

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Proposed Erection of Three Poultry Houses and Associated Infrastructure

**Carr House Farm, Celery Bank, Laxton
East Riding of Yorkshire, DN14 7YD**

Applicant: L Sweeting & Son

Agent: Harrison Pick Ltd

Pre-Application Reference: 25/10743/STPREP

Date: June 2026

Prepared by Harrison Pick Ltd, Planning Consultants

Ian Pick MRICS

Contents

Chapters

1. Introduction	3
2. The Project.....	6
3. Alternatives Considered	8
4. EIA Methodology and Scoping	10
5. Planning and Policy Framework	12
6. Landscape and Visual Appraisal	15
7. Ecology and Biodiversity	18
8. Ammonia and Nitrogen Deposition.....	21
9. Noise.....	23
10. Odour.....	25
11. Transport and Access	27
12. Flood Risk and Drainage	29
13. Nutrient Management.....	32
14. Climate Change	36
15. Summary and Conclusions	41
References.....	43

Appendices

Appendix 1 Application Plans.....	
Appendix 2 Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVIA Ltd, Report Ref. IPA1784lva).....	
Appendix 3a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Wold Ecology)	
Appendix 3b Bird Survey Report (Wold Ecology)	
Appendix 4 Ammonia and Nitrogen Deposition Assessment (AS Modelling & Data Ltd.)	
Appendix 5 Noise Assessment (Matrix Acoustics).....	
Appendix 6 Odour Assessment (AS Modelling & Data Ltd.).....	
Appendix 7 Transport Statement (LTP)	
Appendix 8 Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment (Egorum).....	
Appendix 9 Nutrient Management Plan (L Sweeting and Son)	

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this Document

This Environmental Statement (ES) has been prepared by Harrison Pick Ltd on behalf of L Sweeting & Son in support of a planning application for the erection of three poultry houses and associated infrastructure at Carr House Farm, Celery Bank, Laxton, East Riding of Yorkshire, DN14 7YD.

The ES has been prepared in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the 'EIA Regulations'). It presents the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) undertaken for the proposed development, assessing the likely significant effects on the environment and proposing mitigation measures to avoid, prevent, reduce or offset those effects.

The proposed development constitutes Schedule 1 development under the EIA Regulations. Schedule 1, paragraph 17(b) specifies that installations for the intensive rearing of poultry exceeding 85,000 places for broilers are Schedule 1 developments for which EIA is mandatory. The proposed development would provide 111,000 places for broiler chickens, exceeding this threshold. Accordingly, this ES has been prepared and must accompany the planning application.

1.2 The Applicant and the Agent

The applicant is L Sweeting & Son, a long-established family farming business. The business operates Carr House Farm and has farmed the land in the Laxton area for many years. The applicant proposes to diversify the farming enterprise through the development of an intensive broiler production unit, making use of the applicant's own arable land for the sustainable recycling of poultry manure.

The agent is Ian Pick MRICS of Harrison Pick Ltd, Planning Consultants. Harrison Pick Ltd has specialist expertise in the preparation of planning applications and Environmental Statements for agricultural development.

1.3 Pre-Application Engagement

Pre-application discussions were undertaken with East Riding of Yorkshire Council under reference 25/10743/STPREP in September 2025. The Council's pre-application advice informed the design of the development and the scope of the EIA. No formal scoping opinion was requested under Regulation 36 of the EIA Regulations, although the scope of this ES reflects the subjects identified as potentially significant during pre-application engagement.

1.4 Schedule 4 Compliance

Schedule 4 of the EIA Regulations sets out the information that must be included in an Environmental Statement. The table below demonstrates how this ES satisfies each requirement of Schedule 4.

Item	Schedule 4 Requirement	Where Addressed in this ES
1	A description of the project comprising information on the site, design, size and other relevant features of the project, including a description of the physical characteristics of the whole project and, where relevant, of demolition works.	Chapter 2 – The Project. Application plans provided at Appendix 1.
2	A description of the reasonable alternatives studied by the developer,	Chapter 3 – Alternatives Considered.

Item	Schedule 4 Requirement	Where Addressed in this ES
	which are relevant to the project and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for the option chosen, taking into account the effects of the project on the environment.	
3	A description of the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment (baseline scenario) and an outline of the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the project as far as natural changes from the baseline scenario can be assessed with reasonable effort, on the basis of the availability of environmental information and scientific knowledge.	Baseline conditions are described within each technical chapter (Chapters 6–14) and their respective appendices.
4	A description of the factors specified in regulation 4(2) likely to be significantly affected by the project: population and human health; biodiversity; land; soil; water; air; climate; material assets; cultural heritage, including architectural and archaeological aspects; landscape; and the interaction between these factors.	Addressed across Chapters 6–14. Population and human health: Chapters 9 and 10. Biodiversity: Chapter 7. Land and soil: Chapter 13. Water: Chapter 12. Air: Chapter 8. Climate: Chapter 14. Material assets and landscape: Chapters 6 and 11. Cultural heritage: Chapter 2. Interactions: Chapter 15.
5	A description of the likely significant effects of the project on the environment, with due regard to cumulative effects, transboundary effects, and effects arising from the vulnerability of the project to natural disasters.	Significant effects are assessed in each technical chapter with significance conclusions summarised in Chapter 15.
6	A description of the forecasting methods or evidence used to identify and assess the significant effects on the environment, including details of difficulties encountered compiling required information.	Methodology is described in Chapter 4 and within each technical chapter. Specialist reports are provided at Appendices 2–9.
7	A description of the measures envisaged to avoid, prevent, reduce or, if possible, offset any identified significant adverse effects on the environment, and where appropriate, monitoring arrangements.	Mitigation measures are described within each technical chapter and summarised in Chapter 15.
8	A description of the expected significant adverse effects deriving	Considered in Chapter 12 (Flood Risk and Drainage) and Chapter 14 (Climate Change).

Item	Schedule 4 Requirement	Where Addressed in this ES
	from the vulnerability of the project to risks of major accidents and/or disasters, including those caused by climate change, in accordance with scientific knowledge.	
9	A non-technical summary of the information referred to above.	A Non-Technical Summary accompanies this Environmental Statement as a separate document.
10	A reference list detailing the sources used for the descriptions and assessments included in the environmental statement.	References are provided at the end of this Environmental Statement.

1.5 Structure of this Environmental Statement

This ES is structured as follows:

Chapter 2: The Project — describes the proposed development, the site and the operational context.

Chapter 3: Alternatives Considered — examines reasonable alternatives studied.

Chapter 4: EIA Methodology and Scoping — explains the methodology for the EIA and the significance criteria applied.

Chapter 5: Planning and Policy Framework — summarises the relevant national and local planning policies.

Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Appraisal — supported by Appendix 2.

Chapter 7: Ecology and Biodiversity — supported by Appendices 3a and 3b.

Chapter 8: Ammonia and Nitrogen Deposition — supported by Appendix 4.

Chapter 9: Noise — supported by Appendix 5.

Chapter 10: Odour — supported by Appendix 6.

Chapter 11: Transport and Access — supported by Appendix 7.

Chapter 12: Flood Risk and Drainage — supported by Appendix 8.

Chapter 13: Nutrient Management — supported by Appendix 9.

Chapter 14: Climate Change.

Chapter 15: Summary and Conclusions.

2. The Project

2.1 Site Location and Description

Carr House Farm is located at Celery Bank, Laxton, in the East Riding of Yorkshire (National Grid Reference approximately SE 808 242). The site lies within the broad agricultural landscape of the Humberhead Levels, to the south of the village of Laxton, approximately 3 kilometres north of the River Ouse. The site is accessed from the B1230 via Metham Lane and Greenoak Lane.

The application site comprises an existing farmstead with arable land to all sides. The site is flat and low-lying, characteristic of the agricultural land in this part of the East Riding. The land is in productive arable use and farmed as part of the applicant's wider agricultural holding of approximately 1,087 hectares.

The wider landholding managed by L Sweeting & Son extends to approximately 1,087 hectares of arable land in the locality, providing the land base for the sustainable management of poultry manure arising from the proposed development.

2.2 Surrounding Context

The surrounding landscape is characterised by large-scale open arable farming with flat topography and wide horizons. Settlement is sparse, with Laxton being the nearest settlement. The nearest residential property to the proposed development is located approximately 800 metres to the north-east. Laxton Public Right of Way No. 1 runs along the southern and eastern boundary of the farm.

The Humber Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar Site lies approximately 2.5 kilometres to the south of the application site. The Metham Hall Farm Moated Site (Scheduled Monument) lies approximately 1 kilometre to the south.

2.3 The Proposed Development

The proposed development comprises:

(a) Three poultry houses, each measuring 110 metres in length by 20.42 metres in width, with eaves at 3 metres and a ridge height of 5.74 metres. Each house would accommodate 37,000 broiler chickens, giving a total capacity of 111,000 birds across the three houses.

(b) Associated infrastructure including: 6 feed bins, concrete apron for loading and turning of vehicles, dirty water containment tank, backup generator, clean water storage tank, a building providing a plant room and catchers room, a gatehouse building providing staff facilities, car parking, bulk LPG tanks, and an attenuation pond for sustainable drainage.

(c) Roof-mounted photovoltaic (solar) panels on each house, providing 45 kilowatts (kW) peak output per house and 135 kW in total.

The external cladding of the poultry houses would be finished in Olive Green (RAL 6003), chosen to integrate the buildings into the agricultural landscape. Roof sheets would also be olive green.

2.4 Operational Details

The development would operate on a continuous flock cycle of approximately 7.6 flocks per year. Each flock would consist of 111,000 day-old chicks (DOC) placed at the start of the cycle, growing over a period of 38 days to slaughter weight, followed by a rest period of approximately 10 days for cleaning and disinfection before the next flock is placed. This gives an annual throughput of approximately 844,000 birds per year ($111,000 \times 7.6$).

Ventilation is provided by mechanical fans operating continuously throughout the growing cycle, managed to maintain optimum temperature and air quality within the houses. The poultry houses are designed to current industry standards for bird welfare and biosecurity, incorporating LED lighting, nipple drinker lines, and automatic feed chain systems.

LPG heating provides supplementary warmth particularly during the early stages of each flock cycle when chicks require elevated ambient temperatures. The 135 kW of rooftop solar PV provides on-site renewable electricity generation, reducing the development's carbon footprint and energy costs.

2.5 Feed, Deliveries and Collection

Feed is delivered by HGV bulker to the feed bins positioned adjacent to each poultry house. Deliveries are made throughout the growing cycle as required. Day-old chick deliveries take place at the beginning of each flock. At the end of each cycle, chickens are collected by specially adapted HGVs. Litter (used bedding material incorporating poultry manure) is removed after each cycle by tractor and trailer for spreading on the applicant's arable land, as described further in Chapter 13.

2.6 Construction

Construction is anticipated to take approximately 30 weeks. Works would include site preparation and earthworks, installation of drainage infrastructure and the SuDS attenuation pond, construction of the concrete slab foundations, erection of the steel portal frame poultry houses, installation of internal equipment, and completion of external works including access road, hardstanding, fencing and landscaping. Construction traffic would use the same Metham Lane/Greenoak Lane access route as the operational traffic.

2.7 Cultural Heritage

A heritage assessment has been undertaken by MAP Archaeological Practice Ltd. The applicants have undertaken a geophysical survey of the site which does not identify any areas of notable archaeological potential. Documented evidence of archaeological activity within the 1 km search radius includes putative Iron Age/Romano-British enclosures and medieval ridge and furrow. The site is located within the wider setting of listed buildings and a scheduled monument at Metham Hall. The development is anticipated to have a negligible impact on the setting and significance of those heritage assets, and the principle of development is considered acceptable on heritage grounds. East Riding of Yorkshire Council's County Archaeological Service has agreed that further archaeological works can be addressed by planning condition. Should further evaluation be required, it is anticipated that this would initially take the form of trial trenching.

3. Alternatives Considered

3.1 Introduction

Schedule 4 of the EIA Regulations requires an ES to include a description of the reasonable alternatives studied by the developer and the main reasons for the option chosen, taking into account the effects of the project on the environment. This chapter addresses those requirements.

3.2 The Need for the Development

The UK broiler sector supplies approximately 45% of all meat consumed in the United Kingdom. UK self-sufficiency in poultry has been declining, with increasing reliance on imported product from countries with lower animal welfare standards and higher carbon footprints per kilogram of liveweight produced. The development would contribute to UK food security and support the domestic supply chain.

L Sweeting & Son has identified poultry production as an appropriate diversification of the farming business, making use of the existing farm infrastructure and the applicant's substantial arable landholding to provide a sustainable closed-loop nutrient management system. The development would provide long-term economic viability for the farm business.

3.3 Alternative Sites

The applicant considered the potential to locate the development on alternative parts of the farm holding or on other land in the applicant's ownership. Carr House Farm was selected as the most appropriate location for the following reasons:

- (a) The existing farm infrastructure at Carr House Farm, including the access road, utilities, and farmstead buildings, provides an efficient base for the proposed development.
- (b) The site is sufficiently separated from the nearest sensitive residential receptors (approximately 800 metres to the north-east) to minimise amenity impacts.
- (c) The site is located at a sufficient distance from the Humber Estuary SPA that, as demonstrated by the ammonia modelling (Chapter 8 and Appendix 4), ammonia deposition on the SPA's sensitive habitats is within acceptable thresholds.
- (d) The principal driving force in site selection was maximising the separation distance between the proposed development and the Humber Estuary Special Area of Conservation (SAC), in order to mitigate ammonia emissions to the greatest extent practicable. Carr House Farm represents the furthest separation distance available within the applicants' land holding from the Humber Estuary SAC. Alternative locations on the holding were considered but offered shorter separation distances from the SAC and were therefore discounted.

3.4 Design Alternatives

A number of design alternatives were considered during the development of the scheme:

Scale: The applicant considered a smaller development of two poultry houses. However, a three-house scheme was identified as providing the optimum economic return while remaining proportionate to the site and its setting.

Orientation: The three houses are oriented parallel to one another and aligned along the long axis of the available site area. The orientation is dictated by the access route and the need for a south-facing roof slope to maximise the output of the rooftop solar PV installation. This orientation also maximises the use of the available land and minimises the footprint of access roads and hardstanding.

Cladding: Olive Green (RAL 6003) cladding was selected to minimise the visual impact of the buildings in the agricultural landscape. This colour is consistent with that used on other approved poultry developments in the region.

Energy: The installation of rooftop solar PV panels (135 kW total) was included at design stage to maximise the renewable energy credentials of the development. Biomass heating was considered but rejected on cost and operational grounds; LPG provides reliable and controllable backup heating with a lower capital cost. Ground source heat pumps were also considered but discounted on financial viability grounds.

3.5 The 'Do Nothing' Alternative

The 'do nothing' alternative would result in the continuation of existing arable farming on the site without development of the proposed poultry unit. This would mean no significant environmental effects from the development, but would also mean no economic benefit to the farm business, no contribution to UK food security, and no closed-loop nutrient management system. The do-nothing alternative does not address the identified need for the development and is therefore not the preferred option.

4. EIA Methodology and Scoping

4.1 Introduction

This chapter sets out the methodology applied in preparing the Environmental Statement, including the criteria used to assess the significance of environmental effects.

4.2 EIA Methodology

The EIA has been carried out in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment, and relevant topic-specific guidance.

The assessment follows a standard EIA methodology comprising:

- (a) Identification of the proposed development's potential effects on the environment.
- (b) Description of the baseline conditions (existing environment without the development).
- (c) Assessment of the magnitude of change to baseline conditions resulting from the development.
- (d) Assessment of the significance of those changes, having regard to the sensitivity of the receiving environment.
- (e) Identification of mitigation measures to avoid, prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse effects.
- (f) Assessment of residual significance (the significance of effects remaining after mitigation).

4.3 Significance Criteria

The significance of potential environmental effects within each subject chapter of this Environmental Statement has been assessed in accordance with the significance criteria 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.

This methodology has been applied consistently across all topic areas to ensure a robust and transparent evaluation of potential environmental impacts. Effects are qualified as adverse (where conditions deteriorate) or beneficial (where conditions improve).

4.4 Scoping

No formal Regulation 36 scoping opinion was requested. The scope of this ES was however informed by the pre-application discussions with East Riding of Yorkshire Council (reference

25/10743/STPREP), review of relevant national and local guidance, and the professional judgement of the team of specialists who contributed to the various technical assessments.

The following topics have been assessed within this ES:

- Landscape and Visual Appraisal (Chapter 6 and Appendix 2)
- Ecology and Biodiversity (Chapter 7 and Appendices 3a and 3b)
- Ammonia and Nitrogen Deposition (Chapter 8 and Appendix 4)
- Noise (Chapter 9 and Appendix 5)
- Odour (Chapter 10 and Appendix 6)
- Transport and Access (Chapter 11 and Appendix 7)
- Flood Risk and Drainage (Chapter 12 and Appendix 8)
- Nutrient Management (Chapter 13 and Appendix 9)
- Climate Change (Chapter 14)

The following topics were scoped out of the assessment having been considered and found unlikely to give rise to significant effects:

Archaeology and Cultural Heritage: A heritage assessment has been undertaken by MAP Archaeological Practice Ltd. A geophysical survey of the site did not identify any areas of notable archaeological potential within the application site. The archaeological potential of the site is assessed as low to medium. Documentary evidence of archaeological activity within the 1 km search radius includes putative Iron Age/Romano-British enclosures and medieval ridge and furrow. The site lies within the wider setting of listed buildings and a scheduled monument at Metham Hall; the development is anticipated to have a negligible impact on the setting and significance of those assets. East Riding of Yorkshire Council's County Archaeological Service has agreed that further archaeological works can be left to a planning condition. This topic is accordingly scoped into the assessment at a proportionate level within the project description (Section 2.7) and is not the subject of a separate technical chapter.

Socio-economics: The development is not of a scale or nature likely to give rise to significant socio-economic effects requiring detailed EIA assessment. The development would support rural employment and contribute to the local farming economy.

5. Planning and Policy Framework

5.1 Introduction

This chapter summarises the national and local planning policies relevant to the determination of this application. The proposed development falls to be determined under Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material consideration.

5.2 National Planning Policy Framework 2024

The NPPF (December 2024) sets out the Government's planning policies for England. The following paragraphs and policies are of particular relevance:

Paragraph 85 states that planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt, and that 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.

Paragraph 88 provides that planning policies and decisions should enable the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings, and the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses. Paragraph 88(a) and 88(b) are directly applicable to this development.

Paragraph 187 requires that planning decisions contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment, including protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains for biodiversity, and preventing unacceptable levels of pollution. The EIA accompanying this application provides the evidence base to demonstrate that the proposal meets these requirements.

Paragraph 201 is of particular significance for this application as it states “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”. This development will be subject to an Environmental Permit from the Environment Agency which will control its operation and emissions.

Paragraphs 173 and 174 require that a sequential risk-based approach is taken to development in areas at risk of flooding, with development steered to areas with the lowest risk. Where a Sequential Test is satisfied but the site remains at risk, an Exception Test must also be passed. Both tests are addressed in Chapter 12.

5.3 East Riding Local Plan Update Strategy Document (ERLPU SD)

The East Riding Local Plan Update Strategy Document (ERLPU SD) was adopted on 2 April 2025 and forms the development plan for this application. The following policies are relevant:

Policy Reference	Summary and Relevance to the Proposed Development
S1	Sustainable development. The overarching development strategy for the East Riding. Carr House Farm is located in the open countryside. Development in the countryside is addressed by Policy S4, which specifically supports agricultural uses.

Policy Reference	Summary and Relevance to the Proposed Development
	Policy S1 requires development to contribute to sustainable development across its economic, social and environmental dimensions.
S2	Addressing Climate Change. Requires development to mitigate and adapt to climate change. The proposed development includes 135 kW of rooftop solar PV and an energy-efficient building design, addressing this policy. Broader climate change matters are assessed in Chapter 14.
S4	Supporting development in Villages and the Countryside. Policy S4 D9 specifically supports agricultural, horticultural and forestry uses in the countryside. The proposed broiler development is an agricultural use and falls squarely within the policy support. Proposals must respect the intrinsic character of their surroundings, which is addressed in Chapter 6 and the accompanying Design and Access Statement.
EC1	Supporting the growth and diversification of the East Riding economy. Policy EC1 supports employment development that contributes to the modernisation and diversification of the local economy, including the agriculture/food and drink sector. The proposed broiler development strengthens this sector and contributes to the East Riding's rural economy.
EC4	Enhancing sustainable transport. Policy EC4 requires that development is accessible and does not give rise to unacceptable transport impacts. The Transport Statement (Appendix 7) and Chapter 11 demonstrate that the development can be satisfactorily accessed and that highway impacts are acceptable.
ENV1	Design. Requires all development to be of high quality design that responds positively to its context. The design of the poultry houses — including green cladding, considered siting, and landscape planting — is addressed in Chapter 6.
ENV2	Promoting a high quality landscape. Policy ENV2 requires development to protect and enhance the landscape character and visual amenity of the East Riding. The Landscape and Visual Appraisal (Chapter 6 and Appendix 2) demonstrates that the development's landscape and visual effects are acceptable following mitigation.
ENV3	Valuing our Heritage. Policy ENV3 requires development to protect, conserve and enhance heritage assets and their settings. The heritage assessment by MAP Archaeological Practice Ltd (Section 2.7) demonstrates acceptable impacts on heritage assets.
ENV4	International, National and Local Sites of Importance for Biodiversity. Policy ENV4 requires development to protect international and national designated sites, including SPAs, SACs and SSSIs. The assessment of the Humber Estuary SPA/SAC/SSSI/Ramsar in Chapters 7 and 8 demonstrates no likely significant effect on the designated site.
ENV5	Enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity. Policy ENV5 requires development to protect and enhance biodiversity. The mandatory 10% Biodiversity Net Gain requirement under the Environment Act 2021 is addressed in Chapter 7. The BNG strategy delivers at least 10% net gain over the pre-development baseline.
ENV6	Managing environmental hazards. Policy ENV6 requires development to avoid or satisfactorily mitigate flood risk, noise, air quality and other environmental hazards. The technical assessments in Chapters 8 (ammonia), 9 (noise), 10 (odour) and 12

Policy Reference	Summary and Relevance to the Proposed Development
	(flood risk and drainage) demonstrate that all environmental hazards are managed to an acceptable standard.
S8	Connecting People and Places. Policy S8 supports improvements to transport connectivity and requires development to minimise its transport impacts. The development's transport effects are assessed in Chapter 11 and Appendix 7, and highway improvement works are proposed to address any impacts on the local network.
S9	Strengthening blue/green infrastructure. Policy S9 requires development to protect and enhance the blue/green infrastructure network. The proposed sustainable drainage attenuation pond and native species landscaping (hedgerows and tree planting) make a positive contribution to the blue/green infrastructure network.

5.4 East Riding Design Code 2025

The East Riding Design Code (2025) was adopted alongside the ERLPU SD. The Code sets design standards for new development across the East Riding. In the context of agricultural development, the Code emphasises the importance of siting, scale, materials and landscaping to ensure new buildings sit comfortably within the landscape. The design of the proposed development addresses each of these considerations, as described in Chapter 6 and in the supporting Design and Access Statement.

5.5 Other Material Considerations

The following national guidance and policy documents are material to this application:

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG): Provides technical guidance supplementary to the NPPF on topics including EIA, flood risk, biodiversity, air quality, and noise.

Natural England Air Pollution and Development: Advice for Local Planning Authorities (October 25) Relevant to the ammonia assessment in Chapter 8.

The Habitats Regulations 2017: The Humber Estuary SPA lies within 2.5 kilometres of the site. An assessment of likely significant effects on the SPA is included within Chapter 7 (Ecology) and Chapter 8 (Ammonia) of this ES.

Environment Act 2021: Introduces a mandatory requirement for a minimum 10% Biodiversity Net Gain for development permitted in England. This requirement is addressed in Chapter 7.

Farming Rules for Water 2018 (The Reduction and Prevention of Agricultural Diffuse Pollution (England) Regulations 2018): Relevant to the management and spreading of poultry manure. Compliance is demonstrated by the Nutrient Management Plan (Chapter 13 and Appendix 9).

The Nitrate Vulnerable Zones (NVZ) Regulations: The application site may lie within an NVZ designation. Compliance requirements are addressed in Chapter 13.

The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016: The proposed development will require an Environmental Permit from the Environment Agency. An application has been submitted and is in progress. In accordance with paragraph 201 of the NPPF, the existence of the permitting regime should not lead the Council to refuse planning permission for an otherwise acceptable development.

6. Landscape and Visual Appraisal

6.1 Introduction and Methodology

This chapter presents the findings of the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) for the proposed development. The full LVA report is provided at Appendix 2. The assessment has been prepared by LVIA Ltd (Report Reference IPA17841va, June 2026) following the methodology set out in the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition (GLVIA3, Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, 2013). The site survey was carried out on 27 April 2026.

The LVA considers two types of effect: landscape effects (effects on landscape character and specific landscape features) and visual effects (effects on views and visual amenity enjoyed by people in the vicinity). The assessment area extends to 3 kilometres from the application site, representing the zone within which the proposed development could reasonably be expected to have landscape or visual effects of significance.

6.2 Policy Context

The relevant policy context is set out in Chapter 5. Policy ENV1 (Integrating high quality design) and Policy ENV2 (Promoting a high quality landscape) of the ERLPU SD are of particular relevance. The site does not lie within any nationally designated landscape (National Park or National Landscape). The NPPF (paragraph 187) requires planning decisions to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment, including recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

6.3 Baseline Landscape Character

6.3.1 National Character Area

The application site falls within National Character Area (NCA) 39: Humberhead Levels, as defined by Natural England. This NCA is characterised by flat, low-lying, predominantly arable farmland underlain by peat and alluvial deposits. The landscape has been progressively drained and reclaimed from the medieval period, resulting in large field patterns, wide skies, and sparse settlement of isolated farmsteads and small villages linked by drainage ditches. Woodland cover is limited.

6.3.2 Local Landscape Character

At the local scale, the application site lies within Landscape Character Type (LCT) 9: Wooded Open Farmland, and specifically within Landscape Character Area (LCA) 9D: Blacktoft and Laxton Farmland. This character area is described as a flat, open arable landscape with a strong rectilinear field pattern formed by drainage ditches. Large-scale arable crops (cereals, oil-seed rape, sugar beet) dominate. Existing farm buildings and structures are already established features. The Humber Estuary lies approximately 1.5 kilometres to the south of the application site. The application site itself does not lie within any statutory or local landscape designation. The LVA assesses the landscape sensitivity of the character area as Medium.

6.4 Viewpoint Assessment

Five viewpoints were selected by LVIA Ltd for detailed assessment, as described in the full LVA at Appendix 2. The viewpoints are summarised below.

VP1: Metham Lane (0.91 km north-east)

Viewpoint 1 is located on Metham Lane approximately 0.91 km to the north-east of the application site. Receptor sensitivity is assessed as Medium. The magnitude of visual change is assessed as Small. The resulting significance of visual effect is Moderate/Minor, which is not considered a material change in views.

VP2: Footpath LAXTF01 (0.04 km south-west — closest approach)

Viewpoint 2 is located on Public Footpath LAXTF01 at its closest approach to the application site, approximately 0.04 km to the south-west. Receptor sensitivity is assessed as High (users of a public right of way with a recreational interest in the landscape). The magnitude of visual change is assessed as Medium due to the proximity of the development and the absence of intervening landscape features. The significance of visual effect is assessed as Major/Moderate, which is considered a material change in views from this location.

VP3: Footpath LAXTF01 (0.42 km east)

Viewpoint 3 is located on Public Footpath LAXTF01 approximately 0.42 km to the east of the application site. Receptor sensitivity is assessed as High. The magnitude of visual change is assessed as Small-Medium. The significance of visual effect is assessed as Moderate, which is considered a material change in views from this location.

VP4: Footpath LAXTF01 (further east)

Viewpoint 4 is located on Public Footpath LAXTF01 further along the route to the east of the application site. Receptor sensitivity is assessed as High. The magnitude of visual change is assessed as Small, reflecting greater separation distance and additional landscape filtering. The significance of visual effect is assessed as Moderate/Minor, which is not considered a material change in views.

VP5: Bridleway KILPB05 (1.34 km south-east)

Viewpoint 5 is located on Bridleway KILPB05 approximately 1.34 km to the south-east of the application site. Receptor sensitivity is assessed as High. The magnitude of visual change is assessed as Negligible: the proposed development is not discernible from this viewpoint due to intervening vegetation. The significance of visual effect is assessed as Negligible, which is not a material change in views.

6.5 Landscape Character Effects

The landscape character sensitivity of LCA 9D: Blacktoft and Laxton Farmland is assessed as Medium. The magnitude of landscape change resulting from the proposed development is assessed as Medium. The resulting landscape character effect is therefore assessed as Moderate, which is not considered a material change to landscape character. The LVA notes that the landscape already contains modern agricultural buildings and is broadly resilient to further agricultural development of appropriate scale and design. The proposed buildings, with their olive green finish and considered siting, are appropriate to the agricultural character of the area.

6.6 Mitigation

The following mitigation measures are recommended in the LVA and have been incorporated into the scheme:

- (a) Retention and management of existing native hedgerows and trees on the boundaries of the application site.
- (b) Planting of new mixed native shrubs and trees to the east and south of the development to provide progressive landscape screening and integration.
- (c) Building heights matching the scale of existing agricultural development in the surrounding landscape.
- (d) External cladding and roof sheeting in olive green, chosen to minimise visual intrusion and integrate the buildings into the agricultural landscape.

6.7 Residual Significance

After implementation of mitigation measures, the LVA concludes as follows:

Visual effects: The material visual effects identified at VP2 (Footpath LAXTF01 at closest approach) and VP3 (Footpath LAXTF01 at 0.42 km) remain after mitigation, reflecting the proximity of the public right of way to the development. However, these effects reduce over time as the proposed landscaping matures and provides increasing screening. Users of footpath LAXTF01 at VP2 and VP3 would experience Moderate visual effects. No other viewpoints experience material visual effects after mitigation.

Landscape character effects: After mitigation, the landscape character effect is assessed as Minor, which is not a material change to the character of LCA 9D. The proposed landscaping, appropriate building scale, and olive green materials integrate positively with the existing agricultural character of the area.

Overall, the LVA concludes that the proposed development results in moderate visual effects for users of Footpath LAXTF01 at its closest approach, and minor landscape character effects. These are the maximum residual effects. Other viewpoints experience minor or negligible effects. The landscape and visual effects of the development are considered acceptable in the context of the agricultural landscape character of the area and the mitigation measures incorporated into the scheme.

Significance of Effects

The overall significance of landscape and visual effects is assessed as Medium for users of Footpath LAXTF01 at its closest approach to the development, reducing over time as the proposed landscaping matures. Landscape character effects are assessed as Low. All other identified visual receptors experience Low impacts.

7. Ecology and Biodiversity

7.1 Introduction and Methodology

This chapter presents a summary of the ecological assessment undertaken for the proposed development. The full Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) is provided at Appendix 3a and the Bird Survey Report at Appendix 3b. The assessment has been undertaken by suitably qualified ecologists in accordance with the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA, 2018).

The ecological assessment considered: habitats present on the site and within the Zone of Influence; protected and priority species; statutory and non-statutory nature conservation designations; potential for Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) in relation to the Humber Estuary SPA; and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) requirements under the Environment Act 2021.

7.2 Policy Context

Policies ENV4 and ENV5 (Biodiversity) of the ERLPU SD requires development to protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity and avoid adverse impacts on designated sites. The Environment Act 2021 requires a minimum 10% Biodiversity Net Gain for all major development in England. The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (Habitats Regulations) apply to the Humber Estuary SPA. Under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, certain species receive statutory protection.

7.3 Baseline Habitats

The application site comprises predominantly improved agricultural land (arable cropping) with field margins and drainage ditches. Existing hedgerows are present along the southern and eastern boundaries, which have been assessed in accordance with the Hedgerow Regulations 1997. Hedgerows are of local ecological value but do not meet the criteria for 'important hedgerows' under the Regulations. Drainage ditches provide potential habitat for marginal plants, invertebrates and amphibians, though the management regime limits their ecological value.

The following habitats were identified during the Phase 1 habitat survey:

- Intensive arable cropland (dominant) — low ecological value.
- Improved field margins and tracks — low ecological value.
- Boundary hedgerows with occasional hedgerow trees — low to moderate ecological value.
- Drainage ditches — low to moderate ecological value.

7.4 Protected and Priority Species

7.4.1 Bats

The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA, Appendix 3a) assessed the bat interest of the application site. No trees, buildings or structures with potential to support roosting bats were identified within the application site. No bat roost features were recorded. The site comprises open arable land with fragmented hedgerow boundaries, which is considered to be of low suitability for commuting and foraging bats. The habitats within 3 km are primarily fragmented sub-optimum secondary habitats. No further bat activity surveys or static detector deployment were considered necessary by the ecologists undertaking the PEA. The impact of the proposed development on foraging and commuting bats is assessed as neutral.

7.4.2 Birds

Breeding and wintering bird surveys were carried out and are reported in detail in Appendix 3b. Breeding bird surveys identified a range of common farmland and hedgerow species using the site.

Wintering bird surveys were conducted to assess the potential for waterbird species qualifying the Humber Estuary SPA to use the site.

The wintering bird survey found no evidence of SPA-qualifying species (including pink-footed goose, golden plover, Bewick's swan, and other waterfowl associated with the Humber Estuary SPA) roosting or feeding within the application site with regularity. The arable cropping of the site provides a feeding resource for some common farmland bird species, but the survey did not reveal use of the site by qualifying SPA species at levels that would suggest the site functions as a regular feeding or roosting area for such species.

Works during the breeding bird season (typically March to August) should be avoided unless a suitably qualified ecologist has confirmed the absence of active nests. A Habitat Management Plan condition could appropriately manage this.

7.4.3 Great Crested Newts

The application site and its surroundings do not contain ponds of suitable character and connectivity to support significant great crested newt populations. No great crested newt records exist within 2 km of the site. No great crested newt surveys are required and none have been carried out. The site is assessed as presenting a Negligible risk for great crested newts.

7.4.4 Badgers

No badger setts were identified within or immediately adjacent to the application site during the survey. The risk of significant impact on badgers is assessed as Negligible.

7.5 Designated Sites

7.5.1 Humber Estuary SPA and Ramsar

The Humber Estuary SPA (and associated Ramsar designation) is located approximately 2.5 kilometres to the south of the application site. The SPA qualifies for the following species: pink-footed goose, golden plover, Bewick's swan, shelduck, dunlin, grey plover, knot, spotted redshank, black-tailed godwit, bar-tailed godwit, redshank, avocet, and little egret (and as a wetland under Ramsar Criterion 6 for waterfowl). The SPA is also designated as a SSSI.

The potential for the development to have a likely significant effect (LSE) on the Humber Estuary SPA was considered under two pathways: (a) disturbance of qualifying species through noise and human activity; and (b) ammonia deposition on the SPA's notified habitats.

In respect of pathway (a), the application site lies approximately 2.5 kilometres from the SPA. Construction and operational activities at this distance are unlikely to cause disturbance to qualifying species on the SPA. The SPA qualifying species identified through the bird surveys do not regularly use the application site as a functional part of their SPA resource.

In respect of pathway (b), the ammonia impact assessment (Appendix 4 and Chapter 8) demonstrates that modelled deposition of ammonia from the proposed development onto the SPA's SSSI units does not exceed the critical load thresholds identified by Natural England as requiring further assessment. The predicted increment at the SPA habitats is within acceptable limits. No likely significant effect on the Humber Estuary SPA is therefore identified, and a full Appropriate Assessment is not considered necessary. Notwithstanding this conclusion, the assessment has been prepared in a precautionary manner and all relevant information is provided to enable the local planning authority as competent authority to discharge its Habitats Regulations duties.

7.5.2 Other Designated Sites

The screening distances applied to this assessment are: 10 km for internationally designated habitat sites (SPAs, SACs, Ramsar sites); 5 km for Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs); and 2 km for local wildlife sites and ancient woodlands. Within these screening distances, the Humber Estuary SSSI/SAC/SPA/Ramsar (approximately 2.5 km to the south-south-west) is the principal statutory

designation, assessed in Section 7.5.1 above. One Local Wildlife Site (Trandy Lane/Kilpin Lane) has been identified at approximately 1,408 m from the application site; the ecology of this site would not be adversely affected by the proposed development. No ancient woodland is present within 2 km of the application site. No other statutory or non-statutory designated sites fall within the relevant screening distances.

7.6 Biodiversity Net Gain

The Environment Act 2021 requires all major development in England to deliver a minimum of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) over the pre-development baseline. BNG has been assessed using the Defra Biodiversity Metric 4.0.

The pre-development baseline habitats on the application site have been assessed and assigned biodiversity units in accordance with the Metric. The development would result in the loss of some low-value arable habitat and field margin. The BNG strategy proposes to achieve the 10% net gain requirement through:

- (a) Creation of new modified grassland areas;
- (b) Provision of native species tree planting around the site periphery.

The BNG calculation demonstrates that the proposed mitigation and enhancement measures deliver at least 10% net gain in biodiversity units compared to the pre-development baseline. A Biodiversity Net Gain Plan will be submitted pursuant to planning permission and secured by condition.

7.7 Mitigation and Enhancement

The following ecological mitigation and enhancement measures are proposed:

- (a) Pre-construction nesting bird and bat surveys to be undertaken immediately prior to any vegetation clearance.
- (b) Vegetation clearance outside the bird nesting season (March to August), unless confirmed clear by a qualified ecologist.
- (c) Retention and enhancement of all existing boundary hedgerows.
- (d) Implementation of the Biodiversity Net Gain measures described above.
- (e) Biosecurity protocols to be implemented throughout construction and operation to prevent the introduction of invasive species.
- (f) Exclusion zones around drainage ditches maintained during construction to prevent pollution.
- (g) An Ecological Mitigation and Enhancement Strategy (EMES) to be submitted and approved prior to commencement and implemented thereafter.

7.8 Residual Significance

No significant residual ecological effects are predicted. The development would deliver a net gain for biodiversity through the proposed enhancement measures.

Significance of Effects

The overall significance of ecological effects is assessed as None following the implementation of the mitigation measures described above. The Biodiversity Net Gain strategy delivers a Positive significance for biodiversity through the creation of native species grassland margins and tree planting.

8. Ammonia and Nitrogen Deposition

8.1 Introduction and Methodology

This chapter summarises the findings of the Ammonia Impact Assessment prepared by AS Modelling & Data Ltd. (17 April 2026), the full report for which is provided at Appendix 4. The assessment uses the ADMS 6 atmospheric dispersion model to predict annual mean ground-level ammonia concentrations and nitrogen deposition rates at sensitive ecological receptors in the surrounding area. The assessment follows the methodology set out in Natural England's Air Pollution and Development guidance (October 2025), the Environment Agency H1 Risk Assessment framework, and the JNCC Guidance on Decision-making Thresholds for Air Pollution (December 2021).

8.2 Emission Sources

The proposed development would house 111,000 broiler chickens across three poultry houses (37,000 birds per house). Ammonia emission rates have been calculated using Environment Agency standard ammonia emission factors for broiler chickens. The emission factor applied is 0.024 kg-NH₃/place/year. The total ammonia emission rate across the three houses is 0.084 g-NH₃/s (0.028 g/s per house), emitted via uncapped high-speed ridge-mounted fans. Gable-end fans provide supplementary ventilation in hot weather conditions and are modelled as volume sources.

8.3 Sensitive Receptors

The following sensitive ecological receptors have been identified within the screening distances set out in Natural England's guidance:

Humber Estuary SSSI/SAC/SPA/Ramsar: approximately 2.2 km to the south-south-west (closest point). This is the principal sensitive receptor. The critical level for ammonia concentration is 3.0 µg-NH₃/m³ (annual mean) and the critical load for nitrogen deposition is 10.0 kg-N/ha/year. One Local Wildlife Site (LWS) has been identified within 2 km of the site, with a critical level of 1.0 µg-NH₃/m³ and a critical load of 10.0 kg-N/ha/year (precautionary figures). No other internationally designated sites are present within 10 km.

8.4 Background Levels

Background ammonia concentration in the area around Carr House Farm is 1.81 µg-NH₃/m³ (APIS, April 2026). Background nitrogen deposition rates are 27.76 kg-N/ha/year to woodland and 14.56 kg-N/ha/year to short vegetation. These background figures are used in the assessment of in-combination effects where required.

8.5 Modelling Results

Atmospheric dispersion modelling was carried out using ADMS 6 with four years of meteorological data (2022–2025) derived from the Global Forecast System (GFS), terrain-modified using FLOWSTAR. The modelling results at the detailed discrete receptor locations are summarised below:

(a) Local Wildlife Site receptors (2 receptors, approximately 0.8–1.5 km from the site): maximum predicted process contribution of 0.015 µg-NH₃/m³ (1.53% of the 1.0 µg/m³ critical level) and maximum nitrogen deposition of 0.080 kg-N/ha/year (0.80% of the 10.0 kg-N/ha/year critical load). Both values are below the Environment Agency's lower threshold of 100% for local wildlife sites, meaning the impact is deemed acceptable for permitting purposes.

(b) Humber Estuary SSSI/SAC/SPA/Ramsar receptors (16 receptors): maximum predicted process contribution of 0.009 µg-NH₃/m³ (0.29% of the 3.0 µg/m³ critical level) and maximum nitrogen deposition of 0.034 kg-N/ha/year (0.34% of the 10.0 kg-N/ha/year critical load). All predicted values are below 1% of the relevant critical level and critical load at the internationally designated site. This is below the threshold at which Natural England's guidance requires further assessment, and below the Environment Agency's lower threshold of 1% for internationally designated sites.

8.6 Habitats Regulations Assessment

The predicted process contribution to ammonia concentration and nitrogen deposition at the Humber Estuary SAC/SPA/Ramsar is below 1% of the relevant critical level and critical load from the development alone. In accordance with Natural England's guidance (October 2025), where process contributions from a proposed development are below 1% of the critical level and/or critical load, no likely significant effect on the designated site is predicted. The local planning authority as competent authority can therefore conclude, on the basis of this assessment, that the proposed development would not adversely affect the integrity of the Humber Estuary SAC. The site selection process (Chapter 3) was specifically designed to maximise separation from the Humber Estuary SAC in order to achieve these results.

8.7 Environmental Permit

An Environmental Permit application has been submitted to the Environment Agency. The permit will regulate ammonia emissions through Best Available Techniques (BAT) requirements for the housing and litter management systems. In accordance with paragraph 201 of the NPPF, the local planning authority should not refuse planning permission on the basis that the Environmental Permit has not yet been granted, provided there is no clear evidence that the development could not be permitted. The technical evidence in this ES demonstrates that the development can be managed to acceptable environmental standards.

8.8 Conclusions

The ammonia dispersion modelling demonstrates that the predicted process contributions to ammonia concentration and nitrogen deposition at all sensitive ecological receptors within the screening distances are below the relevant threshold percentages of the critical level and critical load. At the Humber Estuary SSSI/SAC/SPA/Ramsar — the principal sensitive receptor — the maximum predicted process contribution is 0.29% of the critical level and 0.34% of the critical load, both well below the 1% threshold. At the Local Wildlife Site receptors, predicted contributions are below 100% of the critical level and load. No significant adverse effects on any identified sensitive ecological receptor are predicted from the ammonia emissions of the proposed development. The residual significance of ammonia effects is assessed as Negligible.

Significance of Effects

The overall significance of ammonia and nitrogen deposition effects is assessed as Low. Predicted process contributions at all sensitive receptors are well below the relevant assessment thresholds and do not give rise to any discernible environmental effect at any identified designated site or receptor.

9. Noise

9.1 Introduction and Methodology

This chapter summarises the findings of the Noise Impact Assessment for the proposed development. The full assessment is provided at Appendix 5. The assessment has been prepared by acoustic consultants and follows the methodology set out in:

- BS 4142:2014+A1:2019: Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound.
- BS 8233:2014: Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings.
- Planning Practice Guidance on Noise (PPG Noise).
- ProPG: Planning and Noise — Professional Practice Guidance on Planning and Noise (2017).
- BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014: Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites.

9.2 Policy Context

The NPPF (paragraph 198) requires planning decisions to avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life. Policy ENV6 of the ERLPU SD requires development to protect residential amenity from unacceptable levels of noise and vibration.

9.3 Noise Sources

The principal noise sources associated with the proposed development are:

- (a) Ventilation fans: The poultry houses would be equipped with mechanical ventilation fans operating continuously throughout the growing cycle. Fan noise is the principal continuous source of noise from the operational development.
- (b) HGV traffic: Feed delivery vehicles, day-old chick delivery lorries, catch lorries (for bird collection at the end of each growing cycle), and lorries removing litter/manure generate intermittent HGV noise on the access road.
- (c) Catching operations: Catching is undertaken on day 30 and day 38 of each flock, with all three sheds emptied at the same time. Catching operations occur on a maximum of 14 to 16 occasions per annum. Activities include use of catching equipment and loading specially adapted HGVs.
- (d) Construction: Ground works, foundation laying, building erection, and associated plant and vehicle movements during the construction phase.

9.4 Background Noise Survey

An attended and unattended background noise survey was carried out at the site and at the nearest sensitive residential receptor (approximately 800 metres to the north-east). The survey methodology and results are detailed in Appendix 5. The survey confirmed that the area is characterised by a quiet rural soundscape, with background noise levels dominated by wind noise, birdsong, and distant agricultural machinery. LA90 background noise levels in the daytime period are in the range 27–35 dB(A) and in the night-time period are in the range 20–28 dB(A), consistent with a quiet rural environment.

9.5 Impact Assessment

9.5.1 Ventilation Fan Noise

Predicted noise levels from the ventilation fans at the nearest sensitive residential receptor were assessed using noise propagation modelling, taking into account the source sound power levels of the proposed fans, the separation distance (~800 m), and ground absorption and screening effects. The predicted fan noise level at the nearest receptor is significantly below the background noise level at all

times of day and night. The rating level difference (specific noise level minus background noise level) under BS 4142 is negative, indicating low risk of complaint.

9.5.2 HGV Traffic Noise

HGV movements on Metham Lane and Greenoak Lane are intermittent and infrequent. Feed deliveries, chick placements, and catch operations are spread across the year such that no single day is characterised by high numbers of HGV movements. The traffic noise assessment demonstrates that the increase in road traffic noise at sensitive receptors is below the 1 dB LAEQ increase threshold that would normally be considered perceptible.

9.5.3 Catching Operations

Catching operations are undertaken on day 30 and day 38 of each flock, with all three sheds emptied at the same time. This gives a maximum of 14 to 16 catching occasions per annum. The operations are short in duration. Noise from catching operations at the nearest residential receptor is predicted to be low, given the separation distance and the relatively infrequent nature of the operations. Adverse effects on residential amenity from catching noise are not predicted.

9.5.4 Construction Noise

Construction noise is assessed against the BS 5228-1 framework. Construction would take place during normal working hours (typically 07:30–18:00 Monday to Friday, 08:00–13:00 on Saturdays). Predicted construction noise levels at the nearest sensitive receptor are assessed as below the levels at which adverse effects would be significant, given the separation distance of approximately 800 metres.

9.6 Mitigation

The following noise mitigation measures are incorporated into the scheme:

- (a) Low-noise high-speed ventilation fans selected as part of the building specification.
- (b) Construction hours restricted to social working hours as described above.
- (c) A Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to be agreed with the LPA prior to commencement, incorporating noise management measures.

9.7 Residual Significance

No significant residual noise effects are predicted from either the construction or operational phases of the proposed development. The assessment demonstrates that the proposed development is acceptable with regard to noise under BS 4142:2014+A1:2019 and the PPG on Noise.

Significance of Effects

The overall significance of noise effects is assessed as Low. Catching operations and temporary construction noise are assessed as Low significance. All other receptors, including the nearest residential receptor, experience low impacts. No effects of Medium or High impacts are predicted.

10. Odour

10.1 Introduction and Methodology

This chapter summarises the findings of the Odour Impact Assessment prepared by AS Modelling & Data Ltd. (17 April 2026), the full report for which is provided at Appendix 6. The assessment uses the ADMS 6 atmospheric dispersion model to predict annual 98th percentile hourly mean odour concentrations at sensitive receptors in the surrounding area. The assessment has been prepared by chartered environmental scientists with experience in odour impact assessment and follows the methodology set out in the Environment Agency H4 Odour Management guidance (April 2011). It is noted that the H4 guidance was withdrawn in December 2025 with no known replacement available at the time of assessment. The H4 guidance has been used as the only official national guidance providing assessment thresholds and remains consistent with current Scottish and Irish government guidance and the guidance of the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM).

10.2 Assessment Benchmark

Odour from intensive livestock rearing is classified as ‘moderately offensive’ under the H4 classification. The benchmark for moderately offensive odours is a maximum annual 98th percentile hourly mean odour concentration of 3.0 ou^E/m³. This figure represents the concentration at or below which the likelihood of unacceptable odour impacts on sensitive receptors is low. The 98th percentile statistic accounts for both the frequency and intensity of odour exposure over the course of a year, allowing for periods when meteorological conditions result in elevated odour concentrations at receptors.

10.3 Odour Sources and Emission Rates

The principal source of odour from the proposed development is the uncapped high-speed ridge-mounted ventilation fans on each of the three poultry houses. Gable-end fans provide supplementary ventilation in hot weather. Odour emission rates have been calculated using an emissions model that takes into account internal odour concentrations and ventilation rates at different stages of the growing cycle. Internal odour concentrations increase significantly towards the end of each crop cycle as bird biomass and litter accumulation increase. Peak odour emissions occur during clearance of spent litter at the end of each crop, when the housing is being emptied and cleaned. The three houses would accommodate a total of 111,000 broiler chickens, with birds reared for 38 days per crop.

10.4 Modelling Approach

Atmospheric dispersion modelling was carried out using ADMS 6 with four years of meteorological data (2022–2025) derived from the Global Forecast System (GFS), with terrain effects modelled using the FLOWSTAR2 flow field module. The model was run with the calms and terrain modules active and was effectively run twelve times — once for each year of the four-year meteorological record and for each of the three crop cycle stages. Nine discrete receptors were defined at sensitive locations in the surrounding area, positioned at 1.5 m above ground level. Maximum annual 98th percentile hourly mean odour concentrations were derived across all modelling runs to provide worst-case predicted exposure levels.

10.5 Modelling Results

The predicted maximum annual 98th percentile hourly mean odour concentrations at the nine discrete receptors are set out below. Carr House Farm Yard is the applicant’s own farm property and is associated with the development. All remaining receptors are non-associated residences and commercial properties:

Carr House Farm Yard: 3.88 ou^E/m³ (applicant’s associated property); High Metham (R2): 2.47 ou^E/m³; High Metham (R3): 1.30 ou^E/m³; Low Metham Grange: 0.57 ou^E/m³; Low Metham Cottage:

0.37 ou^E/m³; Northside Farm: 0.55 ou^E/m³; Shortbutts Lane: 0.17 ou^E/m³; Laxton: 0.25 ou^E/m³; Cotness Cottage: 0.26 ou^E/m³.

The only receptor where the predicted odour concentration exceeds the 3.0 ou^E/m³ benchmark is Carr House Farm Yard (3.88 ou^E/m³), which is the applicant's own farmyard and is associated with the development. The applicant's acceptance of this impact is implicit in their bringing forward the planning application. At all non-associated residential receptors, predicted odour concentrations are below the benchmark. The highest predicted concentration at a non-associated residential receptor is 2.47 ou^E/m³ at High Metham, which is below the 3.0 ou^E/m³ benchmark.

10.6 Conclusions

At all non-associated residences and sensitive receptors in the area, the predicted maximum annual 98th percentile hourly mean odour concentration is below the benchmark of 3.0 ou^E/m³ adopted for moderately offensive odours in accordance with the withdrawn H4 guidance. No significant adverse odour effects are predicted at any non-associated receptor from the operation of the proposed development. The residual significance of odour effects is assessed as low.

Significance of Effects

The overall significance of odour effects is assessed as Low. Predicted odour concentrations at all non-associated sensitive receptors are below the 3.0 ou^E/m³ assessment benchmark and do not give rise to any discernible adverse odour impact.

11. Transport and Access

11.1 Introduction and Methodology

This chapter summarises the findings of the Transport Statement for the proposed development, the full report for which is provided at Appendix 7. The assessment was prepared by transport planning consultants and considers the potential effects of the development on the local highway network, including traffic generation, road capacity, and access suitability.

11.2 Policy Context

The NPPF requires that development does not give rise to unacceptable highway safety risks or cause undue congestion. Policy S1 and ENV1 of the ERLPU SD require that development can be satisfactorily accessed and does not give rise to unacceptable highway effects. The Highway Authority for the area is East Riding of Yorkshire Council.

11.3 Existing Highway Network

The application site is accessed from the B1230 via Metham Lane and Greenoak Lane. The B1230 is a classified road of moderate standard. Metham Lane and Greenoak Lane are both unclassified rural roads of a standard typical of agricultural access routes in the East Riding. Both roads are used by existing agricultural traffic from Carr House Farm and other farms in the locality. The junction of Metham Lane with the B1230 has been assessed in the Transport Statement.

The Transport Statement (Appendix 7) includes a road condition survey of Metham Lane and Greenoak Lane and a swept path analysis for the vehicle types that would use the access routes. The survey confirmed that both lanes are in a condition suitable for agricultural vehicle use and that the width and alignment are adequate for the proposed vehicle types with the highway improvement works described below.

11.4 Traffic Generation

The principal vehicle movements associated with the proposed development are:

- Feed deliveries: HGV bulker delivering approximately every 5–7 days per house during the growing cycle. For the three houses, approximately 3–4 feed delivery vehicles per week on average during each cycle.
- Day-old chick (DOC) deliveries: Specialist livestock vehicles delivering day-old chicks at the start of each flock cycle. The combined 3 poultry houses require 2 x HGV chick deliveries.
- Catching lorries: At the end of each cycle, 16.5m articulated catch lorries collect the chickens for slaughter. The whole site will generate 5 lorries on day 30, and 10 on day 38.
- Litter/manure removal: After each cycle, spent litter is removed by tractor and trailer for spreading on the applicant's arable land. This generates approximately 10 tractor and trailer movements per cycle.
- Staff: The development would be managed by a full-time manager with additional part time labour as required. Staff movements would typically be by car.
- LPG deliveries: 2 tanker deliveries per flock for LPG heating.

The Transport Statement provides detailed trip generation tables.

11.5 Impact Assessment

The additional HGV traffic generated by the proposed development, when distributed across the local highway network, represents a modest increase in HGV movements on Metham Lane and Greenoak Lane. These lanes already carry agricultural traffic associated with the farm operation. The percentage increase in overall traffic flows on the B1230, as a classified road, is negligible.

The assessment concludes that, with the implementation of the highway improvement works described below, the access route can accommodate the proposed development without giving rise to unacceptable highway safety or amenity effects.

11.6 Highway Improvement Works

The Transport Statement identifies the following highway improvement works to be implemented by the applicant as part of the development:

- (a) Provision of an improved site access junction onto Greenoak Lane, incorporating adequate visibility splays in accordance with Manual for Streets standards.
- (b) Strengthening of the carriageway surface on sections of Metham Lane and Greenoak Lane as required to accommodate the proposed HGV loading, secured by a Section 278 agreement with the Highway Authority.
- (c) Provision of a passing place on Greenoak Lane at a location identified in the Transport Statement to allow two-way passage of agricultural vehicles.

These works are to be agreed with the Highway Authority and secured by planning condition or by Section 278 agreement under the Highways Act 1980.

11.7 Construction Traffic

Construction traffic would use the same Metham Lane/Greenoak Lane access route. During the construction phase, there would be a higher frequency of HGV and plant movements over a period of approximately 30 weeks. A Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) would be prepared and agreed with the Highway Authority prior to commencement, setting out routing, timing of deliveries, and welfare facilities for drivers.

11.8 Residual Significance

No significant residual transport or highway effects are predicted from the proposed development, subject to the implementation of the identified highway improvement works.

Significance of Effects

The overall significance of transport and access effects is assessed as Low. The development is acceptable in highway terms subject to the implementation of the identified highway improvement works.

12. Flood Risk and Drainage

12.1 Introduction and Methodology

This chapter summarises the findings of the Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment (FRDA) for the proposed development. The full assessment is provided at Appendix 8. The assessment has been prepared by drainage and flood risk consultants in accordance with:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2024) — Section 14: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change.
- Planning Practice Guidance: Flood Risk and Coastal Change.
- CIRIA C753: The SuDS Manual (2015).
- Environment Agency guidance on flood risk assessment for planning applications.

12.2 Policy Context

Paragraph 165 of the NPPF requires that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk. Where development cannot be located in areas with lower flood risk, the Sequential Test must be applied and, where relevant, the Exception Test must be satisfied. Policy ENV5 of the ERLPU SD applies the NPPF flood risk policy in the local context.

12.3 Flood Risk Baseline

The application site lies within Flood Zone 3 as defined by the Environment Agency's Flood Map for Planning. Flood Zone 3 is defined as land which has a 1 in 100 (1%) or greater probability of flooding from rivers in any year. The flood risk at the site is primarily from the Eastrington Drain and the wider drainage network associated with the Humberhead Levels. The area is managed by the Ouse and Humber Internal Drainage Board (IDB).

The site is relatively flat and low-lying, consistent with the reclaimed floodplain character of the area. The Eastrington Drain passes to the east of the site and is maintained by the IDB. Historical records indicate that flooding at the site is associated with extended periods of high rainfall combined with high water levels in the Humber Estuary limiting drainage.

12.4 Sequential Test

The Sequential Test requires that development should be steered away from areas at risk of flooding to areas with a lower probability of flooding. The applicant has considered alternative sites and alternative locations on the farm holding as part of the alternatives assessment in Chapter 3. All practicable alternative locations on the landholding are assessed as being in Flood Zone 2 or Flood Zone 3. There are no reasonably available alternative sites in Flood Zone 1 (low probability) that could accommodate the proposed development with the same functional and economic relationship to the existing farm enterprise.

The Sequential Test is accordingly satisfied, in that there are no reasonably available alternatives at lower flood risk.

12.5 Exception Test

Where the Sequential Test is satisfied but the site remains in Flood Zone 3, an Exception Test must be passed. The Exception Test has two parts, both of which must be satisfied:

12.5.1 Exception Test Part 1: Wider Sustainability Benefits

Part 1 of the Exception Test requires that it can be demonstrated that the development provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk.

The proposed development would make a significant contribution to UK food security by increasing domestic broiler chicken production capacity, reducing reliance on imported product with higher food miles and carbon footprints. The development supports a viable long-term farming business in a rural area with limited alternative economic opportunities. It creates rural employment and contributes to the local agricultural supply chain. The closed-loop nutrient management system (manure from the poultry unit spread on the applicant's arable land) delivers wider environmental benefits by reducing reliance on manufactured nitrogen fertilisers.

On balance, the wider sustainability benefits of the development outweigh the flood risk to the site, satisfying Part 1 of the Exception Test.

12.5.2 Exception Test Part 2: Safe for its Lifetime

Part 2 of the Exception Test requires that the development is safe for its lifetime, taking into account the vulnerability of its users, and will not increase flood risk elsewhere.

The Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment (Appendix 8) demonstrates that:

- (a) Floor levels within the proposed poultry houses are set above the design flood level (DFL) for the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) flood event, including an allowance for climate change over the lifetime of the development.
- (b) The development does not involve a vulnerable residential use. Broiler chicken houses are 'less vulnerable' development as defined by the NPPG, for which flood risk management can be achieved through design.
- (c) The development will not increase flood risk elsewhere. The proposed Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) attenuation pond will attenuate surface water run-off from the developed site to a rate no greater than the Greenfield run-off rate, discharging to the Eastrington Drain at a controlled rate agreed with the Ouse and Humber IDB.

The development is therefore safe for its lifetime and will not increase flood risk elsewhere, satisfying Part 2 of the Exception Test.

12.6 Surface Water Drainage Strategy

The proposed surface water drainage strategy is based on the SuDS hierarchy set out in CIRIA C753. Surface water from the roofs of the poultry houses and from the access road and hardstanding areas would be collected and directed to a SuDS attenuation pond designed in accordance with IDB consent requirements. Overflow from the pond would discharge to the Eastrington Drain at a controlled rate not exceeding the Greenfield run-off rate. The IDB has been consulted and its consent requirements are incorporated into the drainage design.

The attenuation pond will be designed to accommodate the critical storm event (1% AEP plus climate change allowance) without surcharging. The pond will also provide a degree of water quality treatment before discharge, protecting the water quality of the Eastrington Drain.

12.7 Mitigation

- (a) Finished floor levels set above design flood level.
- (b) SuDS attenuation pond with controlled outfall to Eastrington Drain, consented by IDB.
- (c) Flood resilience measures incorporated into building design (flood-resistant construction for ground floor elements where appropriate).
- (d) A Flood Emergency Plan (FEP) to be prepared for the operational development.

12.8 Residual Significance

The Sequential Test is satisfied and both parts of the Exception Test are met. The proposed development is assessed as acceptable in terms of flood risk and drainage, subject to implementation of the mitigation measures described above and the conditions recommended in the Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment (Appendix 8).

Significance of Effects

The overall significance of flood risk and drainage effects is assessed as Low. The development is acceptable in flood risk terms following the Sequential and Exception Tests. Flood resilience measures incorporated into the building design, together with the SuDS attenuation system, reduce residual risks to acceptable levels.

13. Nutrient Management

13.1 Introduction

This chapter assesses the environmental effects arising from the management and disposal of poultry manure produced at the proposed development. The full Nutrient Management Plan (NMP) is provided at Appendix 9. The chapter addresses the legal framework established by *R (Finch) v Surrey County Council* [2024] UKSC 20 (the 'Finch judgment') and *R (Caffyn) v Shropshire Council* [2025] EWHC 1497 (Admin) (the 'Caffyn judgment'), which require the environmental effects of the downstream disposal of poultry manure to be assessed within the EIA.

13.2 Legal Framework: The Finch and Caffyn Judgements

13.2.1 *R (Finch) v Surrey County Council* [2024] UKSC 20

In *Finch*, the Supreme Court held, by a majority of five to two, that the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 require that an Environmental Statement must assess all significant effects of a proposed project on the environment, including effects that are indirect, downstream, or off-site, provided they are reasonably foreseeable consequences of the project. The case concerned the omission from an ES of an assessment of the greenhouse gas emissions arising from the downstream combustion of oil to be produced from an oil extraction development in Surrey. The Court held that such emissions were direct effects of the project (in the sense that oil production inevitably leads to oil combustion) and that they ought to have been assessed.

The key principle established in *Finch* is that the obligation to assess 'the effects of the project on the environment' in EIA law extends to all effects that are 'direct' or 'reasonably foreseeable' consequences of the project, even where those effects occur off-site and are brought about by third parties. The statutory requirement does not permit a narrow focus on effects occurring only within the application site boundary.

13.2.2 *R (Caffyn) v Shropshire Council* [2025] EWHC 1497 (Admin)

In *Caffyn*, the High Court applied the *Finch* principles to a poultry development. The case concerned a planning permission granted by Shropshire Council for an intensive poultry unit. The Claimant argued that the ES had failed to assess the environmental effects of the spreading of poultry manure on agricultural land — the inevitable downstream consequence of operating a poultry unit — as required by *Finch*.

The Court held that the spreading of poultry manure on agricultural land was indeed a reasonably foreseeable consequence of the proposed poultry development, and that the environmental effects of that spreading (including nitrate leaching, phosphorus loading, and ammonia volatilisation from spreading) were 'direct' effects of the project in the *Finch* sense. The ES was therefore legally deficient in failing to assess those effects, and the planning permission was quashed.

Caffyn is directly on point for the proposed development at Carr House Farm. It establishes that this ES must include an assessment of the environmental effects of spreading the poultry manure arising from the development on agricultural land.

13.2.3 The Approach Adopted in this ES

The applicant fully accepts the legal framework established by *Finch* and *Caffyn*, and this ES has been prepared on the basis that the environmental effects of manure spreading must be assessed. Critically, the situation at Carr House Farm is significantly more straightforward — and the EIA is significantly more positive — than the situations in either *Finch* or *Caffyn*, for the following reasons:

(a) The applicant, L Sweeting & Son, is also the farmer who will spread the manure. The entire manure arising from the proposed development will be spread on the applicant's own arable landholding of approximately 1,087 hectares within the locality. There is no third-party contractor whose destination for the manure is unknown or uncertain.

(b) A comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan (NMP) has been prepared (Appendix 9), which assesses the quantity of manure to be produced, its nutrient composition, the land available to receive it, the spreading rates to be applied, and the environmental controls that will govern its management. The NMP provides precisely the assessment of downstream manure disposal effects that the courts in *Finch* and *Caffyn* found was absent in those cases.

(c) The NMP demonstrates full compliance with the Farming Rules for Water 2018 and with NVZ regulations. The environmental effects of spreading on the applicant's own land are assessed as positive or negligible — because the managed application of manure as a nutrient source displaces the need for manufactured nitrogen fertiliser and contributes to a circular economy approach to nutrient management.

This ES therefore not only meets but positively demonstrates compliance with the legal duty established in *Finch* and *Caffyn*, by providing a thorough and transparent assessment of the downstream environmental effects of manure disposal.

13.3 Manure Production

The proposed development would house 111,000 broiler chickens producing approximately 7.6 flocks per year, giving an annual throughput of approximately 844,000 birds per year. Broiler litter (poultry manure mixed with bedding material, typically wood shavings) is produced throughout each growing cycle and removed at the end of each cycle. The quantity and nutrient composition of broiler litter is well characterised:

Based on the Nutrient Management Plan (Appendix 9), the exact manure production figures are: 111,000 birds on site; 7.6 cycles per year; 1.45 kg of litter per bird per cycle; estimated annual litter production of 1,223 tonnes. Each tonne of broiler litter (based on AHDB RB209 analysis) contains 25 kg of available nitrogen (N), 20 kg of available phosphate (P) and 20 kg of available potash (K) per tonne.

The exact nutrient values are confirmed in the Nutrient Management Plan (Appendix 9) based on the AHDB Nutrient Management Guide (RB209) recommended values for broiler litter.

13.4 Land Available for Manure Spreading

The applicant farms approximately 1,087 hectares of arable land in the locality of Carr House Farm. This land provides a substantial and adequate resource for the spreading and utilisation of all manure produced by the proposed development. The NMP (Appendix 9) identifies the specific fields available for manure spreading and demonstrates that the land area available is significantly in excess of the minimum required to assimilate the manure in compliance with regulatory limits.

The NMP confirms that the application of broiler litter to the identified fields, at the agronomically appropriate rates, would not give rise to regulatory exceedance of nitrogen application limits under the NVZ Regulations or the Farming Rules for Water 2018. The spreading plan takes full account of soil types, slope, proximity to watercourses and boreholes, existing soil nutrient levels, and crop nitrogen requirements.

13.5 Environmental Effects of Manure Spreading

13.5.1 Nitrate Leaching

Poultry litter, when correctly applied at agronomically appropriate rates and at the correct time of year, does not give rise to significant nitrate leaching beyond that which would occur through conventional mineral fertiliser use. The NMP specifies application rates that comply with the NVZ total nitrogen input limits and avoids applications at times of high leaching risk (e.g. late autumn and winter applications are avoided or minimised). The risk of nitrate leaching from the proposed manure spreading programme is assessed as no greater than that arising from current mineral fertiliser use on the same land, and is accordingly assessed as Negligible Adverse.

13.5.2 Phosphorus Loading

The NMP identifies the total phosphorus input from the poultry litter and compares this with the phosphorus demand of the crops to be grown on the receiving land. The assessment demonstrates that phosphorus application rates are within RB209 recommendations and do not give rise to a risk of excessive soil phosphorus levels that could lead to diffuse pollution of watercourses. The risk of phosphorus loading from the proposed manure spreading programme is assessed as Negligible Adverse.

13.5.3 Ammonia Volatilisation from Spreading

Some ammonia is volatilised during the spreading of poultry litter. The NMP requires that spreading is undertaken in accordance with BAT for land application, including avoidance of spreading during high wind or rainfall conditions, and where practicable the use of spreading methods that reduce surface exposure time. The ammonia volatilised during spreading is a diffuse source spread across the 1,087 hectares of the landholding and is incorporated into the general background of agricultural ammonia emissions in the locality. The contribution of spreading ammonia from this development to concentrations at any identified sensitive receptor is predicted to be negligible given the dispersed nature of the source and the absence of sensitive receptors adjacent to the spreading land.

13.5.4 Soil Health and Carbon

The regular application of organic matter through poultry litter spreading has a positive effect on soil organic matter content, soil structure, and the soil biota. The substitution of organic nitrogen for mineral nitrogen reduces the energy-intensive Haber-Bosch process of nitrogen fertiliser manufacture and reduces the carbon footprint of crop production. These are positive environmental effects of the manure management system.

13.6 Regulatory Controls

The management of manure spreading is subject to the following regulatory controls:

- (a) The Farming Rules for Water 2018 (The Reduction and Prevention of Agricultural Diffuse Pollution (England) Regulations 2018): These rules require that organic manure is applied only at agronomic rates, at appropriate times, and with appropriate exclusion zones from water features. The NMP demonstrates full compliance.
- (b) NVZ Regulations: Where the application site or spreading land falls within a Nitrate Vulnerable Zone, additional restrictions apply including limits on total nitrogen applications from all sources and a closed period for spreading. The NMP addresses NVZ requirements.
- (c) Environmental Permit (if required for manure storage): The Environmental Permit for the development, which is in progress with the Environment Agency, will set conditions relating to the management of manure on site.
- (d) RB209 Nutrient Management Guide: The AHDB's RB209 provides the technical basis for calculating crop nutrient requirements and recommended organic manure application rates. The NMP follows RB209 methodology.

13.7 Significance Assessment

The Nutrient Management Plan (Appendix 9) provides the comprehensive downstream assessment of manure disposal effects required by Finch [2024] UKSC 20 and Caffyn [2025] EWHC 1497 (Admin). The assessment concludes that the downstream environmental effects of manure disposal are either Negligible Adverse or Minor Beneficial, and are manageable to an acceptable standard through the regulatory controls and management practices described. The proposed development meets the EIA assessment duty in relation to downstream manure disposal effects.

Significance of Effects

The overall significance of nutrient management effects is assessed as None. The management of poultry manure through the closed-loop system results in Positive significance through improvements to soil health and the displacement of manufactured nitrogen fertiliser, reducing the carbon and environmental footprint of crop production on the applicant's landholding.

14. Climate Change

14.1 Introduction

This chapter assesses the climate change implications of the proposed development. In departing from the conventional approach of seeking to identify and quantify negative greenhouse gas (GHG) impacts, this assessment demonstrates that, when properly considered in its full context, the proposed development of three poultry houses at Carr House Farm has a net positive climate change effect. This is because the development reduces, rather than increases, the total GHG emissions associated with meeting UK poultry consumption demand.

The chapter also considers the resilience of the development to climate change effects over its operational lifetime, and the positive contribution made by on-site renewable energy generation, energy-efficient building design, and the closed-loop nutrient management system.

14.2 Policy Context

Policy S2 (Addressing Climate Change) of the ERLPU SD requires all development to mitigate and adapt to climate change in accordance with Government policy. Policy EC5 (Supporting the Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Sector) supports the production of renewable energy. The NPPF (Section 14) requires planning policies and decisions to support the transition to a low-carbon future.

The Climate Change Act 2008 (as amended 2019) commits the UK to achieving net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. The UK Food Strategy (2022) and subsequent Government statements identify UK food security and the reduction of food import dependencies as important national objectives.

14.3 Construction Phase Emissions

Construction of the proposed development would involve the use of diesel-powered plant and machinery (excavators, concrete mixers, cranes, and vehicles) and the transport of construction materials to site. These activities generate greenhouse gas emissions (principally CO₂ and some CH₄ and N₂O from diesel combustion). Construction emissions are one-off and temporary in nature, occurring over the approximately 30 week construction programme.

Mitigation measures for construction emissions include:

- Use of modern, fuel-efficient plant and machinery.
- Sourcing of construction materials locally where practicable, to minimise transport distances.
- Optimisation of the construction programme to minimise plant standing time.
- Good site management practices to reduce unnecessary vehicle movements.

Construction emissions are assessed as Minor Adverse in the short term and temporary. They are not considered significant for EIA purposes in the context of the long-term operational benefits described below.

14.4 Operational Emissions

14.4.1 LPG Backup Heating

The proposed poultry houses are heated using LPG as heating during the early stages of each flock cycle, when supplementary warmth is required for young chicks. LPG combustion produces CO₂ emissions. However, broiler chickens generate significant body heat themselves, and the thermal efficiency of modern tunnel-ventilated buildings is high. LPG consumption per flock is therefore limited to the early weeks of each cycle. As flock size and bird body heat increase, supplementary heating requirements reduce to zero.

While LPG produces CO₂ emissions from combustion, its CO₂ intensity (approximately 1.5 kg CO₂e per kg LPG) is lower than that of heating oil. The rooftop solar PV (see section 14.5 below) does not

directly substitute for LPG heating but reduces the overall site energy cost and carbon footprint by generating on-site renewable electricity for lighting, motors, and control systems.

14.4.2 Vehicle Movements

HGV and tractor movements associated with feed deliveries, bird collection, and manure removal generate CO₂ emissions from diesel combustion. These are inherent in any livestock production operation and are reflected in the full Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) of UK broiler production discussed further in section 14.6 below.

14.4.3 Litter and Manure

Poultry litter spread on agricultural land produces some N₂O and CH₄ emissions during decomposition. These emissions are accounted for within the full LCA of UK chicken production. As described in Chapter 13, the application of poultry litter displaces the need for manufactured nitrogen fertiliser, which has its own significant embedded carbon. The net effect on greenhouse gas emissions from the nutrient management system is considered broadly neutral to positive when compared with the mineral fertiliser baseline.

The British Poultry Council has noted that around three quarters of UK poultry litter and manure is used as a renewable fuel in electricity generation. Poultry manure used as a biomass fuel in permitted power stations displaces fossil fuels and contributes to the national renewable energy supply. Where manure is used as a fertiliser, it displaces manufactured inorganic fertiliser, the production of which is highly energy-intensive and GHG-intensive. These are positive climate change contributions from the manure generated by the proposed development.

14.5 Renewable Energy

Each of the three poultry houses would be equipped with rooftop solar photovoltaic (PV) panels with a peak output of 45 kW per house, giving a total installed capacity of 135 kW across the development. At this capacity, and with the insolation levels typical of East Yorkshire, the solar installation would generate approximately 115,000–130,000 kWh of electricity per year (assuming a performance ratio of around 80% and approximately 1,000 peak sun hours per year). This represents a very substantial proportion of the electricity consumption of the development.

The solar PV generation displaces grid electricity, which in 2026 still has a significant carbon intensity (though declining year on year as the UK grid decarbonises). Each kWh generated on site avoids approximately 0.2–0.25 kg CO₂e compared with grid purchase (applying the 2025/26 grid carbon intensity). The annual carbon saving from solar generation is therefore in the order of 23,000–32,000 kg CO₂e per year.

Any surplus electricity generated beyond site consumption can be exported to the national grid, providing further carbon and economic benefits.

14.6 Import Substitution

Poultry Meat and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The British Poultry Council (BPC) has submitted evidence to Parliament confirming that poultry meat is the most environmentally efficient of all meat proteins. Life Cycle Analysis (LCA) data demonstrates that chicken meat production generates 4.6 tonnes CO₂ equivalent per tonne of carcass – compared to 16 tCO₂e for beef, 6.4 tCO₂e for pigmeat and 17 tCO₂e for sheepmeat. Poultry meat consumption accounts for just 1% of total UK GHG emissions, despite chicken being the most widely consumed meat in the UK.

These environmental advantages arise from the inherent efficiency of poultry production: the productivity of parent breeding stock, high feed conversion efficiency, short growing cycles, and lower methane emissions compared to ruminant livestock. The BPC evidence confirms that improvements in poultry genetics and nutrition have substantially reduced the environmental footprint of UK broiler production over recent decades. The same volume of feed (1.5 million tonnes) that sustained 369

million chickens in 1973 now sustains 527 million chickens to the same live-weight – a more than 40% effective reduction in the resources required per unit of output.

Livestock Type	GWP100 (tCO ₂ e per tonne carcass)	Primary Energy (GJ per tonne carcass)	Eutrophication (kg PO ₄ per tonne carcass)
Beef	16.0	28	158
Sheepmeat	17.0	23	200
Pigmeat	6.4	17	100
Poultry (Chicken)	4.6	12	49

Source: British Poultry Council evidence to Parliament (LCA data, BPC submission). The environmental burdens of poultry production have continued to reduce since the date of the original study.

Import Substitution and Climate Benefit

Imported poultry now accounts for over 25% of UK consumption, with imports rising by 8.6% year-on-year in early 2026 and total imports exceeding 700,000 tonnes. The principal sources of imports are Thailand (import value £685 million in 2025), Poland (£281 million) and Brazil (£136 million), with imports from Ukraine rising approximately 300% since 2022.

The transportation of imported poultry from these countries to UK consumers generates substantial GHG emissions. Frozen poultry transported from Thailand or Brazil must be maintained in a refrigerated supply chain throughout ocean transport and UK distribution – a process with a significant energy and carbon cost. This is in stark contrast to domestically produced chicken. The BPC has highlighted this point explicitly in its parliamentary evidence: “the imported feed ingredient would be replaced by increases in imported meat. The environmental impact would be more damaging in that unlike the soybean meal, the meat has to be kept frozen throughout the whole chain.”

The most significant climate change benefit of the proposed development, in terms of its contribution to overall greenhouse gas emissions, is its contribution to UK food security and the displacement of higher-carbon imported chicken.

The British Poultry Council (BPC) has published Life Cycle Assessment data for UK broiler production demonstrating that UK chicken has a significantly lower carbon footprint per kilogram of liveweight than imports from major supplying countries. The key data points are:

UK broiler production carbon intensity: approximately 2.3–2.6 kg CO₂e per kg liveweight (full LCA including feed production, transport, processing, and packaging). This is among the lowest in the world, reflecting the UK's efficient production systems, high welfare standards, and the progressive decarbonisation of the UK electricity grid.

By contrast, chicken imported from major producing countries such as Brazil, Thailand, and Ukraine has a significantly higher carbon intensity, typically in the range 3.5–5.0+ kg CO₂e per kg liveweight, reflecting higher feed conversion ratios, different energy mixes, and longer transport distances.

The proposed development would produce approximately 844,000 birds per year with an estimated average target liveweight at slaughter of 2.55 kg, giving approximately 2,152,200 kg (2,152 tonnes) of liveweight per year. At a UK average carbon intensity of 2.4 kg CO₂e/kg liveweight compared with an import alternative of 4.0 kg CO₂e/kg liveweight, the import substitution benefit is approximately 1.6 kg CO₂e per kg liveweight, or approximately 2,971 tonnes CO₂e per year avoided through domestic production compared with the equivalent import volume.

This import substitution benefit substantially outweighs the operational carbon emissions of the development, providing a clear and significant net climate change benefit.

14.7 Carbon Sequestration and Nutrient Cycling

As described in Chapter 13, the systematic application of poultry litter to the applicant's arable land increases soil organic matter over time. Enhanced soil organic matter has a net positive effect on soil carbon content, contributing to carbon sequestration in agricultural soils over the long term. Additionally, the displacement of manufactured nitrogen fertiliser (whose production is energy-intensive, involving the Haber-Bosch process consuming natural gas and generating significant CO₂e per tonne of nitrogen fixed) by organic nitrogen in poultry litter provides a secondary carbon benefit.

Using IPCC Tier 1 emission factors for nitrogen fertiliser manufacture (approximately 5.5 kg CO₂e per kg N₂O₅, equivalent to approximately 8.1 kg CO₂e per kg N), the displacement of synthetic nitrogen across the landholding represents a material carbon saving.

The landscaping scheme proposed for the development includes the planting of native trees and hedgerows, which will sequester carbon in both above-ground biomass and in soil organic matter over time. Whilst the sequestration rates achievable through on-farm planting schemes are modest in absolute terms, they represent a positive contribution to the carbon balance of the development.

14.8 Climate Change Adaptation

The development has been designed to be resilient to the effects of climate change over its operational lifetime:

- (a) Flood resilience: As addressed in Chapter 12, finished floor levels are set above the design flood level including climate change allowances, and the SuDS system is designed for the design storm event with climate change.
- (b) Overheating: Modern tunnel-ventilated poultry houses are designed to manage internal temperatures through controlled ventilation. Variable-speed fans allow management of cooling loads under warmer summer conditions projected under UK climate change scenarios.
- (c) Water availability: The development's water consumption (drinking water for birds) is relatively modest. The site has an existing water supply connection.

14.9 Assessment Conclusion

When properly considered in its full context, the proposed development at Carr House Farm has a net positive effect on climate change. The key reasons for this conclusion are:

- The 111,000 bird places at Carr House Farm, producing approximately 844,000 birds per year, will directly substitute for imported poultry meat produced overseas (principally in Thailand, Brazil, and Ukraine) and transported to the UK in refrigerated containers. The GHG emissions associated with this substituted imported production are substantially higher than those of equivalent UK domestic production.
- Poultry meat is the most environmentally efficient of all animal proteins, with a GHG intensity approximately 70% lower than beef and 73% lower than sheepmeat. Expanding domestic chicken production is therefore a positive response to the climate challenge of feeding a growing population with a lower-carbon diet.
- The development incorporates 135 kW of on-site solar PV generation (three 45 kW arrays, one per new house), contributing to on-site renewable energy generation and reducing grid electricity demand.
- Poultry manure produced at the farm will be used as a renewable fuel or organic fertiliser, displacing fossil fuels and manufactured inorganic fertilisers respectively.
- The proposed landscaping will deliver carbon sequestration through native tree and hedgerow planting.

The proposed development is consistent with the Climate Change Act 2008 and national net zero commitments. It strengthens domestic food security, reduces reliance on high-carbon imported supply chains, and incorporates meaningful on-site renewable energy measures.

Significance of Effects

The overall significance of climate change effects is assessed as Positive. The development delivers a substantial net climate change benefit through the substitution of higher-carbon imported chicken, on-site renewable energy generation from 135 kW of solar PV, and the displacement of manufactured fertiliser through nutrient cycling. This represents a significant positive contribution to national net zero commitments.

15. Summary and Conclusions

15.1 Introduction

This chapter summarises the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment for the proposed erection of three poultry houses and associated infrastructure at Carr House Farm, Celery Bank, Laxton, East Riding of Yorkshire. The proposed development would house 111,000 broiler chickens across three houses (37,000 birds per house), operating with approximately 7.6 flocks per year.

15.2 Summary of Effects

The table below summarises the significance of environmental effects assessed in this Environmental Statement, using the significance scale set out in Section 4.3.

Chapter	Subject	Significance
Chapter 6	Landscape and Visual Appraisal	Low
Chapter 7	Ecology and Biodiversity	Positive
Chapter 8	Ammonia and Nitrogen Deposition	Low
Chapter 9	Noise	Low
Chapter 10	Odour	Low
Chapter 11	Transport and Access	Low
Chapter 12	Flood Risk and Drainage	Low
Chapter 13	Nutrient Management	Positive
Chapter 14	Climate Change	Positive

15.3 EIA Conclusions

The Environmental Impact Assessment concludes that the proposed development would not give rise to any significant adverse environmental effects. Adverse effects on landscape and visual receptors, ammonia and nitrogen deposition, odour, transport and access, noise from catching operations, and flood risk to the development are each assessed as Low significance – below the threshold of significance for EIA purposes.

Against these adverse effects, the development delivers a number of Positive environmental outcomes: a minimum 10% Biodiversity Net Gain; significant renewable energy generation from 135 kW of rooftop solar PV; a net Positive contribution to climate change mitigation through import substitution and lower lifecycle emissions; and Positive contributions from nutrient cycling, displaced mineral fertiliser, and improved soil health and carbon.

The proposed development also provides important wider benefits including: support for UK food security and domestic poultry production; rural employment; and a sustainable closed-loop nutrient management system through the applicant's own substantial arable landholding.

15.4 Planning Policy Compliance

The proposed development is consistent with the development plan and with national planning policy. In particular:

- It is supported by Policies S4 and EC4 of the ERLPU SD as appropriate agricultural diversification in the rural area.

- It meets the requirements of Policy ENV2 (Biodiversity Net Gain), Policy ENV3 (Landscape), Policy ENV5 (Flood Risk), and Policy ENV6 (Managing Environmental Hazards) as demonstrated by the technical chapters and appendices of this ES.
- It is consistent with the NPPF's policies on rural development (paragraphs 85 and 88), flood risk (paragraphs 173 and 174), and the relationship between planning and environmental permitting (paragraph 201).
- The EIA fully complies with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 and Schedule 4 thereof.
- The ES addresses the legal framework established by R (Finch) v Surrey County Council [2024] UKSC 20 and R (Caffyn) v Shropshire Council [2025] EWHC 1497 (Admin) by providing a comprehensive assessment of the downstream environmental effects of manure disposal within the Nutrient Management Plan (Appendix 9) and Chapter 13.

Planning permission is respectfully sought for the proposed development. Harrison Pick Ltd is available to discuss any aspects of this Environmental Statement with the local planning authority or its technical consultees.

Harrison Pick Ltd Ian Pick MRICS June 2026

References

Legislation

Climate Change Act 2008 (as amended by the Climate Change Act 2008 (2050 Target Amendment) Order 2019). HMSO, London.

Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (SI 2017/1012). HMSO, London.

Environment Act 2021. HMSO, London.

Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 (SI 2016/1154). HMSO, London.

Hedgerow Regulations 1997 (SI 1997/1160). HMSO, London.

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. HMSO, London.

Reduction and Prevention of Agricultural Diffuse Pollution (England) Regulations 2018 (SI 2018/151) (Farming Rules for Water 2018). HMSO, London.

Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (SI 2017/571). HMSO, London.

Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). HMSO, London.

National Planning Policy

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2024) National Planning Policy Framework. MHCLG, London. (December 2024 edition.)

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (updated) National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/planning-practice-guidance> [online].

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (updated) Planning Practice Guidance: Flood Risk and Coastal Change. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change> [online].

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (updated) Planning Practice Guidance: Noise (PPG Noise). Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/noise> [online].

Local Planning Policy

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (2023) East Riding Local Plan Update Strategy Document (ERLPU SD). ERYC, Beverley.

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (2025) East Riding Design Code. ERYC, Beverley.

Technical Guidance and Standards

Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board (AHDB) (2022) Nutrient Management Guide (RB209). AHDB, Kenilworth.

Association of Noise Consultants, Chartered Institute of Environmental Health and Institute of Acoustics (2017) ProPG: Planning and Noise - Professional Practice Guidance on Planning and Noise. ANC/CIEH/IOA.

British Standards Institution (2014, amended 2019) BS 4142:2014+A1:2019: Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound. BSI, London.

British Standards Institution (2009, amended 2014) BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014: Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites - Part 1: Noise. BSI, London.

British Standards Institution (2014) BS 8233:2014: Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings. BSI, London.

Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) (2018) Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater, Coastal and Marine. CIEEM, Winchester.

CIRIA (2015) C753: The SuDS Manual. CIRIA, London.

Environment Agency (2011) H4 Odour Management: How to comply with your environmental permit. Environment Agency, Bristol. (Withdrawn December 2025; applied as the only available national odour assessment guidance.)

Environment Agency H1: Assess the Risk from Your Waste Activities. Environment Agency, Bristol.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) (2006) 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories. IPCC, Geneva.

Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) (2021) Guidance on Decision-making Thresholds for Air Quality Impacts on Statutory Nature Conservation Sites (December 2021). JNCC, Peterborough.

Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2013) Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition (GLVIA3). Routledge, London.

Natural England (2025) Air Pollution and Development: Advice for Local Planning Authorities.

Natural England, October 2025.

Natural England National Character Area Profile 39: Humberhead Levels. Natural England, Peterborough. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-character-area-profiles-data-for-local-decision-making> [online].

Case Law

R (Finch) v Surrey County Council [2024] UKSC 20. UK Supreme Court, 20 June 2024.

R (Caffyn) v Shropshire Council [2025] EWHC 1497 (Admin). High Court (Administrative Court), 2025.

Other Documents

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) (2024) Statutory Biodiversity Metric: User Guide. Defra, London.

HM Government (2022) UK Food Strategy. HM Government, London.