly for more intensive farming have a tighter and parallel shed layout. The following reasons are provided by the applicants to keep the original layout as proposed:

- The applicants' landholding is constrained, and they are unable to acquire additional land to meet the Planning Authority's recommendation to reorientate the development to a parallel layout.
- Applicants would like the flexibility to operate the farm on a free-range basis, and therefore a quantity of land is required around the sheds as range areas. The proposed layout is more effective in that regard than two parallel sheds close together. This was discussed on site directly with the applicants.
- The development is situated on relatively low ground, with higher ground in the background. The overall impact of the development is minimised as a result.
- The development is itself low profile in form, reaching a maximum height of just 6,468mm.
- A high standard of finish, similar to 20/416 under construction which includes dark grey / green roof and wall cladding, ensures a high quality of development.
- The site is only seen from one vantage point (i.e. the site entrance), and the impact can be further reduced by additional landscaping.



My assessment is that the applicants have made some reasonable arguments in defence of the development layout as proposed. In terms of the site's ability to absorb the development, this was carefully considered during my second site inspection when I met with applicants and the agent prior to this response. The development area was marked out and views from different vantage points assessed. The extent of excavation necessary at the rear corner (NE) was also assessed. The low profile of the site and the development itself was noted, and the high standard of materials being used in the construction of 20/416 adjacent to the proposed second shed. The limited view of the site from the public road, except for the entrance area, was noted. The site does not form a terminating view from any direction and there are more elevated fields to the rear of the site. For these reasons, and for the operational reasons cited by the applicants/agent, I consider that there is merit to the original layout as proposed.

A landscape plan is superimposed onto the revised site layout, and although the proposed tree and hedge lines do follow the main areas that would reduce visual impact as agreed at the site meeting, there is no tree schedule attached. For completeness and in order to assist enforcement, I recommend a detailed landscape plan to be formally submitted and agreed prior to the development commencing. Planning conditions should also ensure a quality standard of building finish.

#### Finished floor level

The agent has confirmed the FFL as 142, equating it to the shed already under construction (20/416). This is satisfactory.

The agent has also enclosed a photo-image of the proposed development demonstrating the limited visual of the development once all site works and planting are complete.

On the basis of the above assessment I recommend a conditional grant of planning permission. As this would be an EPA licenced development, the Planning Authority cannot impose conditions relating to environmental discharges or emissions.

## Appropriate Assessment

A Screening Exercise for Appropriate Assessment was carried out for this proposed development and submitted with the planning application (Included as Appendix 18 of the EIAR). The application site is located within the buffer zone of River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC and is 17.5 kms north of that SAC measured by the shortest linear distance. No European Sites are situated within 15kms of the site.

There are no Natura 2000 sites identified within a distance of 15km, the potential impact zone, of the application site but there are three such sites within 20km. These are:

- Killyconny Bog SAC – located 16.4km south. Qualifying Interests: Active raised bogs [7110], Degraded raised bogs still capable of natural regeneration [7120].
- River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC - located 17.5km south. Qualifying Interests: Alkaline fens [7230], Alluvial forests with *Alnus glutinosa* and *Fraxinus excelsior* (Alno-Padion, Alnion incanae, Salicion albae) [91E0], *Lampetra fluviatilis* (River Lamprey) [1099], *Salmo salar* (Salmon) [1106] and *Lutra lutra* (Otter) [1355].
- River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA - located 17.5km south. Qualifying Interests: Kingfisher (*Alcedo atthis*) [A229].

The Stage 1 Assessment concludes that there would be no impacts upon the integrity of the site structure or function of the designated European Sites in light of their conservation objectives as a result of the proposed development, including from any associated activities such as the spreading of poultry manure on the spreadland maps identified. Therefore, there would be no impacts on designated habitats or species arising from emissions from the proposed facility. Cumulative impacts with other developments have also been taken into account in the screening exercise.

The Stage 1 report is discussed in more detail in the Planning Authority Assessment section above under 'Biodiversity'. I concur with the above findings of the Stage 1 assessment. My conclusion is based on the physical context of the proposed development and surrounding area in conservation terms, and the statements within the

scoping report that demonstrate no adverse impacts would arise from the proposed development.

### Development Contribution

#### Agricultural Structures

Proposed development = 3,290.15 sqm

300 sqm exemption already availed of on this site.

X €5 = €16,450.75, rounded to €16,450.

### Conclusion & Recommendation

Having regard to the size and agricultural nature of the proposed poultry unit shed extensions and their location in a rural area on the site of an existing poultry operation, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would be in accordance with the character of the area and with Policy EDP3 and Objective EDO1 of the Cavan County Development Plan 2014-2020. The proposed development, either individually or in combination with any other plan or projects, would not be likely to have a significant effect on the environment or an adverse impact on any Natura 2000 site, would not cause a deterioration in the quality of waters and would not seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity of the site. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

### Conditions

1. (a) The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application on the 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2021, and as amended by further information and particulars received by the Planning Authority on 9<sup>th</sup> July 2021, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the Planning Authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the Planning Authority prior to commencement of development and

the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

(b) The development in combination with the adjoining permitted development planning ref. 20/416 shall provide no more than 100,000 places for the rearing of broilers (non-free range) or 85,000 broilers (free range).

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The developer shall pay the sum of €16,450 to the Planning Authority in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the Planning Authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the Planning Authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment.

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

3. The materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes of the proposed development shall match the adjoining permitted development (planning ref. 20/416).

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and consistency.

4. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit to the Planning Authority for its written agreement a detailed landscape plan for the site to include a tree schedule.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.



5. The following landscape measures shall also apply to this site:

- a) No non-native species shall be introduced into the site or its boundaries.
- b) All sound trees on site (including those in surrounding hedgerows) shall be retained except those that require to be removed to facilitate the actual physical development of the site.
- c) Any failures within a tree planting scheme within five years of planting shall be replaced.
- d) No invasive species shall be introduced into the site or its boundaries. Any invasive species occurring on the site shall only be dealt with by an invasive species specialist.

Reason: In the interests of traffic safety and visual amenity.

6. All areas of this poultry farm site that are not required for building, hardstanding or ancillary development works as permitted shall be covered with topsoil and reseeded prior to the operation of the development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

7. During the construction phase the developer shall be responsible for ensuring that no pavement or structural damage occurs to the adjoining public road network as a consequence of heavy plant using the local system and any damage shall be repaired by the Council at cost to the developer.

Reason: In the interest of traffic safety.

8. Excess soil and stone that is not reused as part of the development shall be removed from the site using appropriately authorised waste collection contractors only, and such soil and stone shall be subject to a waste recovery activity at an appropriately authorised waste facility.

Reason: In the interests of sustainable waste management.

PLANNER SIGNATURE

Finter CTA

DATE 20/8/2021



Entrance to site shown



Adjoining poultry house under construction (planning ref. 20/416)

Approximate position of proposed development shown in red.



Close-up of planning ref. 20/416 under construction

For inspection purposes only.  
Content of copyright owner required for any other use.