

From:
Sent: 10 February 2026 14:46
To: DC Admin
Subject: Planning Application 2025/93387

Objection to Planning Application Number 2025/93387

I have the following objections to make regarding this application.

This is the second time the applicant has applied for planning permission for a poultry building. Objections to the previous application pointed out numerous omissions and inaccuracies contained in the application. These omissions and inaccuracies are still present in this second application.

Firstly, and most importantly, the proposed building will be too close to residential properties, although this fact has not been made clear on the Block Layout diagram. Airborne pollutants will be produced continuously by the poultry and, due to the prevailing wind direction, will blow across these close properties constantly. Poultry dust will be deposited inside and outside houses, on vegetation, cars and clothing of those closest to the poultry building. Poultry dust is toxic and is listed by COSHH as being a respiratory hazard and harmful to health. A document published by DEFRA in January 2024 states that “wherever possible, sources of ammonia should be positioned as far as possible from sensitive receptors like people and protected habitats”. It would not be acceptable to have this source of ammonia so close to these sensitive receptors.

Page 3 of the Biodiversity Gain Plan included in the application paperwork states that this building is “for the keeping of 1500 poultry meeting minimum welfare standards”. I am appalled to read that these hens will be housed under **minimum welfare standards**. It is clear from this paperwork that the applicant is putting profit before the welfare of these hens - wanting to squeeze as many hens into this building as he possibly can, and then sell these eggs in the applicant’s farm shop. Reading the applicant’s farm shop website, it appears to pride itself on providing quality products – a quote from the website states “As always, where possible our products are locally produced and of the highest quality”. How do they intend to balance “**highest quality**” with these eggs laid by hens kept in “**minimum welfare standards**”? How often will these hens be inspected by anyone other than the applicant to ensure that a) their welfare is not at risk and b) the applicant hasn’t squeezed in more than the 1,500 hens detailed in the application? In today’s world of improving animal welfare, granting permission for the building of a shed to house as many hens as possible seems to be taking us back into the dark ages.

It should be a red flag that anyone wanting to farm animals under “minimum welfare standards” is not fit to be allowed to do so. The welfare standards of the applicant’s sheep are often less than ideal – with numerous sheep displaying lameness for months on end, seemingly with no treatment being given to them. Sheep can also often be heard with breathing difficulties over long periods of time.

The Code of Practice for the Welfare of Laying Hens and Pullets states, amongst other things, that a stockman should have affinity and empathy with animals. This does not describe the applicant who is known to trap wild birds and foxes simply to protect his flock of pigeons.

There is a distinct lack of information accompanying this application – where is the waste management plan, biosecurity measures to be taken and the manure management plan, for instance.

It appears from the lack of biosecurity measures in the application that the applicant doesn't take them seriously. This lackadaisical attitude towards biosecurity is backed up by the fact that during the most recent avian flu outbreak and the DEFRA housing order relating to poultry, the applicant's flock of free range poultry could be seen, on a daily basis, wandering around his property and were often seen wandering along Bolster Moor Road having escaped from his smallholding. The application makes no mention of the fact that the applicant already has dozens of racing pigeons which are kept in a pigeon loft very close to the proposed site for the poultry. Given his obvious disregard for biosecurity, how is he going to ensure that strict biosecurity measures and segregation are maintained between the poultry and the racing pigeons in order to prevent cross-transmission of serious diseases such as avian flu and pigeon paramyxovirus?

The poultry building appears to be a single space building with one large door. There seems to be no attempt in the design to prevent the regular escape of hens whenever the large door is opened.

The proposed site for this poultry building is far too close to a public walking route. The Colne Valley Circular route includes Drummer Lane, meaning that many walkers will regularly pass within 9m of this building, with the potential of creating a biosecurity issue.

There is a watercourse near to the proposed site – although the applicant appears to be denying knowledge of it in this application – just as he did in his first application. He is well aware of the existence of this watercourse. Poultry sheds normally have a soil floor. There is a high probability of manure-related water contamination - pollutants (manure/cleaning products, etc) would get into the watercourse at fairly high concentrations, polluting it. This watercourse feeds livestock on other properties in the area and eventually drains down into Colne Valley. This watercourse also frequently floods onto properties. Manure-related water flooding across people's properties is not pleasant – especially when the pollutants from poultry are so toxic.

The applicant states that the proposal will not involve the use or storage of hazardous substances. Cleaning and disinfecting to support a biosecurity programme is surely an important part of disease prevention. The Health and Safety Executive classes disinfectants as hazardous substances. Disinfectants and cleaning products will need to be used for the required deep cleaning at the end of each production cycle. Yet another (deliberate?) error in the application. These products will soak into the groundwater and have the potential to enter the watercourse, polluting it.

Additional traffic would be generated by this poultry building – feed deliveries, poultry bedding deliveries, waste removal. Bolster Moor is already inundated with huge amounts of traffic due to the applicant's farm shop on Bolster Moor Road. Kirklees Council is already aware of the traffic problems associated with Bolster Moor. Additional traffic related to the poultry building would only exacerbate these problems.

The site lies in an area of Green Belt – within which it is intended that new development be severely restricted. Paragraph 19.7 of the Kirklees Local Plan states "inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved unless very special circumstances exist that would outweigh the harm so caused." The Local Plan also states that "wherever possible and in accordance with core planning principles the reuse of existing buildings will be preferable to

the erection of new ones.” This development does not appear to be appropriate to the Green Belt and there do not appear to be any special reasons as to why it should be permitted.

The applicant’s family already own empty poultry huts in Bolster Moor which could be utilised by the applicant.

The applicant’s farm shop has already changed the village hugely over recent years, changing it from a quiet, rural village very few people had heard of, into one that is never without traffic – either visiting the farm shop or using it as a cut through from Manchester Road to Outlane. Residents do not want the applicant to change the village further by building a malodorous polluting poultry shed in its midst.

I therefore believe that this building would be totally inappropriate, unnecessary and unsuitable in the Green Belt and permission for it should be refused.