

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE
12th August 2020
ADDITIONAL PAGES UPDATE

**AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE LOCAL
GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985**

| ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS ON SCHEDULE ITEMS : Pages 1 - 5 | | |
|---|---|--|
| Item: | Ref No: | Content: |
| 01 | 19/04052/FUL <i>(Scrubbets Farm Scrubbets Lane Bagpath Kingscote)</i> | <p>ADDITIONAL THIRD PARTY COMMENT RECEIVED:</p> <p>A comment from a third party received on Saturday 8th August is attached. The comment relates to objection (viii) of Section 5 which should read that there would be a threat to biosecurity from the increase in traffic to the farm.</p> <p>AGENT RESPONSE ON THE ISSUE OF BIOSECURITY:</p> <p>In respect of Policy EC5 I refer you to specifically paragraphs 1.4, 3.2.7 and 5.1.10 of the Planning Statement, which I believe addresses the “severance or disruption” policy considerations.</p> <p>In respect of local concerns about the viability of the pig-rearing enterprise, unlike at the time of the neighbouring application 02/01283/FUL where the applicant operated a specialist pig-breeding enterprise, some 6 years ago the farm practices at Bagpath were changed to a ‘fattening’ or ‘finishing’ pig enterprise where pigs in their latter stage of rearing are brought in ready for ‘finishing’. Therefore, as this ‘finishing’ process is not subject to meeting the higher controls of biosecurity, there is no risk to the viability of the ‘finishing’ pig enterprise that currently operates on the farm.</p> <p>Furthermore, as is clear from paragraph 1.4 of the Planning Statement, the 80 acres of farmland owned at Bagpath/Kingscote is a very small part of the overall Farm Business, in fact, less than 12%; the more specialised operations are now conducted on other land in the District. Therefore, the proposal clearly accords with the above policy.</p> <p>PETITION SUBMITTED BY LOCAL RESIDENTS RECEIVED 10th AUGUST 2020</p> <p>Petition Summary: Total number of households in hamlet excluding applicant = 30 Number of households who have signed the petition opposing the development = 26 Number of households unavailable to respond = 2 % of households in hamlet who have signed the petition opposing the development = 86%</p> |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| | | <p>CASE OFFICER UPDATE:</p> <p>The following conditions have been amended:</p> <p>4. Prior to the kennels being brought into use, the alterations and conversion of the existing pig buildings shall incorporate a design and build of dog kennels that incorporate the following bespoke acoustic performance for the building envelope; namely, all side walls and roofs shall achieve an acoustic sound reduction index (SRI) rating of no less than RW 40 dB. The design shall include fully enclosed runs. The building envelope shall be acoustically sealed to its floor and roof. All glazing shall have a minimum sound reduction index of no less than 40 dB. <u>All of the above to be maintained as such thereafter.</u></p> <p>6. The alterations and conversions shall include the installation of an alternative means of air space ventilation, other than natural ventilation, which does not compromise the acoustic performance of the building envelope. The details of which shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to work commencing on the conversion of the buildings <u>and shall be maintained as such thereafter.</u></p> <p>7. A documented Noise Management Plan (NMP) shall be submitted to the Council and prior to the use of the dog kennels. The NMP shall state how noise complaints will be responded to and detail full management procedures, policies and the administration of the business to address barking noise. <u>The approved NMP shall be adhered to at all times thereafter.</u></p> |
| 04 | <p>19/03648/FUL</p> <p><i>(Manor Fields Court Burford Road Lechlade)</i></p> | <p>CASE OFFICER UPDATE:</p> <p>1. An amended page of the application form (Section 10. Materials) has been provided to remove an out-of-date drawing reference</p> <p>2. Officer's report updated to include the following in section (b) Impact on Highway Safety after acknowledgement of GCC Highways providing no comment:</p> <p>"That being said, it should be noted that for the previously withdrawn scheme, which was for the retention of the same fencing across the site's frontage and its reduction in height (ref. 19/01430/FUL), a no objection comment was received."</p> |

ADDITIONAL PAGES UPDATE ATTACHMENTS:

| | |
|----|---|
| 01 | 19/04052/FUL - (<i>Scrubbets Farm Scrubbets Lane Bagpath Kingscote</i>) |
|----|---|

ADDITIONAL THIRD PARTY COMMENT RECEIVED 08/08/2020:

Attn. Case Officer – Kennels at Bagpath

I draw your attention to a gross error and misrepresentation in your report to Council to be considered as Agenda Item 1 - Application 19/04052/FUL Kennels at Scrubbetts Farm.

At Section 5 para (viii) of your report you summarise my objection as “there would be a threat to the biosecurity of the pig rearing business from the noise which would be contrary to Local Plan Policy EC5 - Rural diversification.”

I did not link the noise from the dogs with the threat to biosecurity. I identified the increase in traffic to the farm as a potential threat to the biosecurity of the existing business and a consequential threat to its viability in contravention of the criteria of Policy EC5 .

I request that you correct this error and bring that correction to the attention of Members when they consider your report on the 12th August.

The error also extends to the main body of the report. In the same objection I drew attention to DEFRA’s guidance and regulations (in which traffic to farms features extensively) on the steps to be taken to minimise transmission of swine fever. These regulations clearly identify a potential threat but are not addressed in your report.

In respect of Local Plan Policy EC5 – Farm Diversification, despite your attention being drawn by me and I understand others, to Defra’s advice, the only reference to potential threats to the existing business is a reported assurance from the applicant that the “proposed enterprise is compatible with the existing pig rearing farming operation.” This is surprising since in an objection to a previous application for a residential development adjacent to his farm the applicant for these kennels provided a letter to him from Defra in which it is stated that “all pig herds ... should be sited away from public as it is thought that the year 2000 Classical Swine Fever outbreak in East Anglia was cause by a walker throwing an unwanted ham sandwich to sows on an outside unit.” (copy of his and Defra’s letter attached). This pig farm comprises exclusively outside units.

I request that this anomaly, which must surely throw doubt on other reported unquestioned responses from the applicant, is also brought to the attention of Members on the 12th August . Failure to consider these potential threats to the existing business and, according to the Defra letter, a risk costing the taxpayer millions, might be considered as negligence.

Attachments = 2

**Scrubbets Farm
Bagpath
TETBURY
Gloucestershire
GL8 8YG**

25 June 2003

Principal Planner
Directorate of Development and Heritage
Cotswold District Council
Trinity Road
Cirencester
Gloucestershire
GL78 1PX

| | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cotswold District Council | |
| Post Room | |
| Attn: <i>MC</i> | Date Recd: <i>21 JUL 2003</i> |
| Act Date: | |
| Reply Date: | |
| File No.: | |

For the Attention of Mr. Marcus Kitchen

Dear Sir,

Planning Ref: CT 8238/A

I am writing to register my strong objections to this plan.

Firstly, I am concerned that the name implies that Brimpscombe Park exists. It does not. It is merely a name for a dream that the applicants wish could come true. There is no established holding or remains of a significant house and there is insufficient land holding to support such a major house as this. Many people play the lottery but this game has very specific rules, namely PPG7.

Scrubbets Farm always has been, and still is, a pig farm. It is one of the few biosecure locations available essential for the safe production of clean, disease free breeding stock. Allowing this application would bring significant risks with the inflow of vehicles containing people who will park in gateways to eat their lunch and throwing scraps over hedges, sometimes even deliberately feeding food remains to the pigs without understanding the consequences. Allowing this application would cause considerable difficulty to our farming operation by making it hard to achieve access against the inflow of traffic.

This location should be left for farming and wildlife. It is a beautiful quiet valley and is not devoid of significant houses nearby. This location needs to remain as it is. It is rare and should stay that way. It has taken me a long time to find a suitable place to complete our breeding policy. It could be ruined in minutes by an incorrect decision.

Yours faithfully,



R. J. Hazell

ATTACHMENT 2

DEFRA

Animal Health Divisional Office, Saw Mill's End, Cornium Avenue, Gloucester

GL8008 Telephone: Direct line: E-mail:

01452627400 GTN:
07703 172946 FAX: 01225717211
Ralph.Drewin@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs

Your reference: Our reference:

14/368/0027

Mr R J Hazell Scrubbets Farm Bagnath Tetbury
Glos GL8 8YG

10 October 2003

Dear Mr Hazell

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT BAG PATH

Thank you for your letter of 10 October expressing concern about the risks to the biosecurity of your high health pig unit at Scrubbets Farm. I confirm that in December 2001, following satisfactory inspection of your facilities and premises, the status of a nucleus herd was conferred on Scrubbets Farm by DEFRA.

Nucleus herd status is only granted to the pig units in England that have the highest biosecurity or disease prevention levels. Probably only 1% of the pig units recorded by the agricultural census have Nucleus herd status. Nucleus herds should be sited several kms away from other pig units and have no contact with cattle/sheep enterprises. Visitors are kept to a minimum and are required to sign a declaration that they have had no pig contact for the previous 48 hours. Visitors have to shower on arrival at the unit and change into clothing provided by the owner before being allowed on site. No pig meat containing products are allowed on site. Staff are only employed on the condition that they have no contact with pigs outside their working hours. Hauliers and feedstock lorries are required to come to nucleus units as the first stop on a Monday morning to either collect stock or deliver feed. The drivers are not allowed to enter the units. All vehicles either have to pass through a wheelbath or have their wheels and mudguards cleansed and disinfected with an approved disinfectant on arrival.

All pig herds, and in particular Nucleus units, should be sited away from access by the public as it is thought that the year 2000 Classical Swine Fever (CSF) outbreak in East Anglia was caused by a walker throwing an unwanted ham sandwich to sows on an outdoor unit. That outbreak was overshadowed by the Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD) epidemic of the following spring but nevertheless cost the taxpayer several

15/10/03