
Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 22 November 2016

Site visit made on 23 November 2016

by B.Hellier BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 05 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/W/16/3147467

Dodleston Hall Farm, Kinnerton Road, Dodleston, Chester, CH4 9LP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Giles Dodd against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
 - The application Ref 14/04711/FUL, dated 4 November 2014, was refused by notice dated 12 November 2015.
 - The development proposed is the construction of two poultry sheds and feed bins, ancillary works, amendments to existing vehicular access, erection of biomass building and associated landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two poultry sheds and feed bins, ancillary works, amendments to existing vehicular access, erection of biomass building and associated landscaping at Dodleston Hall Farm, Kinnerton Road, Dodleston, Chester, CH4 9LP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 14/04711/FUL, dated 4 November 2014, subject to the conditions set out in the accompanying Schedule.

Preliminary matters

2. An application for an intensive rearing unit for more than 85,000 broiler hens is a Schedule 1¹ development for which an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is mandatory. An Environmental Statement was submitted and forms part of the application. The EIA documentation also formed the basis of an application to the Environment Agency for an operating permit² which is designed to ensure that statutory environmental controls are met. An Environmental Permit has been issued³.
3. The application was also accompanied by a Unilateral Undertaking (UU). However for reasons set out in paragraph 10 later I do not consider it to come within the statutory definition of a planning obligation⁴ and I have not taken it into account in my decision.

¹ Schedule 1 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2011

² Under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010

³ Permit number EPR/ZP3830WQ

⁴ As described in S106(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Principle of a rural location

4. The proposal is of a significant scale. The sheds would each have a footprint of 105m x 35m and, together, would house 100,000 birds. The birds would be brought onto the site as chicks and removed as fattened birds. They would remain within the sheds at all times. The fuel for the boiler would be imported. It was put to me that as there is no direct connection with the land there is no reason for it to be in a rural area and that it would be more sensibly located in an industrial area.
5. There is a clear distinction to be drawn between agricultural production and manufacturing. There is no dispute that this is an agricultural use. In this case there would be a functional relationship with the land in that the poultry manure would be used on the farm and there is the potential for grain grown on the land to be used to supplement the imported feed. Generically farmers have transferable animal husbandry skills and the poultry units here would be managed hand in hand with the milking herd. In principle therefore I consider the farm holding to be a suitable location for poultry production.

Main issues

6. That does not mean that the impacts of the proposal would automatically be acceptable on the appeal site. It lies within the North Cheshire Green Belt where there is a presumption against non-essential development. However it is common ground that as agricultural development the proposal would be not inappropriate in the Green Belt. From what I have heard I consider the main issues are:
 - whether the HGV traffic generated by the development would be safely and conveniently accommodated by the surrounding road network;
 - the effect of noise associated with the night-time removal of birds on the occupiers of nearby properties; and
 - whether any harm from traffic and noise impacts or any other harm would be such as to outweigh the benefits of the proposed development.

Reasons

Planning policy

7. The development plan includes the saved policies of the Chester District Local Plan (CDLP) adopted in 2006 and the Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan (Part 1) Strategic Policies (LP) adopted in 2015. LP Policy STRAT 9 supports agricultural development of an appropriate scale in rural areas. LP Policy STRAT 10 requires that any traffic from new development should be able to be accommodated safely and satisfactorily within the existing highway network. LP Policy SOC 5 says that development that gives rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life, including from noise, will not be allowed. CDLP Policy EC22 allows the erection of agricultural buildings subject to various criteria, including avoiding unacceptable impacts on residential amenity and highway safety.
8. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. It promotes a strong rural economy and the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses (paragraph 28). It also expects there to be safe and suitable

access to a site. Development should only be refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts are severe (paragraph 32). In relation to noise the NPPF states that noise from new development should not give rise to significant adverse impacts. Where any impact is less than significant then it should be mitigated and reduced to a minimum. I consider the development plan policies referred to above are in general conformity with the NPPF.

Highway safety

9. The appeal site fronts onto the unclassified Kinnerton Road on the opposite side of the road to the existing farm complex. It would have a new access about 400m north of the built up area of Dodleston village. The intended route for HGVs follows Kinnerton Road north for 420m to a junction with a Class III road (Welsh Road/Main Road) at Gorstella cross roads. It then goes west along Main Road, through the small roadside village of Lower Kinnerton, eventually reaching the A5104 some 3km from Gorstella. If HGVs turned south from the site they would pass through Dodleston. It was agreed that this would be an unsuitable route.
10. The appellants submitted a planning obligation in the form of a UU setting out penalties that would be imposed if any operator did not use the preferred HGV route. As worded I do not consider this to be a valid obligation as it does not impose a restriction on the use of the land. Even if I am wrong on this, I consider that in any event, the Council would not be able to enforce the provisions since the haulage contractor who is expected to use the preferred route is not party to the UU.
11. As an alternative a condition might be imposed. However traffic orders are the normal means of controlling the right of passage over public highways and there would again be the practical difficulty of enforcement. Because of where the intended poultry processor and feed supplier are currently based I accept that as things stand the preferred route is the only sensible one and would be likely to be used. However, at the end of the day the Council as local planning authority would have no means to enforce this.
12. The poultry farm would operate on a 46 day cycle. Chicks would be brought in on day 1, thinned with a collection on day 35 and the remaining birds collected on day 42. The HGV poultry collection movements would take place over two 24 hour periods, principally at night. Manure would, when conditions are right, be used on the farm but in a worst case scenario would be removed over two days at the end of the cycle.
13. As shown in the table below each cycle would generate some 102 vehicle movements on Kinnerton Road (70 HGV, 20 tractor and 12 other) giving a daily average of just over 2 for all vehicles and rather less than 2 for HGVs. A recent traffic survey showed average daily two-way flows of 1358 vehicles of which only 6 were HGVs. Most of these HGVs are likely to have been visiting Dodleston Hall Farm which the appellant estimates generates an average 5 such movements daily, including 2 milk tanker movements. No traffic census data was available for the Class III road but it quite evidently accommodates higher traffic volumes than Kinnerton Road.

	Traffic source	Movements per cycle	Peak hour movement
Heavy goods vehicles	Bedding delivery	2	2
	Chick delivery	4	1
	Feed delivery	22	2
	Mortality collection	6	2
	Fuel delivery	2	2
	Poultry collection	34	2
Tractor and trailer	Manure collection	20	2
Small vehicles	Vets, engineers, inspections, cleaning contractors, catchers	12	1

14. The highway authority objects to the increase in the number of the very largest HGVs using the rural network although it produced no information on existing use. Many of the HGVs associated with the proposal would be 44 tonne, 16.5m long and 2.6m wide articulated vehicles, the largest permitted on the public road network. There are a number of locations on the preferred route where cars and HGVs would need to exercise care when passing and where two HGVs could only pass by encroaching on to the verge.
15. Of greatest concern to the highway authority and to local people is the use of the Gorstella junction. As it approaches the junction Kinnerton Road narrows to a neck with a garden wall on one side and a hedge on the other. There is insufficient room for a car and HGV to pass here. The junction then widens to a bell mouth but even so an HGV pulling out would have to cross over the centre line of the Class III road. Although there is a 40mph speed limit it is apparent that it is not always respected. There is an additional hazard created by vehicles cutting across the Class III road to and from the industrial zone/out of town shopping at Bretton.
16. The use of the Gorstella junction needs care. However over the last five years there have been no recorded accidents at the junction or anywhere else along the preferred access route. It is already used by HGVs and farm traffic. Unusually for a rural area it is also used by an hourly bus service. As in many parts of the country the rural road network is not designed for large HGVs and yet they are now a part of the agricultural economy. A certain amount of inconvenience arises from this and should be accepted but only if road safety is not unacceptably compromised. In this case I am not persuaded that the additional HGV traffic would result in a severe cumulative impact on road safety. I come to this conclusion even though it would not be possible to control, as part of the planning process, the route taken by HGVs.
17. The new access onto Kinnerton Road would have adequate visibility to the north. To the south an existing hedge would need to be lowered/removed and several trees removed to secure visibility of 134m to the south¹. Although the speed limit is 60mph actual 85 percentile speeds for vehicles coming north is only about 43mph² due to bends just after the road leaves the village. On this basis the southern splay would be adequate.

¹ From a position 4.5m back from the carriageway edge

² A figure confirmed by the surveys carried out independently by both the Parish Council and appellant

Noise

18. The application was accompanied by a noise assessment. This included a noise survey measuring ambient and background noise levels at the farm and at the two nearest properties on Kinnerton Road: Tudor Farm about 265m to the north and The Bungalow at the entrance to the village proper about 280m to the south. The effect of noise from fixed plant and loading/unloading operations on these properties was assessed. This showed that the greatest impact was on Tudor Farm because it was nearer and because background noise levels were lower.
19. The noise readings for Tudor Farm¹ were not taken from the nearest part of the dwelling to the noise source but from a roadside location nearly 100m to the south which is the nearest land in the ownership of the appellant. The owner of Tudor Farm would have been willing for readings to have been taken from his property. It is reasonable to assume that noise levels from vehicles would be the same in the two locations. However background noise levels at the farm are slightly higher than the Tudor Farm measurements. It is thus arguable that the further away one gets from the farm the lower background noise would be. This uncertainty is unhelpful.
20. The noise assessment underwent several updates during consideration of the application and at the appeal stage. This was due to a number of factors: new national guidance with BS4142/2014 replacing BS4142/1997; a review of details of bird collection noise as a source; correcting calculation errors; a reduction in night time operations; and testing the results against various noise barrier heights. Only at the hearing was data on maximum noise levels produced although lack of such data had been flagged up when the application was refused. The number of changes does little to inspire the confidence of local people in the assessment.
21. Notwithstanding the various iterations there was a definitive noise assessment before the hearing which assumed the provision of a 2.0m bund or other acoustic barrier around the service yard and access track. There was agreement that the main potential for a significant noise impact on Tudor Farm would arise from night time collection of birds on day 35 and day 42 of each production cycle. The first of these nights would involve 10 HGV movements over 5 hours and the second 24 movements over 12 hours. Within the site boundary the main noise sources would be the ventilation system, the manoeuvring of HGVs in the yard and an electric fork lift truck transferring pallets of birds into the vehicles.
22. The noise assessment indicates that during this period noise levels arising from operations within the site would at no time exceed background noise levels at Tudor Farm by more than 5dB. BS4142/2014 states that a difference of around +5dB would indicate an adverse impact but that it is only when this increases to around +10dB that there is likely to be a significant adverse impact.
23. As this is a night time noise it is also helpful to consider noise levels within the Tudor Farm bedrooms. The highest predicted noise rating level at the nearest external facade would be 35.6dBL_{Aeq} compared with the measured background

¹ No longer a farm but a private residence

of 31.3dB_{L_{A90}}. Open windows would reduce noise by about 15dB. In this case the main bedroom windows face east and west rather than south to the appeal site. Thus noise levels within the bedrooms would be well below 30dB _{L_{Aeq}} which was agreed was a sensible target. Maximum noise levels would be less than the recommended ceiling of 45dB_{L_{Amax}} over the night time period¹.

24. This assessment excludes HGVs on the public road. At present there are very few, if any, night time HGV trips past Tudor Farm. For someone sleeping in one of the front bedrooms this new noise could be disturbing. However occupiers would already be affected by the noise of the occasional passing car and these night time trips would occur on only 16 nights of the year.
25. Overall, with the mitigation proposed, I find that the noise associated with the night time removal of birds from within the site and from passing HGVs would not have a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of Tudor Farm or on those of other nearby properties.

Other issues

Aviagen Turkeys

26. Aviagen Turkeys Ltd is one of only two primary turkey breeding companies in the world. Some 25% of the turkeys in the world come from the pedigree breeding stock housed on the six laying farms owned by the company. It is essential that the pedigree stock is kept free of bacteria and viruses which may impact on the human and poultry health. Pedigree and broiler stocks are at the opposite end of the breeding chain. Broilers may be slaughtered and eaten even when they are infected and there is no requirement or incentive to maintain the levels of biosecurity which are necessary for pedigree stock.
27. One of the Aviagen sites is at New House Farm in Lower Kinnerton about 1km from the appeal site. It is a good local employer with 8 full time staff and a number of part time positions. Evidence was given by the Director of Production and Veterinary Support who is an expert in poultry diseases. He objects to the proposal because it would result in a significant increased risk of infections and diseases breaching biosecurity at the farm. These could be transmitted by air from the site itself, from bird transport and from the spreading of manure.
28. It was acknowledged that there are no statutory controls to deal with this risk and no guidance from the Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs. The company refers to New House Farm being in the path of the prevailing winds from the appeal site. However it lies almost due west of the appeal site, outside locations which have the highest potential for impacts from wind borne emissions². This would lessen the transmission risk. There is also another, smaller but long established, poultry business on Welsh Road a distance of 1.7km to the east which suggests that some level of risk can be accepted.
29. The proposal is likely to increase risk to the pedigree farm stock and potentially the economic viability of the Aviagen establishment. This must count against the proposal. However the level of risk is not clear and in the absence of any definitive national guidance I am not persuaded that it would be such as to warrant dismissing the proposal.

¹ WHO Guidelines for Community Noise 1999

² Figure 5-1 p14 Odour Impact Assessment SLR October 2014

Landscape and visual impact

30. Strong representations were made by the Parish Council and residents about the impact of the development on landscape character and appearance. The submitted landscape and visual impact assessment has not been carried out entirely in accordance with current guidance¹. In particular there is no formal assessment of sensitivity to change and assessment of significance of impact. On these matters I have relied on my own assessment.
31. The landscape is not designated. It is gently undulating working agricultural countryside characterised by medium sized fields with good hedgerows and occasional small blocks of trees. Locally there are two nearby poultry units and groups of modern farm buildings/silos including the range of buildings at Dodleston Hall Farm opposite the site. I consider it has a low sensitivity to a development of modern farm buildings. The new access would involve breaking through a hedge, the loss of trees within the roadside copse and a loss of some agricultural land but this does not amount to a significant loss of existing landscape elements.
32. Whilst the landform is relatively flat the horizon is often restricted to medium distance views of trees, hedgerows and scattered dwellings. The proposed poultry sheds would be built about 1m above road level with a further 6m to the ridge. They would appear as monolithic horizontal structures which would be likely to be on the skyline viewed both leaving and entering Dodleston. I consider there would be a large magnitude of change giving a moderate significance of landscape effect.
33. The development would not be prominent over a wide area. At close quarters there would be a major impact on users of the public footpath crossing the appeal field although once through the field the development would be out of sight. Drivers on Kinnerton Road would see the long rooflines from both the Dodleston and Gorstella directions and the buildings would be conspicuous in medium distance views from Tudor Farm and some of the Dodleston properties. Occupiers of these properties should be treated as being having high sensitivity to visual change.
34. Without mitigation I consider there would be a significant adverse effect on both the character and appearance of the local landscape. To address this substantial tree planting is proposed on land within the ownership of the appellant to the north and south and along the Kinnerton Road frontage. This planting would create a positive landscape feature and support biodiversity. Over time these trees would form the skyline and would be effective in screening the development. Nonetheless until the planting becomes established there would be significant landscape and visual harm. Because it would be temporary I consider it should attract moderate weight.

Heritage

35. The proposal would be situated between Dodleston and the hamlet of Gorstella which are both designated conservation areas. Their conservation significance lies principally in the historic interest and architectural quality of their buildings and townscape. They are appreciated from within. Those buildings features that do stand out, such as the tower and small spire of Dodleston church,

¹ Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (third edition) Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment April 2013

would continue to do so. I do not find that the setting to the conservation areas contributes greatly to their heritage significance or that the proposal would have a materially detrimental effect on these settings.

Odour management

36. An odour assessment has been carried out and is considered acceptable by the Environment Agency. The assessment is accompanied by an Odour Management Plan. I agree with the Council that the mitigation measures set out in the Management Plan should be subject to a condition. In the light of the concerns of the Parish Council I also agree that provision for managing odours associated with manure collection, transport and disposal should likewise be conditioned.

Ecology

37. The original ecological assessment was carried out in 2014¹. At that time the ecological impact was found to be acceptable subject to an appropriate management regime. Since then, in addition to the elapse of two years, the revised visibility splay results in the loss of some trees. The trees may be suitable for bat roosts. However they are within a larger woodland habitat and I considered this possibility can be adequately addressed through an updated assessment/ management proposals which could be secured by condition.

Conditions

38. There was a discussion on suggested conditions put forward by the Council and I have also considered whether they meet the tests in NPPF paragraph 206. Standard conditions should be imposed for commencement and listing approved plans. On highway safety grounds there is a need for further details of the access design to allow two vehicles to pass each other at the junction with Kinnerton Road and a construction management plan to minimise conflict with other road users during the construction phase.
39. To protect the living conditions of local residents deliveries should be restricted to daytime hours apart from the 16 occasions over a year when destocking takes place. The submitted Noise Management Plan needs to include further details of the management and mitigation of night time noise. The mitigation measures set out in the submitted odour management plan and the air quality assessment should also be conditioned.
40. A landscaping scheme is necessary to build on the indicative submitted proposals and to incorporate the acoustic barriers around the service yard. The need for an updated ecological assessment has been referred to above. The scale and intensity of any lighting should be controlled. Finally there is a need for further archaeological investigations.

Other matters

41. The Council and the Parish Council argue that an acoustic barrier secured either by fencing or bunding would have a significant adverse effect on local character and appearance. Therefore, since it was not part of the original proposal it is a significant change that should be considered afresh in a new application. However I take the view that the required 2m high barrier could be readily

¹ Proposed Poultry Units at Dodleston Hall Farm Ecological Assessment September 2014. Turnstone Ecology

assimilated by minor changes to the indicative planting proposals. I do not consider a new application to be necessary.

42. The landscaping proposals leave room for introducing one or two more poultry houses in the future. However such development would need a new planning application and would be determined on the basis of its impact and the circumstances pertaining at the time, one being the actual impact of the present proposal. It is not a relevant consideration in determining this appeal.
43. The Environmental Statement refers to potential alternative sites¹ although there is no plan of these. Key factors in selecting the appeal site were visual impact, proximity to the farm and proximity to residential property. These are sensible considerations. I looked at lower land to the west which was further away from dwellings but inaccessible and visually open. No other obviously better locations were put to me. I find that there has been adequate consideration of alternative sites.

Planning balance and conclusions

44. The poultry industry makes an important contribution to the rural economy and to the demand for home produced food. The present proposal would also assist in maintaining a viable business at Dodleston Hall Farm which needs to reduce its dependence on its milking herd. There would be a positive contribution to the economic and social strands of sustainable development to which I give significant weight.
45. Set against this is I do not find that there would be a significant adverse impact on living conditions as a result of noise or on road safety from the HGV traffic that would be generated. With the proposed mitigating planting there would be moderate harm to local character and appearance. I also note the potential for the transmission of diseases to the pedigree turkey establishment at New House Farm but in the absence of any statutory control or independent authoritative guidance this is not a determinative consideration. Taken overall I conclude that the factors against the proposal do not clearly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.
46. As I do not find that highway, noise and other environmental harms outweigh the benefits then LP Policies STRAT9, STRAT10 and SOC5 and CDLP Policy EC22 would be satisfied and there would be no conflict with the development plan.
47. The Hearing was well attended by local residents whose opposition to the development was ably represented by the Parish Council and I have not disagreed with their views lightly. However for the reasons given above I find that this would be a sustainable development for which the economic and social benefits are not outweighed by the local environmental impact. I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Bern Hellier

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions overleaf

¹ Section 3 Page 13

Schedule of Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the revised location plan SA/14575/01 submitted on 22 November 2016 and the following approved plans: SA/14575/03 Rev B (block plan); SA/14575/04 (building plans and elevations); SA/14575/05 (site elevations and sections); DH-R-302 Rev A (routing plan).
3. No development shall commence until details of the access, including a visibility splay set back 4.5m from the carriageway edge as shown on plan DH-AA-300 Rev A, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The access shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details and made available for use prior to any poultry being brought onto the site.
4. No development shall commence until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Statement shall provide for:
 - the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
 - loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
 - wheel washing facilities;
 - delivery and construction working hours.

The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.

5. No deliveries, including chick or feed deliveries, shall be taken at or despatched from the site outside the period 08.00 hours to 18.00 hours and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays, with the exception of those occasions detailed in Condition 6.
6. Between the hours of 23.00 and 07.00 motorised vehicles shall be used on site for bird de-stocking events only. These events shall not occur on more than 16 occasions during each calendar year and shall take place in accordance with the approved Noise Management Plan. A log shall be maintained of those occasions on which collections are made during these hours and this log shall on request be made available to the Council.
7. No development shall commence until a Noise Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. In order to demonstrate best practicable means the Plan shall include details of
 - The electric fork-lift truck and all other vehicles to be used for destocking events between 23.00 and 07.00 hours and the methods that will be used to minimise their night time noise levels
 - How impact noise will be mitigated
 - An on-site speed limit of 10mph between 23.00 and 07.00 hours
 - Meteorological considerations for the selection of nights on which de-stocking is to take place
 - Any further noise mitigation to be applied to poultry shed ventilation systems
 - Maintenance plans for the poultry shed ventilation systems to ensure quiet running

The Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained in place.

8. No development shall commence until details of suitable acoustic barriers and/or bunds have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning

authority. These shall be a minimum of 2m high and shall enclose all outside areas accessed by HGVs during night time destocking and in line of site to Tudor Farm and The Bungalow. Specifically: the northern barrier/bund shall have no gaps and shall overlap the poultry sheds to the west and run to the north of the access road until it reaches the Kinnerton Road; and the southern barrier/bund shall have no gaps and shall overlap the poultry sheds to the west and the biomass buildings to the east. Any acoustic fencing shall be of close-boarded construction and of a sufficient density to prevent the passage of sound.

9. The development shall be operated in accordance with the submitted Odour Management Plan (Version 3) dated March 2015.
10. The development shall be constructed and operated in accordance with the mitigation measures set out in the SLR Air Quality Assessment dated August 2016.
11. No development shall take place until an external lighting scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained in place.
12. No development shall commence until details of both hard and soft landscape works based on block plan SA/14575/03 Rev B have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include: full specification of tree and hedgerow planting; acoustic barriers/bunds required to satisfy Condition 8; means of enclosure and retaining structures; hard surfacing materials; a maintenance regime for the establishment of the trees and hedgerows; and a timescale for carrying out the works. The works and planting shall be carried out and maintained as approved in accordance with the agreed timescale.
13. Any trees or hedgerow plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.
14. No development shall commence until an updated ecological assessment and management plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This shall address the ecological impact of the access visibility splay and include proposals to maximise the biodiversity benefits of the landscaping proposals. The plan shall be implemented as approved.
15. No development shall commence until the implementation of a programme of archaeological work, in accordance with a written scheme of investigation, has been secured and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.
16. No development shall commence until an integrated drainage scheme for foul, surface water and land drainage has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The drainage scheme shall be implemented as approved.
17. No development shall commence until a management plan to deal with the storage and removal of dead birds and the removal, storage and disposal of manure has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The plan shall be implemented as approved.

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Giles Dodd	Appellant
Mr Harry Dodd	Son of Appellant
Mr Stuart Thomas	Planning Consultant and Director (Berrys)
Ms Mandy Seedhouse	Planning Consultant (Berrys)
Mr Andrew Gough	Consultant Engineer
Ms Michelle Dawson	Acoustic Consultant (SLR Consulting Limited)

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr Mike Allard	Senior Planning Officer
Mr Anthony Lungley	Highways Development Officer
Mr Peter Hargreaves	Environmental Protection Officer
Mr Jim Candlin	Environmental Protection Officer

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Mr Mike Maughan	Dodlesdon Parish Council
Mr Paul Buchanan	Dodlesdon Parish Council
Mr Peter Bullivant	Resident (Tudor Farm)
Dr Kenton Hazel	Aviagen Turkeys Limited
Several other residents also spoke	

DOCUMENTS

- 1 Statement of Dodleston Parish Council
- 2 Presentation by Mr Peter Bullivant
- 3 Statement on behalf of Aviagen Turkeys
- 4 Revised location plan now including ownership boundary in blue
- 5 Swept path analysis of HGV using the Gorstella junction
commissioned by the Parish Council
- 6 Maximum noise from night time noise sources at Tudor Farm and
The Bungalow
- 7 Some 60 proforma objections from residents unable to attend the
Hearing
- 8 Possible condition on a preferred HGV route for discussion
circulated by Inspector