

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Jennie Townsend	Date of report: 15/07/2025	Ref: 71451/FUL
Registration: 22/05/2025	LDfC: 19/06/2025	Expiry Date: 17/07/2025
Site Visit: 30/05/2025	Site Notice: 30/05/2025	Press Date: 05/06/2025
Objections: 5	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: ARW
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: MIOT

Proposal: Installation of a slurry lagoon

Location: Sheep Hey Farm, Leaches Road, Shuttleworth, Ramsbottom, Bury, BL0 0EC

Description

The application relates to Sheep Hey Farm and associated land and agricultural holding. The site is located in the Green Belt, Landscape Character Area and River Valley as defined in UDP and PfE Policies.

Sheep Hey Farmhouse and its farm buildings which are located off Leaches Lane are no longer in agricultural use or associated the submitted land holdings plan shows there is 28 hectares of agricultural land associated with the farm and prior approval was granted for an agricultural building for storage purposes on a parcel of land (ref 69814) off Leaches Lane in August 2024.

The application site relates to a field which is accessed from Leaches Lane and the motorway bridge. From the lane, access is via a single lane track which is a Public Right of Way (109RAM). The field has undulating levels and slopes downwards from east to west with level areas between and there is an access track which runs along the eastern boundary. In the northern part of the field is an agricultural building which is located outside of the applicant's agricultural holding.

The nearest sensitive receptors and residential properties are to the north east and comprise The Paddock campsite, approx 250m away and just beyond are houses at the Sheep Hey complex which are approximately 300m away. To the south, the application is bounded by Cross Bank Brook and to the west is the River Irwell approx 200m away beyond which are industrial units and residential properties at Stubbins.

The application seeks the installation of a slurry pond/lagoon.

The proposed site plan shows the lagoon would be located more or less halfway down the field towards the eastern field boundary and approximately 140m south of the agricultural building.

The proposed plan shows the slurry pond as a rectangular shape, 30 m x 20m and would be 4m deep. It would have a hardcore base with a 2mm thick black plaster liner to make the pond impermeable with 45 degree slopes to each side.

It would be enclosed by 2m high deer fencing with planting around the perimeter.

The applicant states the slurry pond is needed due to the high cost of purchasing chemically produced fertiliser, which may also not have the same environmental soil benefits as animal slurry.

Relevant Planning History

46756 - Tipping of inert waste (clay and subsoil only) - Refused 24/11/2006

47771 - Tipping of inert waste (clay and subsoil only) (RESUBMISSION) - Refused
20/06/2007

59550 - Change of use of field to camping site including siting of 2 no. moveable portaloos and shower block - Approve with Conditions 26/05/2016

61223 - Retention of shed to store hay, feed and associated equipment; retention of boundary fencing - - Approve with Conditions 24/05/2017

63407 - Variation of condition nos. 2 and 9 of planning permission 59550 for the gate on the corner to be used for maintenance purposes and a single passing place provided
- Approve with Conditions 19/12/2018

69406 - Prior approval for proposed agricultural building - Prior Approval Required and Refused 18/04/2023

69814 - Prior approval for proposed agricultural building - Required and Granted 22/8/25

Publicity

Letters sent on 22/5/25 to 13 properties.

Site notice posted 30/5/25.

Press advert 5/6/25.

5 objections and 1 support received.

Objections

- They have no livestock at Sheep Hey so presume the slurry would be brought from other farms in this location by tanker. Only slurry generated on the farm should be stored in the lagoon.
- We also note there is a similar application at their Twine Valley Farm for another slurry - why are two required? Does the applicant have slurry lagoons at their other farms?
- this site is in open spaces of Shuttleworth and in the Green belt.
- The slurry lagoon is 20m x 30m in size - approx two thirds the size of an Olympic swimming pool. Its siting and appearance would be a prominent and intrusive feature on the open landscape.
- Located within 200m of a number of houses and within 10m or so of an active campsite that brings visitors to the locality. It is certainly within 400m of a habitable building.
- The applicant would need to ensure that this type of waste management is carried out without endangering human health, without harming the environment and in particular without risk to water, air, soil, plants or animals; without causing a nuisance through noise or odours; and without adversely affecting the countryside and Green Belt.
- There is no detailed environmental assessment, or odour emission assessment / management plan and as a result, the application should be refused.
- The proposed slurry lagoon would be seriously detrimental to the residential amenity of local residents and visitors to the camp site in terms of odour etc.
- Slurry lagoons are known to have issues with foul rotten-egg odours, linked to increased rates of headaches, eye, nose and throat irritation, and excessive coughing. They create ammonia, hydrogen sulfide, methane and carbon dioxide.
- Any adequate environmental assessment should have considered the risk of contamination, odour control and other matters of health and safety, including the provision of: Slurry Lagoon Liners, Slurry lagoon covers, adequate fencing, odour management plan.
- Impact on Local Wildlife and Ecology - The area is home to a wide range of wildlife including deer, birds, and other species that use the nearby fields and watercourses. The construction and ongoing use of a slurry lagoon risks disrupting these habitats through noise, pollution, and increased human and vehicle activity.
- Proximity to Water Sources and Risk of Pollution - The proposed site is close to water sources and drainage routes and the risk of contamination from slurry run-off or overflow, particularly during periods of heavy rain. This could lead to pollution of natural water systems, with long-term environmental consequences.
- Traffic, Odour, and Waste Spreading Practices - Residents have previously experienced significant disruption from frequent slurry spreading including - strong and persistent odours affecting quality of life, especially in warm weather, debris and residue on the road, leading to damage to cars and windows, excessive run-off, causing large

DELEGATED REPORT

- pools of slurry-contaminated water along the road
- Increased vehicle movements, raising concerns about road safety and congestion - has a traffic management plan been prepared?
- Concerns Over Slurry Contents - It is widely rumoured that the farm has contracts for the disposal of non-agricultural waste such as septic tank effluent and brewery waste, which may have been spread on this land in previous years. Clarity is needed on exactly what materials will be stored, and assurances as well as ongoing auditing would help to ensure that no industrial or non-agricultural waste will be included.
- Potential Misrepresentation of Livestock Numbers - The application states that the slurry lagoon is required for slurry produced by up to 250 cows. As a neighbouring resident, I have not observed livestock numbers anywhere near this figure. This raises questions about the scale of the development and whether it is justified by current on-site operations.
- Impact on Local Businesses and Community - There is a campsite nearby which may be negatively affected by the odour, appearance, and increased traffic associated with this proposal. There are also concerns regarding the safety of children who regularly walk, cycle, or play in the area.
- Request for Clarification and Reconsideration - The specific contents of the slurry to be stored, management plan for preventing pollution and odour, verification of livestock numbers, potential impact on the local environment, businesses, and residents
- Crossbank Brook is close by and the River Irwell not far away, brooks and underground streams, aquifer are common in this area. The positioning of the slurry, indicates a strong possibility of contamination into our waterways, heavy rainfall can cause runoff from slurry lagoons, carrying pollutants into nearby streams and rivers .
- Proposed to have 2 metre high deer fencing around the lagoon. There needs to be access for the farmer but it still poses a risk.
- Potential to damage the Greenbelt and public amenity for the future.
- The applicants have had waste sprayed over the fields opposite the Duckworth Arms late at night/early morning, on many occasions. the smell the next day is unbearable and does not smell of natural manure spreading.

Support

- Live close to the proposed site and have no issues with this.
- The owners of the land are farming it , the land has improved considerably since they bought it . The tractor drivers / workers are always polite and give way when on the lane.
- Noise / traffic/ smell is minimal and varies depending on the season - all things you would expect from a working farm. It can be weeks between any activity at the site - certainly not everyday .It's not like it's right next door to somebodies garden .

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - No response received.

Borough Engineer - Drainage Section - No response received.

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land - No comments to make.

Environmental Health - Pollution Control - No objection

Public Rights of Way Officer - No comments received.

Environment Agency - No objection in principle

United Utilities (Water and waste) - No objection subject to condition

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit - No objection subject to conditions

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Development Plan and Policies

NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
EN7/3	Water Pollution
EN7/4	Groundwater Protection
OL4/5	Agricultural Development

OL5/2	Development in River Valleys
EN7/2	Noise Pollution
GMMWP	Greater Manchester Minerals and Waste Plan
JP-G1	Landscape Character
JP-G9	The Green Belt
JP-P1	Sustainable Places
JP-C8	Transport Requirements of New Development
JP-S4	Flood Risk and the Water Environment
JP-S5	Clean Air

Issues and Analysis

The following report includes analysis of the merits of the application against the relevant policies of both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (PfE) and the saved policies within the adopted Bury Unitary Development Plan (UDP), together with other relevant material planning considerations.

The policies of the UDP that have been used to assess this application are considered to be in accordance with the NPPF and as such are material planning considerations. For simplicity, just the UDP and PfE Policies will be referred to in the report, unless there is a particular matter to highlight arising from the NPPF where it would otherwise be specifically mentioned.

Equality Act 2010: All planning applications are considered in light of the Equality Act 2010 and associated Public Sector Equality Duty, where the Council is required to have due regard for:

The elimination of discrimination, harassment and victimisation;

The advancement of equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and person who do not share it;

The fostering of good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and person who do not share it; which applies to people from the protected equality groups.

Human Rights: All planning applications are considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998.

Under Article 6 the applicants (and those third parties who have made representations) have the right to a fair hearing and to this end full consideration will be given to their comments.

Article 8 and Protocol 1 of the First Article confer a right to respect private and family life and a right to the protection of property, ie peaceful enjoyment of one's possessions which could include a person's home, and other land and business assets.

In taking account of the Council policy as set out in the Bury Unitary Development Plan 1997 and all material planning considerations, it is concluded on balance that the rights conferred upon the applicant/ objectors/ residents/ other interested party by Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol may be interfered with, since such interference is in accordance with the law and is justified in the public interest. Any restriction of these rights posed by refusal/ approval of the application is legitimate since it is proportionate to the wider benefits of such a decision, is based upon the merits of the proposal, and falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town & Country Planning Acts.

The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 imposes (without prejudice to any other obligation imposed on it) a duty upon the Council to exercise its functions and have due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of its functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area. In so doing and on making planning decisions

under the Town and Country Planning Acts, the material Planning considerations shall have due regard to the provisions of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and its implications in the exercise of its functions.

Principle (Green Belt)

PfE Policy JP-G9: The Green Belt defines the limits of the Green Belt within the Plan area and confirms the five purposes of the Green Belt as set out within national policy:

- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another;
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from further encroachment;
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns;
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other land

Paragraph 154 of the NPPF confirms that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of the following exceptions applies:

- a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;
- b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use), including buildings, for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
- c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- e) limited infilling in villages;
- f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and
- g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed use including residential), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.
- h) Other forms of development provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These are:
 - i. mineral extraction;
 - ii. engineering operations;
 - iii. local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location;
 - iv. the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction;
 - v. material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds); and
 - vi. development, including buildings, brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order

The submitted planning statement confirms that the slurry would be collected from the land holdings of the applicant and his close family and would be taken by tanker where the material would be pumped into the lagoon for storage purposes and when needed used to fertilise land. A plan has also been submitted that shows the land holding at Sheep hey Farm.

The proposal would fall under exception a of paragraph 154 providing a slurry pond in association with an agricultural use and would therefore be acceptable in principle subject to the consideration of the issues set out below.

Need for the proposed slurry lagoon.

The applicant states that the cost of chemical fertiliser is now very high and natural by-product is likely to be more environmentally friendly.

In addition, the applicant states that the slurry is needed for the 400 cows which are kept on

the various land holdings which comprise -

250 cows at Twine Valley

110 cows at Sheep Hey Farm in the shed immediately to the north of the application site

40 cows at Close Nook Farm, Turn Village.

However, the plan which has been submitted to show the extent of the farm holding (which is circa 28 hectares) does not include the agricultural shed to the north or part of the field where it is located and this agricultural building is in fact owned by someone else.

As such, this conflicts with the information and justification for the need for the development and therefore insufficient information to understand the need for the development, the size of the proposed slurry lagoon and the reason for the proposed siting of the pond.

The proposed development would therefore be contrary to policies EN1/2, OL4/5, JP-P1.

Siting, layout and design

The site is located in the Green Belt, a Landscape Character Area and River Valley.

UDP Policy EN1/2 seeks to ensure that development proposals would not have a detrimental effect on the visual amenity and character of a particular area.

PfE Policy JP-G1 states that development within a Landscape Character Type should reflect and respond to the special qualities and sensitivities of the key landscape characteristics of its location, including having regard to:

- Topography, geology and drainage;
- Land use and field patterns;
- Semi-natural habitats and woodland cover;
- Archaeology and cultural heritage;
- Settlement, road pattern and rights of way; and
- Views and perceptual qualities.

UDP Policy OL4/5 - Agricultural development require developments to be sited and designed in such a manner as to minimise visual impact to the landscape having regards to height, materials, landform and landscaping; relate well to existing farm buildings and not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of any neighbouring properties.

As set out above under paragraph 154 of the NPPF, buildings for agriculture are considered as appropriate development in the Green Belt. However, paragraphs 142 and 143 confirm the importance attached to Green Belt and the retention of the essential characteristics of Green Belts which are their openness and permanence.

The applicant states that the site was chosen for 3 reasons -

- to limit its visual impact (mitigated by tree planting)
- the levels would aid its siting and construction
- access can be provided to it from the existing track above it so material can be pumped into it.

The site and surrounding land form is one which is characterised by undulating hills and in this location the land falls from the east from Leaches Lane and the motorway bridge to the River Irwell to the west and the site itself slopes in this direction with some level areas within parts of the field. Views of the field and the proposed slurry pond would be therefore be from close to and from further away, especially from the west.

A topographical survey has been submitted to show existing and proposed levels with a section plan provided to show how the slurry pond would sit within the land form. The plan however does not include the boundary fields, adjacent buildings or the surrounding landform and as such no indication as to whether the slurry would be visible

from views near to or from a distance.

Similarly, the proposed location plan only shows a red edge rectangular shape of the location of the slurry, again without indicating field boundaries or the wider area whilst the 'general location' of the slurry lagoon is denoted on the aerial photograph and it lacks any detail.

Even when read together, the topographical plan, red edge site plan and aerial photograph do not provide sufficient detail to understand the exact location of the slurry pond, how it would be formed within the existing landscape and the extent of engineering operations required to construct the pond in the land.

The topographical plan of the slurry lagoon and slurry lagoon cross sections reference a 2m high deer security fence although details of its exact location and design are poor.

The odour report suggests mitigation for the control of odour from the proposed pond would be to secure a plastic floating cover. Details of this have not been provided and therefore an assessment of any visual impacts cannot be assessed in relation to its siting and design.

Given the above, it is therefore considered that insufficient information has been submitted to adequately assess the proposals in terms of policies JP-G1, OL4/5, EN1/2, JP-P1 and the principles of the NPPF.

Impacts on amenity

UDP Policy EN1/2 seeks to ensure that the relationship of the proposal to the surrounding area is taken into consideration when assessing proposals. SPD 6 provides guidance on aspect standards between residential properties and would be relevant in this case.

PfE Policy JP-S5 confirms that comprehensive range of measures will be taken to support improvements in air quality, focusing particularly on locations where people live. PfE Policy JP-P1 further reinforces this by stating that developments should offer comfortable and inviting indoor and outdoor environments "offering a high level of amenity that minimises exposure to pollution". This is further reinforced by UDP Policy EN7/2 - Noise Pollution which does not permit development which would lead to an unacceptable noise and environmental nuisance to nearby occupiers and/or amenity users.

An odour report has been submitted with the application, providing a qualitative odour assessment. A qualitative odour assessment focuses on describing and evaluating the characteristics of an odour, rather than measuring its concentration or intensity. The report states that a more sophisticated assessment would not be practical given the poor characterisation of the potential odour source and the fact the lagoon has not yet been constructed and therefore cannot be monitored.

The report confirms that the assessment has been provided utilising IAQM guidance.

The odour report identifies the nearest sensitive receptors would be The Paddock campsite to the east, approximately 250m away. There is also a small hamlet of residential properties circa 50m beyond the campsite. (These residential dwelling were formally the farmhouse and agricultural buildings for Sheep Hey farm but which have been converted to residential properties).

To the west, over 200m away beyond the River Irwell are industrial units and residential properties.

The slurry lagoon would be 30m x 20m x 4m deep and would have 45 degree slopes to each side. The odour report states that the slurry lagoon would have an area of 600 m² and a volume of approximately 1,200 m³ but the exact contents of the slurry are unknown at this time as the pond is not yet in place and an assessment of the odour intensity (eg sniff testing) cannot be undertaken. The contents of the slurry lagoon would be classed as the most offensive odour category in the H4 odour criteria.

The overall Source of Odour Potential of the Site has therefore been assessed as Large.

Taking into account these risk factors and location of sensitive receptors, an impermeable floating plastic cover is proposed over the slurry pond with the aim of reducing ammonia and odour emissions from the pond.

The Planing Statement states that slurry would be collected by tanker from the applicant's land holdings where the slurry would be pumped into the pond for storage purposes. However, this contradicts the odour report which highlights the unknowns in relation to the exact contents of the pond.

There are also unknowns in relation to the anticipated level of usage of the slurry pond or maintenance requirements in terms of needing to open the cover. Given that the contents of the slurry lagoon appear to be unknown it is unclear therefore if the proposed mitigation is adequate.

The Council's in-house Environmental Health team have confirmed they have limited expertise in relation to odour and as such would have to support the findings of the report. However, given the unknowns of the contents of the pond, maintenance of it and lack of information on the effectiveness of the cover, there is insufficient information to understand how far and how intense odour would travel to the nearest sensitive receptors or impact on users of the nearby land and PRow.

Given the insufficient and conflicting information and the unknown impacts on sensitive receptors, the proposed development cannot be supported and would be contrary to policies EN1/2, JP-S5 and JP-P1.

Access

UDP Policy EN1/2 requires the consideration of the design and appearance of access, parking and service provision. PfE Policies JP-C5 and JP-C6 require streets to be well designed and managed to make a significant positive contribution to the quality of place and support high levels of walking, cycling and public transport. PfE Policy JP-C8 states that the LPA should prioritise convenient and safe access to the site and buildings for all users and ensuring that the layout, design and landscaping of development prioritises the provision of safe, secure and attractive access to local services and facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and people with a disability.

The site would be accessed via a track and Public Right of Way.

A Construction Traffic Management and Operations Plan has been submitted which states that the slurry would be collected from the applicant's various cow barns by tanker, notably at Twine Valley and Sheep Hey (although no information has been provided as to the location of the farm buildings at Sheep Hey and the building to the north of the proposed site is outside the applicant's ownership and landholding), and pumped from the field access road onto the pond below. Where the slurry is needed it would be pumped from the lagoon into a tanker for distributing on the land.

There is no information provided with regards to the route which the tanker would take to access the site or the frequency of trips.

The Local Highway Authority and PRow Officer have been consulted who note that there is a mixture of adopted highways, public footpath and private access tracks to access the site and in addition, there is a 'weak bridge' on the route in from Bolton Road North (to the west).

As such, insufficient information has been submitted to assess the impacts on the PRow and highway network.

The proposed development would therefore be contrary to policies JP-S1, JP-C5 and JP-C8.

Ecology

Summary

The only likely ecological issue is biodiversity net gain.

Protected Species

It is very unlikely that there will be any protected species issues associated with this development. The proposed lagoon is located in an open field with no high value habitats nearby or records of protected species held by the GMEU. No further information or measures are required.

Other Wildlife

There is a theoretical risk of disturbance to ground nesting birds such as lapwing or skylark. This risk is however very low. It is very unlikely that any other wildlife will be harmed by the development. GMEU therefore recommend an informative .

Contributing to and Enhancing the Natural Environment & Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

Section 187 of the NPPF 2024 states that the planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. 10% BNG is mandatory under Schedule 7A of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021).

The development will result in the loss of a relatively small area of low ecological value grassland to development. Tree planting is proposed around the perimeter of the slurry lagoon.

With regards biodiversity net gain, a metric has been provided that demonstrates that if 16 trees are planted around the perimeter of the lagoon, 10% net gain will be achieved. GMEU are satisfied that there is adequate spacing for this to be applicable, ie not align of trees. All sixteen trees would however have to survive for 30 years to achieve 10% net gain. It may be worth planting 17 in order to provide a margin of error. This is however a minor point and can be resolved at discharge of condition stage. Overall, GMEU are satisfied that 10% net gain can be achieved on site.

The tree planting would be regarded as significant as defined by defra as a medium distinctive habitat and critical to the achievement of 10% BNG. An HMMP will be required, though given it will only apply to planting and maintaining 16 trees, GMEU are satisfied that the full defra template is not required. The HMMP can be controlled via condition. With regards the proposed trees, the use of native species is recommended given that moderate condition is the target.

Environment Agency (EA) and other Regulators

A number of objections reference legislations and regulators. Outside of the proposed planning application it is clear that there are potentially other regulatory bodies that would need to be involved with this development, including but not limited to the Environment Agency.

The applicant states that they are aware that the EA requires to be notified before the lagoon would be brought into use and states that representatives of the EA have already visited Twine Valley where a similar lagoon is proposed.
(This application has since been refused planning permission but is currently under appeal).

The Town and Country Planning Act 1990, section 70 sets out the general considerations for determining planning applications and matters dealt with by other legislation, or regulators (eg building regulations, Defra, EA) would not be considered to be material considerations in determination of a Planning Application however it is acknowledged there is often an overlap in issues to be considered.

DELEGATED REPORT

The Environment Agency have been consulted and have no objection in principle but provide comments as follows -

The applicant must be able to store the slurry produced in accordance with the Regulations on capacity, construction, and the associated calculations and records.

Depending on the relevant regulations, slurry stores must have the capacity to store 4, 5 or 6 months slurry and:

- rainfall expected to enter the store during the storage period including yards and roofs; and
- any wash water or other liquids that enter the store during that period.

As compliance with EA regulations or any other regulatory body would be outside the remit of planning, this would not be a matter for the LPA.

Recommendation: Refuse

Conditions and Reasons:

- 1 The application, submitted plans and supporting information contain insufficient and conflicting information in relation to the need for the proposed slurry pond, siting of the proposed slurry pond, levels, fencing and the impermeable UV-stabilised plastic floating cover to enable them to be adequately assessed in relation to visual amenity, impact on the Green Belt and landscape character. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Development Plan Policies: OL4/5 - Agricultural Development, OL1/2 - New Buildings in the Green Belt, EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design, JP-G9: The Green Belt, JP-G1: Landscape Character and JP-P1: Sustainable Places.
- 2 The application contains insufficient information to assess impacts of odour and other bi-products on the amenity of nearby residential properties and commercial businesses. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policies: OL4/5 - Agricultural Development
EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design
JP-S5 - Clean Air
JP-S1 - Sustainable Places
- 3 The application and submitted plans contain insufficient information in order to adequately assess the potential impact of the proposed additional vehicle movements on the adjacent public right of way network namely 110RAM, 109RAM, 108RAM which make up the access to the site.
The proposed development therefore conflicts with Development Plan Policies:
JP-C5: Streets for All
JP-C6: Walking and Cycling
JP-C8: Transport Requirements of New Development
RT3/3 - Access to the Countryside
RT3/4 - Recreational Routes

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
JT	15/7/25		