

**Sent:** 04 January 2026 19:29  
**To:** DC Admin  
**Subject:** Planning ref: 2025/93387

Planning application objection (Planning ref: 2025/93387)  
(Application number: 2025/62/93387/W)

I strongly object to this application on the following grounds:

The application contains a number of inaccuracies/omissions:

1. The block diagram seems to have been drawn so as to deliberately omit the existence of the nearest residential dwellings/protected buildings.
2. The application claims there are NO water courses within 20m of the proposed site. There is a land drain in close proximity to the downhill side of the proposed building. The applicant regularly walks past clear evidence of this water course and would be well aware of its existence. This land drain runs the length of Bolster Moor into Headwall Green and then down the side of Colne Valley splitting into two at Dyke End. The water from this land drain surfaces at intervals for the watering of livestock on other holdings. The water, eventually, feeds into the River Colne. Consideration must be given to the contamination of this water resource when it is consumed by other livestock.
3. The application claims that the waste from this poultry unit will be spread on fields but claims there will be no storage of this waste. DEFRA/EA codes of practice suggest restrictions on muck spreading (time/quantities/weather etc), so the applicant will need to store his poultry excrement/bedding mix - perhaps the poultry cycle will magically coincide with DEFRA's restrictions? Wherever it is stored, DEFRA regulations pertaining to storage of poultry excrement should preclude this area's reuse for a significant length of time. In the meantime the application makes no mention of where manure will be stored within the regulations. Poultry manure should not be spread until its water content has reduced, again this will require storage and yet there's no mention of storage in the application. Figures vary, but an average value for a laying hen's production of excrement is 100grams/day. Multiplied up this is ~55 tonnes/year.
4. The applicant states that the proposed site is not vacant. The site is grassland used for grazing and mowing, so there is nothing that needs demolishing to make way for the proposed poultry house; the site is, therefore, vacant.
5. The application states how the unit will be constructed but there are no details of what material will be used for the floor. Will this simply be left as soil or will it be an impermeable material such as concrete. The previously mentioned "mistake" concerning the adjacent water course makes the floor construction important, as a soil floor will allow excrement and other pollutants including cleaning materials to soak into the soil and immediately and directly into the land drain at HIGH concentrations.
6. The application states that the method of construction will be "timber space boarding". The included construction diagram reinforces the impression that there will be gaps between the planks comprising the walls which will allow the wind to blow through. Bolster Moor is notoriously windy. Residents will be constantly in the path of all the dust, smell and other pollutants that will be blown out of this shed on the prevailing south westerly (SW) wind, directly over their properties. Many of the nearest properties are of older stone construction with open eaves which

will allow the easy ingress of windborne dust from this poultry shed, increasing the level of particulate contaminants that will be inhaled by residents to the detriment of their respiratory health.

7. Under "Industrial or Commercial Processes and Machinery" the applicant states there will be no commercial activity at this site. There will be significant activity involved in the feeding/tending of these birds as well as the collection of eggs. All this is activity of a commercial nature given that the eggs will be supplied to the family's farm shop - a commercial operation. 1500 hens have the potential to generate an output of approximately 450,000 eggs per year (ref: BHWT). A significant quantity! Perhaps if he were selling them at the field gate he could get away with claiming no commercial activity, but this would require the retailing of over 200 boxes of eggs every day, 365 days a year. So this site WILL see significant commercial activity.
8. The application states that no people will be employed in connection with the proposed poultry unit. The inference is that the applicant will be carrying out all the work required to run a medium sized poultry shed himself. Every day of the year? Feeding, receiving deliveries to the unit, biosecurity responsibilities, egg collecting, egg cleaning, egg packing, egg deliveries; all whilst carrying on his main employment of handyman/double glazing installation for his existing company bearing his name. Perhaps this is another error and there *will* be employees; in which case the application makes no mention of staff changing facilities, washing or toilet arrangements.
9. The application claims that the nearest residential properties (southeast, northeast) do not have windows facing the site. This is blatantly incorrect as would have been evident on the "site visit" claimed to have taken place. It also claims that the nearest residence is 100metres away. This is incorrect as the nearest residence is less than 90metres away - a map and a ruler shows this to be the case.

#### Proximity to third party residential properties and schoolchildren

The close proximity of this proposed poultry shed to nearby residential buildings is completely unacceptable. The applicant seems to be attempting to "massage" the distance to neighbouring residential property to his own advantage - the block diagram omits these adjacent properties; I wonder why? The UK rules for Permitted Development (PD) on agricultural holdings specifically exclude livestock (including poultry) buildings unless they are at least 400 metres from residential properties, requiring specific planning permission be granted. This 400 metre restriction must have been included in the PD rules for a specific purpose - namely that this type of building has the real potential to cause problems for neighbours of agricultural holdings including health problems, noise and odour nuisance, foul water runoff and general friction between neighbours and the agricultural entity. A local early years nursery and the local school are located less than 400metres from the proposed site and will be susceptible to windborne pollutants and noxious odours. It should also be noted that Bolster Moor Road is the main walking access for the school and nursery as well as a route used by the school for nature walks together with Meeting House Lane and Drummer Lane. The school's cycling proficiency lessons also use the roads within 100metres of the proposed site. What price developing young lungs?

#### Cleaning

The application does not state how the fluids used to clean/sterilise the unit at the end of each production cycle will be collected and disposed of. Even biodegradable disinfectants degrade to create significant quantities of CO<sub>2</sub>. This does not fit with the council's net zero ambitions. The application does not mention anything about cleaning and mitigating chemical runoff when the shed is deep cleaned at the end of each production cycle. The application does not make any mention of floor construction. Poultry sheds usually have earth floors; if this is the case then why does the application fail to state how cleaning fluids, not to mention poultry excrement will be prevented from soaking into the soil and hence into the adjacent land drain?

#### Biosecurity

The application seems to be missing any details about the type of biosecurity measures required by Govt/DEFRA of poultry unit operators. In the event of an outbreak of avian flu, the design of the poultry shed seems to be wholly inadequate should a housing order be suddenly put in place. The shed is to be a single space with a large "12' steel sliding door" and, as such, it seems there are no means to prevent birds

escaping whenever the door is opened. Similarly, there are no measures, such as a separate vestibule, to allow biosecurity separation, such as clothing changes and foot washing, between outside and inside. The applicant keeps a large flock of pigeons which he races from locations countrywide and beyond. The pigeon "loft" to which these pigeons return, having mixed with assorted wildlife on their journeys, is located in a building less than 90 metres from the proposed location of the poultry shed. Disease crossover, in these times of heightened inter-species disease risk must, surely, be taken more seriously than this application seems to.

### Transport/Roads

The roads in Bolster Moor have seen a huge increase in traffic levels in recent years and this proposal will simply add to this - the road infrastructure is already crumbling badly. Potholes are multiplying daily due to the weight of the vehicles visiting the farm shop. The application shows that entry/egress will be via an existing narrow field gate from Drummer Lane. Drummer Lane is a quiet (so far), narrow country lane without pavements. It is used by local residents and the wider public as a walking route and also by the local nursery and school for outdoor activity. This unit will require regular deliveries of bulk feedstuff and collection of spent hens, carcasses, manure and general poultry keeping refuse. To put this in context, the average laying hen requires ~120g of feed per day; therefore this unit will get through approximately 1.2 tonnes of feed per week not to mention all the other supplies a successful poultry unit requires. These deliveries and collections will most likely involve HGVs attempting to reverse through the field gate. This will quickly change to trucks parking and being loaded/unloaded in Drummer Lane causing blockages for residents of Westwood. If trucks are unable to turn round upon leaving they will have to attempt the acute turn at the top of Drummer Lane or risk becoming stuck on the narrow road through Westwood (Westwood Edge Road). The only viable route away from the site, suitable for large goods vehicles, is via the junction of Drummer Lane and Bolster Moor Road. This junction has less than ideal sight lines given the number of vehicles often parked on Bolster Moor Road and the very heavy traffic from the farm shop. The application makes no mention of how problems caused by increased numbers of large vehicle movements will be mitigated.

The application form claims there will be NO change to parking or hard standing however it is proposed to remove several cubic yards of grass/topsoil and replace it with rolled stone chippings which will, in the fullness of time and after several months of use by heavy vehicles, be compacted to prevent this hardcore from spilling out onto the public road. In the meantime, who is responsible for ensuring the highway is cleared of large, sharp limestone debris and how frequently will this cleanup occur?

Consideration should be given by the planning authority to whether the applicant will make a subsequent request, pleading "necessity", for the building of more hardstanding, parking areas and turning facilities for traffic, as he realises that he, alone, can't/won't staff this unit 365 days per year and employs additional staff with car parking needs.

### Nature of the property and property owner

Regardless of whose name(s) appear on his application, the main applicant is the owner of 33 Bolster Moor Road who, as stated, will be responsible for running this operation. The proposed site is on his land and the inclusion, on the application details, of land belonging to Harden Road Farm seems to be little more than a ruse to make this proposal an "agricultural" enterprise.

seems to place the applicant firmly in the category of "hobby" farmer as defined in several government documents as well as Kirklees Council's own Local Plan document. It is difficult, therefore, to see how the applicant can argue that there is any agricultural need for this new building, in line with Para 19.10 of the Kirklees Local Plan. The applicant seems to have cherry picked land from Harden Road Farm to make his property appear larger than it is, but seems to have avoided including land that already has poultry houses on it, thus neatly circumventing Paragraph 19.12 of the Local Plan which suggests that whenever possible, reuse of existing buildings is preferred.

The general tone of section 19 of the Local Plan indicates that planning permission for a building of this nature will not be granted unless a genuine agricultural need can be clearly demonstrated. The size of the property, nature of the applicant's "main, principal or full time occupation or business" and general "hobby" nature of this development (claimed to be not a commercial activity) must, if the Local Plan holds any weight, make this development fall far short of the requirements of "agricultural need" and result in permission being denied.

It should also be noted that Bolster Moor Farm Shop and Cafe already has an egg supply that is sufficient for the normal running of the business and, as such, a "new supplier" cannot be considered as a requirement (agricultural or otherwise) in line with the requirements of the Kirklees Local Plan (para 19.10).

The applicant has a long history of frequent bonfires on which he burns a variety of substances such as straw bedding from his barn and dog kennels, plastic packaging and other business waste from his existing business activities and, quite recently, the larger parts of what appeared to be a plastic lawn mower, generating thick plumes of acrid smoke. He has been approached several times by local residents and asked to desist in this behaviour and has also been contacted by Kirklees Council's Environmental Health team on more than one occasion to make him aware of his responsibilities. He has ignored all these approaches and the bonfires have continued, making residents' enjoyment of their outside space difficult and the drying of laundry outdoors a lottery. It would not surprise his neighbours if he started burning all the waste generated by this poultry unit, too.

The applicant has maintained a "muck heap" on the area behind his barn/pigeon loft for many years. This has caused effluent runoff from the applicant's property whenever there is prolonged heavy rain. This runoff firstly floods the top garage of the row of garages behind nos 3-19A Bolster Moor Road. It then flows down the lane behind the same properties, forcing those residents to step over this stream of effluent to enter and exit their properties. The stream finally flows into the road drains on Bolster Moor Road. This is a disgustingly unhealthy state of affairs which has only happened since the applicant started to store rubbish/scrap/asbestos sheet/excrement on this piece of land - shortly after he purchased the property. Again he has been asked to prevent this runoff, but has made no attempt to do so. As already stated, his application contains no details of poultry excrement storage to meet DEFRA rules on muck spreading; what steps would the council take to ENSURE this disgusting waste isn't piled up behind the aforementioned garages?

### Pollution

Poultry units, whether for breeding or laying hens are well known for producing pollution, whether from day to day operation or the deep cleaning required at the end of each production cycle. Poultry dust from feathers, bedding and drying manure has been shown to cause and/or exacerbate respiratory health conditions. High levels of ammonia from poultry excrement combine with other aerosols to create particulate matter (PM10/PM2.5) which are well known as dangers to human health.

1500 laying hens will create a significant amount of both background and foreground noise: scratching, clucking, squawking and crowing mere metres from residential properties.

Policy LP54 of the Local Plan states that, (if all other considerations are met), new buildings will be accepted "...provided that: c. there will be no detriment to the amenity of nearby residents by reason of noise or odour or any other reason..."

### Health

Poultry units are renowned for producing obnoxious odours. This poultry unit will be upwind (SW) of the majority of the residences in Bolster Moor and, as such, the odours will be apparent to most residents for much of the time. This is bound to have an effect on residents' mental health as there will be no escape from the smell. It is known that ammonia, a key constituent in the foul odour, can be detected by humans at a level of 20 parts per million (ppm) but it can cause/exacerbate respiratory diseases at levels as low as 5ppm; so, when residents can smell this poultry unit (most of the time), it will already be risking their long term health.

### Listed Buildings

It should be noted that two of the properties within 75metres of the proposed poultry shed are heritage assets (Grade II), which require special consideration where the possibility of contamination with damaging substances is concerned (corrosive ammonia dust).

#### In Summary

This application is full of inaccuracies and omissions. Many of these must be deliberate in an attempt to paint this development in as kind a light as possible. However, the Planning Authority must surely require answers to the points raised in this objection before they can even think of embarking upon a decision. Once these answers are forthcoming, the application must be denied as it fails to meet any of the requirements of the relevant local or national legislation.