



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**TUESDAY 2 FEBRUARY 2016  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HOUSE, HADDINGTON**

---

**Committee Members Present:**

Councillor N Hampshire (Convener)  
Councillor D Berry  
Provost L Broun-Lindsay  
Councillor S Brown  
Councillor J Caldwell  
Councillor S Currie  
Councillor T Day  
Councillor A Forrest  
Councillor J Gillies  
Councillor J Goodfellow  
Councillor D Grant  
Councillor P MacKenzie  
Councillor K McLeod  
Councillor J McMillan  
Councillor J McNeil  
Councillor T Trotter  
Councillor J Williamson

**Council Officials Present:**

Ms M Ferguson, Service Manager – Legal and Procurement  
Mr I McFarlane, Service Manager – Planning  
Mr K Dingwall, Principal Planner  
Mr M Greenshields, Transportation Planning Officer  
Mr E Bean, Graduate Planner  
Mr C Clark, Principal Environmental Protection Officer  
Ms C Molloy, Legal Team Leader  
Ms P Bristow, Communications Officer

**Clerk:**

Ms A Smith

**Visitors Present:**

Item 4 – Mr R Gill, Ms S Jamieson, Mr D Peck, Mr D Slight

**Apologies:**

Councillor W Innes

**Declarations of Interest:**

Item 2 – Councillor Goodfellow stated that for previous Mains Farms applications he had declared an interest as the Council's representative on the North Berwick Trust however the Trust had sold its financial interests to the developer so he now considered that he had no interest to declare.

**1. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL**

The minutes of the meetings of the Planning Committee held on 1 December 2015 and 5 January 2016 were approved.

**2. PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 15/00774/AMM: APPROVAL OF MATTERS SPECIFIED IN CONDITIONS OF PLANNING PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE 13/00227/PPM – ERECTION OF 77 HOUSES, 28 FLATS AND ASSOCIATED WORKS AT LAND AT MAINS FARM, NORTH BERWICK**

A report was submitted in relation to Planning Application No. 15/00774/AMM. Keith Dingwall, Principal Planner presented the report, summarising the key points. He highlighted an issue raised at the site visit regarding the proposed terraced housing for plots 16-19. As explained in the planning permission in principle applications, the whole terrace would front onto the road. There had been no objection in principle to those terraces but there was a view that something other than a blank gable should be considered; recommended condition 4 referred. This matter had been discussed with the architect and revised details submitted – instead of gabled roofs there would now be hipped roofs, instead of a blank gable 2 windows would be inserted. Given these alterations recommended condition 4 was no longer required. The report recommendation was to grant consent.

Mr Dingwall responded to questions from Councillor Berry about removal of this condition. In relation to queries about the outline, Mr Dingwall advised that the masterplan submitted with the planning permission in principle application set the design principals of the site, one of these was a terrace of properties, so it would be very difficult for the Council to say this was not now possible. Councillor Berry remarked that this particular development was the gateway to the rest of the Mains Farm development and asked why a more creative layout had not been proposed. Mr Dingwall replied that the proposal had been regarded as acceptable, adding that this part of the site would also be landscaped.

Councillor Day, referring to the Kingston junction and to interventions proposed previously by Road Services, queried progress. Mr Dingwall confirmed that work had commenced. Marshall Greenshields, Transportation Planning Officer, stated that the Road Safety Audit had been done; the results indicated that not many areas needed addressed. The junction would be made more conspicuous with additional signage and skid resistant surfacing would be laid. Councillor Day took issue with these findings; he asked about changing the priority of the junction. Mr Greenshields replied that the audit had considered this but results indicated this would make the junction worse as speeds would be higher and visibility splays would be compromised. Regarding completion timescales, Mr Dingwall confirmed this would be checked and local members informed.

Councillor Goodfellow queried the location chosen by the developer for the 2 storey housing. The agent, Kyle Kernohan of EMA Architecture and Design, stated that the reason for this was that in discussion with the housing association the single storey disabled properties needed to be close to the parking facilities.

Local Member Councillor Goodfellow welcomed this development. It was good to see affordable housing being built at the initial stage of a development rather than at the latter

stage. He also welcomed the mix of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom properties. He supported the application.

Local Member Councillor Day referred to the long stated intention to develop on this land; the principle of development had been established in the 2008 Local Plan. Progress after a number of years was welcomed; he expressed support for this detailed application.

Local Member Councillor Berry agreed with colleagues' comments but had a couple of issues. The presentation of the gateway of this site was a missed opportunity. In relation to Kingston junction he disagreed with the officer's evaluation; this was a dangerous junction and the measures proposed were not sufficient. He did not however feel there were enough reasons to object so he would be supporting the application.

Councillor Currie welcomed this application. Affordable housing was obviously particularly welcome and he hoped that local people would have the opportunity to acquire this housing. He also hoped that the affordable housing would not be clustered separately but integrated throughout the site. He supported the application.

The Convener welcomed this development. He would be supporting the recommendation to grant planning permission as set out in the report. He moved to the vote on the report recommendation (to grant consent):

For: 17

Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

### **Decision**

The Committee agreed that approval of matters specified in conditions for the proposed housing development be granted subject to the following conditions:

- 1 No development shall take place on site unless and until final site setting out details have been submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority.

The above mentioned details shall include a final site setting-out drawing to a scale of not less than 1:200, giving:

- a. the position within the application site of all elements of the proposed development and position of adjoining land and buildings;
- b. finished ground and floor levels of the development relative to existing ground levels of the site and of adjoining land and building(s). The levels shall be shown in relation to an Ordnance Bench Mark or Temporary Bench Mark from which the Planning Authority can take measurements and shall be shown on the drawing; and
- c. the ridge height of the proposed shown in relation to the finished ground and floor levels on the site.

Reason:

To enable the Planning Authority to control the development of the site in the interests of the amenity of the area.

- 2 The external finishes of the houses and flats shall be in accordance with a co-ordinated scheme of materials and colours that shall be submitted to and approved in advance by the Planning Authority. This co-ordinated scheme shall in detail promote render as the predominant finish to the walls of the houses and flats, with a use of more than one render colour and with a strongly contrasting difference in the colours such that they will not each be of a light colour. All such materials used in the construction of the houses and flats shall conform to the details so approved.

Reason:

To ensure the development is of a satisfactory appearance in the interest of the amenity of the locality.

- 3 Prior to the commencement of development details of the position and type of all boundary enclosures to be erected on the application site and a timescale for their provision shall be submitted to and approved in advance by the Planning Authority. The submitted details shall include the provision of plot

frontage boundary treatments such as walls, hedges, fences or railings to enclose the front gardens of the houses and flats hereby approved.

Development shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with the details so approved, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason:

To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the boundary enclosures in the interest of safeguarding the visual amenity of the area and to safeguard the privacy and amenity of residential properties nearby.

- 4 Prior to the occupation of the last residential unit hereby approved, the proposed access roads, parking spaces, and footpaths shall have been constructed on site, in accordance with the docketed drawings and the transportation conditions specified below. Those areas of land shall not thereafter be used for any other purpose than for accessing and for the parking of vehicles in connection with the residential use of the houses and shall not be adapted or used for other purposes without the prior written approval of the Planning Authority.

Reason:

To ensure that adequate and satisfactory provision is made for access and for off-street parking in the interests of road safety.

- 5 No work shall be carried out on the site unless and until an effective vehicle wheel washing facility has been installed in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority prior to its installation. Such facility shall be retained in working order and used such that no vehicle shall leave the site carrying earth and mud in their wheels in such a quantity which causes a nuisance or hazard on the road system in the locality.

Reason:

In the interests of road safety.

- 6 Prior to the commencement of development, details showing compliance with the following transportation requirements shall be submitted to and approved in writing in advance by the Planning Authority.

(i) a supplementary construction method statement shall be provided for the site to expand on that already provided and controlled through planning permission in principle 13/00227/PPM. This shall take account of routes to the site from the main access onto Haddington Road and include potential delivery restrictions to take account of the new access to be formed to the Law Primary School, also from Haddington Road;

(ii) cycle parking shall be provided at the rate of 1 space per flat. This shall be provided in a secure/undercover area;

(iii) localised widening of the carriageway width in the vicinity of the junctions adjacent to (i) plots 34 to 38; and (ii) 68 to 69 shall be undertaken to enable large vehicles to manoeuvre without encroachment into pedestrian areas (including vehicle overhang);

(iv) all footpaths and cycle paths from a zone under construction to their connections to existing pedestrian/cycle routes shall be constructed to an adoptable standard before the occupation of any of the residential units of the particular zone;

(v) driveways shall have minimum dimensions of 6 metres by 2.5 metres. Double driveways shall have minimum dimensions of 5 metres width by 6 metres length or 3 metres width by 11 m length;

(vi) within private parking areas, the minimum dimensions of a single parking space shall be 2.5 metres by 5 metres. All visitor parking spaces within these areas shall be clearly marked for visitors with the remaining private parking spaces allocated to individual dwellings;

(vii) all prospectively adoptable parking bays (i.e. that will form part of the public road) shall have minimum dimensions of 2.5 metres by 6 metres; and

(viii) all carriageway and footway/ footpath connections shall meet with existing links to adjacent sites, both horizontally and vertically.

The residential development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the details so approved.

Reasons:

In the interests of road and pedestrian safety.

- 7 No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority a scheme of landscaping. The scheme shall provide details of : the height and slopes of any mounding on or recontouring of, the site; tree and shrub sizes, species, habitat, siting, planting distances and a programme of planting. The scheme shall include indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, details of any to be retained, and measures for their protection in the course of development.

All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner, and any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason:

In order to ensure the implementation of a landscaping scheme to enhance the appearance of the development in the interests of the amenity of the area.

**3. PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 15/00794/AMM: APPROVAL OF MATTERS SPECIFIED IN CONDITIONS OF PLANNING PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE 13/00227/PPM – ERECTION OF 110 HOUSES AND ASSOCIATED WORKS AT LAND AT MAINS FARM, NORTH BERWICK**

A report was submitted in relation to Planning Application No. 15/00794/AMM. Mr Dingwall presented the report, summarising the key points. The report recommendation was to grant consent.

Local Member Councillor Day indicated he would be supporting the application.

Local Member Councillor Goodfellow also expressed support for the application.

Local Member Councillor Berry stated he had no objections but made reference to issues regarding infrastructure, raised at previous North Berwick development applications, with specific reference to the situation at GP surgeries, which were already at capacity.

Councillor Currie made reference to discussions on this specific issue at the Integration Joint Board and to advice from the Director of Health and Social Care David Small. He would be supporting the application.

Iain McFarlane, Planning Service Manager, informed Members that the Planning service worked with Mr Small and his team looking at the NHS estate across East Lothian as a whole. The NHS recognised there were operational issues and ways to address these were being considered.

Councillor Grant, Chair of the Integration Joint Board, added his reassurance to colleagues, reiterating that work was being carried out with Mr Small and colleagues; progress was being made.

The Convener moved to the vote on the report recommendation (to grant consent):

For: 17

Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

**Decision**

The Committee agreed that approval of matters specified in conditions for the proposed housing development be granted subject to the following conditions:

- 1 No development shall take place on site unless and until final site setting out details have been submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority.

The above mentioned details shall include a final site setting-out drawing to a scale of not less than 1:200, giving:

- a. the position within the application site of all elements of the proposed development and position of adjoining land and buildings;
- b. finished ground and floor levels of the development relative to existing ground levels of the site and of adjoining land and building(s). The levels shall be shown in relation to an Ordnance Bench Mark or Temporary Bench Mark from which the Planning Authority can take measurements and shall be shown on the drawing; and
- c. the ridge height of the proposed shown in relation to the finished ground and floor levels on the site.

Reason:

To enable the Planning Authority to control the development of the site in the interests of the amenity of the area.

- 2 The external finishes of the houses shall be in accordance with a co-ordinated scheme of materials and colours that shall be submitted to and approved in advance by the Planning Authority. This co-ordinated scheme shall in detail promote render as the predominant finish to the walls of the houses, with a use of more than one render colour and with a strongly contrasting difference in the colours such that they will not each be of a light colour. All such materials used in the construction of the houses shall conform to the details so approved.

Reason:

To ensure the development is of a satisfactory appearance in the interest of the amenity of the locality.

- 3 Prior to the commencement of development details of the timescales for the provision of all boundary enclosures to be erected on the application site shall be submitted to and approved in advance by the Planning Authority.

Development shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with the details so approved, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason:

To ensure the satisfactory provision of the boundary enclosures in the interest of safeguarding the visual amenity of the area and to safeguard the privacy and amenity of residential properties nearby.

- 4 All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner, and any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason:

In order to ensure the implementation of a landscaping scheme to enhance the appearance of the development in the interests of the amenity of the area and to improve the biodiversity value of the area.

- 5 Prior to the occupation of the last residential unit hereby approved, the proposed access roads, parking spaces, and footpaths shall have been constructed on site, in accordance with the docketed drawings and the transportation conditions specified below. Those areas of land shall not thereafter be used for any other purpose than for accessing and for the parking of vehicles in connection with the residential use of the houses and shall not be adapted or used for other purposes without the prior written approval of the Planning Authority.

Reason:

To ensure that adequate and satisfactory provision is made for access and for off-street parking in the interests of road safety.

- 6 No work shall be carried out on the site unless and until an effective vehicle wheel washing facility has been installed in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority prior to its installation. Such facility shall be retained in working order and used such that no vehicle shall leave the site carrying earth and mud in their wheels in such a quantity which causes a nuisance or hazard on the road system in the locality.

Reason:

In the interests of road safety.

- 7 Prior to the commencement of development, details showing compliance with the following transportation requirements shall be submitted to and approved in writing in advance by the Planning Authority.
- (i) a supplementary construction method statement shall be provided for the site to expand on that already provided and controlled through planning permission in principle 13/00227/PPM. This shall take account of routes to the site from the main access onto Haddington Road and include potential delivery restrictions to take account of the new access to be formed to the Law Primary School, also from Haddington Road;
  - (ii) access to the private parking courtyards serving plots 89 to 95 and 124 to 126 shall be widened to 5 metres to enable adequate two way movement of vehicles over the access's;
  - (iii) three additional visitor parking bays shall be provided in the vicinity of plots 119 to 126;
  - (iv) all footpaths and cycle paths from a zone under construction to their connections to existing pedestrian/cycle routes shall be constructed to an adoptable standard before the occupation of any of the residential units of the particular zone;
  - (v) driveways shall have minimum dimensions of 6 metres by 2.5 metres. Double driveways shall have minimum dimensions of 5 metres width by 6 metres length or 3 metres width by 11 m length;
  - (vi) within private parking areas, the minimum dimensions of a single parking space shall be 2.5 metres by 5 metres. All visitor parking spaces within these areas shall be clearly marked for visitors with the remaining private parking spaces allocated to individual dwellings;
  - (vii) all prospectively adoptable parking bays (i.e. that will form part of the public road) shall have minimum dimensions of 2.5 metres by 6 metres. This can be reduced to a minimum length of 5 metres on the proviso that there is adequate road space to manoeuvre in adjacent to the parking bay; and
  - (viii) all carriageway and footway/ footpath connections shall meet with existing links to adjacent sites, both horizontally and vertically.

The residential development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the details so approved.

Reasons:

In the interests of road and pedestrian safety.

#### **4. PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 15/00541/P: ERECTION OF POULTRY BUILDING AT HOWDEN FARM, GIFFORD**

A report was submitted in relation to Planning Application No. 15/00541/P. Mr McFarlane presented the report, summarising the key points. He clarified several matters. Page 43 of the report – the residential property of Muirwood was 280 metres from the site, not 350 metres as stated. Page 49/51 – British Standard 4142 date should be 2014, not 1997 as stated. The proposed decision set out in the report was to grant consent.

Mr McFarlane and Colin Clark, Principal Environmental Protection Officer, responded to questions from Members. Mr Clark stated that the Environmental Health service was satisfied that the proposals had been adequately assessed and any issues that might arise had been addressed; the Odour Management Plan submitted by the applicant had been approved. The Environmental Protection team had statutory powers to deal with any potential issues that may arise. Regarding avoiding sites less than the 400 metres from residential properties, Mr McFarlane stated this was guidance, not national policy; locating a site within 400 metres was not precluded. He confirmed that the tree belt would be higher than the proposed shed. He clarified that this application required planning permission due to the proposed size and use.

Roger Gill, speaking on behalf of the applicant, informed the Committee that he represented the Lakes Free Range Egg Company, who had the egg contract. The company had 100 flocks over 50 farms and had never received any complaints about noise, odour or dust. He advised that when considering a site the company always considered measures to limit the environmental impact; this area had been chosen as it was close to the road and was screened by the tree belt. Any objections raised had been addressed as detailed in the report.

Mr Gill clarified, in response to questions from Councillor MacKenzie that the chickens would be able to roam freely from dawn to dusk. He informed Members that the company was audited by Freedom Foods.

Shena Jamieson spoke against the application on behalf of Bolton Community Association. This planning application contained errors and inconsistencies; there had been many revisions, with misleading and inaccurate drawings. She made reference to planning online, taking Members through a timeline of events and submissions, highlighting issues. Referring to Scottish Government guidance she stated there were 13 houses within 400 metres of the site, 11 of these downwind of the poultry shed. She urged refusal of this application.

David Peck, joint owner of Muirwood, the nearest property, spoke against the application. He took issue with many of the assessments in the report. Policy DC1: visual impact would be significant; the shed would be considerably larger than the existing building and would sit in an elevated position. Nature and scale: this huge imposing building would not integrate into the landscape. Impact: there were serious concerns about the environmental impact; there would be significant adverse impact on nearby uses. Several residents had visited other similar facilities, negative effects were difficult to mitigate. With regard to good planning practice there had been no attempt to engage with the local community. The applicant could find an alternative site on his land. Inconsistencies in the report had not been addressed.

Following allegations by speakers Councillor Trotter asked Mr McFarlane to comment. Mr McFarlane advised that the process with this application had been complicated, officers had questioned a number of aspects of the application and amendments had been made as required; all efforts had been made to notify the community council and others when new documents were submitted. Environmental Protection officers had been consulted as stated. The report, as with all reports to Committee, contained all the relevant information to enable Members to determine the application; all the correct procedures had been followed.

Douglas Slight spoke against the application. He also raised a number of concerns in relation to odour, dust, noise and light pollution. He remarked that it would be many years before the trees would be of sufficient height to screen the shed. He stated that refusal of this application would not stop the applicant building a poultry shed; it could be built at a different, more appropriate, location on his land.

Local Member Councillor McMillan outlined his reasons for bringing this application to Committee. He referred to Policy DC1, Part 5(c) regarding the nature and scale of a new development integrating into the landscape. According to this policy a proposal must have no significant impact on nearby uses, including residential use. He referred to the number of objections, stressing that when 80% of residents objected this had to be taken into account. Concerns had been raised about the potential environmental impact; issues of noise, dust and odour. He felt the proposal would have a negative impact on the landscape; it would be detrimental to the nearby steading. It was not compatible with the immediate area; it would be a visual intrusion. Given all the risks, he would not be supporting the application.

Local Member Provost Broun-Lindsay disagreed with his colleague. He understood the objections of residents however change was part of agricultural practice and farmers had to reinvest as required. The key was to make sure that such changes were not incompatible



with the surrounding area. The poultry shed, in its proposed location, surrounded by trees, was acceptable. The proposal was significantly below the bird threshold requiring a SEPA permit. The report had addressed all the concerns raised. He would be supporting the application.

Local Member Councillor Trotter remarked that whilst he had sympathy with the residents, living in the countryside, close to a farm, meant encountering changes to agricultural working methods. He felt the report recommendation was correct and the report had addressed all the objections. He would be supporting the application.

Councillor MacKenzie, referring to his personal experience in relation to a similar operation near his home, stated there were no issues regarding noise or odour or dust. The appropriate safeguards were in place. He was satisfied in terms of animal husbandry and environmental impact. The application was a significant economic development in the heart of the countryside and as such was welcomed. He supported the report recommendation.

Councillor Currie stated that the guidelines took into account the flexibility required for economic development in the countryside; job creation was also important. East Lothian was primarily an agricultural county. The Council's Environmental Protection officers would take the necessary action if the appropriate regulations were not adhered to. He supported the application, there were no material grounds to refuse and all objections had been addressed.

Councillor Berry believed there were shortcomings in this application. If 80% of residents objected to an application this was significant and had to be taken seriously. He agreed with Councillor McMillan; this proposal was too close to residential properties, too big and especially intrusive. He did not support the officer's recommendation.

Councillor Grant felt the objectors had presented a powerful case but unfortunately he could not support their objections; the appropriate measures were in place and the Environmental Health service was satisfied. He would therefore be supporting the application.

Councillor McNeil stated that the operation of the development would be monitored by Environmental Health officers; the necessary guidelines were in place. This proposal would be beneficial for agricultural development in the countryside. He supported the application.

The Convener brought the discussion to a close. He noted the difference of opinion in the Chamber. He would be supporting the recommendation to grant planning permission as set out in the report. He moved to the vote on the report recommendation (to grant consent):

For: 15

Against: 2

Abstentions: 0

### **Decision**

The Committee agreed to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

- 1 All planting comprised in the "Tree planting specification – Planting stock requirement" schedule docketed to this planning permission shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the completion of the building and any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason:

In order to ensure the implementation of a landscaping scheme to enhance the appearance of the development in the interests of the amenity of the area.

- 2 No external lighting shall be installed within the application site unless in accordance with details of it submitted to and approved in advance by the Planning Authority. Any such lighting shall be positioned and designed to ensure that no light from within the site spills beyond the boundaries of the site and shall meet the following requirement:

Light Trespass (into windows) of neighbouring residential properties, measured as Vertical Illuminance in Lux, (Ev), shall not exceed 5 between the hours of 0700-2300 and shall not exceed 1 between the hours of 2300-0700.

Reason:

In order to minimise the possibility of loss of amenity for occupiers of residential properties in the area due to light pollution.

- 3 The noise rating level, measured as LArTr of noise associated with any plant or equipment within the proposed building, when measured 3.5 metres from the facade of any neighbouring residential property, shall be no more than 10 dB(A) above the background noise level LA90T, all in accordance with BS 4142:2014 Method for rating industrial noise affecting mixed residential and industrial areas; and

(ii) any plant or equipment within the proposed building shall be designed and constructed so that noise emanating from there shall not exceed Noise Rating Curve NR20 at any octave band frequency when measured within any neighbouring residential property, assuming windows open at least 50 mm.

Reason:

In order to minimise the possibility of loss of amenity for occupiers of residential properties in the area due to operational plant or machinery noise.

- 4 The poultry shed hereby approved shall be operated in strict accordance with the Noise, Odour and Dust Management Plans docketed to this planning permission, unless otherwise approved by the Planning Authority.

Reason:

In the interests of the amenity of residents of the area.

- 5 No use shall be made of the access hereby approved unless and until the first 15 metres of the access onto the public road of the B6368 has been hardsurfaced to prevent loose materials entering the public road and thereafter shall remain hard surfaced.

Reason:

In the interests of road safety.

- 6 A Construction Method Statement to minimise the impact of construction activity on the amenity of the area shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. The Construction Method Statement shall recommend mitigation measures to control noise, dust, construction traffic and shall include hours of construction work.

Reason:

In the interests of road safety.

- 7 Prior to the chicken shed development hereby approved being brought into operation, the 2 metres high stock proof fencing as indicated on the plans docketed to this planning permission shall be installed in accordance with those plans and thereafter will be retained for the duration of the poultry shed operation

Reason:

In order to protect the biodiversity of the area of ancient woodland known as Howden Wood from erosion through scratching and pecking of free range chickens.

Signed .....

Councillor Norman Hampshire  
Convener of the Planning Committee