

DC Admin

From:
Sent: 16 February 2026 10:58
To: DC Admin
Subject: Objection to Planning Application Number 2025/93387

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I am registering my strong objection to this planning application.

This is the second time the applicant has applied for planning permission for a poultry building. The first time was in 2024 when Kirklees Environmental Health's response to the application stated "we have concerns that noise, odours, dust and flies from the housing of such a large number of hens and the spreading of waste (sawdust and animal waste to land) can cause loss of amenity. We are therefore unable to support this application due to the proximity to nearby residents and the potential for loss of amenity."

Given that this second application only differs from the first application in that the location of the building has been moved a few metres, I believe that Kirklees Environmental Health's response to this second application should be exactly the same as to the first application. I also believe that all the objections to that first application should be read in relation to this second application. The reference number relating to the first application is 2024/91484.

As pointed out in other objections, there appear to be many errors and omissions in this planning application; surely this automatically renders the application null and void.

The Statement of Evidence – Respiratory Hazards of Poultry Dust document issued by the HSE makes for grim reading. It has been written in relation to those individuals working within poultry farms who would only have to suffer this during their normal working hours and who would be able to wear protective clothing. However, given the close proximity of this proposed building to residential properties and the prevailing wind direction, the individuals living in these properties will be breathing in these toxic gases 24 hours a day, every day. There is nothing contained within the application to state how emissions will be properly controlled in order to protect local residents against constant exposure to these respiratory health hazards. The health and wellbeing of those closest to this proposed site must be taken seriously. COSSH lists poultry dust as being harmful to health and a respiratory hazard.

Biosecurity measures are non-existent in the application – surely a huge oversight when wanting to own 1,500 hens in such close proximity to residential properties, a walking route and the applicant's current flocks of birds (including widely travelled racing pigeons). The drawing of the proposed building shows that there is no way of preventing the hens from escaping from the building whenever the door is opened – how does the applicant propose to stop this from happening? There is no mention, either, of facilities for changing footwear and clothing or the location of a disinfectant foot bath at the entrance/exit of the building in order to prevent spread of disease.

Yet again, the applicant appears to have forgotten about the watercourse running across his land. This watercourse would be within 20m of the poultry building (despite what the applicant has said in his application) – in fact, the proposed site for the building may even be right on top of the watercourse. This watercourse would be at serious risk of contamination. This watercourse regularly blocks and floods, groundwater contaminated by the poultry building would then flood over residential properties – a health hazard. I understand there are a number of properties that already suffer contaminated runoff from the applicant's existing manure heap.

It is concerning to read that the application is for 1,500 hens to be kept under minimal welfare standards, with the eggs being sold in the applicant's farm shop. Surely a farm shop should be promoting the highest standards of animal welfare – not just wanting to make a quick buck by the cheapest (and most cruel) means possible.

The level of constant noise generated by the hens, machinery and vehicles servicing the building would be intrusive to the local residents and unacceptable in an area that is normally known for its peace and quiet. The hens will all lay eggs at different times to each other and have a habit of squawking loudly after laying. This loud squawking would be non-stop every day.

The application shows that access to the poultry building would be through a narrow gate on Drummer Lane. Drummer Lane is a narrow lane, with no pavements, popular with walkers (including children from the local Nursery and school) as, due to its rural nature, it is a quiet and safe road to walk along. Drummer Lane forms part of the Colne Valley Circular route. The traffic required to regularly service this poultry building would have a detrimental effect on this safe space for walkers. Traffic through the village has increased exponentially over the last few years (due to the applicant's farm shop), and this poultry building will only add to traffic density through Bolster Moor. The roads are already in a serious state of disrepair due to this large increase in traffic.

There is no mention in the application of how waste products, feed and other items are to be stored. Where are waste products to be stored prior to collection? Where are food and other items required by the poultry building to be stored? No mention is made of manure management – poultry manure is extremely toxic and should not be stored near residential properties. Where are the eggs going to be cleaned, sorted and packed – there is no mention of machinery or facilities required for this process.

It is also clear to people familiar with the applicant that this poultry business will not stop at one building. The applicant is well known for flouting planning laws – expanding his farm shop and farm business aggressively, often without obtaining the correct planning permission beforehand (overflow car park/plant storage shed/café decking?).

Bolster Moor is a designated Green Belt area and this building is totally unnecessary. The farm shop already sells eggs from other suppliers – therefore this building cannot possibly be deemed necessary and the application should be refused.