ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

ERECTION OF 3 NO. ADDITIONAL POULTRY HOUSES AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE AT OLD RUSH FARM, SPALDINGTON, EAST RIDING OF YORKSHIRE, DN14 7GX

RUSTON EGGS LTD

SEPTEMBER 2025

Report Prepared By: Ian Pick BSc (Hons) MRICS
Harrison Pick Ltd
Station Farm Offices
Wansford Road
Nafferton
Driffield
YO25 8NJ

Tel: 01377 253363
ian@harrisonpick.co.uk

Harrison Pick Ltd
PLANNING CONSULTANTS

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1.

INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Environmental Statement has been commissioned by Ruston Eggs Ltd to accompany a planning application for the erection of three additional poultry houses with associated feed bins and infrastructure at Old Rush Farm, Spaldington, East Riding of Yorkshire, DN14 7GX. The proposed development will increase the capacity of the farm from 240,000 birds up to 390,000 birds.

1.2 The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 provide for the submission of an Environmental Statement for certain types of development. The regulations prescribe the types of development for which EIA is mandatory (Schedule 1 Development). Regulation 17a provides for mandatory EIA with all proposals which exceed 85,000 birds.

1.3 This report has been prepared by Ian Pick. Ian Pick is a specialist agricultural and rural planning consultant. He holds a Bachelor of Science with Honours Degree in Rural Enterprise and Land Management and is a Professional Member of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors, being qualified in the Rural Practice Division of the Institution.

1.4 Ian Pick has 27 years' experience specialising in agricultural and rural planning whilst employed by MAFF, ADAS, Acorus, Ian Pick Associates Limited and most recently Harrison Pick Ltd.

1.5 Copies of this Environmental Statement are available from Ian Pick Associates Ltd for the sum of £50 for a paper copy, and £10 for a CD copy.

CHAPTER 2.

2. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Regulatory Context

2.1 The requirements of Environmental Impact Assessment are provided within the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. These are referred to as the EIA regulations within this document. The EIA regulations require that any development which is listed in Schedule 1 be subject to EIA.

2.2 The proposed development falls within the definition of Section 17 of Schedule 1, 'Installations for the intensive rearing of poultry or pigs' as it exceeds the threshold of 85,000 broilers as defined in Section 17 part (a).

Screening

2.3 The process of determination whether a proposed development requires an EIA is called 'screening'. The EIA Regulations permit for a developer to request a screening opinion from the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to determine whether the EIA process should be followed. In this instance, EIA is mandatory under Schedule 1 of the 2017 EIA regulations and therefore a screening opinion was not required.

Scoping

2.4 The development proposal seeks consent for the erection of three additional poultry sheds and associated infrastructure at Old Rush Farm.

2.5 This Environmental Impact Assessment provides the following scope of assessment.

- Amenity Impacts
- Ecological Impacts and Ammonia Deposition
- Manure Management

Subjects Scoped Out

Landscape and Visual Impacts

2.6 Landscape and visual impacts have been scoped out of this Environmental Statement. The proposed development is located within the confines of an existing operational poultry farm and will be visually associated with the current agricultural buildings. The surrounding landscape is flat, open, and in intensive

arable use, with few visual receptors in proximity to the site. The new buildings are modest in height (6 metres to ridge), constructed in muted olive green materials (RAL 6003), and will be sited adjacent to existing structures. There are no public rights of way or designated landscape features in the immediate vicinity. Given the context of the site, the visual containment provided by the existing development, and the absence of sensitive receptors within close range, it is concluded that the proposals will not result in any significant landscape or visual effects. As such, a detailed landscape and visual impact assessment is not required, and this matter has been scoped out of the Environmental Statement.

Highways and Transportation Impacts

2.7 Highways and transportation impacts have been scoped out of this Environmental Statement. The proposed development represents an intensification of an existing, well-established agricultural use and will utilise the existing site access onto Spaldington Road, a rural road with inter-visible passing places located approximately 1.8 km from the A614. While there will be an increase in vehicle movements associated with the uplift in bird numbers, the projected traffic levels remain modest and spread over the 45-day production cycle. The nature, frequency, and routing of HGVs are consistent with current operations and are not anticipated to result in a material impact on the local road network. There are no known capacity or safety constraints on Spaldington Road or the wider network that would be exacerbated by the proposals. Accordingly, given the scale of the increase, the nature of the existing access, and the rural context of the site, highways and transportation impacts are not considered significant and have been scoped out of the Environmental Statement.

Assessment and Reporting Methodology

2.8 Following identification of potential environmental effects through the EIA scoping process, technical assessments were carried out in order to predict potential effects associated with the development and where necessary proposed measures to mitigate the effects. These assessments are contained within the Environmental Statement.

The Environmental Statement

2.9 The Environmental Statement has been prepared to accompany an application for planning permission for the erection three additional poultry houses and associated infrastructure at Old Rush Farm. (OS Grid Reference: X477220, Y432262). The application has been submitted to East Riding of Yorkshire Council under the terms of the Town and County Planning Act 1990.

2.10 The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, Schedule 4, requires that an Environmental Statement should include at least the following information:

- A description of the development including:
  - A description of the location of the development
  - A description of the main characteristics of the whole development and the land use requirements during the construction and operational phases.
  - A description of the main characteristics of the operational phase of the development (in particular any production process)
  - An estimate by type and quantity, of expected residues and emissions.
- A description of the reasonable alternatives studied by the developer which are relevant to the proposed project and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reason for selecting the chosen option.
- A description of the current state of the environment (baseline scenario)
- A description of the factors likely to be significantly affected by the development.
- A description of the likely significant effects of the development on the environment resulting from
  - The construction and existence of the development
  - The use of natural resources, in particular land, soil, water and biodiversity.
  - The emission of pollutants, noise, vibration, light, heat and radiation, the creation of nuisances, and the disposal and recovery of waste.
  - The risks to human health, cultural heritage or the environment
  - The accumulation of effects with other existing and / or approved projects.
  - The impact of the project on the climate and vulnerability of the project to climate change
  - The technologies and substances used
- A description of the forecasting methods or evidence used to identify and assess the significant effects on the environment including any difficulties encountered compiling the required information.
- A description of the measures envisaged to avoid, prevent, reduce or, if possible, offset any identified significant adverse effects on the environment. That description should explain the extent to which significant adverse effects on the environment are avoided, prevented, reduced or offset, and should cover both the construction and operational phases.
- A description of the expected significant adverse effects of the development on the environment deriving from the vulnerability of the development to risks of major accidents and / or disasters which are relevant to the project concerned. Where appropriate, this description should include measures envisaged to prevent or mitigate the significant adverse effects of such events

on the environment and details of the preparedness for and proposed response to such emergencies.

- A non-technical summary of the above.

Contributors to the Environmental Statement

2.11 The team of consultants involved in the EIA are listed in table 2.1 below. Each was selected for their technical services and expertise in their respective fields.

Table 2.1

Chapter	**Consultants**
1. Introduction	Harrison Pick Ltd
2. EIA Process	Harrison Pick Ltd
3. Description of Development	Harrison Pick Ltd
4. Choice of Location	Harrison Pick Ltd
5. Planning Policy Context	Harrison Pick Ltd
6. Potential Environmental Effects	Harrison Pick Ltd
7. Amenity Impacts	Matrix Acoustics / AS Modelling and Data
8. Ecology	Emms and Barnett
9. Ammonia	AS Modelling and Data
10. Manure Management Strategy	Harrison Pick Ltd
Non-Technical Summary	Harrison Pick Ltd

CHAPTER 3.

3. DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

3.1 This chapter provides a comprehensive description of the proposed development to expand the operational capacity of the poultry farm at Old Rush Farm, Spaldington, East Riding of Yorkshire. The development involves the construction of three new poultry houses and associated infrastructure, increasing the site's overall bird capacity from 240,000 to 390,000 broiler chickens.

3.2 This chapter outlines the physical characteristics of the development, operational processes, supporting infrastructure, traffic movements, environmental controls, lighting, and drainage strategy. It also introduces the assessment methodology applied throughout the Environmental Statement and the key impact areas assessed, including amenity (noise and odour), ecology, ammonia, and manure management.

Site Background and Context

3.3 Old Rush Farm is an established commercial poultry production facility located approximately 3.5 km north-north-east of the town of Howden, in the East Riding of Yorkshire. The farm lies in a rural area characterised predominantly by arable agriculture.

3.4 The existing site consists of five poultry houses arranged around a central concrete apron, with associated control rooms, feed bins, drainage infrastructure, and access tracks. The topography of the land is level, at approximately 5 metres Above Ordnance Datum (AOD), and the area is drained.

3.5 The site is accessed from Spaldington Road, approximately 1.8 km from its junction with the A614. The closest off-site residential properties lie approximately 550 metres to the north-west. Other than the Old Rush Farm farmhouse, there are no properties within the immediate vicinity.

Overview of the Proposed Development

3.6 The proposed development comprises the following elements:

- Erection of three poultry houses (each 110 m long by 20.42 m wide)
- Two control rooms linking the poultry houses at the southeastern end (each 6 m x 6 m)
- Installation of six feed bins (3.5 m diameter, 8.6 m in height)
- Extension of the central concrete service apron

- A new dirty water storage tank
- Expansion of the existing infiltration basin
- Associated service connections and internal circulation improvements

3.7 The proposed poultry houses will be positioned to the north of the existing sheds, adjacent to Poultry House 1, forming a second row of four houses mirroring the existing row. The new layout will create two parallel rows of four houses, arranged around the expanded central apron.

3.8 The new buildings will be of steel portal frame construction, externally clad in polyester-coated profiled sheeting in olive green (RAL 6003). The buildings will have an eaves height of approximately 3.3 metres and a ridge height of 6 metres.

3.9 Roof-mounted high-speed uncapped ridge fans will provide primary mechanical ventilation. Gable-end fans will offer supplementary ventilation during hot weather conditions. This design matches the ventilation systems of the existing poultry houses on site.

Operational Process

3.10 Each of the new poultry houses will accommodate up to 50,000 broiler chickens, contributing an additional 150,000 birds per flock cycle. The total site capacity will therefore increase from 240,000 to 390,000 birds.

3.11 The broiler chickens are delivered to the site as day-old chicks and reared over a 38-day growing period. At day 30, approximately 30% of the birds are removed during a process known as thinning. The remaining birds are cleared from the sheds on days 37 and 38.

3.12 Once depopulation is complete, all litter and manure are mechanically removed and loaded directly into articulated HGV trailers for export off-site to licensed biomass energy facilities. The houses and apron areas are then cleaned using high-pressure hoses. All wash water and dirty water are collected into sealed storage tanks and removed by tanker to a licensed treatment facility.

3.13 The poultry houses are equipped with automated feeding and drinking systems. LPG-powered heating systems maintain the optimum internal climate for animal welfare, in conjunction with the ventilation systems.

Environmental Permitting

3.14 The poultry farm is operated under an existing **Environmental Permit (EPR/KP3206BK)** issued by the Environment Agency in accordance with the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016.

3.15 The existing permit regulates key operational aspects including emissions to air, land, and water, waste management, odour, noise, and drainage. A variation to the permit will be sought to incorporate the additional bird capacity. The development will continue to operate within the permitted environmental limits and performance standards set by the Environment Agency.

Traffic and Vehicle Movements

3.16 The proposed expansion will result in an increase in the number of HGV and agricultural vehicle movements associated with the operation of the farm, proportional to the increase in bird numbers.

3.17 The site is accessed from Spaldington Road, a rural road with inter-visible passing places, located approximately 1.8 km from the A614 junction. The road has historically accommodated the existing traffic associated with the poultry operation without constraint.

3.18 The following table provides a comparison between existing and proposed vehicle movements on a per-flock and annual basis (based on 7.6 flocks per annum):

Table 3.1: Existing vs Proposed Traffic Generation

Activity	**Vehicle Type**	**Existing per Flock (240,000 birds)**	**Proposed per Flock (390,000 birds)**	**Pattern of Movements**
Chick Delivery	16.5m Articulated HGV	4	6	All on Day 1
Feed Delivery	16.5m Articulated HGV	26	42	Even distribution – approx daily
Bird Collection	16.5m Articulated HGV	30	49	15 on Day 30 (1 per hr), 17 on Days 37 & 38 (1 per hr)

Dead Bird Collection	Box Van	5	5	1 per week
Manure Removal	16.5m Articulated HGV	13	21	10–11 per day on Days 39 and 40
Dirty Water Removal	Tractor and Tanker	1	2	Day 44
Bedding Delivery	16.5m Articulated HGV	1	2	Day 45
Total Per Flock		**80**	**127**	
Total Per Annum (7.6 flocks)		**608**	**965**	

Drainage and Water Management

3.19 The existing site drainage strategy separates clean and dirty water. Clean roof water is currently discharged to an infiltration basin located within the site boundary. This basin will be expanded as part of the proposed development to accommodate additional surface water runoff from the new buildings.

3.20 Dirty water produced during the cleaning process will continue to be directed to sealed underground tanks. This water will be removed from site by licensed contractors and transported to appropriate treatment facilities. No dirty water will be discharged to land or surface water.

3.21 The design approach reflects best practice and complies with Environment Agency guidance and permit conditions.

Landscape and Visual Impact

3.22 The proposed development is situated within an established agricultural complex and will be visually associated with the existing poultry houses. The flat topography, distance from sensitive receptors, and the olive green cladding of the buildings all contribute to minimising visual prominence.

3.23 The buildings have a modest ridge height of 6 metres and are not expected to result in significant adverse visual or landscape effects. There are no public footpaths or designated landscape features in the immediate vicinity of the site.

Construction and Phasing

3.24 Construction will take place over a period of approximately 6 months, subject to planning approval and environmental permitting.

3.25 The works will be carried out in a single phase and include site preparation, foundation works, erection of poultry houses, installation of feed bins and control rooms, and drainage works. Construction traffic will use the existing site access and will be managed to avoid peak traffic periods.

Lighting

3.26 The proposed development does not involve the installation of any additional 24-hour external lighting. The lighting regime at the site will remain broadly as existing, which does not include any continuous outdoor illumination.

3.27 The only new lighting will comprise directional floodlights positioned above the catching doors on the southeastern elevation of each new poultry house. These lights will be **used** only during the catching process, which takes place on up to three nights per flock (typically days 30, 37, and 38).

3.28 The lights will be directed downwards and shielded to prevent light spill. Their use will be strictly time-limited and controlled to ensure that the rural character of the site is maintained and no unacceptable light pollution occurs.

Scoped Environmental Topics

3.29 The following environmental topic areas are scoped into the Environmental Statement and assessed in full in subsequent chapters:

- Amenity Impacts: Noise and Odour
- Ecological Impacts
- Ammonia Deposition
- Manure Management

Characteristics and Production Processes

3.30 The proposed buildings will be used for the rearing of day-old broiler chickens through to finished table weight. The production cycle operates over a 38-day period followed by a 10-day clean-out and turnaround phase.

Expected Residues and Emissions

3.31 Expected residues and emissions from the site include:

- Airborne emissions in the form of odour, ammonia, and nitrogen
- Noise emissions from mechanical plant and transport
- Wastes in the form of poultry manure and dirty water

Impact of the Project on Climate and Vulnerability to Climate Change

3.32 In line with the EIA Regulations and planning policy guidance, the potential impacts of the proposed development on the climate, and its resilience to future climate change, have been considered.

3.33 The proposed development represents an intensification of an existing poultry enterprise. It does not introduce a new land use but expands a regulated, environmentally permitted activity already in operation under Environmental Permit EPR/KP3206BK. The site is operated in accordance with best practice in terms of efficiency, welfare, waste minimisation, and energy use, including the export of poultry manure to biomass facilities for renewable energy generation.

3.34 The development will increase the total capacity of the farm from 240,000 to 390,000 birds. However, this will be achieved through modern buildings with optimised mechanical ventilation, energy-efficient heating (LPG), and precision-controlled feed and water systems, all of which contribute to a lower carbon intensity per unit of production.

3.35 The design of the drainage system incorporates climate change allowances in accordance with national guidance. An expanded infiltration basin is included to accommodate additional surface water runoff resulting from more intense rainfall patterns associated with future climate change scenarios. The site is not located within a flood risk zone and is not vulnerable to coastal or fluvial flooding.

3.36 In relation to the project's effect on climate change, it is acknowledged that recent case law, particularly Finch v Surrey County Council [2024] UKSC 20, has clarified that downstream greenhouse gas emissions may be a material consideration in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), depending on the nature of the project. However, the Finch judgment concerned the extraction and commercial sale of crude oil — a fossil fuel whose downstream combustion was the primary purpose of the project and an inherent environmental effect.

3.37 That case is materially distinguishable from the current proposal. The development at Old Rush Farm is not a fossil fuel extraction or energy production project, but a form of primary food production. The proposed poultry farming operations are subject to extensive regulatory oversight under the Environmental

Permitting Regime, and associated emissions from feed production, transport, and processing are part of the wider food supply chain — not direct environmental effects of the construction or operation of the poultry houses themselves.

3.38 The Supreme Court in Finch did not establish a general principle that all forms of indirect or downstream emissions must be assessed in every EIA. Rather, the judgment leaves this to be determined by the facts of the individual case and the scope of "likely significant effects" arising from the development itself.

3.39 It is therefore considered that requiring a full lifecycle greenhouse gas assessment — including emissions associated with animal feed, slaughter, packaging, retail, and consumer use — is neither proportionate nor required in this case. These activities are not within the applicant's control or the project's direct effects. Moreover, the farm already operates under a permit that includes controls over emissions, waste, and energy use.

3.40 The expansion of domestic poultry production has clear benefits in terms of food security and sustainability. The UK is not self-sufficient in poultry meat, and a substantial proportion of demand is met through imports from overseas. Increasing local production contributes to reducing food miles, shortening supply chains, and improving the resilience of the national food system — all of which are consistent with the Government's environmental and climate change goals.

3.41 In summary, the project does not give rise to likely significant climate change impacts that would require further specific assessment beyond those covered by this Environmental Statement. The development is resilient to future climate risks, contributes to sustainable domestic food production, and aligns with national climate and food security objectives.

Forecasting Methods

3.42 The forecasting methods used within this assessment are detailed within the individual topic chapters and associated technical appendices. These include:

- **Noise**: BS4142:2014
- **Odour**: Environment Agency H4 Odour Guidance & IAQM Odour Guidance
- **Ecology**: Handbook for Phase 1 Habitat Survey (JNCC, 2010) and CIEEM guidance (2017)
- **Ammonia Deposition**: Ammonia modelling has been completed in line with the requirements of *Guidance on modelling the concentration and deposition of ammonia emitted from intensive farming. Air Quality Modelling and Assessment Unit, 22 November 2010, v3*.
- **Manure Management**: Consideration of case law including *R (Squire) v Shropshire Council* [2019] and *R (Caffyn) v Shropshire Council* [2025]

Environmental Assessment Level Methodology

3.43 The potential environmental effects of the proposed development have been assessed using a qualitative impact significance framework, based on the scale, extent, and sensitivity of the effect. The following table defines the levels of effect:

Table 3.2: Significance Levels of Environmental Effects

Level	**Definition**
None	*No discernible environmental effect beyond those already occurring under the existing agricultural regime.*
Low	*A minor, localised effect that does not adversely affect environmental features or receptors. Effects are limited in scale or distance, and do not compromise existing land uses.*
Medium	*A moderate effect that results in some impact on environmental features or receptors, but not to a degree considered significant under applicable planning or environmental regulations.*
High	*A significant environmental effect. This may require mitigation or result in notable changes to environmental quality or land use.*
Positive	*A beneficial effect that enhances environmental quality or contributes positively to existing environmental conditions.*

3.44 This assessment methodology has been applied consistently across all scoped topic areas in this Environmental Statement to ensure a robust, transparent, and proportionate analysis of potential environmental impacts.

CHAPTER 4.

4. CHOICE OF LOCATION / ALTERNATIVE SITES

4.1 The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 require an Environmental Statement to cover alternatives **studied** by the applicants.

4.2 In accordance with the EIA Regulations, the requirement to consider alternative sites has been reviewed. In this case, no alternative locations have been assessed, as the proposal relates specifically to the expansion of an existing, long-established poultry farming operation at Old Rush Farm. The infrastructure, environmental permitting, operational expertise, and logistical connections already in place make this site uniquely suited to the development. Relocating the proposed development elsewhere would not be viable or sustainable, as it would require the duplication of existing facilities, infrastructure, and environmental controls. Furthermore, the proposed new poultry houses are sited immediately adjacent to the existing units, ensuring efficient use of land, containment of operational impacts, and minimal landscape intrusion. As such, the proposed location represents the most appropriate and logical site for the development, and no alternative sites have been considered.

CHAPTER 5.

5. PLANNING AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

Introduction

5.1 This chapter identifies planning policy relevant to the proposed development and the application site, together with an assessment of the development proposal against the planning policy and guidance.

5.2 The proposed development has been prepared having regard to national and local policy and guidance.

National Planning Policy Framework

5.3 The National Planning Policy Framework confirms that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development. Paragraph 8 of the NPPF states "Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives):

a) **an economic objective** – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;

b) **a social objective** – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe places, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and

c) **an environmental objective**–to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.

5.4 Paragraph 85 set the Governments position on economic growth, as detailed below:

Planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on

the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development. The approach taken should allow each area to build on its strengths, counter any weaknesses and address the challenges of the future. This is particularly important where Britain can be a global leader in driving innovation, and in areas with high levels of productivity, which should be able to capitalise on their performance and potential.

5.5 Paragraph 88 provides support for economic growth in rural areas, as detailed below:

88. Planning policies and decisions should enable:

a) the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings;

b) the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses;

5.6 Paragraph 201 refers to developments where a separate Environmental Permit is required in terms of the operation of the site.

201. The focus of planning policies and decisions should be on whether proposed development is an acceptable use of land, rather than the control of processes or emissions (where these are subject to separate pollution control regimes). Planning decisions should assume that these regimes will operate effectively. Equally, where a planning decision has been made on a particular development, the planning issues should not be revisited through the permitting regimes operated by pollution control authorities.

Local Planning Policy – *East Riding Local Plan 2025*

5.7 Policy S4 relates to Supporting Development in Villages and the Countryside. Part D of S4 relates to the Countryside and states "*Outside of a development limit, land will be regarded as the Countryside and the following forms of development are supported, where proposals respect the intrinsic character of their surroundings*". D (9) provides support for agricultural development.

CHAPTER 6.

6. POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL AFFECTS

6.1 The bird numbers associated with the proposed development exceeds Schedule 1 threshold, and therefore an EIA is mandatory as part of the planning application process.

6.2 The scope of the Environmental Statement is detailed below:

- Amenity Impacts
- Ecological Impacts and Ammonia Deposition
- Manure Management

Scope of the Assessments

Amenity Issues – Noise & Odour

6.3 Noise is assessed in Chapter 7, and within the Noise Impact Assessment at ***Appendix 2***. The scope of the noise assessment includes all potential noise sources arising from the operation of the proposed development described in Chapter 3, including plant in the form of the mechanical ventilation systems and transport related activities. The assessment has been prepared in accordance with BS4142:2014.

6.4 Odour is assessed in Chapter 7, and within the Odour Impact Assessment at ***Appendix 3***. The scope of the odour assessment includes odour sources arising from the operation of the proposed development described in Chapter 3. The assessment has been prepared in accordance with Environment Agency H4 Odour Management Guidance and IAQM Odour Guidance.

Ecological and Ammonia Impacts

6.5 Ecological impacts are assessed in Chapter 8, and within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal at **Appendix 4**. The survey and ecological assessment of the site follows the approach set out in guidance published by the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM, 2017).

6.6 Ammonia and Nitrogen Deposition has been assessed in Chapter 9, and within the Ammonia Impact Assessment at **Appendix 5**. Ammonia modelling has been completed in line with the requirements of *Guidance on modelling the concentration and deposition of ammonia emitted from intensive farming. Air Quality Modelling and Assessment Unit, 22 November 2010, v3*.

Manure Management

6.7 Manure Management is assessed in Chapter 10 including consideration of case law including *R (Squire) v Shropshire Council* [2019] and *R (Caffyn) v Shropshire Council* [2025]

CHAPTER 7.

7. AMENITY IMPACTS

Noise

Introduction

7.1 This chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES) considers the potential noise impacts arising from the proposed development at Old Rush Farm, Spaldington. It is informed by a detailed Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) prepared by Matrix Acoustic Design Consultants, which is provided in full at **Appendix 2** of the ES.

7.2 The NIA assesses noise emissions from both fixed plant (i.e., mechanical ventilation systems) and vehicle movements associated with the proposed poultry houses. The methodology and assessment criteria follow best practice standards, specifically **BS4142:2014+A1:2019**, and the findings demonstrate that the development will not result in significant adverse effects on residential amenity.

Overview of the Development

7.3 The proposed development comprises three additional poultry houses to be constructed adjacent to the existing five sheds, resulting in a total of eight poultry buildings on site. The primary noise-generating components of the proposal are:

- Mechanical ventilation systems, including:
  - 18 ridge-mounted Skov DCT 920-1 fans per shed
  - 9 gable-end Skov BF50 fans per shed (emergency/high-temperature use only)
- Transport-related noise**,** including HGV movements and activities on the central concrete apron.

7.4 The nearest sensitive receptor is a private dwelling approximately **570 metres** to the northwest of the proposed sheds (identified as Receptor A in the NIA).

Methodology and Assessment Criteria

7.5 The assessment follows the methodology set out in **BS4142:2014+A1:2019**, which is the industry standard for assessing industrial and commercial noise near dwellings. The assessment compares the **rating level** of the specific noise sources (adjusted for tonal and temporal characteristics) against measured **background sound levels**.

7.6 According to BS4142, the following guidance thresholds are applied:

- A difference of **+10dB or more** indicates a **significant adverse impact**
- A difference of **+5dB** indicates a **likely adverse impact**
- Where the **rating level is equal to or below** the background sound level, the impact is likely to be **low or negligible**, depending on context

7.7 The assessment also considers night-time noise ingress using **BS8233** and **ProPG guidance**, particularly the **LAmax,F 45dB** criterion for maximum permissible night-time internal noise events.

Baseline Conditions

7.8 A baseline noise survey was conducted at the site on **8–9 September 2025** during dry weather and low wind conditions. Monitoring equipment included Brüel & Kjær Type 2238 noise meters and a Kestrel Type 5500 weather station. Background sound levels were measured at Receptor A, representative of the local noise environment during day, evening, and night-time periods.

Assessment of Effects

Mechanical Ventilation Plant

7.9 The noise generated by the ridge-mounted and gable-end fans was modelled using manufacturers' noise data and standard propagation modelling. The fans operate intermittently, and gable-end fans only function during emergency or high-temperature scenarios.

7.10 At Receptor A, the **BS4142 assessment concluded a "low to very low" impact** during the daytime and evening. During night-time hours, when ventilation systems are typically operating at reduced capacity, noise levels at the receptor were well below both background sound levels and relevant internal noise thresholds.

Transport Noise

7.11 Vehicle movements and loading/unloading occur on the central apron between poultry houses. The proposed buildings will provide **full acoustic screening** between these activities and Receptor A, with no line of sight.

7.12 Noise ingress calculations show that the **maximum LAmax,F during the night is below 45dB**, remaining **under the threshold that should not be exceeded more than 10 times per night**, in line with **ProPG guidance**. Therefore, the noise associated with transport activities is considered **negligible**, even during catching operations (days 30, 37, and 38 of the crop cycle).

Mitigation Measures

7.13 No additional mitigation is required, as the proposed ventilation and transport activities fall well within acceptable noise impact levels.

Cumulative and Operational Effects

7.14 The additional sheds form part of the existing poultry operation and do not introduce new noise sources. The cumulative effect of operating all eight sheds simultaneously has been included in the assessment. The results demonstrate that **cumulative operational noise remains within acceptable limits**, and in some respects, the **layout improves the acoustic environment** by shielding existing sources from sensitive receptors.

Conclusion

7.15 The noise assessment demonstrates that the proposed development will not result in significant noise impacts at nearby dwellings, including during sensitive night-time periods. Predicted levels fall within the thresholds considered to have **low or negligible impact** under BS4142:2014+A1:2019 and ProPG guidance.

7.15 The development is therefore considered to be **acceptable in noise terms**, and no adverse effects on residential amenity are anticipated as a result of the proposal.

Environmental Impact Assessment Level

7.17 Based on the criteria in table 3.2 on page 15 of this statement, the noise impacts are assessed as **Low -** *A minor, localised effect that does not adversely affect environmental features or receptors. Effects are limited in scale or distance, and do not compromise existing land uses.*

Odour

Introduction

7.18 This chapter of the Environmental Statement considers the potential odour impacts associated with the proposed development at Old Rush Farm, Spaldington. The assessment is based on a detailed Odour Impact Assessment (OIA)prepared by AS Modelling & Data Ltd., which is provided in full at Appendix 3 to this ES.

7.19 The OIA evaluates the cumulative odour impacts of the existing poultry operations and the proposed three additional poultry houses. The assessment

includes atmospheric dispersion modelling using recognised methodologies and up-to-date meteorological data to determine whether the development could result in odour levels that would cause adverse effects at nearby sensitive receptors.

Methodology

7.20 The assessment follows current Environment Agency guidance and best practice in odour modelling. Odour emissions from the poultry houses were calculated using an emissions model that accounts for:

- The likely internal odour concentrations within the buildings.
- Ventilation rates, based on fan specifications and typical operational conditions.

7.21 The resulting odour emission rates were input into the ADMS (Atmospheric Dispersion Modelling System), incorporating both the terrain module and the calms module, to simulate dispersion under a range of meteorological conditions.

7.22 The model was run twelve times – once for each year of a four-year meteorological record and for each of the three crop cycles typical of annual broiler production. From this, the annual 98th percentile of hourly mean odour concentrations was calculated at each receptor location, in accordance with Environment Agency benchmarking methodology.

7.23 The key assessment criterion used is the Environment Agency's odour benchmark of 3.0 ouE/m³ as a 98th percentile of hourly means – the threshold above which odour is considered to potentially cause loss of amenity.

Baseline Conditions

7.24 Old Rush Farm is located in a rural area approximately 3.5 km north-northeast of Howden, East Riding of Yorkshire. The surrounding area consists primarily of arable farmland. There are five existing poultry houses on the site, accommodating up to 240,000 broiler chickens.

7.25 The nearest off-site residential receptors include properties located along Spaldington Road, approximately 550 metres from the proposed development. The farmhouse at Old Rush Farm is closer, and therefore represents the most sensitive receptor.

Proposed Development

7.26 The proposal involves the construction of three additional poultry houses on land to the north of the existing poultry sheds. These new units will accommodate an additional 150,000 broiler chickens, increasing the total capacity of the farm to 390,000 birds.

7.27 The ventilation system for the new buildings will be similar to the existing setup: ridge-mounted, uncapped high-speed fans, with gable-end fans used only during periods of hot weather or in emergencies.

7.28 Chickens will be reared on a 38-day cycle, followed by a 10-day turnaround. Manure will be removed at the end of each cycle and exported off-site to biomass energy facilities. This regime mirrors current best practice and limits potential odour sources to within the controlled housing environment.

Assessment Results

7.29 The results of the dispersion modelling demonstrate that odour concentrations at all off-site residential receptorsare predicted to remain below the Environment Agency's benchmark of 3.0 ouE/m³ as an annual 98th percentile of hourly means.

7.30 The only receptor where this benchmark is exceeded is the on-site farmhouse, which is associated with the farming operation and therefore not classified as a public receptor in this context.

7.31 Table 2 of the OIA (reproduced in Appendix 3) summarises predicted concentrations for each modelled receptor, confirming compliance with odour thresholds in all cases other than the farmhouse.

Cumulative Effects

7.32 The modelling considers cumulative odour emissions from both the existing and proposed poultry houses. The expansion does not introduce new or different odour-generating activities but increases the scale of existing processes.

7.33 The combined emissions have been shown to remain within acceptable limits at all sensitive receptors, demonstrating that the proposed development can be accommodated without resulting in a material change in odour exposure levels in the surrounding area.

Mitigation Measures

7.34 Given the results of the odour modelling, no additional mitigation measures are deemed necessary. The farm's existing operational practices already reflect good agricultural and environmental practice.

Conclusion

7.34 The odour assessment demonstrates that the proposed development will not result in significant odour impacts at any residential receptor, with all predicted concentrations falling below the Environment Agency's odour benchmark of 3.0 ouE/m³.

7.36 The development complies with national and local planning policies relating to amenity, and the results confirm that odour will not be a constraint to the proposed expansion. The impact is therefore assessed as not significant.

Environmental Impact Assessment Level

7.37 Based on the criteria in table 3.2 on page 15 of this statement, the odour impacts are assessed as **Low -** *A minor, localised effect that does not adversely affect environmental features or receptors. Effects are limited in scale or distance, and do not compromise existing land uses.*

CHAPTER 8

8. ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS

Ecological Impacts

Introduction

8.1 This chapter of the Environmental Statement considers the potential ecological impacts arising from the proposed expansion of the poultry farm at Old Rush Farm, Spaldington. It draws upon a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA)undertaken by Craig Emms and Linda Barnett, which is included in full at **Appendix 4** of this ES.

8.2 The assessment identifies habitats and species that may be present on or near the site and evaluates whether the proposed development would result in any significant adverse ecological effects. It also confirms whether further ecological surveys or mitigation are necessary, and whether the scheme can deliver measurable Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG).

Methodology

8.3 The PEA followed standard guidelines for ecological assessment, combining a desk study with a Phase 1 Habitat Survey, which was carried out during a walkover of the site on 30th August 2025.

8.4 The Phase 1 survey methodology followed the Handbook for Phase 1 Habitat Survey (JNCC, 2010) and current survey guidance from the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM, 2017). The objective was to:

- Identify and characterise habitats on site;
- Identify any features of ecological interest or potential protected species;
- Evaluate the intrinsic ecological value of the site; and
- Provide recommendations for further survey, mitigation, or enhancement if necessary.

Baseline Conditions

8.5 The site lies within a rural agricultural landscape, largely surrounded by arable land. The proposed development site itself comprises modified grassland, tall ruderal vegetation, and some farm infrastructure, including existing poultry houses and access roads.

8.6 An attenuation pond is present on site, and three off-site ponds were identified within 500 metres. However, these off-site ponds were not accessible at the time

of survey and their potential to support amphibians, including Great Crested Newts, could not be confirmed through direct survey.

8.7 No designated ecological sites (statutory or non-statutory) lie within the development boundary or immediate area.

8.8 The PEA concluded that the habitats on site are common and widespread, with low intrinsic biodiversity value. The site was found to be not of sufficient ecological value to warrant protection from development and does not provide habitat features of high sensitivity or importance at the local or national level.

Potential Ecological Impacts

8.9 The proposed development will involve the removal of areas of modified grassland and the expansion of existing hardstanding surfaces and buildings. These land covers are of low ecological value, and their loss will not result in significant effects on habitats or associated species.

8.10 Although the off-site ponds could not be surveyed directly, the distances involved, the lack of high-quality terrestrial habitat on site, the risk of significant effects on amphibians is very low. Nevertheless, a precautionary approach to site clearance will be adopted as good practice.

8.11 There are no features on or adjacent to the site suitable for use by roosting bats or nesting birds, and no signs of protected species were found during the walkover.

Mitigation and Enhancement

8.12 As the site is of low ecological value and no protected species are confirmed, no specific mitigation is required beyond adherence to best practice construction methods and precautionary working during site clearance.

8.13 In line with national planning policy and the Environment Act 2021, a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessmenthas been undertaken. The assessment demonstrates that a minimum 10% net gain in biodiversity units can be achieved on-site, without reliance on off-site compensation or credits.

Residual Effects

8.14 With the implementation of the proposed design, best practice construction management, and habitat enhancement measures, the ecological impact of the development will be negligible.

8.15 The scheme results in the loss of low-value habitat but delivers measurable habitat creation and improvement, resulting in a net gain for biodiversity and aligning with relevant planning policy and legal obligations.

Conclusion

8.16 The ecological survey confirms that the development site is of low biodiversity value and does not support protected habitats or species. No significant adverse impacts are anticipated.

8.17 A Biodiversity Net Gain of at least 10% will be delivered through targeted habitat creation and enhancement on site. The proposed development is therefore considered ecologically acceptable and in accordance with both national and local environmental planning policy.

Environmental Impact Assessment Level

8.18 Based on the criteria in table 3.2 on page 15 of this statement, the ecological impacts are assessed as **Low -** *A minor, localised effect that does not adversely affect environmental features or receptors. Effects are limited in scale or distance, and do not compromise existing land uses.*

CHAPTER 9

9. AMMONIA IMPACTS

Introduction

9.1 This section presents the findings of the ammonia impact assessment undertaken in support of the proposed expansion of the poultry facility at Old Rush Farm, Spaldington. The assessment was completed by AS Modelling & Data Ltd. and is appended in full at **Appendix 5** of this Environmental Statement.

9.2 The assessment evaluates the likely impacts of ammonia emissions and associated nitrogen and acid deposition arising from the proposed development on designated ecological sites in the surrounding area. It uses recognised Environment Agency emission factors and atmospheric dispersion modelling to forecast potential impacts in accordance with current regulatory expectations.

Assessment Methodology

9.3 The assessment employed standard ammonia emission factors published by the Environment Agency for broiler chicken rearing. Emissions were modelled from the proposed three new poultry houses, which will accommodate up to 150,000 birds, using high-speed roof-mounted extract fans and gable-end fans (used during warm weather only).

9.4 The dispersion modelling used considers local meteorological data and topographical conditions. The ADMS atmospheric dispersion model was applied to assess:

- Ammonia concentrations in the surrounding air,
- Nitrogen deposition rates, and
- Acid deposition rates.

9.5 These outputs were then compared to the Critical Levels and Loads for ammonia and nitrogen deposition set for various designated ecological sites, in line with Natural England and Environment Agency guidance.

Baseline Conditions

9.6 Old Rush Farm is located in a rural, arable landscape approximately 3.5 km north-northeast of Howden, East Riding of Yorkshire. The site sits at around 5m above sea level on level, well-drained land.

9.7 The nearest designated site is a Local Wildlife Site (LWS) within 2 km. There are no Ancient Woodlands within the study area.

9.8 Within a 10 km radius, there are six Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), several of which are also designated as Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), Special Protection Areas (SPAs), and Ramsar sites. These include:

- Barn Hill Meadows SSSI – approx. 5.1 km southwest
- South Cliffe Common SSSI – approx. 8.8 km east-northeast
- Breighton Meadows SSSI/SAC/SPA/Ramsar – approx. 6.1 km west
- Derwent Ings SSSI/SAC/SPA/Ramsar – approx. 7.0 km northwest
- River Derwent SSSI/SAC/SPA – approx. 6.4 km west
- Humber Estuary SSSI/SAC/SPA/Ramsar – approx. 5.4 km south-southwest

9.9 These designated sites are sensitive to increases in atmospheric ammonia and nitrogen deposition due to their floristic compositions.

Predicted Impacts

9.10 The modelled outputs show that process contributions from the proposed development to annual mean ammonia concentrations, nitrogen deposition, and acid deposition:

- Are well below the Environment Agency's lower screening thresholds at all non-statutory and statutoryecological receptors.
- Are below 1% of the relevant Critical Level/Load at all statutory sites assessed, including SACs, SPAs, and Ramsar sites.

9.11 The modelling demonstrates that the proposed development will not lead to exceedances of any relevant ecological thresholds for ammonia or nitrogen deposition at sensitive receptors.

Significance of Effects

9.12 According to current regulatory guidance (including the Environment Agency's "Air Emissions Risk Assessment for your Environmental Permit"), where process contributions are below 1% of the Critical Level/Load, the effects are considered insignificant and do not warrant further assessment.

9.13 As all modelled impacts fall below this threshold, and cumulative emissions (including from the existing poultry houses) remain within acceptable bounds, the residual ecological impact from ammonia emissions is considered to be negligible.

Mitigation and Management

9.14 Given the low predicted impact, no specific mitigation measures are required to reduce ammonia emissions beyond what is already proposed within the design and operational plans of the facility.

Conclusion

9.15 The detailed dispersion modelling assessment has demonstrated that ammonia emissions from the proposed development will not result in significant adverse effects on any designated ecological site within the 10 km study area.

9.16 The predicted contributions are well below all applicable regulatory thresholds, and the development is considered environmentally acceptable in respect of ammonia and nitrogen impacts.

9.17 The proposal complies with relevant legislation and planning policy regarding protection of ecological receptors from atmospheric pollution.

Environmental Impact Assessment Level

9.18 Based on the criteria in table 3.2 on page 15 of this statement, the ammonia impacts are assessed as **Low -** *A minor, localised effect that does not adversely affect environmental features or receptors. Effects are limited in scale or distance, and do not compromise existing land uses.*

CHAPTER 10

10. MANURE MANAGEMENT

Introduction

10.1 This chapter outlines the proposed manure management strategy for the expanded poultry operation at Old Rush Farm, Spaldington. The approach has been developed to ensure full compliance with environmental regulations and best practice, and has been reviewed in the context of recent legal judgments relevant to poultry developments and waste disposal. The management strategy confirms that all poultry manure will be handled, removed, and disposed of in a manner that is environmentally sustainable, legally robust, and consistent with the requirements of the planning system.

Manure Generation and Waste Streams

10.2 The primary waste product generated by the proposed development is poultry manure (or litter), comprising a mixture of bedding material and bird droppings. The development will increase bird numbers from 240,000 to 390,000, resulting in the following estimated volumes:

- Existing annual manure production (7.6 flocks/year): 2,645 tonnes
- Proposed annual manure production (7.6 flocks/year): 4,302 tonnes

10.3 There are no other significant agricultural or hazardous wastes generated by the development. Carcasses and mortalities are managed separately under The Animal By-Products (Enforcement) (England) Regulations 2013. Dirty washout water is removed from the site under contact with a licensed treatment works.

Manure Handling and On-Site Controls

10.4 All manure is removed from the poultry houses at the end of each flock cycle, immediately following depopulation and cleaning. It is loaded directly into sheeted HGV trailers stationed on sealed hardstanding adjacent to the poultry sheds. No manure is stored or stockpiled on-site at any time. Typically, manure removal is completed within 48 hours of each flock cycle. All handling occurs on sealed surfaces with effective drainage to prevent runoff or leachate generation, minimising any risk of pollution.

Off-Site Disposal and End Use

10.5 All poultry manure is removed from the site and delivered directly to Thetford Power Station, a licensed biomass energy facility operating under Environmental Permit No. EPR/PP3235LP. The facility is permitted to process up to 550,000 tonnes per annum of organic waste streams, including poultry litter. There is no land spreading, storage, or composting of manure on-site or off-site.

10.6 The manure is combusted for the generation of renewable electricity (35.8 MW capacity), displacing fossil fuels and contributing positively to national decarbonisation targets. This form of waste-to-energy recovery ensures that the manure is not a source of nutrient pollution or ammonia emissions in the wider environment.

Legal Context and Case Law Compliance

10.7 The manure management strategy has been carefully assessed in light of recent case law that establishes precedent for environmental impact assessment and planning decisions related to poultry farming.

10.8 In *R (Caffyn) v Shropshire Council* [2025] EWHC 1497 (Admin), the court emphasised the need for planning authorities to consider indirect environmental effects of exported manure, especially in relation to protected ecological sites such as SACs, SPAs, and Ramsar sites. This requirement applies even where manure is not stored or spread on the application site. However, in this case, no such pathway exists: all manure is transferred directly to Thetford Power Station, a fully permitted energy-from-waste facility. There is no application of manure to land, and no route by which nutrient loading could occur. Accordingly, the proposal does not trigger further screening under the Habitats Regulations 2017 and is consistent with the legal principles set out in Caffyn.

10.9 In *R (Squire) v Shropshire Council* [2019] EWCA Civ 888, the Court of Appeal highlighted the requirement to assess residential amenity impacts, such as odour, dust, and nuisance, particularly where these may arise from off-site manure management. The proposal at Old Rush Farm avoids these risks entirely by ensuring that all manure is removed promptly, transported in sheeted trailers, and processed off-site without any land spreading or stockpiling. There is no route for off-site odour or nuisance to impact local residents, and the development is therefore compliant with the amenity safeguards outlined in Squire.

Environmental Safeguards and Record Keeping

10.10 The proposed manure management strategy includes the following environmental protection measures:

- No storage or spreading of manure on-site or elsewhere
- All trailers are sheeted during transport to prevent odour or spillage
- All handling occurs on sealed hardstanding to prevent runoff or leachate
- Manure is transferred to a permitted facility with appropriate emissions controls
- Full documentation of each manure movement is maintained, including:
    - Transfer notes
    - Haulier and destination details
    - Volumes exported

10.11 Records are retained for a minimum of two years and made available for inspection on request, in line with best practice and regulatory requirements under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016.

Sustainability and Emissions Benefits

10.12 By diverting manure to a biomass energy facility, the development supports the generation of renewable electricity while avoiding the greenhouse gas emissions associated with conventional land-spreading. Thetford Power Station operates under strict regulatory controls governing emissions of particulates, nitrogen oxides (NOx), carbon monoxide, and carbon dioxide (CO_2), ensuring that the combustion process remains within acceptable environmental limits and does not pose a risk to air quality or public health.

Conclusion

10.13 This Manure Management Plan demonstrates that all poultry litter generated by the proposed development will be handled and disposed of in a manner that is compliant with environmental legislation, consistent with recent legal precedent, and designed to eliminate environmental and amenity risks.

Specifically:

- No manure is stored or spread on land, on- or off-site
- Manure is transported directly to a licensed biomass power station
- There is no nutrient pathway to protected ecological receptors
- The approach is legally compliant with the principles in *Squire* and *Caffyn*
- The system supports renewable energy generation, delivering a net environmental benefit

10.14 Accordingly, the Local Planning Authority can be satisfied that the manure management arrangements represent a legally robust, environmentally sustainable, and planning-compliant solution.

Environmental Impact Assessment Level

10.15 Based on the criteria in table 3.2 on page 15 of this statement, the ammonia impacts are assessed as **Low -** *A minor, localised effect that does not adversely affect environmental features or receptors. Effects are limited in scale or distance, and do not compromise existing land uses.*

NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

1.1 This non-technical summary has been produced to summarise the issues, mitigation measures and effects relating to the proposed expansion of the poultry farm and associated infrastructure at Old Rush Farm.

1.2 The proposed development comprises the following elements:

- Erection of three poultry houses (each 110 m long by 20.42 m wide)
- Two control rooms linking the poultry houses at the southeastern end (each 6 m x 6 m)
- Installation of six feed bins (3.5 m diameter, 8.6 m in height)
- Extension of the central concrete service apron
- A new dirty water storage tank
- Expansion of the existing infiltration basin
- Associated service connections and internal circulation improvements

1.2 The three additional poultry houses will each accommodate 50,000 birds, increasing the capacity of the farm from 240,000 birds to 390,000 birds.

Assessment of Significance of Environmental Effects

1.3 In terms of the potential environmental effects, these have been assessed in accordance with the significance criterion outlined below.

Level	**Definition**
None	*No discernible environmental effect beyond those already occurring under the existing agricultural regime.*
Low	*A minor, localised effect that does not adversely affect environmental features or receptors. Effects are limited in scale or distance, and do not compromise existing land uses.*
Medium	*A moderate effect that results in some impact on environmental features or receptors, but not to a degree considered significant under applicable planning or environmental regulations.*
High	*A significant environmental effect. This may require mitigation or result in notable changes to environmental quality or land use.*
Positive	*A beneficial effect that enhances environmental quality or contributes positively to existing environmental conditions.*

1.4 The scheme has been designed to take into account the potential environmental effects, with mitigation inherent in the project design. The scope of assessment included within the Environmental Impact Assessment includes the following:

- Amenity Impacts (noise and odour)
- Ecological Impact
- Ammonia Deposition
- Maure Management

1.5 The impact relating to these issues is summarised in the following sections.

Environmental Impact

Issue	Mitigation Measures	Effect Assuming Mitigation
Noise	None.	**Low (not significant)** The noise assessment concludes that the noise impacts of the development are low.
Odour	Use of High-Speed Roof Fans	**Low (not significant)** The Odour Dispersal Modelling predicts impacts will be compliant with Environmental Benchmarks at all nearby residences.
Ecological Impacts		**Low (not significant)** The ecological assessment reveals that the habitats on site are common and widespread and do not warrant whole scale protection from development.
Ammonia Impact	Use of High-Speed Roof Fans	**Low (not significant)** All ammonia and nitrogen deposition impacts to statutory nature conservation

		sites are below 1% process contribution.
Manure Management	Exported to Biomass Power Station	**Low (not significant) All manure to be exported off site to a permitted biomass power station.**

1.6 In conclusion, the proposed redevelopment of the poultry unit at land will not produce any significant Environmental Impacts. From the information appraised through the Environmental Impact Assessment process, it is clear that the proposed redevelopment will have low impact on the environment taking into account the migration measures proposed.

1.7 No technical difficulties were encountered in preparing this Environmental Statement or assessing the impacts of the proposed development. The preparation of the Environmental Assessment has taken into account the results of UK environmental assessments.

Ian Pick MRICS
September 2025.