

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLANNING](#)
Subject: Objection to 21/00337/FULM
Date: 11 June 2021 08:11:18

FAO Ruari Kelly. Case officer Angus council.

Objection to:
21/00337/FULM | Erection of two 32,000 capacity free-range hen sheds and associated infrastructure including feed silos, egg packing facility, vehicular access, access tracks, drainage and landscaping | Field 530M West Of North Mains Of Cononsyth Farm, Cononsyth, Arbroath.

Dear Ruari and the Planning Committee,

I respectfully ask that you seriously reconsider the above proposed plans, and consider this as a letter of objection.

I understand and absolutely respect that people are entitled to their choice of lifestyle, and this is not meant to be a righteous, preaching email about veganism. I just wish to highlight some serious issues that I hope you'll contemplate.

I ask that a copy of this letter is made available to the whole committee delegated the task of assessing this application.

My reasons for objection are as follows:

HUMAN HEALTH:

ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE

THE WHO states "Antibiotic resistance is one of the biggest threats to global health, food security, and development today." (<https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance>) and "If no action is taken - warns the (UN Ad hoc Interagency Coordinating Group on Antimicrobial Resistance) – drug-resistant diseases could cause 10 million deaths each year by 2050 and damage to the economy as catastrophic as the 2008-2009 global financial crisis. By 2030, antimicrobial resistance could force up to 24 million people into extreme poverty. Currently, at least 700,000 people die each year due to drug-resistant diseases, including 230,000 people who die from multidrug-resistant tuberculosis. More and more common diseases, including respiratory tract infections, sexually transmitted infections and urinary tract infections, are untreatable; lifesaving medical procedures are becoming much riskier, and our food systems are increasingly precarious". (<https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/29-04-2019-new-report-calls-for-urgent-action-to-avert-antimicrobial-resistance-crisis>)

The WHO also state "Antibiotic resistance occurs naturally, but misuse of

antibiotics in humans and animals is accelerating the process.” (www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance)

The Soil Association says (www.soilassociation.org/reducing-antibiotics-in-farming/)

“Farm animals consume one-third of all antibiotics in the UK and it is intensive farming systems that use drugs at unnecessarily high levels, putting human health at risk.”

“The routine use of antibiotics in intensive farming systems is driving this problem. Drugs are given to animals as a preventative measure - before they show signs of illness - to compensate for animals being housed in cramped, unsanitary conditions where infections spread fast. Intensively reared pigs and poultry account for 79 % of UK farming antibiotic use”

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

The short-term benefits of employment and meat production are outweighed by the environmental impact that it will have on the local area which is already facing a climate emergency. What we eat has a huge impact on the environment and has potential to cause disease and pandemics so applications should be considered in line with our broader responsibilities to protect future generations.

Furthermore, the Government sees Local Authorities as central to delivering its CO₂ emission targets yet more and more intensive farming applications are going through planning departments across the UK. It is important to recognise the significant impact just one factory farm will have on the pollution and environment of the local area.

To quote DEFRA 2007 - “The production of food from animal agriculture is a significant source of emissions in the UK, especially the production of GHGs and pollution of water sources. For pigs and poultry, the main pollutants are ammonia and N₂O. Nitrous oxide (N₂O) has 296 times the Global Warming Potential of CO₂ and ammonia (NH₃), contributes significantly to acidification of rain and soils. The agriculture sector accounts for around 37%, 66% and 88% of total UK emissions of CH₄, N₂O and NH₃, respectively (NAEI, 2007), nearly all of which is derived from livestock production.”

(<http://sciencesearch.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=14662>)

If the science was clear in 2007, why are planning applications for intensive livestock units still being approved when the government sees local authorities as central to delivering its CO₂ emission targets?

“Ammonia and nitrogen pollution, mostly from agriculture, is harming more than 60% of the UK’s land area and affecting the most sensitive habitats, according to a DEFRA report. Ammonia pollution also effects species composition through soil acidification, direct toxic damage to leaves and by

altering the susceptibility of plants to frost, drought and pathogens. At its most serious, certain sensitive and iconic habitats may be lost” (<https://www.endsreport.com/article/1588258/ammonia-pollution-harming-60-uk-land-area>)

ANIMAL SUFFERING

Another reason for my objection is that I do not feel this application for a factory farm represents current public opinion. In a recent survey 85% of the public were against factory farms.

In addition, Defra 2019 reported that a survey showed that 78% of people felt it was “very important” to protect the welfare of farmed animals and that 82% said farmers should be rewarded for offering animals higher welfare standards.

Although the current animal welfare laws in the UK are slim I feel it is morally wrong to subject sentient animals capable of fear and misery to overcrowding, unhygienic conditions, large scale antibiotic use, mutilations without anaesthetic and no chance of a normal life. Factory farms like these result in close confinement aggression and arguably completely prevent any sense of normal behaviour as defined in the Animal Welfare Act 2006.

Whilst I appreciate that animal welfare is not a planning consideration, I would like to draw your attention to the recent Animal Aid investigation into another unit where the group exposed some terrible conditions. Footage showed hens with extensive feather loss, injured birds and several dead and decomposing birds left among the living. Conditions were extremely dirty with heavy dust and faeces accumulating. A very small percentage of the birds were outside ‘ranging’ during the daytime, this may be attributed to crowding and social hierarchy which prevents birds accessing pop holes. Some hens may never range outside. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O7ISh7cMOXA&list=UUQU-2dlbbNDhtW7rHr3RG2g>

Two sheds are proposed for the purpose of accommodating 32,000 laying hens each, totalling 64,000 hen capacity at the site. In light of this, we really must question whether the health and welfare of an even larger population of birds can possibly be effectively monitored generally or safeguarded in an emergency situation. And more widely question whether such huge scale, vertical farming with many thousands of hens, can really constitute ‘free-range’.

Whilst sadly not a legal consideration it most certainly should be a moral one.

SUMMARY

- More pandemics.
- A climate raging out of control.

- Environmental damage.
- Biodiversity loss.
- Global food poverty and UK food insecurity.
- Antibiotic resistance - antibiotics used to keep animals in cramped, unhygienic conditions alive until slaughter.
- Animal mutilations without anaesthetic and no chance of a normal life.

The science is clear. Factory farming of animals is a leading cause of all the above.

With this in mind, I write to ask you to protect today's children, from serious problems that will dominate their future if we do not act now. Not just pandemics but the climate crisis, environmental problems, antibiotic resistance... it paints a horrifying picture.

The climate crisis is here but the greatest impacts of it will be felt by our own children. Biodiversity is being lost, environments destroyed, soil quality diminishing. Pandemics are already a threat and antibiotic resistance is growing.

I OBJECT strongly to this application on the above grounds.

Many thanks for your time,

Yours faithfully

Alexandra Wells

Ruari Kelly

From: Alison Skilton [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 June 2021 21:56
To: Ruari Kelly
Subject: Planning Application ref number:21/00337/FULM

For the attention of Ruari Kelly - Case Officer Angus Council

I object to the proposed development of chicken sheds at field 530m west of North Mains of Cononsyth Farm, Cononsyth for the following reasons:


1. Proposed access to the site from the narrow country road known as U467 is totally unsuitable for regular use by large vehicles and an increase in this type of heavy traffic will have detrimental impact on local residents who require access to their homes. The proposed entrance is situated close to a bend with restricted visibility. These vehicles will also endanger walkers, those who ride horses and walk their dogs along with those who cycle along this country road.
2. The proposed site of this large industrial development is close to several residential properties. Why has this site been selected? Cononsyth Farms have existing commercial infrastructure such as Biomass plant, windmill and also existing farm buildings sited elsewhere on their land and these already have roadways that have direct access to the B961 road, this would have less impact on local residents. Building the chicken sheds on the proposed site will also have a huge impact on the landscape.
3. Pollution - from chicken waste, odour, noise and artificial lighting along with pollution of local watercourses caused by run off from the chicken sheds.
4. Flood - the site proposed already floods and the large amounts of concrete involved in this development will only increase the flooding issue.
5. This development will also have an impact on wildlife. We are lucky to see a wide variety of wildlife including red squirrels, bats and wide variety of birds.
6. Loss of amenity - a large industrial unit built in this lovely rural area on land suitable for crop production will greatly impact on local residents enjoyment of their homes, surroundings and way of life.
7. Cononsyth Farm has already made changes recently creating a new access to this proposed industrial development, having removed a large area of old drystone wall along with clearing many trees from the woodland alongside the track they have created.
8. We are all currently living through a Pandemic and the likelihood there may be others in the future, surely building an intensive industrial poultry unit near to residential properties makes this a most unsuitable proposal.

I strongly urge that this proposed development is rejected.

I would appreciate if you could acknowledge receipt of this objection.

Yours sincerely

Alison Skilton
Queenswood Cottage DD8 2SR


Sent from my iPhone

Comments for Planning Application 21/00337/FULM

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00337/FULM

Address: Field 530M West Of North Mains Of Cononsyth Farm Cononsyth Arbroath

Proposal: Erection of two 32,000 capacity free-range hen sheds and associated infrastructure including feed silos, egg packing facility, vehicular access, access tracks, drainage and landscaping

Case Officer: Ruari Kelly

Customer Details

Name: Mr Andrew Llanwarne

Address: 8 Glasclune Way Broughty Ferry Dundee DD5 3TJ

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I am submitting an objection to this application on behalf of Friends of the Earth Tayside. Whilst Angus Council's Local Development Plan indicates a presumption in favour of sustainable development, it seems clear from the application that it would in fact be a development resulting in high levels of CO2 emissions particularly through the initial construction and the feed, transport and energy required for the ongoing operations, although we recognise that some of its operational energy needs will be met from renewable sources.

It appears to be of a scale that is inappropriately large in this rural greenfield location, when more suitable brownfield sites exist, and as such is contrary to Council planning policy.

It would result in the loss of a large area of productive agricultural land, and significant impacts on local biodiversity.

This type of intensive agricultural production is widely believed to facilitate the development and transmission of diseases, such as avian influenza, salmonella, campylobacter and E. Coli, which can be transferred to humans.

I object to the planning application (21/00337/FULM) to build an intensive poultry unit on farm land belonging to Cononsyth Farms Ltd because:

- there are other diversification options for a farm that do not cause such environmental hazards
- the centre of the factory will be only 400 metres from my home and the boundary of the operation only 200m
- it is entirely unsuitable use for grade 1 agri land, involving huge amounts of environmentally damaging concrete, preventing natural soil absorption of climate change weather rainfall, and threatening flooding of its surroundings.
- Our property suffered flooding in August 2019 due to climate change weather rainfall on very dry ground uphill from our property (the area in question). The soil uphill, having become dessertified, was unable to absorb the water and ran like a river through our garden and studio damaging art work.
- Tree planting by the proposer should not give a green light to unsustainable development.
- An IPU is an unsustainable operation. Research has shown that it is only a few years before intensive operations such as these have to be abandoned despite all best hygiene efforts to avoid contamination by poultry diseases. This raises questions regarding sustainability, as sustainability takes future outcomes into account.
- IPUs encourage the opportunity for viral mutations endangering all species of life.
- Any increase in ammonia levels in the environment is unacceptable due the damage and danger to the soil ecology, micro flora and fauna, fungi and amphibians, lichens and mosses and consequently the biodiversity of our area.
- Angus Council have previously told me they do not want HGVs using the U467. I asked a few years ago if a road direction sign could be put at the top of the U467 where it meets the B961 so that our address might be found more easily. Angus Council said it would not do that because it did not want HGVs using the tiny country road and the consequent increase in roads costs to the tax payer. It was also said that a sign would encourage HGVs to use the U467 as a shortcut to the A932. At that time, and currently, I agree. If the applicant widens the road and creates passing places, even only part way, this will surely offer an opportunity for through traffic which is totally undesirable and unfitting on this pretty, residential, single track, rural country lane.
- The traffic survey was undertaken at a time of poor weather and during covid lockdown when there could not have been less traffic on the roads in question. The traffic survey is unbalanced and inaccurate.
- This area has suffered a decline in many species of animals, birds and amphibians in the 30 years I have lived at this address. Nothing should be done that endangers more loss of habitat and increases toxicity of the environment. Numbers of woodcock, snipe, red squirrel, rabbits, foxes, hares, hedgehogs, moorhen, coot, toads, newts, brown trout, salmon, curlew, plover, mallard, oyster catcher, brambling, green finch, swallow, swift, butterflies, badgers, larks, warblers and others have

hugely declined within a 600m radius of my address and need help to re-establish numbers. It is commonly known that pollution in all forms and climate change are responsible for decline in species numbers. It is also known that intensive farming practices contribute to pollution and climate change.

- I consider work to have already been started by the applicant which contravenes planning as an 'assumption of approval'. Beautiful old stone walls and the habitats they provide have been destroyed. A ditch at the centre of the planned IPU has been culverted and planted over. This destroyed a path alongside the ditch used by many neighbours. A track way has been widened and established where none before existed. A hard standing area has been created of the size suited for the turning of HGVs. It is not true this was created in order to clear fell the woodland as it was created after the trees had been felled.
- Our amenity of the area is being, and will be, disrupted and destroyed. The IPU will be unsightly. A screen of trees which take time to grow is not an offset. Light pollution from the unit will directly affect us as will the smell and the noise.
- I work from home and, covid19 excepting, I have students come to my home for study for the reasons of a quieter environment, cleaner air and an improvement to their wellbeing. This IPU will directly affect my working environment and my business.
- I have asthma and an auto immune condition that are directly affected by environmental factors. An increase in micro particulates is unacceptable.
- I am concerned that constant low level noise will effect my stress levels and trigger my depression and anxiety. I don't want to be sitting in my garden in the evening being distressed by noise. I believe the EIA has underestimated noise levels and how sound can travel through the air. The noise from the wind turbine at Cononsyth is upsetting enough and is further away than the proposed buildings.
- Part of the planning procedure is notifying neighbours, my house is on the list of sensitive receptors but we have received no notification from the developer. I am concerned at the lack of open public debate and knowledge regarding the development. I have tried to no avail to find some Community Council representation and feel totally disenfranchised and isolated as there is no Community Council for my area. I don't feel the process is transparent considering the scale of the development.
- The online consultation was not a consultation, it wasn't public.

Comments for Planning Application 21/00337/FULM

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00337/FULM

Address: Field 530M West Of North Mains Of Cononsyth Farm Cononsyth Arbroath

Proposal: Erection of two 32,000 capacity free-range hen sheds and associated infrastructure including feed silos, egg packing facility, vehicular access, access tracks, drainage and landscaping

Case Officer: Ruari Kelly

Customer Details

Name: Mr Crawford Taylor

Address: Carmyllie Schoolhouse Redford Arbroath DD11 2RD

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Dear Sir,

With reference to my comments of objection re Cononsyth Farms hen sheds, I would ask that they are made available to the whole committee tasked with considering this application.

Yours,

Crawford Taylor

David Liddell

Mid Park Of Gardyne, Angus, DD8 2SR

Objection to 21/00337/FULM

Erection of two 32,00 capacity free-range hen sheds and associated infrastructure including feeding silos, egg packing facility, vehicular access, access tracks, drainage and landscaping/530m West of North Mains of Cononsyth Farm, Cononsyth, Arbroath

I object to the development 21/00337/FULM in the strongest possible terms as it conflicts with Angus Councils ALDP which states in Policy PV20 only "small scale" developments will be supported on prime farm land. The building and the total development boundary indicates this is an industrial scale development and is being built in isolation. There is no alternative proposal, like siting the development near existing farm buildings at North Mains. Access already exists at North Mains from the B961, on a clear, straight section of the B961. Avoiding accidents on the corner of Cononsyth Farm Cottages involving large trucks would be important to Angus Council.

The other alternative is using the wind turbine entrance, its large, and again on a clear straight section of the B961. This is the ideal place, as there are substantially less households being exposed to the health risks associated with Intensive Poultry Units (IPU). There is also land for the required range.

Using the U467 is totally unacceptable for the underestimated amount vehicles that will be arriving and departing the factory. The corner junction of the B961 and the U467 is dangerous already and the ATC survey does not reflect usage of the B961, as it was gathered during a lockdown. There is also a field track entrance for large farm vehicles right on the corner to compound the issue. (Appendix 14.4)

The Type 1 Hardcore access road proposed from the U467 to the buildings is unsatisfactory, Type 1 allows puddles to form, and with frost turns to mush. Unsuitable for prolonged HGV vehicle use, will make a mess on the U467, potentially dangerous in winter for HGVs and other road users. The road will lose its character, it is popular with walkers, with dogs, cyclists and horse riders. The proposed passing places plan (Appendix 14.7) takes no account of this, it is thinking only of cars. There is no pavement for other road users, which can include children, to get safely off the road as a HGV will take up all the room. The grass at the edge is narrow, contains ditches and holes, has a high bank and an ancient stone wall directly beside. The distance between the passing places is not acceptable if you are on foot, with a pushchair, riding a bicycle, are using a walking aid or disabled vehicle, coming home from the school bus or on a horse.

Dry stone walls are a haven, acting as a corridor of safety and shelter for many plants, insects and animals. I have seen stoats, toads and bumblebees on the U467, passing places will destroy sections of wall and amounts to removal of habitat.

The development is at odds with Cononsyth Farms Limited (CFL) work in planting hedges, honeyberry research and its community events at the pumpkin patch. Other options regarding diversification exist, such as a Farm Park, with themed accommodation, glamping, pop up camping, biofuel, rare breed, making the most of the pond, recreational and sport activities, letting buildings and farm produce.

Instead CFL have opted for the industrialisation of our rural landscape, raising concerns about development creep, and setting a precedent for this type of intensive farming practices in Angus. The scale of 21/00337/FULM is concerning as I live 400 meters from the proposed site. My main concern is Emissions.

In the EIAs (Appendix 10.5,10.6, 10.7 and 11.1) Cogeo regard as "insignificant" the exhaust fan emission rates. By their own admission, there will be emissions but the documents don't mention variations

affecting the dispersion of Particulate Matter (PM10), NO₂, NO_x, NH₃(ammonia) and dust containing bacteria and viruses.

Variations in dispersion are related to weather, atmospheric pressure, temperature and humidity. A specific atmospheric effect in this part of Angus is the Haar, which can sometimes last days. There is no wind. Water vapour and cold can trap and concentrate emissions in pockets, releasing substances known to affect human, animal and plant life.

Also not considered by Cogeo is the combining of emissions with environmental elements especially ammonia with water creating ammonium hydroxide. Some of these emissions are greenhouse gases or indirect greenhouse gases.

Most concerning is the issue of plumes of bacteria and viruses being spread around the environment by the exhaust fans. Avian flu affects human and wild bird life. The issue of zoonotic disease needs consideration. Cogeo recognise this but the single "biosecurity and disease control mechanism" being considered only explains the positioning of site access, and seems to be based around cost. Not the negative effects on human life.

The accumulative effects of low concentration fan emissions from the proposed IPU are not discussed, especially that of PM10. Also ammonia concentrations build up over time. Both these have a detrimental effect on human health, wildlife (especially aquatic life, amphibians) and plants (especially lichens, bryophytes). Angus Council cannot allow people to be slowly poisoned in their own homes.

In Appendix 11.2 Odour Management Plan "The proposals include the planting up of a shelter belt adjacent to the east gable ends where exhaust fans are located to intercept particulates and gases (mainly ammonia)." Cogeo and CFL believe planting trees will fix everything, this is not true. I didn't know trees were good at catching (?) particulates and gases. True, they absorb CO₂ during photosynthesis, but not particulates and ammonia.

As a council tax payer I don't see why I should be exposed to ANY emissions, no matter how low, where none existed before.

The development goes against the grain of Angus Council's Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan, "protecting and enhancing the biodiversity of Angus". Included in the plan is "ensuring that new development is sympathetic to landscape character", and "safeguarding good quality land from inappropriate and irreversible development"

The 21/00337/FULM application is not sustainable. The circular economy model I discussed with Angus Dowell had flaws. CFL cannot grow enough food for 64,000 hens, even its own grain will have to be treated elsewhere before it is suitable feed. Feed is still delivered by large HGVs. Chickens also need more than home grown grain to thrive as hen health, egg production and quality could be affected. Feed has to be stored and monitored to prevent disease and contamination. Where is the storage?

The scale of spreading manure on the same land becomes unsustainable over time, and chicken manure can only be applied at certain times of year. This means storage and a Manure Management Plan. Where is the storage? Where is the plan?

Profit margins, and egg prices although high now, can fluctuate as they have done in the past. All it takes is a high profile figure, or a government minister making a statement about salmonella, or contamination with insecticides, and the development becomes unsustainable.

Government legalisation recognising the dangers of spreading chicken manure might limit its application. Making this idea unsustainable.

The provision of swales as a dumping ground for contaminated water is very concerning considering the scale of the units to be cleaned. In time this water will soak away affecting watercourses downhill in the area containing a cocktail of nutrients, ammonia and pathogenic microorganisms. Causing serious problems for the ecosystem of Denton Burn.

Residue will collect at the bottom of the swales, the odour will effect property's at Fairfield for weeks. As well as being a health hazard for the occupants. The swales are neared to Fairfield than the factory units.

Why dose the dirty water tank diverter valve connect to surface water pipework and not to a dedicated septic tank?

I don't see why I should tolerate ANY nighttime noise levels where there was non before. Constant exposure to low level noise has been proven to contributes to poor mental health, irritation, stress, depression and hight blood pressure. In section 12.4 of North Mains EIA Cogeo say "noise will be acceptable". Disregarding sound sensitivity over years of exposure, and associated anxiety disorders.

They also ignore the fact that sound levels are enhanced by different atmospheric conditions. Leading to considerable variation, especially at night in winter. They also are taking advantage of existing background noise, but this isn't constant twenty four hour a day, every day.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLANNING](#)
Subject: FAO Ruari Kelly: Case officer Angus council
Date: 11 June 2021 16:45:12

Objection to:

21/00337/FULM | Erection of two 32,000 capacity free-range hen sheds and associated infrastructure including feed silos, egg packing facility, vehicular access, access tracks, drainage and landscaping | Field 530M West Of North Mains Of Cononsyth Farm, Cononsyth, Arbroath.

Dear Ruari and the Planning Committee.

I ask that a copy of this letter is made available to the whole Committee delegated the task of assessing this application.

Please accept my objection to the above planning application.

My reasons are as follows:

HUMAN HEALTH:

PANDEMICS

We are in the middle of a pandemic that is killing people. Scientists have predicted that the next pandemic will start as an Avian Flu.

<https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/66/wr/mm6635a2.htm>

Since November 2020 we have had 25 outbreaks of Avian Flu in the UK.

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/avian-influenza-bird-flu>

-

Some of these have been outbreaks in Scotland itself :

[Avian influenza \(bird flu\): how to spot and report the disease - gov.scot \(www.gov.scot\)](#)

-

On 18 February 2021, the National IHR Focal Point for the Russian Federation notified WHO of detection of avian influenza A(H5N8) in seven **human** clinical specimens. These are the first reported detection of avian influenza A(H5N8) in **humans**.

<https://www.who.int/csr/don/26-feb-2021-influenza-a-russian-federation/en/>

If we just look at the past 100 years of influenza pandemics, epidemics, and control strategies then the question must be whether another pandemic like the 1918 Spanish influenza, with such a deadly and disruptive impact on society killing 50 million people, is possible?

The answer is yes: it is not only possible, but it is just a matter of time.

It is important to note that there are concerns from many people in the UK of another impending pandemic of which a factory farm could well become the cause with their overcrowding and unhygienic conditions. Why on earth would a planning application for another Intensive factory farm even be considered at this time?

It is a massive risk to consider introducing an industrial chicken farm on such an enormous scale, **64000** birds, with high population densities and genetically homogenous birds. Given the known propensity for low pathogenic viral strains to mutate into high pathogenic strains amongst poultry flocks, and potential to become more easily transmissible to other mammals, it is not scaremongering to treat this development as an ongoing risk to human health.

It is noteworthy that the H5 group of highly pathogenic influenza viruses were never reported in humans before the mid-1990s; now they are found in humans in several countries every year.

The World Health Organisation (WHO) has said "... authorities have a responsibility for controlling zoonoses – diseases transmissible from animals to humans through direct contact or through food, water and the environment. An estimated 75% of emerging pathogens are of zoonotic nature".

Scientists estimate "that more than 6 out of every 10 known infectious diseases in people can be spread from animals" (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention <https://www.cdc.gov/onehealth/basics/zoonotic-diseases.html>)

Please consider this list of UK Government zoonotic diseases. It is a long and frightening list.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/list-of-zoonotic-diseases/list-of-zoonotic-diseases>

To exemplify this further, listed UK diseases linked to just chickens (there are similar lists for other farmed species) include:

- Avian Flu (Animal influenza)
- Campylobacteriosis
- Psittacosis
- Salmonellosis

-

ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE

THE WHO states "Antibiotic resistance is one of the biggest threats to global health, food security, and development today." (<https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance>)

and "If no action is taken - warns the (UN Ad hoc Interagency Coordinating Group on Antimicrobial Resistance) – drug-resistant diseases could cause 10 million deaths each year by 2050 and damage to the economy as catastrophic as the 2008-2009 global financial crisis. By 2030, antimicrobial resistance could force up to 24 million people into extreme

poverty. Currently, at least 700,000 people die each year due to drug-resistant diseases, including 230,000 people who die from multidrug-resistant tuberculosis. More and more common diseases, including respiratory tract infections, sexually transmitted infections and urinary tract infections, are untreatable; lifesaving medical procedures are becoming much riskier, and our food systems are increasingly precarious”.

(<https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/29-04-2019-new-report-calls-for-urgent-action-to-avert-antimicrobial-resistance-crisis>)

The WHO also state “Antibiotic resistance occurs naturally, but misuse of antibiotics in humans and animals is accelerating the process.” (www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance)

The Soil Association says (www.soilassociation.org/reducing-antibiotics-in-farming/)

“Farm animals consume one-third of all antibiotics in the UK and it is intensive farming systems that use drugs at unnecessarily high levels, putting human health at risk.”

“The routine use of antibiotics in intensive farming systems is driving this problem. Drugs are given to animals as a preventative measure - before they show signs of illness - to compensate for animals being housed in cramped, unsanitary conditions where infections spread fast. Intensively reared pigs and poultry account for 79 % of UK farming antibiotic use”

Looking holistically, what is more important, planning rules, another factory farm or people dying?

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

-

The short-term benefits of employment and meat production are outweighed by the environmental impact that it will have on the local area which is already facing a climate emergency. What we eat has a huge impact on the environment and has potential to cause disease and pandemics so applications should be considered in line with our broader responsibilities to protect future generations.

Furthermore, the Government sees Local Authorities as central to delivering its CO₂ emission targets yet more and more intensive farming applications are going through planning departments across the UK. It is important to recognise the significant impact just one factory farm will have on the pollution and environment of the local area.

To quote DEFRA 2007 - “The production of food from animal agriculture is a significant source of emissions in the UK, especially the production of GHGs and pollution of water sources. For pigs and poultry, the main pollutants are ammonia and N₂O. Nitrous oxide (N₂O) has 296 times the Global Warming Potential of CO₂ and ammonia (NH₃), contributes significantly to acidification of rain and soils. The agriculture sector accounts for around 37%, 66% and 88% of total UK emissions of CH₄, N₂O and NH₃, respectively

(NAEI, 2007), nearly all of which is derived from livestock production.”

(<http://sciencesearch.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=14662>)

If the science was clear in 2007, why are planning applications for intensive livestock units still being approved when the Government sees Local Authorities as central to delivering its CO2 emission targets?

“Ammonia and nitrogen pollution, mostly from agriculture, is harming more than 60% of the UK’s land area and affecting the most sensitive habitats, according to a DEFRA report. Ammonia pollution also effects species composition through soil acidification, direct toxic damage to leaves and by altering the susceptibility of plants to frost, drought and pathogens. At its most serious, certain sensitive and iconic habitats may be lost” (<https://www.endsreport.com/article/1588258/ammonia-pollution-harming-60-uk-land-area>)

LOCAL IMPACT and SITE-SPECIFIC INFORMATION

On the Angus Council Website there are various statements that the council has committed to which this type of development actively goes against, below are just a few excerpts:

We support the principle of sustainable development and are committed to improving the quality of life for present and future generations in Angus. By a process of integrating responses to environmental, social and economic issues the council will help to maximise human welfare while enhancing the environment in Angus.

We will seek to:

- *promote a sustainable approach to land and habitat management.*
- *protect and enhance local biodiversity.*
- *encourage a sustainable managed approach to public access to the natural environment.*

We will seek to:

- *reduce local pollution of air, land, water and to reduce the incidence of noise and light pollution.*

We will seek to:

- *conserve and enhance the historic and cultural heritage of Angus and the local characteristics of the towns and villages.*
- *encourage design in new or regeneration developments which will improve access for the disabled and create an environment free from the fear of crime.*
- *ensure that new developments are in line with sustainable development priorities in regard to location and design.*
- *conserve and promote a network of greenspace within the built environment which*

links to the surrounding countryside through a footpath network.

The documented discussions from the Angus Council Development Standards Committee 15 Sept also mentions:

In this case the proposed development would involve the loss of prime agricultural land (Policy PV20); it would introduce a use that could generate odour and noise in proximity to existing residential uses (Policy DS4); it would have impacts on the landscape (Policy PV6) and it is located in an area where SEPA flood maps indicate there is a flood risk (Policy PV12 and 15).

Animal agriculture does not protect wildlife – quite the opposite – as this 2019 Defra report illustrates:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/834432/evidence-compendium-26sep19.pdf

“Biodiversity - Farming practices can have many impacts that can lead to a reduction in wildlife biodiversity (including loss of habitats and food sources). The UK farmland bird index, an indicator of the state of wildlife generally, has fallen to less than half its 1970 value”.

According to Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences - since humans became farmers, just 17% of wild mammal species remain (from mice to elephants).

As the site is relatively close to a number of residential properties this development can only have an increased negative effect on the local residents, in particular noise, odour, pollution and disease.

A chicken farm of this size will produce enormous amounts of faecal matter, much of which could be deposited on the outdoor ranging areas and from there into the local watercourses and river habitats.

GLOBAL HUNGER

The impact of factory farming also goes beyond the local environment to global food poverty and UK food insecurity. The Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United

Nations predicts that by 2050 world meat production will have almost [doubled](#) global warming, pollution, deforestation, land degradation, water scarcity and species extinction all increasing as a consequence.

850 million people go hungry every day. Animal agriculture uses 83% of farmland but only produces 18% of calories (Joseph Poore, Oxford University).

“We already produce enough to feed the world. It’s overconsumption – especially of animal protein by the global middle class, inequality, waste and inadequate production/distribution systems - that stands in the way of enough food for everyone and space for wildlife. To feed the world in a way our one planet can sustain, we need to consume and produce food differently”. (Worldwide Fund for Nature. Appetite for Destruction)

-

ANIMAL SUFFERING

Another reason for my objection is that I do not feel this application for a factory farm represents current public opinion. In a recent survey 85% of the public were against Factory Farms.

In addition, Defra 2019 reported that a survey showed that 78% of people felt it was “very important” to protect the welfare of farmed animals and that 82% said farmers should be rewarded for offering animals higher welfare standards.

Although the current animal welfare laws in the UK are slim I feel it is morally wrong to subject sentient animals capable of fear and misery to overcrowding, unhygienic conditions, large scale antibiotic use, mutilations without anaesthetic and no chance of a normal life. Factory farms like these result in close confinement aggression and arguably completely prevent any sense of normal behaviour as defined in the Animal Welfare Act 2006.

Whilst I appreciate that animal welfare is not a planning consideration, I would like to draw your attention to the recent Animal Aid investigation into another unit where the group exposed some terrible conditions. Footage showed hens with extensive feather loss, injured birds and several dead and decomposing birds left among the living. Conditions were extremely dirty with heavy dust and faeces accumulating. A very small percentage of the birds were outside ‘ranging’ during the daytime, this may be attributed to crowding and social hierarchy which prevents birds accessing pop holes. Some hens may never range outside. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O7ISh7eMOXA&list=UUQU-2dIbbNDhtW7rHr3RG2g>

Two sheds are proposed for the purpose of accommodating 32,000 laying hens each, totalling 64,000 hen capacity at the site. In light of this, we really must question whether the health and welfare of an even larger population of birds can possibly be effectively monitored generally or safeguarded in an emergency situation. And more widely question whether such huge scale, vertical farming with many thousands of hens, can really constitute ‘free-range’.

Whilst sadly not a legal consideration it most certainly should be a moral one, the poor

animals suffer their whole life it is cruel and inhumane that these animals suffer a great deal of not only torture and pain but they lose their life to satisfy someone's tastebuds.

Plant based diets are gaining favour with the public as people of this country are recognising that they have been eating diets that are poor for their health and the links meat consumption has to cancer and cardiovascular disease. Vegans and vegetarians look set to make up a quarter of the UK population in 2025 and with vegetarian and vegan product sales expected to increase to £658m by 2021 it begs the question is another factory farm really right for this community?

SUMMARY

-

The future looks grim.

- More pandemics.
- A climate raging out of control.
- Environmental damage.
- Biodiversity loss.
- Global food poverty and UK food insecurity.
- Antibiotic resistance - antibiotics used to keep animals in cramped, unhygienic conditions alive until slaughter.
- Animal mutilations without anaesthetic and no chance of a normal life.

The science is clear. Factory farming of animals is a leading cause of all the above.

With this in mind, I write to ask you to protect today's children, from serious problems that will dominate their future if we do not act now. Not just pandemics but the climate crisis, environmental problems, antibiotic resistance..... it paints a horrifying picture.

The climate crisis is here but the greatest impacts of it will be felt by our own children. Biodiversity is being lost, environments destroyed, soil quality diminishing. Pandemics are already a threat and antibiotic resistance is growing.

I OBJECT strongly to this application on the above grounds.

Yours faithfully,

Grace Pickering

Comments for Planning Application 21/00337/FULM

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00337/FULM

Address: Field 530M West Of North Mains Of Cononsyth Farm Cononsyth Arbroath

Proposal: Erection of two 32,000 capacity free-range hen sheds and associated infrastructure including feed silos, egg packing facility, vehicular access, access tracks, drainage and landscaping

Case Officer: Ruari Kelly

Customer Details

Name: Ms Hannagh Bell

Address: East Mains of Dumbarrow Cottage Kirkden By Letham DD8 2SR

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:ALDP, Policy PV5 SEA Implications, Landscape, and Policy PV6 Development in the Landscape both emphasise the need for development to be proportionate in scale and location to other developments in the immediate area. The proposed buildings themselves are 110 metres long by 78 metres wide, and 6.7 metres to the ridge, with silos rising to approximately 8 metres. This is a huge building, completely and utterly out of character with any buildings nearby. By comparison, Forfar Athletic's ground (not just the pitch) is approximately 131 metres x 90 metres, so the footprint of the development buildings (excluding the range) is only marginally smaller than that, and of similar height. The development is not appropriate to its intended location; it will not 'fit in' and complement the area, but will instead completely dominate it.

ALDP Policy PV14 Water Quality, exists to "To protect and enhance the quality of the water environment ... " and goes on to specify that "Development proposals which do not maintain or enhance the water environment will not be supported", and that "Development proposals must not pollute surface or underground water including water supply catchment areas due to discharge, leachates or disturbance of contaminated land" The development area and close by has several active wells, one of which is the sole water supply for two dwellings not connected to the mains, plus other clear evidence of an active aquifer beneath the entire area of the development. It is impossible to see how the current quality of the water environment will be maintained, let alone enhanced, by 64000 hens having free range over 80 acres of ground which will be subject to run off and leaching, plus run off from the sheds themselves.

ALDP states that Proposals will be expected to comply with all relevant policies within the plan. My contention is that is clearly does not, and the application should be rejected without leave to appeal.

Ruari Kelly

From: Jake Stewart [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 June 2021 12:20
To: Ruari Kelly
Subject: Objection to Ref. No: 21/00337/FULM

Ruari,

I have tried to keep this objection short but am unable to reduce it any further to fit into 2000 characters as allowed on Angus council site. I have sent previous correspondence which indicate the level of detail examination and calculation undertaken when scrutinising this proposal. It is disappointing if this information is not made available to others for review.

Here is my abridged objection to :

Erection of two 32,000 capacity free-range hen sheds and associated infrastructure including feed silos, egg packing facility, vehicular access, access tracks, drainage and landscaping [Open for comment icon](#)

Field 530M West Of North Mains Of Cononsyth Farm Cononsyth Arbroath

Ref. No: 21/00337/FULM

-----000000-----

I am a local resident and live 1.6 km north from this proposed development with a clear uninterrupted view of the field and proposed sheds.

I strongly object to the application on the grounds that the application has elements which are contrary to the Tayside Strategic Development Plan, Angus Development Plan, and pose an indeterminate risk to the biosecurity and community health of the surrounding area.

The Tayside strategy “sets out a presumption in favour sustainable development...” this application does not demonstrate sustainability. It merely cites the use of alternative energy sources and the use of local grown produce. Little supportive evidence is given. It is my belief based on available figures that significant volumes of chicken feed, energy and effluent will be required to be transported to and from the local area, vastly increasing the traffic flow on an unclassified road (U467).

Regarding Policy DS1, this proposed development does not correctly comply with this policy. Other locations closer to existing buildings of similar design should be considered. There is no evidence given that was undertaken, only a statement supporting the siting of the sheds.

The field identified for development is grade 3.1 prime quality agricultural land. Once these buildings are established for this field it will no longer be usable as crop production (PV20.) The applicant claims diversification from cereal crops to poultry/pigs is based on the need to weather climate conditions and market fluctuation. But with the national egg market at 85% saturation and uncertain economic egg demand can be seen a risky development, as is demonstrated by the locally unused IPU sites at Pressock and outside Letham.

Developments of this nature can only add to the global climate condition problem though the CO2 emissions. When asked about the increase in CO2 emissions very little detail was forthcoming from the applicant, so using the available data I believe that the attempts to offset carbon by planting trees is grossly overestimated by the applicant. Our Scottish Government goal of reducing emission by 75% by 2030 will not be supported by this development.

Biodiversity in the area has already been reduced by the applicant with the destruction of 50+ year old woodland, which was used to fuel the applicant biomass boiler.

Traffic on the U467 (a single track road) but a main access/egress road south will be additionally severely impacted by the increase of multiple new HGV movements. I believe the applicant has underestimated the volume and frequency of traffic which will be required to build and subsequently service the development. The solution offered to build a passing place will destroy field dykes and effectively give priority to HGV's and all other traffic will need to give way regardless of through traffic's road position. Furthermore, the accuracy of the traffic survey that was carried in January during the national lockdown should not be considered typical for this road at all times of the year, especially now the lockdown is coming to an end. The traffic emerging point from U467 onto the B961 is dangerous with impaired vision and at the apex of extremely tight bend radius. HGV's will have to take up all the B961 to turn in and out of this junction.

Whereas our lives for the last 18months have been changed due to COVID viruses, avian bird flu is recognised to be most prominent and most likely the next potential epidemic emerging. The Angus Development Plan for biosecurity has not been updated to sufficiently counter this threat. The best way to minimise the risk from epidemic is to remove the source- and not to introduce a new source.

There is mounting academic research and international scrutiny of the negative effects of IPU's on health, especially to children and those with chronic respiratory problems. This community health situation is presently being discussed in the UK and Scottish parliaments. With the outcome most likely being a tightening of regulations. Knowing this inevitability then no further developments such as this proposed should be consciously approved.

Finally, looking at the ALDP VISION AND OUTCOMES, "Angus is a place where a first class quality of life can be enjoyed by all." This development has undeniable adverse impacts on the environment, and the amenity of those who live nearby.

Jake STEWART

Kirkden Schoolhouse,

West Mains of Gardyne

Forfar

DD82SR



Virus-free. www.avg.com

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLANNING](#)
Subject: *POSSIBLE SPAM*Objection to 21/000337FULM
Date: 11 June 2021 16:17:01

FAO Ruari Kelly. Case officer Angus council.

Objection to:

21/00337/FULM | Erection of two 32,000 capacity free-range hen sheds and associated infrastructure including feed silos, egg packing facility, vehicular access, access tracks, drainage and landscaping | Field 530M West Of North Mains Of Cononsyth Farm, Cononsyth, Arbroath.

Dear Ruari and the Planning Committee.

I ask that a copy of this letter is made available to the whole Committee delegated the task of assessing this application.

I strongly object to this application. At a time when the UK has multiple outbreaks of bird flu, the links to pandemics and factory farming are scientifically proven and it has been shown that people who eat a plant-based diet are 73% less likely to contract severe covid it has never been more important for these abhorrent farming practices to be stopped. Please see my full detailed email below.

Please accept my objection to the above planning application.

My reasons are as follows:

HUMAN HEALTH:

PANDEMICS

We are in the middle of a pandemic that is killing people. Scientists have predicted that the next pandemic will start as an Avian Flu.

<https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/66/wr/mm6635a2.htm>

Since November 2020 we have had 25 outbreaks of Avian Flu in the UK.

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/avian-influenza-bird-flu>

Some of these have been outbreaks in Scotland itself :

[Avian influenza \(bird flu\): how to spot and report the disease - gov.scot \(www.gov.scot\)](#)

On 18 February 2021, the National IHR Focal Point for the Russian Federation notified WHO of detection of avian influenza A(H5N8) in seven **human** clinical specimens. These are the first reported detection of avian influenza A(H5N8) in **humans**.

<https://www.who.int/csr/don/26-feb-2021-influenza-a-russian-federation/en/>

If we just look at the past 100 years of influenza pandemics, epidemics, and control strategies then the question must be whether another pandemic like the 1918 Spanish influenza, with such a deadly and disruptive impact on society killing 50 million people, is possible?

The answer is yes: it is not only possible, but it is just a matter of time.

It is important to note that there are concerns from many people in the UK of another impending pandemic of which a factory farm could well become the cause with their overcrowding and unhygienic conditions. Why on earth would a planning application for another Intensive factory farm even be considered at this time?

It is a massive risk to consider introducing an industrial chicken farm on such an enormous scale, **64000** birds, with high population densities and genetically homogenous birds. Given the known propensity for low pathogenic viral strains to mutate into high pathogenic strains amongst poultry flocks, and potential to become more easily transmissible to other mammals, it is not scaremongering to treat this development as an ongoing risk to human health.

It is noteworthy that the H5 group of highly pathogenic influenza viruses were never reported in humans before the mid-1990s; now they are found in humans in several countries every year.

The World Health Organisation (WHO) has said "... authorities have a responsibility for controlling zoonoses – diseases

transmissible from animals to humans through direct contact or through food, water and the environment. An estimated 75% of emerging pathogens are of zoonotic nature”.

Scientists estimate “that more than 6 out of every 10 known infectious diseases in people can be spread from animals” (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention <https://www.cdc.gov/onehealth/basics/zoonotic-diseases.html>)

Please consider this list of UK Government zoonotic diseases. It is a long and frightening list.
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/list-of-zoonotic-diseases/list-of-zoonotic-diseases>

To exemplify this further, listed UK diseases linked to just chickens (there are similar lists for other farmed species) include:

- Avian Flu (Animal influenza)
- Campylobacteriosis
- Psittacosis
- Salmonellosis

ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE

THE WHO states "Antibiotic resistance is one of the biggest threats to global health, food security, and development today." (<https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance>)

and “If no action is taken - warns the (UN Ad hoc Interagency Coordinating Group on Antimicrobial Resistance) – drug-resistant diseases could cause 10 million deaths each year by 2050 and damage to the economy as catastrophic as the 2008-2009 global financial crisis. By 2030, antimicrobial resistance could force up to 24 million people into extreme poverty. Currently, at least 700,000 people die each year due to drug-resistant diseases, including 230,000 people who die from multidrug-resistant tuberculosis. More and more common diseases, including respiratory tract infections, sexually transmitted infections and urinary tract infections, are untreatable; lifesaving medical procedures are becoming much riskier, and our food systems are increasingly precarious”.

(<https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/29-04-2019-new-report-calls-for-urgent-action-to-avert-antimicrobial-resistance-crisis>)

The WHO also state “Antibiotic resistance occurs naturally, but misuse of antibiotics in humans and animals is accelerating the process.” (www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance)

The Soil Association says (www.soilassociation.org/reducing-antibiotics-in-farming/)

“Farm animals consume one-third of all antibiotics in the UK and it is intensive farming systems that use drugs at unnecessarily high levels, putting human health at risk.”

“The routine use of antibiotics in intensive farming systems is driving this problem. Drugs are given to animals as a preventative measure - before they show signs of illness - to compensate for animals being housed in cramped, unsanitary conditions where infections spread fast. Intensively reared pigs and poultry account for 79 % of UK farming antibiotic use”

Looking holistically, what is more important, planning rules, another factory farm or people dying?

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

The short-term benefits of employment and meat production are outweighed by the environmental impact that it will have on the local area which is already facing a climate emergency. What we eat has a huge impact on the environment and has potential to cause disease and pandemics so applications should be considered in line with our broader responsibilities to protect future generations.

Furthermore, the Government sees Local Authorities as central to delivering its CO₂ emission targets yet more and more intensive farming applications are going through planning departments across the UK. It is important to recognise the significant impact just one factory farm will have on the pollution and environment of the local area.

To quote DEFRA 2007 - “The production of food from animal agriculture is a significant source of emissions in the UK, especially the production of GHGs and pollution of water sources. For pigs and poultry, the main pollutants are ammonia and N₂O. Nitrous oxide (N₂O) has 296 times the Global Warming Potential of CO₂ and ammonia (NH₃), contributes significantly to acidification of rain and soils. The agriculture sector accounts for around 37%, 66% and 88% of total UK

emissions of CH₄, N₂O and NH₃, respectively (NAEI, 2007), nearly all of which is derived from livestock production.”
(<http://sciencesearch.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=14662>)

If the science was clear in 2007, why are planning applications for intensive livestock units still being approved when the Government sees Local Authorities as central to delivering its CO₂ emission targets?

“Ammonia and nitrogen pollution, mostly from agriculture, is harming more than 60% of the UK’s land area and affecting the most sensitive habitats, according to a DEFRA report. Ammonia pollution also effects species composition through soil acidification, direct toxic damage to leaves and by altering the susceptibility of plants to frost, drought and pathogens. At its most serious, certain sensitive and iconic habitats may be lost”
(<https://www.endsreport.com/article/1588258/ammonia-pollution-harming-60-uk-land-area>)

LOCAL IMPACT and SITE-SPECIFIC INFORMATION

On the Angus Council Website there are various statements that the council has committed to which this type of development actively goes against, below are just a few excerpts:

We support the principle of sustainable development and are committed to improving the quality of life for present and future generations in Angus. By a process of integrating responses to environmental, social and economic issues the council will help to maximise human welfare while enhancing the environment in Angus.

We will seek to:

- *promote a sustainable approach to land and habitat management.*
- *protect and enhance local biodiversity.*
- *encourage a sustainable managed approach to public access to the natural environment.*

We will seek to:

- *reduce local pollution of air, land, water and to reduce the incidence of noise and light pollution.*

We will seek to:

- *conserve and enhance the historic and cultural heritage of Angus and the local characteristics of the towns and villages.*
- *encourage design in new or regeneration developments which will improve access for the disabled and create an environment free from the fear of crime.*
- *ensure that new developments are in line with sustainable development priorities in regard to location and design.*
- *conserve and promote a network of greenspace within the built environment which links to the surrounding countryside through a footpath network.*

The documented discussions from the Angus Council Development Standards Committee 15 Sept also mentions:
In this case the proposed development would involve the loss of prime agricultural land (Policy PV20); it would introduce a use that could generate odour and noise in proximity to existing residential uses (Policy DS4); it would have impacts on the landscape (Policy PV6) and it is located in an area where SEPA flood maps indicate there is a flood risk (Policy PV12 and 15).

Animal agriculture does not protect wildlife – quite the opposite – as this 2019 Defra report illustrates:
(https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/834432/evidence-compendium-26sep19.pdf)

“Biodiversity - Farming practices can have many impacts that can lead to a reduction in wildlife biodiversity (including loss of habitats and food sources). The UK farmland bird index, an indicator of the state of wildlife generally, has fallen to less than half its 1970 value”.

According to Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences - since humans became farmers, just 17% of wild mammal species remain (from mice to elephants).

As the site is relatively close to a number of residential properties this development can only have an increased negative effect on the local residents, in particular noise, odour, pollution and disease.

A chicken farm of this size will produce enormous amounts of faecal matter, much of which could be deposited on the outdoor ranging areas and from there into the local watercourses and river habitats.

GLOBAL HUNGER

The impact of factory farming also goes beyond the local environment to global food poverty and UK food insecurity. The Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations predicts that by 2050 world meat production will have almost doubled global warming, pollution, deforestation, land degradation, water scarcity and species extinction all increasing as a consequence.

850 million people go hungry every day. Animal agriculture uses 83% of farmland but only produces 18% of calories (Joseph Poore, Oxford University).

“We already produce enough to feed the world. It’s overconsumption – especially of animal protein by the global middle class, inequality, waste and inadequate production/distribution systems - that stands in the way of enough food for everyone and space for wildlife. To feed the world in a way our one planet can sustain, we need to consume and produce food differently”. (Worldwide Fund for Nature. Appetite for Destruction)

ANIMAL SUFFERING

Another reason for my objection is that I do not feel this application for a factory farm represents current public opinion. In a recent survey 85% of the public were against Factory Farms.

In addition, Defra 2019 reported that a survey showed that 78% of people felt it was “very important” to protect the welfare of farmed animals and that 82% said farmers should be rewarded for offering animals higher welfare standards.

Although the current animal welfare laws in the UK are slim I feel it is morally wrong to subject sentient animals capable of fear and misery to overcrowding, unhygienic conditions, large scale antibiotic use, mutilations without anaesthetic and no chance of a normal life. Factory farms like these result in close confinement aggression and arguably completely prevent any sense of normal behaviour as defined in the Animal Welfare Act 2006.

Whilst I appreciate that animal welfare is not a planning consideration, I would like to draw your attention to the recent Animal Aid investigation into another unit where the group exposed some terrible conditions. Footage showed hens with extensive feather loss, injured birds and several dead and decomposing birds left among the living. Conditions were extremely dirty with heavy dust and faeces accumulating. A very small percentage of the birds were outside ‘ranging’ during the daytime, this may be attributed to crowding and social hierarchy which prevents birds accessing pop holes. Some hens may never range outside. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O7ISh7cMOXA&list=UUOU-2dlbbNDhtW7rHr3RG2g>

Two sheds are proposed for the purpose of accommodating 32,000 laying hens each, totalling 64,000 hen capacity at the site. In light of this, we really must question whether the health and welfare of an even larger population of birds can possibly be effectively monitored generally or safeguarded in an emergency situation. And more widely question whether such huge scale, vertical farming with many thousands of hens, can really constitute ‘free-range’.

Whilst sadly not a legal consideration it most certainly should be a moral one.

Plant based diets are gaining favour with the public as people of this country are recognising that they have been eating diets that are poor for their health and the links meat consumption has to cancer and cardiovascular disease. Vegans and vegetarians look set to make up a quarter of the UK population in 2025 and with vegetarian and vegan product sales expected to increase to £658m by 2021 it begs the question is another factory farm really right for this community?

SUMMARY

The future looks grim.

- More pandemics.
- A climate raging out of control.
- Environmental damage.
- Biodiversity loss.
- Global food poverty and UK food insecurity.
- Antibiotic resistance - antibiotics used to keep animals in cramped, unhygienic conditions alive until slaughter.

- Animal mutilations without anaesthetic and no chance of a normal life.

The science is clear. Factory farming of animals is a leading cause of all the above.

With this in mind, I write to ask you to protect today's children, from serious problems that will dominate their future if we do not act now. Not just pandemics but the climate crisis, environmental problems, antibiotic resistance..... it paints a horrifying picture.

The climate crisis is here but the greatest impacts of it will be felt by our own children. Biodiversity is being lost, environments destroyed, soil quality diminishing. Pandemics are already a threat and antibiotic resistance is growing.

I OBJECT strongly to this application on the above grounds.

Yours faithfully
Judith Clegg

[Redacted signature block]

Second Home | 47-49 Princes Place | London | W11 4QA
231 West 29th Street | Suite 703 | New York 10001

[Redacted contact information]

[Redacted contact information]

Comments for Planning Application 21/00337/FULM

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00337/FULM

Address: Field 530M West Of North Mains Of Cononsyth Farm Cononsyth Arbroath

Proposal: Erection of two 32,000 capacity free-range hen sheds and associated infrastructure including feed silos, egg packing facility, vehicular access, access tracks, drainage and landscaping

Case Officer: Ruari Kelly

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Karen Neill

Address: Easter Denhead Farm Coupar Angus PH13 Blairgowrie PH13 9ET

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I support this proposal for free range hen sheds at Cononsyth for the following reasons:

The agricultural industry has had to adapt to the public needs of high welfare and environmentally friendly produced local food, this project is a good example for meeting all of this criteria.

Pressures within the global economy mean that farming has to diversify in order to survive - this project is a good example of future planning to ensure sustainability. Farmers must look to the future and evolve appropriately.

Any enterprise that produces a locally made commodity for a local market must be encouraged.

This project will also meet the requirements of a customer base who demand high quality goods, high levels of animal welfare, locally produced goods ensuring value for money.

Poultry, kept in these conditions, will experience higher welfare standards as they have access to the outdoor environment

The building of this project, and its associated infrastructure, will provide both short and long-term local employment at a time when it is solely needed.

Running this enterprise on renewable energy, highlights the developer's desire to care for the environment as well as making the most of what is naturally available.

From: [REDACTED]
To: PLANNING
Subject: Objection to: 21/00337/FULM | Erection of two 32,000 capacity free-range hen.....
Date: 11 June 2021 17:37:52
Attachments: 21_00337 FULM Angus Chicken Farm - Letter.docx

FAO Ruari Kelly. Case officer Angus council.

Objection to:

21/00337/FULM | Erection of two 32,000 capacity free-range hen sheds and associated infrastructure including feed silos, egg packing facility, vehicular access, access tracks, drainage and landscaping | Field 530M West Of North Mains Of Cononsyth Farm, Cononsyth, Arbroath.

Dear Ruari and the Planning Committee.

I ask that a copy of this letter is made available to the whole Committee delegated the task of assessing this application.

Please accept my objection to the above planning application.

My reasons are as follows:

HUMAN HEALTH:

PANDEMICS

We are in the middle of a pandemic that is killing people. Scientists have predicted that the next pandemic will start as an Avian Flu.

<https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/66/wr/mm6635a2.htm>

Since November 2020 we have had 25 outbreaks of Avian Flu in the UK.

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/avian-influenza-bird-flu>

Some of these have been outbreaks in Scotland itself :

Avian influenza (bird flu): how to spot and report the disease - gov.scot (www.gov.scot)

On 18 February 2021, the National IHR Focal Point for the Russian Federation notified WHO of detection of avian influenza A(H5N8) in seven **human** clinical specimens. These are the first reported detection of avian influenza A(H5N8) in **humans**.

<https://www.who.int/csr/don/26-feb-2021-influenza-a-russian-federation/en/>

If we just look at the past 100 years of influenza pandemics, epidemics, and control strategies then the question must be whether another pandemic like the 1918 Spanish influenza, with such a deadly and disruptive impact on society killing 50 million people, is possible?

The answer is yes: it is not only possible, but it is just a matter of time.

It is important to note that there are concerns from many people in the UK of another impending pandemic of which a factory farm could well become the cause with their overcrowding and unhygienic conditions. Why on earth would a planning application for another Intensive factory farm even be considered at this time?

It is a massive risk to consider introducing an industrial chicken farm on such an enormous scale, **64000** birds, with high population densities and genetically homogenous birds. Given the known propensity for low pathogenic viral strains to mutate into high pathogenic strains amongst poultry flocks, and potential to become more easily transmissible to other mammals, it is not scaremongering to treat this development as an ongoing risk to human health.

It is noteworthy that the H5 group of highly pathogenic influenza viruses were never reported in humans before the mid-1990s; now they are found in humans in several countries every year.

The World Health Organisation (WHO) has said "... authorities have a responsibility for controlling zoonoses –

diseases transmissible from animals to humans through direct contact or through food, water and the environment. An estimated 75% of emerging pathogens are of zoonotic nature”.

Scientists estimate “that more than 6 out of every 10 known infectious diseases in people can be spread from animals” (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention <https://www.cdc.gov/onehealth/basics/zoonotic-diseases.html>)

Please consider this list of UK Government zoonotic diseases. It is a long and frightening list. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/list-of-zoonotic-diseases/list-of-zoonotic-diseases>

To exemplify this further, listed UK diseases linked to just chickens (there are similar lists for other farmed species) include:

- Avian Flu (Animal influenza)
- Campylobacteriosis
- Psittacosis
- Salmonellosis

ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE

THE WHO states "Antibiotic resistance is one of the biggest threats to global health, food security, and development today." (<https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance>)

and “If no action is taken - warns the (UN Ad hoc Interagency Coordinating Group on Antimicrobial Resistance) – drug-resistant diseases could cause 10 million deaths each year by 2050 and damage to the economy as catastrophic as the 2008-2009 global financial crisis. By 2030, antimicrobial resistance could force up to 24 million people into extreme poverty. Currently, at least 700,000 people die each year due to drug-resistant diseases, including 230,000 people who die from multidrug-resistant tuberculosis. More and more common diseases, including respiratory tract infections, sexually transmitted infections and urinary tract infections, are untreatable; lifesaving medical procedures are becoming much riskier, and our food systems are increasingly precarious”. (<https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/29-04-2019-new-report-calls-for-urgent-action-to-avert-antimicrobial-resistance-crisis>)

The WHO also state “Antibiotic resistance occurs naturally, but misuse of antibiotics in humans and animals is accelerating the process.” (www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance)

The Soil Association says (www.soilassociation.org/reducing-antibiotics-in-farming/)

“Farm animals consume one-third of all antibiotics in the UK and it is intensive farming systems that use drugs at unnecessarily high levels, putting human health at risk.”

“The routine use of antibiotics in intensive farming systems is driving this problem. Drugs are given to animals as a preventative measure - before they show signs of illness - to compensate for animals being housed in cramped, unsanitary conditions where infections spread fast. Intensively reared pigs and poultry account for 79 % of UK farming antibiotic use”

Looking holistically, what is more important, planning rules, another factory farm or people dying?

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

The short-term benefits of employment and meat production are outweighed by the environmental impact that it will have on the local area which is already facing a climate emergency. What we eat has a huge impact on the environment and has potential to cause disease and pandemics so applications should be considered in line with our broader responsibilities to protect future generations.

Furthermore, the Government sees Local Authorities as central to delivering its CO₂ emission targets yet more and more intensive farming applications are going through planning departments across the UK. It is important to recognise the significant impact just one factory farm will have on the pollution and environment of the local area.

To quote DEFRA 2007 - “The production of food from animal agriculture is a significant source of emissions in

the UK, especially the production of GHGs and pollution of water sources. For pigs and poultry, the main pollutants are ammonia and N₂O. Nitrous oxide (N₂O) has 296 times the Global Warming Potential of CO₂ and ammonia (NH₃), contributes significantly to acidification of rain and soils. The agriculture sector accounts for around 37%, 66% and 88% of total UK emissions of CH₄, N₂O and NH₃, respectively (NAEI, 2007), nearly all of which is derived from livestock production.”

([http://sciencesearch.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?](http://sciencesearch.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=14662)

[Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=14662](http://sciencesearch.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=14662))

If the science was clear in 2007, why are planning applications for intensive livestock units still being approved when the Government sees Local Authorities as central to delivering its CO₂ emission targets?

“Ammonia and nitrogen pollution, mostly from agriculture, is harming more than 60% of the UK’s land area and affecting the most sensitive habitats, according to a DEFRA report. Ammonia pollution also effects species composition through soil acidification, direct toxic damage to leaves and by altering the susceptibility of plants to frost, drought and pathogens. At its most serious, certain sensitive and iconic habitats may be lost” (<https://www.endsreport.com/article/1588258/ammonia-pollution-harming-60-uk-land-area>)

LOCAL IMPACT and SITE-SPECIFIC INFORMATION

On the Angus Council Website there are various statements that the council has committed to which this type of development actively goes against, below are just a few excerpts:

We support the principle of sustainable development and are committed to improving the quality of life for present and future generations in Angus. By a process of integrating responses to environmental, social and economic issues the council will help to maximise human welfare while enhancing the environment in Angus.

We will seek to:

- *promote a sustainable approach to land and habitat management.*
- *protect and enhance local biodiversity.*
- *encourage a sustainable managed approach to public access to the natural environment.*

We will seek to:

- *reduce local pollution of air, land, water and to reduce the incidence of noise and light pollution.*

We will seek to:

- *conserve and enhance the historic and cultural heritage of Angus and the local characteristics of the towns and villages.*
- *encourage design in new or regeneration developments which will improve access for the disabled and create an environment free from the fear of crime.*
- *ensure that new developments are in line with sustainable development priorities in regard to location and design.*
- *conserve and promote a network of greenspace within the built environment which links to the surrounding countryside through a footpath network.*

The documented discussions from the Angus Council Development Standards Committee 15 Sept also mentions: *In this case the proposed development would involve the loss of prime agricultural land (Policy PV20); it would introduce a use that could generate odour and noise in proximity to existing residential uses (Policy DS4); it would have impacts on the landscape (Policy PV6) and it is located in an area where SEPA flood maps indicate there is a flood risk (Policy PV12 and 15).*

Animal agriculture does not protect wildlife – quite the opposite – as this 2019 Defra report illustrates:

(https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/834432/evidence-compendium-26sep19.pdf)

“Biodiversity - Farming practices can have many impacts that can lead to a reduction in wildlife biodiversity (including loss of habitats and food sources). The UK farmland bird index, an indicator of the state of wildlife

generally, has fallen to less than half its 1970 value”.

According to Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences - since humans became farmers, just 17% of wild mammal species remain (from mice to elephants).

As the site is relatively close to a number of residential properties this development can only have an increased negative effect on the local residents, in particular noise, odour, pollution and disease.

A chicken farm of this size will produce enormous amounts of faecal matter, much of which could be deposited on the outdoor ranging areas and from there into the local watercourses and river habitats.

GLOBAL HUNGER

The impact of factory farming also goes beyond the local environment to global food poverty and UK food insecurity. The Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations predicts that by 2050 world meat production will have almost **doubled** global warming, pollution, deforestation, land degradation, water scarcity and species extinction all increasing as a consequence.

850 million people go hungry every day. Animal agriculture uses 83% of farmland but only produces 18% of calories (Joseph Poore, Oxford University).

“We already produce enough to feed the world. It’s overconsumption – especially of animal protein by the global middle class, inequality, waste and inadequate production/distribution systems - that stands in the way of enough food for everyone and space for wildlife. To feed the world in a way our one planet can sustain, we need to consume and produce food differently”. (Worldwide Fund for Nature. Appetite for Destruction)

ANIMAL SUFFERING

Another reason for my objection is that I do not feel this application for a factory farm represents current public opinion. In a recent survey 85% of the public were against Factory Farms.

In addition, Defra 2019 reported that a survey showed that 78% of people felt it was “very important” to protect the welfare of farmed animals and that 82% said farmers should be rewarded for offering animals higher welfare standards.

Although the current animal welfare laws in the UK are slim I feel it is morally wrong to subject sentient animals capable of fear and misery to overcrowding, unhygienic conditions, large scale antibiotic use, mutilations without anaesthetic and no chance of a normal life. Factory farms like these result in close confinement aggression and arguably completely prevent any sense of normal behaviour as defined in the Animal Welfare Act 2006.

Whilst I appreciate that animal welfare is not a planning consideration, I would like to draw your attention to the recent Animal Aid investigation into another unit where the group exposed some terrible conditions. Footage showed hens with extensive feather loss, injured birds and several dead and decomposing birds left among the living. Conditions were extremely dirty with heavy dust and faeces accumulating. A very small percentage of the birds were outside ‘ranging’ during the daytime, this may be attributed to crowding and social hierarchy which prevents birds accessing pop holes. Some hens may never range outside. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O7ISh7cMOXA&list=UUQU-2dIbbNDhtW7rHr3RG2g>

Two sheds are proposed for the purpose of accommodating 32,000 laying hens each, totalling 64,000 hen capacity at the site. In light of this, we really must question whether the health and welfare of an even larger population of birds can possibly be effectively monitored generally or safeguarded in an emergency situation. And more widely question whether such huge scale, vertical farming with many thousands of hens, can really constitute ‘free-range’.

Whilst sadly not a legal consideration it most certainly should be a moral one.

Plant based diets are gaining favour with the public as people of this country are recognising that they have been eating diets that are poor for their health and the links meat consumption has to cancer and cardiovascular disease. Vegans and vegetarians look set to make up a quarter of the UK population in 2025 and with vegetarian and vegan product sales expected to increase to £658m by 2021 it begs the question is another factory farm really right for this community?

SUMMARY

The future looks grim.

- More pandemics.
- A climate raging out of control.
- Environmental damage.
- Biodiversity loss.
- Global food poverty and UK food insecurity.
- Antibiotic resistance - antibiotics used to keep animals in cramped, unhygienic conditions alive until slaughter.
- Animal mutilations without anaesthetic and no chance of a normal life.

The science is clear. Factory farming of animals is a leading cause of all the above.

With this in mind, I write to ask you to protect today's children, from serious problems that will dominate their future if we do not act now. Not just pandemics but the climate crisis, environmental problems, antibiotic resistance..... it paints a horrifying picture.

The climate crisis is here but the greatest impacts of it will be felt by our own children. Biodiversity is being lost, environments destroyed, soil quality diminishing. Pandemics are already a threat and antibiotic resistance is growing.

I OBJECT strongly to this application on the above grounds.

Yours faithfully,
Kathleen Hogan

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLANNING](#)
Subject: Re: No More Pandemics,Reverse Global warming.
Date: 10 June 2021 18:13:30

Planning application number is 21/00337/FULM

I strongly oppose to this Planning application.
Thank you.

On 10 Jun 2021 18:03, laetitia blanc [REDACTED] wrote:

Laetitia Blanc living in Pinner HA5 3XG
24 Lyndhurst Gardens.

On 10 Jun 2021 18:00, laetitia blanc [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear to whom it may concerns!

Why factory farming are still opening when we must all close them Down?
We have too many of them and they are destroying everything.

How many more pandemics do we need to have before people understand that all
pandemics are coming from meat!
Myself I suffered with swine flu back in 2009!

Meat industry is the NUMBER ONE leading cause for Global warming which is also
causing deforestations and loss of habitat therefore loss of Animals.
The icebergs are melting quicker than previously thought which is very dangerous.
Polar bears and other Animals are struggling because of humans Activities like factory
farming.

Why selling toxic food for people!?
These poor chickens are unhealthy and suffering fill with Antibiotics,hormones and
preservatives.

This is not farming this is Animals abuse and cruelty.

Reasons to oppose
Pandemics,Antibiotics resistance,Environmental impact even if it will be in middle of
nowhere air pollution,Local impact,Global hunger and UK food insecurity,Animals
suffering,biodiversity loss....

More and more people are transitioning towards a plant-based diet.

Your piece of paper won't be able to save us from our own EXTINCTION.

Please can you think of your children?
Even of yourself do you seriously want to witness the END of the world.
The day that we won't have any fish left in the seas and oceans,this will be the END.
Stop destroying everything.

Thank you for taking this email with consideration and seriously.

Laetitia Blanc.
Edouard Monriot.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLANNING](#)
Subject: FAO Ruari Kelly. Case officer Angus council.
Date: 11 June 2021 23:20:43

Objection to:

21/00337/FULM | Erection of two 32,000 capacity free-range hen sheds and associated infrastructure including feed silos, egg packing facility, vehicular access, access tracks, drainage and landscaping | Field 530M West Of North Mains Of Cononsyth Farm, Cononsyth, Arbroath.

Dear Ruari and the Planning Committee.

I ask that a copy of this letter is made available to the whole Committee delegated the task of assessing this application.

Please accept my objection to the above planning application.

I am really disappoint to hear of this and I do not understand how anyone could think this is a good idea for the following reasons:

HUMAN HEALTH:

PANDEMICS

We are in the middle of a pandemic that is killing people. Have we learnt nothing? Scientists have predicted that the next pandemic will start as an Avian Flu.

<https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/66/wr/mm6635a2.htm>

Since November 2020 we have had 25 outbreaks of Avian Flu in the UK.

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/avian-influenza-bird-flu>

Some of these have been outbreaks in Scotland itself :

[Avian influenza \(bird flu\): how to spot and report the disease - gov.scot \(www.gov.scot\)](#)

On 18 February 2021, the National IHR Focal Point for the Russian Federation notified WHO of detection of avian influenza A(H5N8) in seven **human** clinical specimens. These are the first reported detection of avian influenza A(H5N8) in **humans**.

<https://www.who.int/csr/don/26-feb-2021-influenza-a-russian-federation/en/>

If we just look at the past 100 years of influenza pandemics, epidemics, and control strategies then the question must be whether another pandemic like the 1918 Spanish influenza, with such a deadly and disruptive impact on society killing 50 million people, is possible?

The answer is yes: it is not only possible, but it is just a matter of time.

It is important to note that there are concerns from many people in the UK of another impending pandemic of which a factory farm could well become the cause with their overcrowding and unhygienic conditions. Why on earth would a planning application for another Intensive factory farm even be considered at this time?

It is a massive risk to consider introducing an industrial chicken farm on such an enormous scale, **64000** birds, with high population densities and genetically homogenous birds. Given the known propensity for low pathogenic viral strains to mutate into high pathogenic strains amongst poultry flocks, and potential to become more easily transmissible to other mammals, it is not scaremongering to treat this development as an ongoing risk to human health.

It is noteworthy that the H5 group of highly pathogenic influenza viruses were never reported in humans before the mid-1990s; now they are found in humans in several countries every year.

The World Health Organisation (WHO) has said "... authorities have a responsibility for controlling zoonoses – diseases transmissible from animals to humans through direct contact or through food, water and the environment. An estimated 75% of emerging pathogens are of zoonotic nature".

Scientists estimate "that more than 6 out of every 10 known infectious diseases in people can be spread from animals" (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention <https://www.cdc.gov/onehealth/basics/zoonotic-diseases.html>)

Please consider this list of UK Government zoonotic diseases. It is a long and frightening list.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/list-of-zoonotic-diseases/list-of-zoonotic-diseases>

To exemplify this further, listed UK diseases linked to just chickens (there are similar lists for other farmed species) include:

- Avian Flu (Animal influenza)
- Campylobacteriosis

- Psittacosis
- Salmonellosis

ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE

THE WHO states "Antibiotic resistance is one of the biggest threats to global health, food security, and development today." (<https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance>)

and "If no action is taken - warns the (UN Ad hoc Interagency Coordinating Group on Antimicrobial Resistance) – drug-resistant diseases could cause 10 million deaths each year by 2050 and damage to the economy as catastrophic as the 2008-2009 global financial crisis. By 2030, antimicrobial resistance could force up to 24 million people into extreme poverty. Currently, at least 700,000 people die each year due to drug-resistant diseases, including 230,000 people who die from multidrug-resistant tuberculosis. More and more common diseases, including respiratory tract infections, sexually transmitted infections and urinary tract infections, are untreatable; lifesaving medical procedures are becoming much riskier, and our food systems are increasingly precarious".

(<https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/29-04-2019-new-report-calls-for-urgent-action-to-avert-antimicrobial-resistance-crisis>)

The WHO also state "Antibiotic resistance occurs naturally, but misuse of antibiotics in humans and animals is accelerating the process." (www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance)

The Soil Association says (www.soilassociation.org/reducing-antibiotics-in-farming/)

"Farm animals consume one-third of all antibiotics in the UK and it is intensive farming systems that use drugs at unnecessarily high levels, putting human health at risk."

"The routine use of antibiotics in intensive farming systems is driving this problem. Drugs are given to animals as a preventative measure - before they show signs of illness - to compensate for animals being housed in cramped, unsanitary conditions where infections spread fast. Intensively reared pigs and poultry account for 79 % of UK farming antibiotic use"

Looking holistically, what is more important, planning rules, another factory farm or people dying?

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

The short-term benefits of employment and meat production are outweighed by the environmental impact that it will have on the local area which is already facing a climate emergency. What we eat has a huge impact on the environment and has potential to cause disease and pandemics so applications should be considered in line with our broader responsibilities to protect future generations.

Furthermore, the Government sees Local Authorities as central to delivering its CO₂ emission targets yet more and more intensive farming applications are going through planning departments across the UK. It is important to recognise the significant impact just one factory farm will have on the pollution and environment of the local area.

To quote DEFRA 2007 - “The production of food from animal agriculture is a significant source of emissions in the UK, especially the production of GHGs and pollution of water sources. For pigs and poultry, the main pollutants are ammonia and N₂O. Nitrous oxide (N₂O) has 296 times the Global Warming Potential of CO₂ and ammonia (NH₃), contributes significantly to acidification of rain and soils. The agriculture sector accounts for around 37%, 66% and 88% of total UK emissions of CH₄, N₂O and NH₃, respectively (NAEI, 2007), nearly all of which is derived from livestock production.”

<http://sciencesearch.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=14662>

If the science was clear in 2007, why are planning applications for intensive livestock units still being approved when the Government sees Local Authorities as central to delivering its CO₂ emission targets?

“Ammonia and nitrogen pollution, mostly from agriculture, is harming more than 60% of the UK’s land area and affecting the most sensitive habitats, according to a DEFRA report. Ammonia pollution also effects species composition through soil acidification, direct toxic damage to leaves and by altering the susceptibility of plants to frost, drought and pathogens. At its most serious, certain sensitive and iconic habitats may be lost”
<https://www.endsreport.com/article/1588258/ammonia-pollution-harming-60-uk-land-area>

LOCAL IMPACT and SITE-SPECIFIC INFORMATION

On the Angus Council Website there are various statements that the council has committed to which this type of development actively goes against, below are just a few excerpts:

We support the principle of sustainable development and are committed to improving the quality of life for present and future generations in Angus. By a process of integrating responses to environmental, social and economic issues the council will help to maximise human welfare while enhancing the environment in Angus.

We will seek to:

- *promote a sustainable approach to land and habitat management.*
- *protect and enhance local biodiversity.*
- *encourage a sustainable managed approach to public access to the natural environment.*

We will seek to:

- *reduce local pollution of air, land, water and to reduce the incidence of noise and light pollution.*

We will seek to:

- *conserve and enhance the historic and cultural heritage of Angus and the local characteristics of the towns and villages.*
- *encourage design in new or regeneration developments which will improve access for the disabled and create an environment free from the fear of crime.*
- *ensure that new developments are in line with sustainable development priorities in regard to location and design.*
- *conserve and promote a network of greenspace within the built environment which links to the surrounding countryside through a footpath network.*

The documented discussions from the Angus Council Development Standards Committee 15 Sept also mentions:

In this case the proposed development would involve the loss of prime agricultural land (Policy PV20); it would introduce a use that could generate odour and noise in proximity to existing residential uses (Policy DS4); it would have impacts on the landscape (Policy PV6) and it is located in an area where SEPA flood maps indicate there is a flood risk (Policy PV12 and 15).

Animal agriculture does not protect wildlife – quite the opposite – as this 2019 Defra report illustrates:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/834432/evidence-compendium-26sep19.pdf

“Biodiversity - Farming practices can have many impacts that can lead to a reduction in wildlife biodiversity (including loss of habitats and food sources). The UK farmland bird index, an indicator of the state of wildlife generally, has fallen to less than half its 1970 value”.

According to Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences - since humans became farmers, just 17% of wild mammal species remain (from mice to elephants).

As the site is relatively close to a number of residential properties this development can only have an increased negative effect on the local residents, in particular noise, odour, pollution and disease.

A chicken farm of this size will produce enormous amounts of faecal matter, much of which could be deposited on the outdoor ranging areas and from there into the local watercourses and river habitats.

GLOBAL HUNGER

The impact of factory farming also goes beyond the local environment to global food poverty and UK food insecurity. The Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations predicts that by 2050 world meat production will have almost **doubled** global warming, pollution, deforestation, land degradation, water scarcity and species extinction all increasing as a consequence.

850 million people go hungry every day. Animal agriculture uses 83% of farmland but only produces 18% of calories (Joseph Poore, Oxford University).

“We already produce enough to feed the world. It’s overconsumption – especially of animal protein by the global middle class, inequality, waste and inadequate production/distribution systems - that stands in the way of enough food for everyone and space for wildlife. To feed the world in a way our one planet can sustain, we need to consume and produce food differently”. (Worldwide Fund for Nature. Appetite for Destruction)

ANIMAL SUFFERING

Another reason for my objection is that I do not feel this application for a factory farm represents current public opinion. In a recent survey 85% of the public were against Factory Farms.

In addition, Defra 2019 reported that a survey showed that 78% of people felt it was “very important” to protect the welfare of farmed animals and that 82% said farmers should be rewarded for offering animals higher welfare standards.

Although the current animal welfare laws in the UK are slim I feel it is morally wrong to subject sentient animals capable of fear and misery to overcrowding, unhygienic conditions, large scale antibiotic use, mutilations without anaesthetic and no chance of a normal life. Factory farms like these result in close confinement aggression and arguably completely prevent any sense of normal behaviour as defined in the Animal Welfare Act 2006.

Whilst I appreciate that animal welfare is not a planning consideration, I would like to draw your attention to the recent Animal Aid investigation into another unit where the group exposed some terrible conditions. Footage showed hens with extensive feather loss, injured birds and several dead and decomposing birds left among the living. Conditions were extremely dirty with heavy dust and faeces accumulating. A very small percentage of the birds were outside ‘ranging’ during the daytime, this may be attributed to crowding and social hierarchy which prevents birds accessing pop holes. Some hens may never range outside. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O7ISh7eMOXA&list=UUQU-2dlbbNDhtW7rHr3RG2g>

Two sheds are proposed for the purpose of accommodating 32,000 laying hens each, totalling 64,000 hen capacity at the site. In light of this, we really must question whether the health and welfare of an even larger population of birds can possibly be effectively monitored generally or safeguarded in an emergency situation. And more widely question whether such huge scale, vertical farming with many thousands of hens, can really constitute ‘free-range’.

Whilst sadly not a legal consideration it most certainly should be a moral one.

Plant based diets are gaining favour with the public as people of this country are recognising that they have been eating diets that are poor for their health and the links meat consumption has to cancer and cardiovascular disease. Vegans and vegetarians look set to make up a quarter of the UK population in 2025 and with vegetarian and vegan product sales expected to increase to £658m by 2021 it begs the question is another factory farm really right for this community?

SUMMARY

The future looks grim.

- More pandemics.
- A climate raging out of control.
- Environmental damage.
- Biodiversity loss.
- Global food poverty and UK food insecurity.
- Antibiotic resistance - antibiotics used to keep animals in cramped, unhygienic conditions alive until slaughter.
- Animal mutilations without anaesthetic and no chance of a normal life.

The science is clear. Factory farming of animals is a leading cause of all the above.

With this in mind, I write to ask you to protect today's children, from serious problems that will dominate their future if we do not act now. Not just pandemics but the climate crisis, environmental problems, antibiotic resistance... it paints a horrifying picture.

The climate crisis is here but the greatest impacts of it will be felt by our own children. Biodiversity is being lost, environments destroyed, soil quality diminishing. Pandemics are already a threat and antibiotic resistance is growing.

I OBJECT strongly to this application on the above grounds.

Kindest regards,

Lucy Graham

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLANNING](#)
Subject: Objection to the factory farm in Scotland
Date: 10 June 2021 18:38:23

Dear Ruari and the Planning Committee.

I ask that a copy of this letter is made available to the whole Committee delegated the task of assessing this application.

Please accept my objection to the above planning application.

My reasons are as follows: It is a scientific fact that factory farming is harmful to the environment, the communities in which they are built, and cause unnecessary suffering to hundreds of thousands of sensitive animals, creating food that is incredibly unhealthy for people, that people don't even need. Factory farming is a backwards way of producing food and will entrench Scotland into outdated, inefficient systems. PLEASE DO NOT DO THIS.

HUMAN HEALTH:

PANDEMICS

We are in the middle of a pandemic that is killing people. Scientists have predicted that the next pandemic will start as an Avian Flu.

<https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/66/wr/mm6635a2.htm>

Since November 2020 we have had 25 outbreaks of Avian Flu in the UK.

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/avian-influenza-bird-flu>

Some of these have been outbreaks in Scotland itself :

Avian influenza (bird flu): how to spot and report the disease - gov.scot (www.gov.scot)

On 18 February 2021, the National IHR Focal Point for the Russian Federation notified WHO of detection of avian influenza A(H5N8) in seven **human** clinical specimens. These are the first reported detection of avian influenza A(H5N8) in **humans**.

<https://www.who.int/csr/don/26-feb-2021-influenza-a-russian-federation/en/>

If we just look at the past 100 years of influenza pandemics, epidemics, and control strategies then the question must be whether another pandemic like the 1918 Spanish influenza, with such a deadly and disruptive impact on society killing 50 million people, is possible?

The answer is yes: it is not only possible, but it is just a matter of time.

It is important to note that there are concerns from many people in the UK of another impending pandemic of which a factory farm could well become the cause with their overcrowding and unhygienic conditions. Why on earth would a planning application for another Intensive factory farm even be considered at this time?

It is a massive risk to consider introducing an industrial chicken farm on such an enormous scale, **64000** birds, with high population densities and genetically homogenous birds. Given the known propensity for low pathogenic viral strains to mutate into high pathogenic strains amongst poultry flocks, and potential to become more easily transmissible to other mammals, it is not scaremongering to treat this development as an ongoing risk to human health.

It is noteworthy that the H5 group of highly pathogenic influenza viruses were never reported in humans before the mid-1990s; now they are found in humans in several countries every year.

The World Health Organisation (WHO) has said "... authorities have a responsibility for controlling zoonoses – diseases transmissible from animals to humans through direct contact or through food, water and the environment. An estimated 75% of emerging pathogens are of zoonotic nature".

Scientists estimate "that more than 6 out of every 10 known infectious diseases in people can be spread from animals" (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention <https://www.cdc.gov/onehealth/basics/zoonotic-diseases.html>)

Please consider this list of UK Government zoonotic diseases. It is a long and frightening list.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/list-of-zoonotic-diseases/list-of-zoonotic-diseases>

To exemplify this further, listed UK diseases linked to just chickens (there are similar lists for other farmed species) include:

- Avian Flu (Animal influenza)
- Campylobacteriosis
- Psittacosis
- Salmonellosis

ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE

THE WHO states "Antibiotic resistance is one of the biggest threats to global health, food security, and development today." (<https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance>)

and "If no action is taken - warns the (UN Ad hoc Interagency Coordinating Group on Antimicrobial Resistance) – drug-resistant diseases could cause 10 million deaths each year by 2050 and damage to the economy as catastrophic as the 2008-2009 global financial crisis. By 2030, antimicrobial resistance could force up to 24 million people into extreme poverty. Currently, at least 700,000 people die each year due to drug-resistant diseases, including 230,000 people who die from multidrug-resistant tuberculosis. More and more common diseases, including respiratory tract infections, sexually transmitted infections and urinary tract infections, are untreatable; lifesaving medical procedures are becoming much riskier, and our food systems are increasingly precarious". (<https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/29-04-2019-new-report-calls-for-urgent-action-to-avert-antimicrobial-resistance-crisis>)

The WHO also state "Antibiotic resistance occurs naturally, but misuse of antibiotics in humans and animals is accelerating the process." (www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance)

The Soil Association says (www.soilassociation.org/reducing-antibiotics-in-farming/)

"Farm animals consume one-third of all antibiotics in the UK and it is intensive farming systems that use drugs at unnecessarily high levels, putting human health at risk."

"The routine use of antibiotics in intensive farming systems is driving this problem. Drugs are given to animals as a preventative measure - before they show signs of illness - to compensate for animals being housed in cramped, unsanitary conditions where infections spread fast. Intensively reared pigs and poultry account for 79 % of UK farming antibiotic use"

Looking holistically, what is more important, planning rules, another factory farm or people dying?

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

The short-term benefits of employment and meat production are outweighed by the environmental impact that it will have on the local area which is already facing a climate emergency. What we eat has a huge impact on the environment and has potential to cause disease and pandemics so applications should be considered in line with our broader responsibilities to protect future generations.

Furthermore, the Government sees Local Authorities as central to delivering its CO₂ emission targets yet more and more intensive farming applications are going through planning departments across the UK. It is important to recognise the significant impact just one factory farm will have on the pollution and environment of the local area.

To quote DEFRA 2007 - "The production of food from animal agriculture is a significant source of emissions in the UK, especially the production of GHGs and pollution of water sources. For pigs and poultry, the main pollutants are ammonia and N₂O. Nitrous oxide (N₂O) has 296 times the Global Warming Potential of CO₂ and ammonia (NH₃), contributes significantly to acidification of rain and soils. The agriculture sector accounts for around 37%, 66% and 88% of total UK emissions of CH₄, N₂O and NH₃, respectively (NAEI, 2007), nearly all of which is derived from livestock production."

(<http://sciencesearch.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=14662>)

If the science was clear in 2007, why are planning applications for intensive livestock units still being approved when the Government sees Local Authorities as central to delivering its CO₂ emission targets?

"Ammonia and nitrogen pollution, mostly from agriculture, is harming more than 60% of the UK's land area and affecting the most sensitive habitats, according to a DEFRA report. Ammonia pollution also effects species composition through soil acidification, direct toxic damage to leaves and by altering the susceptibility of plants to frost, drought and pathogens. At its most serious, certain sensitive and iconic habitats may be lost" (<https://www.endsreport.com/article/1588258/ammonia-pollution-harming-60-uk-land-area>)

LOCAL IMPACT and SITE-SPECIFIC INFORMATION

On the Angus Council Website there are various statements that the council has committed to which this type of development actively goes against, below are just a few excerpts:

We support the principle of sustainable development and are committed to improving the quality of life for present and future generations in Angus. By a process of integrating responses to environmental, social and economic issues the council will help to maximise human welfare while enhancing the environment in Angus.

We will seek to:

- promote a sustainable approach to land and habitat management.
- protect and enhance local biodiversity.
- encourage a sustainable managed approach to public access to the natural environment.

We will seek to:

- reduce local pollution of air, land, water and to reduce the incidence of noise and light pollution.

We will seek to:

- conserve and enhance the historic and cultural heritage of Angus and the local characteristics of the towns and villages.
- encourage design in new or regeneration developments which will improve access for the disabled and create an environment free from the fear of crime.
- ensure that new developments are in line with sustainable development priorities in regard to location and design.
- conserve and promote a network of greenspace within the built environment which links to the surrounding countryside through a footpath network.

The documented discussions from the Angus Council Development Standards Committee 15 Sept also mentions: *In this case the proposed development would involve the loss of prime agricultural land (Policy PV20); it would introduce a use that could generate odour and noise in proximity to existing residential uses (Policy DS4); it would have impacts on the landscape (Policy PV6) and it is located in an area where SEPA flood maps indicate there is a flood risk (Policy PV12 and 15).*

Animal agriculture does not protect wildlife – quite the opposite – as this 2019 Defra report illustrates:

(https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/834432/evidence-compendium-26sep19.pdf)

“Biodiversity - Farming practices can have many impacts that can lead to a reduction in wildlife biodiversity (including loss of habitats and food sources). The UK farmland bird index, an indicator of the state of wildlife generally, has fallen to less than half its 1970 value”.

According to Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences - since humans became farmers, just 17% of wild mammal species remain (from mice to elephants).

As the site is relatively close to a number of residential properties this development can only have an increased negative effect on the local residents, in particular noise, odour, pollution and disease.

A chicken farm of this size will produce enormous amounts of faecal matter, much of which could be deposited on the outdoor ranging areas and from there into the local watercourses and river habitats.

GLOBAL HUNGER

The impact of factory farming also goes beyond the local environment to global food poverty and UK food insecurity. The Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations predicts that by 2050 world meat production will have almost doubled global warming, pollution, deforestation, land degradation, water scarcity and species extinction all increasing as a consequence.

850 million people go hungry every day. Animal agriculture uses 83% of farmland but only produces 18% of calories (Joseph Poore, Oxford University).

“We already produce enough to feed the world. It’s overconsumption – especially of animal protein by the global middle class, inequality, waste and inadequate production/distribution systems - that stands in the way of enough food for everyone and space for wildlife. To feed the world in a way our one planet can sustain, we need to consume and produce food differently”. (Worldwide Fund for Nature. Appetite for Destruction)

ANIMAL SUFFERING

Another reason for my objection is that I do not feel this application for a factory farm represents current public opinion. In a recent survey 85% of the public were against Factory Farms.

In addition, Defra 2019 reported that a survey showed that 78% of people felt it was “very important” to protect the welfare of farmed animals and that 82% said farmers should be rewarded for offering animals higher welfare

standards.

Although the current animal welfare laws in the UK are slim I feel it is morally wrong to subject sentient animals capable of fear and misery to overcrowding, unhygienic conditions, large scale antibiotic use, mutilations without anaesthetic and no chance of a normal life. Factory farms like these result in close confinement aggression and arguably completely prevent any sense of normal behaviour as defined in the Animal Welfare Act 2006.

Whilst I appreciate that animal welfare is not a planning consideration, I would like to draw your attention to the recent Animal Aid investigation into another unit where the group exposed some terrible conditions. Footage showed hens with extensive feather loss, injured birds and several dead and decomposing birds left among the living. Conditions were extremely dirty with heavy dust and faeces accumulating. A very small percentage of the birds were outside 'ranging' during the daytime, this may be attributed to crowding and social hierarchy which prevents birds accessing pop holes. Some hens may never range outside. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O7ISh7cMOXA&list=UUQU-2dlbbNDhtW7rHr3RG2g>

Two sheds are proposed for the purpose of accommodating 32,000 laying hens each, totalling 64,000 hen capacity at the site. In light of this, we really must question whether the health and welfare of an even larger population of birds can possibly be effectively monitored generally or safeguarded in an emergency situation. And more widely question whether such huge scale, vertical farming with many thousands of hens, can really constitute 'free-range'.

Whilst sadly not a legal consideration it most certainly should be a moral one.

Plant based diets are gaining favour with the public as people of this country are recognising that they have been eating diets that are poor for their health and the links meat consumption has to cancer and cardiovascular disease. Vegans and vegetarians look set to make up a quarter of the UK population in 2025 and with vegetarian and vegan product sales expected to increase to £658m by 2021 it begs the question is another factory farm really right for this community?

SUMMARY

The future looks grim.

- More pandemics.
- A climate raging out of control.
- Environmental damage.
- Biodiversity loss.
- Global food poverty and UK food insecurity.
- Antibiotic resistance - antibiotics used to keep animals in cramped, unhygienic conditions alive until slaughter.
- Animal mutilations without anaesthetic and no chance of a normal life.

The science is clear. Factory farming of animals is a leading cause of all the above.

With this in mind, I write to ask you to protect today's children, from serious problems that will dominate their future if we do not act now. Not just pandemics but the climate crisis, environmental problems, antibiotic resistance..... it paints a horrifying picture.

The climate crisis is here but the greatest impacts of it will be felt by our own children. Biodiversity is being lost, environments destroyed, soil quality diminishing. Pandemics are already a threat and antibiotic resistance is growing.

I OBJECT strongly to this application on the above grounds.

Yours faithfully
Maggie Li-Calis

--

Maggie Li-Calis
School of International and Public Affairs | Columbia University '15
The Medill School of Journalism | Northwestern University '09

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLANNING](#)
Subject: Re: 21/00337/FULM | Cononsyth #CompassionInCommerce
Date: 10 June 2021 20:33:04

Objection to: 21/00337/FULM | Erection of two 32,000 capacity free-range hen sheds and associated infrastructure including feed silos, egg packing facility, vehicular access, access tracks, drainage and landscaping | Field 530M West Of North Mains Of Cononsyth Farm, Cononsyth, Arbroath.

Ruari and the Planning Committee,

I'd be super grateful if you'd kindly send this email to the whole Committee assessing the above named application.

Kindly accept my objection to the above planning application based on these reasons:

HUMAN HEALTH:

PANDEMICS

We are in the middle of a pandemic that is killing people. Scientists have predicted that the next pandemic will start as an Avian flu:

<https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/66/wr/mm6635a2.htm>

Since November 2020 we have had 25 outbreaks of Avian Flu in the UK:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/avian-influenza-bird-flu>

Some of these have been outbreaks in Scotland itself: [Avian influenza \(bird flu\): how to spot and report the disease - gov.scot \(www.gov.scot\)](#)

On 18 February 2021, the National IHR Focal Point for the Russian Federation notified WHO of detection of avian influenza A(H5N8) in seven **human** clinical specimens. These are the first reported detection of avian influenza A(H5N8) in **humans**:
<https://www.who.int/csr/don/26-feb-2021-influenza-a-russian-federation/en/>

If we just look at the past 100 years of influenza pandemics, epidemics, and control strategies then the question must be whether another pandemic like the 1918 Spanish influenza, with such a deadly and disruptive impact on society killing 50 million people, is possible? Not only is it possible, it is simply a matter of time.

It is important to note that there are concerns from many in the UK of another impending pandemic of which a factory farm could well become the cause with their overcrowding and unhygienic conditions. Why would a planning application for another Intensive factory farm be considered at this historic time?

It is a massive risk to consider introducing an industrial chicken farm on such an enormous scale, **64000** birds, with high population densities and genetically homogenous birds. Given the known propensity for low pathogenic viral strains to mutate into high pathogenic strains amongst poultry flocks, and potential to become more easily transmissible to other mammals, it is not scaremongering to treat this development as an ongoing risk to human health.

It is noteworthy that the H5 group of highly pathogenic influenza viruses were never reported in humans before the mid-1990s; now they are found in humans in several countries every year.

The World Health Organisation (WHO) has said "... authorities have a responsibility for controlling zoonoses – diseases transmissible from animals to humans through direct contact or through food, water and the environment. An estimated 75% of emerging pathogens are of zoonotic nature".

Scientists estimate "that more than 6 out of every 10 known infectious diseases in people can be spread from animals" (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention <https://www.cdc.gov/onehealth/basics/zoonotic-diseases.html>).

Please consider this list of UK Government zoonotic diseases. It is a long and frightening list: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/list-of-zoonotic-diseases/list-of-zoonotic-diseases>

To exemplify this further, listed UK diseases linked to just chickens (there are similar lists for other farmed species) include:

- Avian flu (Animal influenza)
- Campylobacteriosis
- Psittacosis
- Salmonellosis

ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE

THE WHO states "Antibiotic resistance is one of the biggest threats to global health, food security, and development today." (<https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance>)

and "If no action is taken - warns the (UN Ad hoc Interagency Coordinating Group on Antimicrobial Resistance) – drug-resistant diseases could cause 10 million deaths each year by 2050 and damage to the economy as catastrophic as the 2008-2009 global financial crisis. By 2030, antimicrobial resistance could force up to 24 million people into extreme poverty. Currently, at least 700,000 people die each year due to drug-resistant diseases, including 230,000 people who die from multidrug-resistant tuberculosis. More and more common diseases, including respiratory tract infections, sexually transmitted infections and urinary tract infections, are untreatable; lifesaving medical procedures are becoming much riskier, and our food systems are increasingly precarious".

(<https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/29-04-2019-new-report-calls-for-urgent-action-to-avert-antimicrobial-resistance-crisis>)

The WHO also state "Antibiotic resistance occurs naturally, but misuse of antibiotics in humans and animals is accelerating the process." (www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance)

The Soil Association says (www.soilassociation.org/reducing-antibiotics-in-farming/)

"Farm animals consume one-third of all antibiotics in the UK and it is intensive farming systems that use drugs at unnecessarily high levels, putting human health at risk."

“The routine use of antibiotics in intensive farming systems is driving this problem. Drugs are given to animals as a preventative measure - before they show signs of illness - to compensate for animals being housed in cramped, unsanitary conditions where infections spread fast. Intensively reared pigs and poultry account for 79 % of UK farming antibiotic use”

Looking holistically, what is more important, planning rules, another factory farm or people dying?

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

The short-term benefits of employment and meat production are outweighed by the environmental impact that it will have on the local area which is already facing a climate emergency. What we eat has a huge impact on the environment and has potential to cause disease and pandemics so applications should be considered in line with our broader responsibilities to protect future generations.

Furthermore, the Government sees Local Authorities as central to delivering its CO₂ emission targets yet more and more intensive farming applications are going through planning departments across the UK. It is important to recognise the significant impact just one factory farm will have on the pollution and environment of the local area.

To quote DEFRA 2007 - “The production of food from animal agriculture is a significant source of emissions in the UK, especially the production of GHGs and pollution of water sources. For pigs and poultry, the main pollutants are ammonia and N₂O. Nitrous oxide (N₂O) has 296 times the Global Warming Potential of CO₂ and ammonia (NH₃), contributes significantly to acidification of rain and soils. The agriculture sector accounts for around 37%, 66% and 88% of total UK emissions of CH₄, N₂O and NH₃, respectively (NAEI, 2007), nearly all of which is derived from livestock production.”

<http://sciencesearch.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=14662>

If the science was clear in 2007, why are planning applications for intensive livestock units still being approved when the Government sees Local Authorities as central to delivering its CO₂ emission targets?

“Ammonia and nitrogen pollution, mostly from agriculture, is harming more than 60% of the UK’s land area and affecting the most sensitive habitats, according to a DEFRA report. Ammonia pollution also effects species composition through soil acidification, direct toxic damage to leaves and by altering the susceptibility of plants to frost, drought and pathogens. At its most serious, certain sensitive and iconic habitats may be lost” (<https://www.endsreport.com/article/1588258/ammonia-pollution-harming-60-uk-land-area>).

LOCAL IMPACT and SITE-SPECIFIC INFORMATION

On the Angus Council Website there are various statements that the council has committed to which this type of development actively goes against, below are just a few excerpts:

We support the principle of sustainable development and are committed to improving the quality of life for present and future generations in Angus. By a process of integrating responses to environmental, social and economic issues the council will help to maximise

human welfare while enhancing the environment in Angus.

We will seek to:

- *promote a sustainable approach to land and habitat management.*
- *protect and enhance local biodiversity.*
- *encourage a sustainable managed approach to public access to the natural environment.*

We will seek to:

- *reduce local pollution of air, land, water and to reduce the incidence of noise and light pollution.*

We will seek to:

- *conserve and enhance the historic and cultural heritage of Angus and the local characteristics of the towns and villages.*
- *encourage design in new or regeneration developments which will improve access for the disabled and create an environment free from the fear of crime.*
- *ensure that new developments are in line with sustainable development priorities in regard to location and design.*
- *conserve and promote a network of greenspace within the built environment which links to the surrounding countryside through a footpath network.*

The documented discussions from the Angus Council Development Standards Committee 15 Sept also mentions: *In this case the proposed development would involve the loss of prime agricultural land (Policy PV20); it would introduce a use that could generate odour and noise in proximity to existing residential uses (Policy DS4); it would have impacts on the landscape (Policy PV6) and it is located in an area where SEPA flood maps indicate there is a flood risk (Policy PV12 and 15).*

Animal agriculture does not protect wildlife – quite the opposite – as this 2019 Defra report illustrates:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/834432/evidence-compendium-26sep19.pdf

“Biodiversity - Farming practices can have many impacts that can lead to a reduction in wildlife biodiversity (including loss of habitats and food sources). The UK farmland bird index, an indicator of the state of wildlife generally, has fallen to less than half its 1970 value”.

According to Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences - since humans became farmers, just 17% of wild mammal species remain (from mice to elephants).

As the site is relatively close to a number of residential properties this development can only have an increased negative effect on the local residents, in particular noise, odour, pollution and disease.

A chicken farm of this size will produce enormous amounts of faecal matter, much of which could be deposited on the outdoor ranging areas and from there into the local watercourses and river habitats.

GLOBAL HUNGER

The impact of factory farming also goes beyond the local environment to global food poverty and UK food insecurity. The Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations predicts that by 2050 world meat production will have almost [doubled](#) global warming, pollution, deforestation, land degradation, water scarcity and species extinction all increasing as a consequence.

850 million people go hungry every day. Animal agriculture uses 83% of farmland but only produces 18% of calories (Joseph Poore, Oxford University).

“We already produce enough to feed the world. It’s overconsumption – especially of animal protein by the global middle class, inequality, waste and inadequate production/distribution systems - that stands in the way of enough food for everyone and space for wildlife. To feed the world in a way our one planet can sustain, we need to consume and produce food differently”. (Worldwide Fund for Nature. Appetite for Destruction)

ANIMAL SUFFERING

Another reason for my objection is that I do not feel this application for a factory farm represents current public opinion. In a recent survey 85% of the public were against Factory Farms.

In addition, Defra 2019 reported that a survey showed that 78% of people felt it was “very important” to protect the welfare of farmed animals and that 82% said farmers should be rewarded for offering animals higher welfare standards.

Although the current animal welfare laws in the UK are slim I feel it is morally wrong to subject sentient animals capable of fear and misery to overcrowding, unhygienic conditions, large scale antibiotic use, mutilations without anaesthetic and no chance of a normal life. Factory farms like these result in close confinement aggression and arguably completely prevent any sense of normal behaviour as defined in the Animal Welfare Act 2006.

Whilst I appreciate that animal welfare is not a planning consideration, I would like to draw your attention to the recent Animal Aid investigation into another unit where the group exposed some terrible conditions. Footage showed hens with extensive feather loss, injured birds and several dead and decomposing birds left among the living. Conditions were extremely dirty with heavy dust and faeces accumulating. A very small percentage of the birds were outside ‘ranging’ during the daytime, this may be attributed to crowding and social hierarchy which prevents birds accessing pop holes. Some hens may never range outside. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O7ISh7cMOXA&list=UUQU-2dIbbNDhtW7rHr3RG2g>

Two sheds are proposed for the purpose of accommodating 32,000 laying hens each, totalling 64,000 hen capacity at the site. In light of this, we really must question whether the health and welfare of an even larger population of birds can possibly be effectively monitored generally or safeguarded in an emergency situation. And more widely question whether such huge scale, vertical farming with many thousands of hens, can really constitute ‘free-range’.

Whilst sadly not a legal consideration it most certainly should be a moral one.

Plant based diets are gaining favour with the public as people of this country are

recognising that they have been eating diets that are poor for their health and the links meat consumption has to cancer and cardiovascular disease. Vegans and vegetarians look set to make up a quarter of the UK population in 2025, and with vegetarian and vegan product sales expected to increase to £658m by 2021, is another factory farm right for this community?

SUMMARY

The future looks grim.

- More pandemics.
- A climate raging out of control.
- Environmental damage.
- Biodiversity loss.
- Global food poverty and UK food insecurity.
- Antibiotic resistance - antibiotics used to keep animals in cramped, unhygienic conditions alive until slaughter.
- Animal mutilations without anaesthetic and no chance of a normal life.

The science is clear. Factory farming of animals is a leading cause of all the above.

The climate crisis is here but the greatest impact of it will be felt by our children. Biodiversity is being lost, environments destroyed, soil quality diminishing. Pandemics are already a threat and antibiotic resistance is growing.

I unequivocally OBJECT to this application on the above grounds.

Maggie Richards

Comments for Planning Application 21/00337/FULM

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00337/FULM

Address: Field 530M West Of North Mains Of Cononsyth Farm Cononsyth Arbroath

Proposal: Erection of two 32,000 capacity free-range hen sheds and associated infrastructure including feed silos, egg packing facility, vehicular access, access tracks, drainage and landscaping

Case Officer: Ruari Kelly

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Marion Taylor

Address: Carmyllie Schoolhouse Redford Arbroath DD11 2RD

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I am writing to object strongly to the plans for Cononsyth Farms to site two large sheds, housing a total of 64000 hens.

This development would absolutely ruin the environment of those residents in the area proposed. This will pose a great health hazard and should not be allowed.

It is interesting to note that the development will not be beside the applicants' homes despite there being far more suitable access than that proposed. This would allow the development to be beside the existing farm complex.

Please make my comments available to the committee tasked with considering the said application.

Yours,

Marion Taylor

Comments for Planning Application 21/00337/FULM

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00337/FULM

Address: Field 530M West Of North Mains Of Cononsyth Farm Cononsyth Arbroath

Proposal: Erection of two 32,000 capacity free-range hen sheds and associated infrastructure including feed silos, egg packing facility, vehicular access, access tracks, drainage and landscaping

Case Officer: Ruari Kelly

Customer Details

Name: Mrs PHYHLLIS JOLLY

Address: 8 THE DEN LETHAM FORFAR DD8 2PY

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:Comments sent by Email due to insufficient space in this box.

21/00337/FULM

TWO HEN SHEDS etc AT NORTH MAINS OF CONONSYTH

PUBLIC COMMENT by Phyllis Jolly, 8 The Den, Letham DD8 2PY

SUMMARY: I object to the proposed development on the grounds:-

- There are alternative sites on the Applicant's land that are better suited in terms of road safety due to the traffic that will be generated.
- There are alternative sites on the Applicant's land that are better suited to minimise negative impact on residential amenity, particularly at Summerhill.

In both of the above grounds of objection, a solution exists by positioning the sheds at the opposite uphill boundary of the overall HEN range area, which will enable vehicular access off the B961, with no negative impact on business operational areas and bio-diversity security. This will create closer links to the existing operational centres of the farm business and will reduce the predictable legal nuisance that threatens the protected residential property at Summerhill in terms of the minimum 400 metre cordon sanitaire. Vehicles can use any of the farm business existing access points off the B961 removing the potential hazard at the blind corner where the unclassified road joins the B961.

It has been very difficult to adequately comment on this application due to the volume of documents and large plans that have only been available on-line. I participated in the on-line public consultation but it was no substitute for the usual type of public consultation meeting. I have no doubt that elected Members will have similar difficulties and suggest that a site inspection is needed, including a visit to the garden of Summerhill, to truly appreciate how residential amenity will be impacted. If a new house was proposed at Summerhill and the hen sheds were existing, it is likely that planning permission would be refused on the grounds of the conflict between agricultural activity (bad neighbour) and residential amenity. Experience of a drive along the unclassified road from Pressock to the dangerous junction with the B961 will reveal how existing agricultural traffic damages the narrow road verges and breaks drain covers causing a hazard for pedestrian traffic forced on to the verges by wide vehicles. The following comments address:

1. close links to existing farm business,
2. alternative sites,
3. traffic safety,
4. recreational multi user rural roads,
5. sustainability of business structure.

1 Claim of close links to existing operational centres: Policy DS1 Development

Boundaries: contrary to the statement that the site selected by the Applicant results in a clear link to the farming business's existing operational areas, the opposite is unarguably a fact. As can be clearly observed in **the Location and Ownership Plan at 5.1**, there is no geographical link or infrastructure link to any of the three farm operational areas at (1) Mid Mains of Cononsyth, (2) North Mains of Cononsyth and (3) Cononsyth. The opposite appears to be the case, as the sheds are located at the furthest point within the overall development site area, from any of the farm business's three operational sites. As vehicular traffic across the free range area is prohibited for bio-security reasons,

this means that all day to day operational vehicles including the likes of staff on quad bikes, tractor and trailer combinations taking away manure etc will have to use the unclassified road to reach the hazardous junction onto the B961 before proceeding to any of the three existing operational centres; all of these have good visibility junctions with the B961 at some distance from the bad corner with restricted visibility splays.

2 ALTERNATIVE SITES : The EIA non-technical summary 3.5 is very brief and grossly inadequate in seeking to convey how operational requirements mean the site selected is the only suitable location that exists. It makes no acknowledgement of the “cordon sanitaire” provided for in **Circular ANNEX E Agricultural Buildings** which aims to protect non-agricultural housing from the typical legal nuisance issues that go hand in hand with any intensive agricultural operation. The most concerning negative impacts on these homes arise from increased traffic use of the unadopted road and the noise of 24/7 extractor fans, particularly overnight, which often result in sleep deprivation which then impacts on all sorts of health conditions.

3 Traffic Safety: **Appendix 14.5 Visibility splays** indicates that the required splays at the junction between the B961 and the unclassified road can only be achieved if field crops or vegetation is regularly mowed by the landowner and the road verges are regularly cropped by the Roads Authority. I can see a great debate over how foreseeable a lapse in scheduled cutting of vegetation could easily contribute to a fatal accident at this junction. **Appendix 14.7 New passing places in the unclassified road**: sight lines between curves in the road seem to indicate that more passing places would be required if the route seeks to maintain continuous inter-visibility in both directions. How will site traffic be prevented from using the unclassified road between the site and Pressock?

4 Public recreation, multi-use rural roads. The offer of a new pedestrian path to compensate for any loss of recreational amenity due to increased heavy traffic on the unclassified road does not stand up to scrutiny. In answer to a question as to what surface finish would be used and what maintenance would be proposed:- the proposal is for an informal path with no surface treatment, meaning the narrow fenced path will be waist high in weeds in summer and ankle deep in mud in the winter.

5 Sustainability is an issue due to the short-term nature of large scale egg producers such as Glenrath. A similar development of two hen sheds were constructed not too long ago at Bractullo near Letham. After only months of use, the production contract was not renewed and the sheds have been redundant ever since. This results in sites such as this proposed extensive industrial scale of infrastructure in a rural area being open to a change of use in terms of planning permission; this is now available under agricultural permitted development rights.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLANNING](#)
Subject: FAO Ruari Kelly: 21/00337/FULM | Erection of two 32,000 capacity free-range hen sheds at Cononsyth Farm, Arbroath
Date: 11 June 2021 19:28:41

Dear Mr Kelly

I wish to raise objections to the proposed erection of two 32,000 capacity free-range hen sheds and associated infrastructure including feed silos, egg packing facility, vehicular access, access tracks, drainage and landscaping | Field 530M West Of North Mains Of Cononsyth Farm Cononsyth Arbroath.

My objections are based on the following concerns:

Cumulative Industrialisation of Rural Landscape

I request that this application is reviewed within the context of other recent and proposed developments in the local area, including wind turbines and large agricultural buildings. The cumulative effect of these developments has a significant visual impact and represents an unacceptable level of industrialisation of the countryside.

Habitat Surveys.

Angus Council is asked to consider if the habitat, wildlife and tree surveys are sufficiently thorough and assess the full and realistic impact of the development on the natural environment, including the many protected species that are found in the vicinity of the proposed site, including badgers, red squirrels, raptors, and kingfishers.

Denton Burn

The Denton Burn runs through my property and is valuable and rich wildlife habitat that includes range of protected species. I am concerned that the proposal presents a significant risk to this habitat through a breakdown of the applicant's protective measures This risk is exacerbated by the weather extremes resulting from climate change. I am not convinced that the application is in strict accordance with LDP Policy PV14 (Water Quality). It should be noted that the Burn has recently been subject to major pollution in the area, with no noticeable action to mitigate the damage or action taken against the culprits. Further pollution from this intensive poultry unit could have catastrophic impact on this ecologically valuable green corridor through intensively farmed land.

Traffic

I observe that the roads in the area of the proposed development are increasingly busy, not only with motor vehicles but with walkers, cyclists and riders. These roads are unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles of the type that will service the chicken sheds, with no capacity for side by side passing along most stretches.

This development presents an increased risk of accidents to vehicles, animals and people, and would inconvenience and stress many residents. It must be noted that the traffic survey was conducted at a non-typical period for movement and activity due to poor weather and pandemic lockdown.

Local Development Plan

I question if the proposed development is in accordance with the Angus Local Development Plan (ALDP) (2016) particularly with regard to:

- Appropriate scale and nature of the new buildings, and the failure to re-use existing structures.
- The likelihood of compromising the air quality of the local area, particularly to properties down wind of the chicken sheds and associated chicken waste storage/holding.
- Risk of damage to the local natural environment and its biodiversity through pollution run-off

Land Classification

In reviewing the application Angus Council is asked to question how the proposed site can be permitted on prime arable land. The question should be asked why the applicant is not making an application for the development on the existing (brown-site) footprint of farm buildings. This would place the development significantly further from residential properties and conserve arable land.

Thank you for considering my objections

Yours sincerely

Simon Milne

Denton Mill
Guthrie
By Forfar
Angus DD8 2SR

planning@angus.gov.uk

FAO Ruari Kelly. Case officer Angus council.

Objection to:

21/00337/FULM | Erection of two 32,000 capacity free-range hen sheds and associated infrastructure including feed silos, egg packing facility, vehicular access, access tracks, drainage and landscaping | Field 530M West Of North Mains Of Cononsyth Farm, Cononsyth, Arbroath.

Dear Ruari and the Planning Committee.

I ask that a copy of this letter is made available to the whole Committee delegated the task of assessing this application.

Please accept my objection to the above planning application.

My reasons are as follows:

HUMAN HEALTH:

PANDEMICS

We are in the middle of a pandemic that is killing people. Scientists have predicted that the next pandemic will start as an Avian Flu.

<https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/66/wr/mm6635a2.htm>

Since November 2020 we have had 25 outbreaks of Avian Flu in the UK.

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/avian-influenza-bird-flu>

Some of these have been outbreaks in Scotland itself :

[Avian influenza \(bird flu\): how to spot and report the disease - gov.scot \(www.gov.scot\)](https://www.gov.scot/publications/avian-influenza-bird-flu/pages/10.aspx)

On 18 February 2021, the National IHR Focal Point for the Russian Federation notified WHO of detection of avian influenza A(H5N8) in seven **human** clinical specimens. These are the first reported detection of avian influenza A(H5N8) in **humans**.

<https://www.who.int/csr/don/26-feb-2021-influenza-a-russian-federation/en/>

If we just look at the past 100 years of influenza pandemics, epidemics, and control strategies then the question must be whether another pandemic like the 1918 Spanish influenza, with such a deadly and disruptive impact on society killing 50 million people, is possible?

The answer is yes: it is not only possible, but it is just a matter of time.

It is important to note that there are concerns from many people in the UK of another impending pandemic of which a factory farm could well become the cause with their overcrowding and unhygienic conditions. Why on earth would a planning application for another Intensive factory farm even be considered at this time?

It is a massive risk to consider introducing an industrial chicken farm on such an enormous scale, **64000** birds, with high population densities and genetically homogenous birds. Given the known propensity for low pathogenic viral strains to mutate into high pathogenic strains amongst poultry flocks, and potential to become more easily transmissible to other mammals, it is not scaremongering to treat this development as an ongoing risk to human health.

It is noteworthy that the H5 group of highly pathogenic influenza viruses were never reported in humans before the mid-1990s; now they are found in humans in several countries every year.

The World Health Organisation (WHO) has said "... authorities have a responsibility for controlling zoonoses – diseases transmissible from animals to humans through direct contact or through food, water and the environment. An estimated 75% of emerging pathogens are of zoonotic nature".

Scientists estimate "that more than 6 out of every 10 known infectious diseases in people can be spread from animals" (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention <https://www.cdc.gov/onehealth/basics/zoonotic-diseases.html>)

Please consider this list of UK Government zoonotic diseases. It is a long and frightening list. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/list-of-zoonotic-diseases/list-of-zoonotic-diseases>

To exemplify this further, listed UK diseases linked to just chickens (there are similar lists for other farmed species) include:

- Avian Flu (Animal influenza)
- Campylobacteriosis
- Psittacosis
- Salmonellosis

ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE

THE WHO states "Antibiotic resistance is one of the biggest threats to global health, food security, and development today." (<https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance>)

and "If no action is taken - warns the (UN Ad hoc Interagency Coordinating Group on Antimicrobial Resistance) – drug-resistant diseases could cause 10 million deaths each year by 2050 and damage to the economy as catastrophic as the 2008-2009 global financial crisis. By 2030, antimicrobial resistance could force up to 24 million people into extreme poverty. Currently, at least 700,000 people die each year due to drug-resistant diseases, including 230,000 people who die from multidrug-resistant tuberculosis. More and more common diseases, including respiratory tract infections, sexually transmitted infections and urinary tract infections, are untreatable; lifesaving medical procedures are becoming much riskier, and our food systems are increasingly precarious".

<https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/29-04-2019-new-report-calls-for-urgent-action-to-avert-antimicrobial-resistance-crisis>

The WHO also state "Antibiotic resistance occurs naturally, but misuse of antibiotics in humans and animals is accelerating the process." (www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance)

The Soil Association says (www.soilassociation.org/reducing-antibiotics-in-farming/)

"Farm animals consume one-third of all antibiotics in the UK and it is intensive farming systems that use drugs at unnecessarily high levels, putting human health at risk."

"The routine use of antibiotics in intensive farming systems is driving this problem. Drugs are given to animals as a preventative measure - before they show signs of illness - to compensate for animals being housed in cramped, unsanitary conditions where infections spread fast. Intensively reared pigs and poultry account for 79 % of UK farming antibiotic use"

Looking holistically, what is more important, planning rules, another factory farm or people dying?

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

The short-term benefits of employment and meat production are outweighed by the environmental impact that it will have on the local area which is already facing a climate emergency. What we eat has a huge impact on the environment and has potential to cause disease and pandemics so applications should be considered in line with our broader responsibilities to protect future generations.

Furthermore, the Government sees Local Authorities as central to delivering its CO₂ emission targets yet more and more intensive farming applications are going through planning departments across the UK. It is important to recognise the significant impact just one factory farm will have on the pollution and environment of the local area.

To quote DEFRA 2007 - "The production of food from animal agriculture is a significant source of emissions in the UK, especially the production of GHGs and pollution of water sources. For pigs and poultry, the main pollutants are ammonia and N₂O. Nitrous oxide (N₂O) has 296 times the Global Warming Potential of CO₂ and ammonia (NH₃), contributes significantly to acidification of rain and soils. The agriculture sector accounts for around 37%, 66% and 88% of total UK emissions of CH₄, N₂O and NH₃, respectively (NAEI, 2007), nearly all of which is derived from livestock production."

(<http://sciencesearch.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=14662>)

If the science was clear in 2007, why are planning applications for intensive livestock units still being approved when the Government sees Local Authorities as central to delivering its CO₂ emission targets?

"Ammonia and nitrogen pollution, mostly from agriculture, is harming more than 60% of the UK's land area and affecting the most sensitive habitats, according to a DEFRA report. Ammonia pollution also effects species composition through soil acidification, direct toxic damage to leaves and by altering the susceptibility of plants to frost, drought and pathogens. At its most serious, certain sensitive and iconic habitats may be lost"

(<https://www.endsreport.com/article/1588258/ammonia-pollution-harming-60-uk-land-area>)

LOCAL IMPACT and SITE-SPECIFIC INFORMATION

On the Angus Council Website there are various statements that the council has committed to which this type of development actively goes against, below are just a few excerpts:

We support the principle of sustainable development and are committed to improving the quality of life for present and future generations in Angus. By a process of integrating responses to environmental, social and economic issues the council will help to maximise human welfare while enhancing the environment in Angus.

We will seek to:

- *promote a sustainable approach to land and habitat management.*
- *protect and enhance local biodiversity.*
- *encourage a sustainable managed approach to public access to the natural environment.*

We will seek to:

- *reduce local pollution of air, land, water and to reduce the incidence of noise and light pollution.*

We will seek to:

- *conserve and enhance the historic and cultural heritage of Angus and the local characteristics of the towns and villages.*
- *encourage design in new or regeneration developments which will improve access for the disabled and create an environment free from the fear of crime.*
- *ensure that new developments are in line with sustainable development priorities in regard to location and design.*
- *conserve and promote a network of greenspace within the built environment which links to the surrounding countryside through a footpath network.*

The documented discussions from the Angus Council Development Standards Committee 15 Sept also mentions:

In this case the proposed development would involve the loss of prime agricultural land (Policy PV20); it would introduce a use that could generate odour and noise in proximity to existing residential uses (Policy DS4); it would have impacts on the landscape (Policy PV6) and it is located in an area where SEPA flood maps indicate there is a flood risk (Policy PV12 and 15).

Animal agriculture does not protect wildlife – quite the opposite – as this 2019 Defra report illustrates:

(https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/834432/evidence-compendium-26sep19.pdf)

“Biodiversity - Farming practices can have many impacts that can lead to a reduction in wildlife biodiversity (including loss of habitats and food sources). The UK farmland bird index, an indicator of the state of wildlife generally, has fallen to less than half its 1970 value”.

According to Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences - since humans became farmers, just 17% of wild mammal species remain (from mice to elephants).

As the site is relatively close to a number of residential properties this development can only have an increased negative effect on the local residents, in particular noise, odour, pollution and disease.

A chicken farm of this size will produce enormous amounts of faecal matter, much of which could be deposited on the outdoor ranging areas and from there into the local watercourses and river habitats.

GLOBAL HUNGER

The impact of factory farming also goes beyond the local environment to global food poverty and UK food insecurity. The Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations predicts that by 2050 world meat production will have almost **doubled** global warming, pollution, deforestation, land degradation, water scarcity and species extinction all increasing as a consequence.

850 million people go hungry every day. Animal agriculture uses 83% of farmland but only produces 18% of calories (Joseph Poore, Oxford University).

“We already produce enough to feed the world. It’s overconsumption – especially of animal protein by the global middle class, inequality, waste and inadequate production/distribution systems - that stands in the way of enough food for everyone and space for wildlife. To feed the world in a way our one planet can sustain, we need to consume and produce food differently”. (Worldwide Fund for Nature. Appetite for Destruction)

ANIMAL SUFFERING

Another reason for my objection is that I do not feel this application for a factory farm represents current public opinion. In a recent survey 85% of the public were against Factory Farms.

In addition, Defra 2019 reported that a survey showed that 78% of people felt it was “very important” to protect the welfare of farmed animals and that 82% said farmers should be rewarded for offering animals higher welfare standards.

Although the current animal welfare laws in the UK are slim I feel it is morally wrong to subject sentient animals capable of fear and misery to overcrowding, unhygienic conditions, large scale antibiotic use, mutilations without anaesthetic and no chance of a normal life. Factory farms like these result in close confinement aggression and arguably completely prevent any sense of normal behaviour as defined in the Animal Welfare Act 2006.

Whilst I appreciate that animal welfare is not a planning consideration, I would like to draw your attention to the recent Animal Aid investigation into another unit where the group exposed some terrible conditions. Footage showed hens with extensive feather loss, injured birds and several dead and decomposing birds left among the living. Conditions were extremely dirty with heavy dust and faeces accumulating. A very small percentage of the birds were outside 'ranging' during the daytime, this may be attributed to crowding and social hierarchy which prevents birds accessing pop holes. Some hens may never range outside. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O7ISh7cMOXA&list=UUQU-2dibbNDhtW7rHr3RG2g>

Two sheds are proposed for the purpose of accommodating 32,000 laying hens each, totalling 64,000 hen capacity at the site. In light of this, we really must question whether the health and welfare of an even larger population of birds can possibly be effectively monitored generally or safeguarded in an emergency situation. And more widely question whether such huge scale, vertical farming with many thousands of hens, can really constitute 'free-range'.

Whilst sadly not a legal consideration it most certainly should be a moral one.

Plant based diets are gaining favour with the public as people of this country are recognising that they have been eating diets that are poor for their health and the links meat consumption has to cancer and cardiovascular disease. Vegans and vegetarians look set to make up a quarter of the UK population in 2025 and with vegetarian and vegan product sales expected to increase to £658m by 2021 it begs the question is another factory farm really right for this community?

SUMMARY

The future looks grim.

- More pandemics.
- A climate raging out of control.
- Environmental damage.
- Biodiversity loss.
- Global food poverty and UK food insecurity.
- Antibiotic resistance - antibiotics used to keep animals in cramped, unhygienic conditions alive until slaughter.
- Animal mutilations without anaesthetic and no chance of a normal life.

The science is clear. Factory farming of animals is a leading cause of all the above.

With this in mind, I write to ask you to protect today's children, from serious problems that will dominate their future if we do not act now. Not just pandemics but the climate crisis, environmental problems, antibiotic resistance..... it paints a horrifying picture.

The climate crisis is here but the greatest impacts of it will be felt by our own children. Biodiversity is being lost, environments destroyed, soil quality diminishing. Pandemics are already a threat and antibiotic resistance is growing.

I OBJECT strongly to this application on the above grounds.

Please do not show yourselves be as ignorant or out of touch as Doncaster planning officer Jessica Duffield who said of an intensive farming application: "The proposal is considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

"Officers have identified no adverse economic, environmental or social harm that would significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits identified when considered against the policies in the planning framework taken as a whole.

As outlined above, it's plainly economically, environmentally and social not viable to accept the plan.

Yours faithfully

Simon Nightingale

Email to: planning@angus.gov.uk

FAO Ruari Kelly. Case officer Angus council.

Objection to:

21/00337/FULM | Erection of two 32,000 capacity free-range hen sheds and associated infrastructure including feed silos, egg packing facility, vehicular access, access tracks, drainage and landscaping | Field 530M West Of North Mains Of Cononsyth Farm, Cononsyth, Arbroath.

Dear Ruari and the Planning Committee.

I ask that a copy of this letter is made available to the whole Committee delegated the task of assessing this application.

Please accept my objection to the above planning application.

My reasons are as follows:

HUMAN HEALTH:

PANDEMICS

We are in the middle of a pandemic that is killing people. Scientists have predicted that the next pandemic will start as an Avian Flu.

<https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/66/wr/mm6635a2.htm>

Since November 2020 we have had 25 outbreaks of Avian Flu in the UK.

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/avian-influenza-bird-flu>

Some of these have been outbreaks in Scotland itself :

[Avian influenza \(bird flu\): how to spot and report the disease - gov.scot \(www.gov.scot\)](http://www.gov.scot)

On 18 February 2021, the National IHR Focal Point for the Russian Federation notified WHO of detection of avian influenza A(H5N8) in seven **human** clinical specimens. These are the first reported detection of avian influenza A(H5N8) in **humans**.

<https://www.who.int/csr/don/26-feb-2021-influenza-a-russian-federation/en/>

If we just look at the past 100 years of influenza pandemics, epidemics, and control strategies then the question must be whether another pandemic like the 1918 Spanish influenza, with such a deadly and disruptive impact on society killing 50 million people, is possible?

The answer is yes: it is not only possible, but it is just a matter of time.

It is important to note that there are concerns from many people in the UK of another impending pandemic of which a factory farm could well become the cause with their overcrowding and unhygienic conditions. Why on earth would a planning application for another Intensive factory farm even be considered at this time?

It is a massive risk to consider introducing an industrial chicken farm on such an enormous scale, **64000** birds, with high population densities and genetically homogenous birds. Given the known propensity for low pathogenic viral strains to mutate into high pathogenic strains amongst poultry flocks, and potential to become more easily transmissible to other mammals, it is not scaremongering to treat this development as an ongoing risk to human health.

It is noteworthy that the H5 group of highly pathogenic influenza viruses were never reported in humans before the mid-1990s; now they are found in humans in several countries every year.

The World Health Organisation (WHO) has said "... authorities have a responsibility for controlling zoonoses – diseases transmissible from animals to humans through direct contact or through food, water and the environment. An estimated 75% of emerging pathogens are of zoonotic nature".

Scientists estimate "that more than 6 out of every 10 known infectious diseases in people can be spread from animals" (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention <https://www.cdc.gov/onehealth/basics/zoonotic-diseases.html>)

Please consider this list of UK Government zoonotic diseases. It is a long and frightening list. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/list-of-zoonotic-diseases/list-of-zoonotic-diseases>

To exemplify this further, listed UK diseases linked to just chickens (there are similar lists for other farmed species) include:

- Avian Flu (Animal influenza)
- Campylobacteriosis
- Psittacosis
- Salmonellosis

ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE

THE WHO states "Antibiotic resistance is one of the biggest threats to global health, food security, and development today." (<https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance>)

and "If no action is taken - warns the (UN Ad hoc Interagency Coordinating Group on Antimicrobial Resistance) – drug-resistant diseases could cause 10 million deaths each year by 2050 and damage to the economy as catastrophic as the 2008-2009 global financial crisis. By 2030, antimicrobial resistance could force up to 24 million people into extreme poverty. Currently, at least 700,000 people die each year due to drug-resistant diseases, including 230,000 people who die from multidrug-resistant tuberculosis. More and more common diseases, including respiratory tract infections, sexually transmitted infections and urinary tract infections, are untreatable; lifesaving medical procedures are becoming much riskier, and our food systems are increasingly precarious".

(<https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/29-04-2019-new-report-calls-for-urgent-action-to-avert-antimicrobial-resistance-crisis>)

The WHO also state "Antibiotic resistance occurs naturally, but misuse of antibiotics in humans and animals is accelerating the process." (www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance)

The Soil Association says (www.soilassociation.org/reducing-antibiotics-in-farming/)

"Farm animals consume one-third of all antibiotics in the UK and it is intensive farming systems that use drugs at unnecessarily high levels, putting human health at risk."

"The routine use of antibiotics in intensive farming systems is driving this problem. Drugs are given to animals as a preventative measure - before they show signs of illness - to compensate for animals being housed in cramped, unsanitary conditions where infections spread fast. Intensively reared pigs and poultry account for 79 % of UK farming antibiotic use"

Looking holistically, what is more important, planning rules, another factory farm or people dying?

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

The short-term benefits of employment and meat production are outweighed by the environmental impact that it will have on the local area which is already facing a climate emergency. What we eat has a huge impact on the environment and has potential to cause disease and pandemics so applications should be considered in line with our broader responsibilities to protect future generations.

Furthermore, the Government sees Local Authorities as central to delivering its CO₂ emission targets yet more and more intensive farming applications are going through planning departments across the UK. It is important to recognise the significant impact just one factory farm will have on the pollution and environment of the local area.

To quote DEFRA 2007 - "The production of food from animal agriculture is a significant source of emissions in the UK, especially the production of GHGs and pollution of water sources. For pigs and poultry, the main pollutants are ammonia and N₂O. Nitrous oxide (N₂O) has 296 times the Global Warming Potential of CO₂ and ammonia (NH₃), contributes significantly to acidification of rain and soils. The agriculture sector accounts for around 37%, 66% and 88% of total UK emissions of CH₄, N₂O and NH₃, respectively (NAEI, 2007), nearly all of which is derived from livestock production."

(<http://sciencesearch.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=14662>)

If the science was clear in 2007, why are planning applications for intensive livestock units still being approved when the Government sees Local Authorities as central to delivering its CO₂ emission targets?

"Ammonia and nitrogen pollution, mostly from agriculture, is harming more than 60% of the UK's land area and affecting the most sensitive habitats, according to a DEFRA report. Ammonia pollution also effects species composition through soil acidification, direct toxic damage to leaves and by altering the susceptibility of plants to frost, drought and pathogens. At its most serious, certain sensitive and iconic habitats may be lost" (<https://www.endsreport.com/article/1588258/ammonia-pollution-harming-60-uk-land-area>)

LOCAL IMPACT and SITE-SPECIFIC INFORMATION

On the Angus Council Website there are various statements that the council has committed to which this type of development actively goes against, below are just a few excerpts:

We support the principle of sustainable development and are committed to improving the quality of life for present and future generations in Angus. By a process of integrating responses to environmental, social and economic issues the council will help to maximise human welfare while enhancing the environment in Angus.

We will seek to:

- *promote a sustainable approach to land and habitat management.*
- *protect and enhance local biodiversity.*
- *encourage a sustainable managed approach to public access to the natural environment.*

We will seek to:

- *reduce local pollution of air, land, water and to reduce the incidence of noise and light pollution.*

We will seek to:

- *conserve and enhance the historic and cultural heritage of Angus and the local characteristics of the towns and villages.*
- *encourage design in new or regeneration developments which will improve access for the disabled and create an environment free from the fear of crime.*
- *ensure that new developments are in line with sustainable development priorities in regard to location and design.*
- *conserve and promote a network of greenspace within the built environment which links to the surrounding countryside through a footpath network.*

The documented discussions from the Angus Council Development Standards Committee 15 Sept also mentions:

In this case the proposed development would involve the loss of prime agricultural land (Policy PV20); it would introduce a use that could generate odour and noise in proximity to existing residential uses (Policy DS4); it would have impacts on the landscape (Policy PV6) and it is located in an area where SEPA flood maps indicate there is a flood risk (Policy PV12 and 15).

Animal agriculture does not protect wildlife – quite the opposite – as this 2019 Defra report illustrates:

(https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/834432/evidence-compendium-26sep19.pdf)

“Biodiversity - Farming practices can have many impacts that can lead to a reduction in wildlife biodiversity (including loss of habitats and food sources). The UK farmland bird index, an indicator of the state of wildlife generally, has fallen to less than half its 1970 value”.

According to Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences - since humans became farmers, just 17% of wild mammal species remain (from mice to elephants).

As the site is relatively close to a number of residential properties this development can only have an increased negative effect on the local residents, in particular noise, odour, pollution and disease.

A chicken farm of this size will produce enormous amounts of faecal matter, much of which could be deposited on the outdoor ranging areas and from there into the local watercourses and river habitats.

GLOBAL HUNGER

The impact of factory farming also goes beyond the local environment to global food poverty and UK food insecurity. The Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations predicts that by 2050 world meat production will have almost **doubled** global warming, pollution, deforestation, land degradation, water scarcity and species extinction all increasing as a consequence.

850 million people go hungry every day. Animal agriculture uses 83% of farmland but only produces 18% of calories (Joseph Poore, Oxford University).

“We already produce enough to feed the world. It’s overconsumption – especially of animal protein by the global middle class, inequality, waste and inadequate production/distribution systems - that stands in the way of enough food for everyone and space for wildlife. To feed the world in a way our one planet can sustain, we need to consume and produce food differently”. (Worldwide Fund for Nature. Appetite for Destruction)

ANIMAL SUFFERING

Another reason for my objection is that I do not feel this application for a factory farm represents current public opinion. In a recent survey 85% of the public were against Factory Farms.

In addition, Defra 2019 reported that a survey showed that 78% of people felt it was “very important” to protect the welfare of farmed animals and that 82% said farmers should be rewarded for offering animals higher welfare standards.

Although the current animal welfare laws in the UK are slim I feel it is morally wrong to subject sentient animals capable of fear and misery to overcrowding, unhygienic conditions, large scale antibiotic use, mutilations without anaesthetic and no chance of a normal life. Factory farms like these result in close confinement aggression and arguably completely prevent any sense of normal behaviour as defined in the Animal Welfare Act 2006.

Whilst I appreciate that animal welfare is not a planning consideration, I would like to draw your attention to the recent Animal Aid investigation into another unit where the group exposed some terrible conditions. Footage showed hens with extensive feather loss, injured birds and several dead and decomposing birds left among the living. Conditions were extremely dirty with heavy dust and faeces accumulating. A very small percentage of the birds were outside 'ranging' during the daytime, this may be attributed to crowding and social hierarchy which prevents birds accessing pop holes. Some hens may never range outside. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O7ISh7cMOXA&list=UUQU-2dibbNDhtW7rHr3RG2g>

Two sheds are proposed for the purpose of accommodating 32,000 laying hens each, totalling 64,000 hen capacity at the site. In light of this, we really must question whether the health and welfare of an even larger population of birds can possibly be effectively monitored generally or safeguarded in an emergency situation. And more widely question whether such huge scale, vertical farming with many thousands of hens, can really constitute 'free-range'.

Whilst sadly not a legal consideration it most certainly should be a moral one.

Plant based diets are gaining favour with the public as people of this country are recognising that they have been eating diets that are poor for their health and the links meat consumption has to cancer and cardiovascular disease. Vegans and vegetarians look set to make up a quarter of the UK population in 2025 and with vegetarian and vegan product sales expected to increase to £658m by 2021 it begs the question is another factory farm really right for this community?

SUMMARY

The future looks grim.

- More pandemics.
- A climate raging out of control.
- Environmental damage.
- Biodiversity loss.
- Global food poverty and UK food insecurity.
- Antibiotic resistance - antibiotics used to keep animals in cramped, unhygienic conditions alive until slaughter.
- Animal mutilations without anaesthetic and no chance of a normal life.

The science is clear. Factory farming of animals is a leading cause of all the above.

With this in mind, I write to ask you to protect today's children, from serious problems that will dominate their future if we do not act now. Not just pandemics but the climate crisis, environmental problems, antibiotic resistance..... it paints a horrifying picture.

The climate crisis is here but the greatest impacts of it will be felt by our own children. Biodiversity is being lost, environments destroyed, soil quality diminishing. Pandemics are already a threat and antibiotic resistance is growing.

I OBJECT strongly to this application on the above grounds.

Yours faithfully

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLANNING](#)
Subject: FAO Ruari Kelly. Case officer Angus council.
Date: 11 June 2021 11:18:20

Objection to:

21/00337/FULM | Erection of two 32,000 capacity free-range hen sheds and associated infrastructure including feed silos, egg packing facility, vehicular access, access tracks, drainage and landscaping | Field 530M West Of North Mains Of Cononsyth Farm, Cononsyth, Arbroath.

Dear Ruari and the Planning Committee.

I ask that a copy of this letter is made available to the whole Committee delegated the task of assessing this application.

Please accept my objection to the above planning application.

My reasons are as follows:

HUMAN HEALTH:

PANDEMICS

We are in the middle of a pandemic that is killing people. Scientists have predicted that the next pandemic will start as an Avian Flu.

<https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/66/wr/mm6635a2.htm>

Since November 2020 we have had 25 outbreaks of Avian Flu in the UK.

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/avian-influenza-bird-flu>

Some of these have been outbreaks in Scotland itself :

[Avian influenza \(bird flu\): how to spot and report the disease - gov.scot \(www.gov.scot\)](#)

On 18 February 2021, the National IHR Focal Point for the Russian Federation notified WHO of detection of avian influenza A(H5N8) in seven **human** clinical specimens. These are the first reported detection of avian influenza A(H5N8) in **humans**.

<https://www.who.int/csr/don/26-feb-2021-influenza-a-russian-federation/en/>

If we just look at the past 100 years of influenza pandemics, epidemics, and control strategies then the question must be whether another pandemic like the 1918 Spanish influenza, with such a deadly and disruptive impact on society killing 50 million people, is possible?

The answer is yes: it is not only possible, but it is just a matter of time.

It is important to note that there are concerns from many people in the UK of another impending pandemic of which a factory farm could well become the cause with their overcrowding and unhygienic conditions. Why on earth would a planning application for another

Intensive factory farm even be considered at this time?

It is a massive risk to consider introducing an industrial chicken farm on such an enormous scale, **64000** birds, with high population densities and genetically homogenous birds. Given the known propensity for low pathogenic viral strains to mutate into high pathogenic strains amongst poultry flocks, and potential to become more easily transmissible to other mammals, it is not scaremongering to treat this development as an ongoing risk to human health.

It is noteworthy that the H5 group of highly pathogenic influenza viruses were never reported in humans before the mid-1990s; now they are found in humans in several countries every year.

The World Health Organisation (WHO) has said "... authorities have a responsibility for controlling zoonoses – diseases transmissible from animals to humans through direct contact or through food, water and the environment. An estimated 75% of emerging pathogens are of zoonotic nature".

Scientists estimate "that more than 6 out of every 10 known infectious diseases in people can be spread from animals" (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention <https://www.cdc.gov/onehealth/basics/zoonotic-diseases.html>)

Please consider this list of UK Government zoonotic diseases. It is a long and frightening list. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/list-of-zoonotic-diseases/list-of-zoonotic-diseases>

To exemplify this further, listed UK diseases linked to just chickens (there are similar lists for other farmed species) include:

- Avian Flu (Animal influenza)
- Campylobacteriosis
- Psittacosis
- Salmonellosis

ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE

THE WHO states "Antibiotic resistance is one of the biggest threats to global health, food security, and development today." (<https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance>)

and "If no action is taken - warns the (UN Ad hoc Interagency Coordinating Group on Antimicrobial Resistance) – drug-resistant diseases could cause 10 million deaths each year by 2050 and damage to the economy as catastrophic as the 2008-2009 global financial crisis. By 2030, antimicrobial resistance could force up to 24 million people into extreme poverty. Currently, at least 700,000 people die each year due to drug-resistant diseases, including 230,000 people who die from multidrug-resistant tuberculosis. More and more common diseases, including respiratory tract infections, sexually transmitted infections and urinary tract infections, are untreatable; lifesaving medical procedures are becoming much riskier, and our food systems are increasingly precarious".

(<https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/29-04-2019-new-report-calls-for-urgent-action-to-avert-antimicrobial-resistance-crisis>)

The WHO also state "Antibiotic resistance occurs naturally, but misuse of antibiotics in humans and animals is accelerating the process." (www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance)

The Soil Association says (www.soilassociation.org/reducing-antibiotics-in-farming/)

“Farm animals consume one-third of all antibiotics in the UK and it is intensive farming systems that use drugs at unnecessarily high levels, putting human health at risk.”

“The routine use of antibiotics in intensive farming systems is driving this problem. Drugs are given to animals as a preventative measure - before they show signs of illness - to compensate for animals being housed in cramped, unsanitary conditions where infections spread fast. Intensively reared pigs and poultry account for 79 % of UK farming antibiotic use”

Looking holistically, what is more important, planning rules, another factory farm or people dying?

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

The short-term benefits of employment and meat production are outweighed by the environmental impact that it will have on the local area which is already facing a climate emergency. What we eat has a huge impact on the environment and has potential to cause disease and pandemics so applications should be considered in line with our broader responsibilities to protect future generations.

Furthermore, the Government sees Local Authorities as central to delivering its CO₂ emission targets yet more and more intensive farming applications are going through planning departments across the UK. It is important to recognise the significant impact just one factory farm will have on the pollution and environment of the local area.

To quote DEFRA 2007 - “The production of food from animal agriculture is a significant source of emissions in the UK, especially the production of GHGs and pollution of water sources. For pigs and poultry, the main pollutants are ammonia and N₂O. Nitrous oxide (N₂O) has 296 times the Global Warming Potential of CO₂ and ammonia (NH₃), contributes significantly to acidification of rain and soils. The agriculture sector accounts for around 37%, 66% and 88% of total UK emissions of CH₄, N₂O and NH₃, respectively (NAEI, 2007), nearly all of which is derived from livestock production.”

(<http://scienceresearch.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=14662>)

If the science was clear in 2007, why are planning applications for intensive livestock units still being approved when the Government sees Local Authorities as central to delivering its CO₂ emission targets?

“Ammonia and nitrogen pollution, mostly from agriculture, is harming more than 60% of the UK’s land area and affecting the most sensitive habitats, according to a DEFRA report. Ammonia pollution also effects species composition through soil acidification, direct toxic damage to leaves and by altering the susceptibility of plants to frost, drought and pathogens. At its most serious, certain sensitive and iconic habitats may be lost”

(<https://www.endsreport.com/article/1588258/ammonia-pollution-harming-60-uk-land-area>)

LOCAL IMPACT and SITE-SPECIFIC INFORMATION

On the Angus Council Website there are various statements that the council has committed to which this type of development actively goes against, below are just a few excerpts:

We support the principle of sustainable development and are committed to improving the quality of life for present and future generations in Angus. By a process of integrating responses to environmental, social and economic issues the council will help to maximise human welfare while enhancing the environment in Angus.

We will seek to:

- *promote a sustainable approach to land and habitat management.*
- *protect and enhance local biodiversity.*
- *encourage a sustainable managed approach to public access to the natural environment.*

We will seek to:

- *reduce local pollution of air, land, water and to reduce the incidence of noise and light pollution.*

We will seek to:

- *conserve and enhance the historic and cultural heritage of Angus and the local characteristics of the towns and villages.*
- *encourage design in new or regeneration developments which will improve access for the disabled and create an environment free from the fear of crime.*
- *ensure that new developments are in line with sustainable development priorities in regard to location and design.*
- *conserve and promote a network of greenspace within the built environment which links to the surrounding countryside through a footpath network.*

The documented discussions from the Angus Council Development Standards Committee 15 Sept also mentions:

In this case the proposed development would involve the loss of prime agricultural land (Policy PV20); it would introduce a use that could generate odour and noise in proximity to existing residential uses (Policy DS4); it would have impacts on the landscape (Policy PV6) and it is located in an area where SEPA flood maps indicate there is a flood risk (Policy PV12 and 15).

Animal agriculture does not protect wildlife – quite the opposite – as this 2019 Defra report illustrates:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/834432/evidence-compendium-26sep19.pdf

“Biodiversity - Farming practices can have many impacts that can lead to a reduction in wildlife

biodiversity (including loss of habitats and food sources). The UK farmland bird index, an indicator of the state of wildlife generally, has fallen to less than half its 1970 value”.

According to Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences - since humans became farmers, just 17% of wild mammal species remain (from mice to elephants).

As the site is relatively close to a number of residential properties this development can only have an increased negative effect on the local residents, in particular noise, odour, pollution and disease.

A chicken farm of this size will produce enormous amounts of faecal matter, much of which could be deposited on the outdoor ranging areas and from there into the local watercourses and river habitats.

GLOBAL HUNGER

The impact of factory farming also goes beyond the local environment to global food poverty and UK food insecurity. The Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations predicts that by 2050 world meat production will have almost [doubled](#) global warming, pollution, deforestation, land degradation, water scarcity and species extinction all increasing as a consequence.

850 million people go hungry every day. Animal agriculture uses 83% of farmland but only produces 18% of calories (Joseph Poore, Oxford University).

“We already produce enough to feed the world. It’s overconsumption – especially of animal protein by the global middle class, inequality, waste and inadequate production/distribution systems - that stands in the way of enough food for everyone and space for wildlife. To feed the world in a way our one planet can sustain, we need to consume and produce food differently”. (Worldwide Fund for Nature. Appetite for Destruction)

ANIMAL SUFFERING

Another reason for my objection is that I do not feel this application for a factory farm represents current public opinion. In a recent survey 85% of the public were against Factory Farms.

In addition, Defra 2019 reported that a survey showed that 78% of people felt it was “very important” to protect the welfare of farmed animals and that 82% said farmers should be rewarded for offering animals higher welfare standards.

Although the current animal welfare laws in the UK are slim I feel it is morally wrong to subject sentient animals capable of fear and misery to overcrowding, unhygienic conditions, large scale antibiotic use, mutilations without anaesthetic and no chance of a normal life. Factory farms like these result in close confinement aggression and arguably completely prevent any sense of normal behaviour as defined in the Animal Welfare Act 2006.

Whilst I appreciate that animal welfare is not a planning consideration, I would like to draw your

attention to the recent Animal Aid investigation into another unit where the group exposed some terrible conditions. Footage showed hens with extensive feather loss, injured birds and several dead and decomposing birds left among the living. Conditions were extremely dirty with heavy dust and faeces accumulating. A very small percentage of the birds were outside 'ranging' during the daytime, this may be attributed to crowding and social hierarchy which prevents birds accessing pop holes. Some hens may never range outside. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O7ISh7cMOXA&list=UUQU-2dlbbNDhtW7rHr3RG2g>

Two sheds are proposed for the purpose of accommodating 32,000 laying hens each, totalling 64,000 hen capacity at the site. In light of this, we really must question whether the health and welfare of an even larger population of birds can possibly be effectively monitored generally or safeguarded in an emergency situation. And more widely question whether such huge scale, vertical farming with many thousands of hens, can really constitute 'free-range'.

Whilst sadly not a legal consideration it most certainly should be a moral one.

Plant based diets are gaining favour with the public as people of this country are recognising that they have been eating diets that are poor for their health and the links meat consumption has to cancer and cardiovascular disease. Vegans and vegetarians look set to make up a quarter of the UK population in 2025 and with vegetarian and vegan product sales expected to increase to £658m by 2021 it begs the question is another factory farm really right for this community?

SUMMARY

The future looks grim.

- More pandemics.
- A climate raging out of control.
- Environmental damage.
- Biodiversity loss.
- Global food poverty and UK food insecurity.
- Antibiotic resistance - antibiotics used to keep animals in cramped, unhygienic conditions alive until slaughter.
- Animal mutilations without anaesthetic and no chance of a normal life.

The science is clear. Factory farming of animals is a leading cause of all the above.

With this in mind, I write to ask you to protect today's children, from serious problems that will dominate their future if we do not act now. Not just pandemics but the climate crisis, environmental problems, antibiotic resistance..... it paints a horrifying picture.

The climate crisis is here but the greatest impacts of it will be felt by our own children. Biodiversity is being lost, environments destroyed, soil quality diminishing. Pandemics are already a threat and antibiotic resistance is growing.

I OBJECT strongly to this application on the above grounds.

Yours faithfully
Suzanne Lewis

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLANNING](#)
Subject: FAO Ruari Kelly, Case officer Angus council.
Date: 10 June 2021 18:21:38

Objection to:

21/00337/FULM | Erection of two 32,000 capacity free-range hen sheds and associated infrastructure including feed silos, egg packing facility, vehicular access, access tracks, drainage and landscaping | Field 530M West Of North Mains Of Cononsyth Farm, Cononsyth, Arbroath.

Dear Ruari and the Planning Committee.

I am extremely dismayed to see this proposal being enacted without intense consultation to the wider community and the country as a whole. It contravenes social ethics that are increasingly prevalent within modern society and is a step backwards for the United Kingdom that we continue to engage with these abhorrent practices.

I ask that a copy of this letter is made available to the whole Committee delegated the task of assessing this application.

Please accept my objection to the above planning application.

My reasons are as follows:

HUMAN HEALTH:

PANDEMICS

We are in the middle of a pandemic that is killing people. Scientists have predicted that the next pandemic will start as an Avian Flu.

<https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/66/wr/mm6635a2.htm>

Since November 2020 we have had 25 outbreaks of Avian Flu in the UK.

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/avian-influenza-bird-flu>

-
Some of these have been outbreaks in Scotland itself :

[Avian influenza \(bird flu\): how to spot and report the disease - gov.scot \(www.gov.scot\)](https://www.gov.scot/resources/documents/2015/04/Avian_influenza_(bird_flu)_how_to_spot_and_report_the_disease_-_gov.scot_(www.gov.scot).pdf)

-
On 18 February 2021, the National IHR Focal Point for the Russian Federation notified WHO of detection of avian influenza A(H5N8) in seven **human** clinical specimens. These are the first reported detection of avian influenza A(H5N8) in **humans**.

<https://www.who.int/csr/don/26-feb-2021-influenza-a-russian-federation/en/>

If we just look at the past 100 years of influenza pandemics, epidemics, and control strategies then the question must be whether another pandemic like the 1918 Spanish influenza, with such a deadly and disruptive impact on society killing 50 million people, is possible?

The answer is yes: it is not only possible, but it is just a matter of time.

It is important to note that there are concerns from many people in the UK of another impending pandemic of which a factory farm could well become the cause with their overcrowding and unhygienic conditions. Why on earth would a planning application for another Intensive factory farm even be considered at this time?

It is a massive risk to consider introducing an industrial chicken farm on such an enormous scale, **64000** birds, with high population densities and genetically homogenous birds. Given the known propensity for low pathogenic viral strains to mutate into high pathogenic strains amongst poultry flocks, and potential to become more easily transmissible to other mammals, it is not scaremongering to treat this development as an ongoing risk to human health.

It is noteworthy that the H5 group of highly pathogenic influenza viruses were never reported in humans before the mid-1990s; now they are found in humans in several countries every year.

The World Health Organisation (WHO) has said "... authorities have a responsibility for controlling zoonoses – diseases transmissible from animals to humans through direct contact or through food, water and the environment. An estimated 75% of emerging pathogens are of zoonotic nature".

Scientists estimate "that more than 6 out of every 10 known infectious diseases in people can be spread from animals" (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

<https://www.cdc.gov/onehealth/basics/zoonotic-diseases.html>)

Please consider this list of UK Government zoonotic diseases. It is a long and frightening list.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/list-of-zoonotic-diseases/list-of-zoonotic-diseases>

To exemplify this further, listed UK diseases linked to just chickens (there are similar lists for other farmed species) include:

- Avian Flu (Animal influenza)
- Campylobacteriosis
- Psittacosis
- Salmonellosis

-

ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE

THE WHO states "Antibiotic resistance is one of the biggest threats to global health, food security, and development today." (<https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance>)

and "If no action is taken - warns the (UN Ad hoc Interagency Coordinating Group on Antimicrobial Resistance) – drug-resistant diseases could cause 10 million deaths each year by 2050 and damage to the economy as catastrophic as the 2008-2009 global financial crisis. By 2030, antimicrobial resistance could force up to 24 million people into extreme poverty. Currently, at least 700,000 people die each year due to drug-resistant diseases, including 230,000 people who die from multidrug-resistant tuberculosis. More and more common diseases, including respiratory tract infections, sexually transmitted infections and urinary tract infections, are untreatable; lifesaving medical procedures are becoming much riskier, and our food systems are increasingly precarious".

(<https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/29-04-2019-new-report-calls-for-urgent-action-to-avert-antimicrobial-resistance-crisis>)

The WHO also state "Antibiotic resistance occurs naturally, but misuse of antibiotics in humans and animals is accelerating the process." (www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance)

The Soil Association says (www.soilassociation.org/reducing-antibiotics-in-farming/)

"Farm animals consume one-third of all antibiotics in the UK and it is intensive

farming systems that use drugs at unnecessarily high levels, putting human health at risk.”

“The routine use of antibiotics in intensive farming systems is driving this problem. Drugs are given to animals as a preventative measure - before they show signs of illness - to compensate for animals being housed in cramped, unsanitary conditions where infections spread fast. Intensively reared pigs and poultry account for 79 % of UK farming antibiotic use”

Looking holistically, what is more important, planning rules, another factory farm or people dying?

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

-

The short-term benefits of employment and meat production are outweighed by the environmental impact that it will have on the local area which is already facing a climate emergency. What we eat has a huge impact on the environment and has potential to cause disease and pandemics so applications should be considered in line with our broader responsibilities to protect future generations.

Furthermore, the Government sees Local Authorities as central to delivering its CO₂ emission targets yet more and more intensive farming applications are going through planning departments across the UK. It is important to recognise the significant impact just one factory farm will have on the pollution and environment of the local area.

To quote DEFRA 2007 - “The production of food from animal agriculture is a significant source of emissions in the UK, especially the production of GHGs and pollution of water sources. For pigs and poultry, the main pollutants are ammonia and N₂O. Nitrous oxide (N₂O) has 296 times the Global Warming Potential of CO₂ and ammonia (NH₃), contributes significantly to acidification of rain and soils. The agriculture sector accounts for around 37%, 66% and 88% of total UK emissions of CH₄, N₂O and NH₃, respectively (NAEI, 2007), nearly all of which is derived from livestock production.”

<http://sciencesearch.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=14662>

If the science was clear in 2007, why are planning applications for intensive livestock units still being approved when the Government sees Local Authorities as central to delivering its CO₂ emission targets?

“Ammonia and nitrogen pollution, mostly from agriculture, is harming more than 60% of the UK’s land area and affecting the most sensitive habitats, according to a DEFRA report. Ammonia pollution also effects species composition through soil acidification, direct toxic damage to leaves and by altering the susceptibility of plants to frost, drought and pathogens. At its most serious, certain sensitive and iconic habitats may be lost” (<https://www.endsreport.com/article/1588258/ammonia-pollution-harming-60-uk-land-area>)

LOCAL IMPACT and SITE-SPECIFIC INFORMATION

On the Angus Council Website there are various statements that the council has committed to which this type of development actively goes against, below are just a few excerpts:

We support the principle of sustainable development and are committed to improving the quality of life for present and future generations in Angus. By a process of integrating responses to environmental, social and economic issues the council will help to maximise human welfare while enhancing the environment in Angus.

We will seek to:

- *promote a sustainable approach to land and habitat management.*
- *protect and enhance local biodiversity.*
- *encourage a sustainable managed approach to public access to the natural environment.*

We will seek to:

- *reduce local pollution of air, land, water and to reduce the incidence of noise and light pollution.*

We will seek to:

- *conserve and enhance the historic and cultural heritage of Angus and the local characteristics of the towns and villages.*
- *encourage design in new or regeneration developments which will improve access for the disabled and create an environment free from the fear of crime.*
- *ensure that new developments are in line with sustainable development priorities in regard to location and design.*
- *conserve and promote a network of greenspace within the built environment which links to the surrounding countryside through a footpath network.*

The documented discussions from the Angus Council Development Standards Committee 15 Sept also mentions:

In this case the proposed development would involve the loss of prime agricultural land (Policy PV20); it would introduce a use that could generate odour and noise in proximity to existing residential uses (Policy DS4); it would have impacts on the landscape (Policy PV6) and it is located in an area where SEPA flood maps indicate there is a flood risk (Policy PV12 and 15).

Animal agriculture does not protect wildlife – quite the opposite – as this 2019 Defra report illustrates:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/834432/evidence-compendium-26sep19.pdf

“Biodiversity - Farming practices can have many impacts that can lead to a reduction in wildlife biodiversity (including loss of habitats and food sources). The UK farmland bird index, an indicator of the state of wildlife generally, has fallen to less than half its 1970 value”.

According to Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences - since humans became farmers, just 17% of wild mammal species remain (from mice to elephants).

As the site is relatively close to a number of residential properties this development can only have an increased negative effect on the local residents, in particular noise, odour, pollution and disease.

A chicken farm of this size will produce enormous amounts of faecal matter, much of which could be deposited on the outdoor ranging areas and from there into the local watercourses and river habitats.

GLOBAL HUNGER

The impact of factory farming also goes beyond the local environment to global food poverty and UK food insecurity. The Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations predicts that by 2050 world meat production will have almost [doubled](#) global warming, pollution, deforestation, land degradation, water scarcity and species extinction all increasing as a consequence.

850 million people go hungry every day. Animal agriculture uses 83% of farmland but only produces 18% of calories (Joseph Poore, Oxford University).

“We already produce enough to feed the world. It’s overconsumption – especially of animal protein by the global middle class, inequality, waste and inadequate production/distribution systems - that stands in the way of enough food for everyone and space for wildlife. To feed the world in a way our one planet can sustain, we need to consume and produce food differently”. (Worldwide Fund for Nature. Appetite for Destruction)

-

ANIMAL SUFFERING

Another reason for my objection is that I do not feel this application for a factory farm represents current public opinion. In a recent survey 85% of the public were against Factory Farms.

In addition, Defra 2019 reported that a survey showed that 78% of people felt it was “very important” to protect the welfare of farmed animals and that 82% said farmers should be rewarded for offering animals higher welfare standards.

Although the current animal welfare laws in the UK are slim I feel it is morally wrong to subject sentient animals capable of fear and misery to overcrowding, unhygienic conditions, large scale antibiotic use, mutilations without anaesthetic and no chance of a normal life. Factory farms like these result in close confinement aggression and arguably completely prevent any sense of normal behaviour as defined in the Animal Welfare Act 2006.

Whilst I appreciate that animal welfare is not a planning consideration, I would like to draw your attention to the recent Animal Aid investigation into another unit where the group exposed some terrible conditions. Footage showed hens with extensive feather loss, injured birds and several dead and decomposing birds left among the living. Conditions were extremely dirty with heavy dust and faeces accumulating. A very small percentage of the birds were outside ‘ranging’ during the daytime, this may be attributed to crowding and

social hierarchy which prevents birds accessing pop holes. Some hens may never range outside. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O7ISh7cMOXA&list=UUQU-2dIbbNDhtW7rHr3RG2g>

Two sheds are proposed for the purpose of accommodating 32,000 laying hens each, totalling 64,000 hen capacity at the site. In light of this, we really must question whether the health and welfare of an even larger population of birds can possibly be effectively monitored generally or safeguarded in an emergency situation. And more widely question whether such huge scale, vertical farming with many thousands of hens, can really constitute 'free-range'.

Whilst sadly not a legal consideration it most certainly should be a moral one.

Plant based diets are gaining favour with the public as people of this country are recognising that they have been eating diets that are poor for their health and the links meat consumption has to cancer and cardiovascular disease. Vegans and vegetarians look set to make up a quarter of the UK population in 2025 and with vegetarian and vegan product sales expected to increase to £658m by 2021 it begs the question is another factory farm really right for this community?

SUMMARY

-

The future looks grim.

- More pandemics.
- A climate raging out of control.
- Environmental damage.
- Biodiversity loss.
- Global food poverty and UK food insecurity.
- Antibiotic resistance - antibiotics used to keep animals in cramped, unhygienic conditions alive until slaughter.
- Animal mutilations without anaesthetic and no chance of a normal life.

The science is clear. Factory farming of animals is a leading cause of all the above.

With this in mind, I write to ask you to protect today's children, from serious problems that will dominate their future if we do not act now. Not just pandemics but the climate crisis, environmental problems, antibiotic resistance..... it paints a horrifying picture.

The climate crisis is here but the greatest impacts of it will be felt by our own children. Biodiversity is being lost, environments destroyed, soil quality diminishing. Pandemics are already a threat and antibiotic resistance is growing.

I OBJECT strongly to this application on the above grounds.

Yours faithfully,

Tim Dutton

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

FAO Ruari Kelly. Case officer Angus council.

Objection to:

21/00337/FULM | Erection of two 32,000 capacity free-range hen sheds and associated infrastructure including feed silos, egg packing facility, vehicular access, access tracks, drainage and landscaping | Field 530M West Of North Mains Of Cononsyth Farm, Cononsyth, Arbroath.

Dear Ruari and the Planning Committee.

Factory farming is not only extremely cruel, inhumane, and unnatural for the animal victims, but it harming us human animals and the environment as well. Given the current COVID-19 pandemic, which is a zoonic disease—therefore sourced from filthy living conditions for animals meant for consumption—I hope you will make the right decision and object to the above planning application.

I ask that a copy of this letter is made available to the whole Committee delegated the task of assessing this application.

Please accept my objection to the above planning application.

My reasons are as follows:

HUMAN HEALTH:

PANDEMICS

We are in the middle of a pandemic that is killing people. Scientists have predicted that the next pandemic will start as an Avian Flu.

<https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/66/wr/mm6635a2.htm>

Since November 2020 we have had 25 outbreaks of Avian Flu in the UK.

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/avian-influenza-bird-flu>

Some of these have been outbreaks in Scotland itself :

[Avian influenza \(bird flu\): how to spot and report the disease - gov.scot \(www.gov.scot\)](https://www.gov.scot/publications/avian-influenza-bird-flu/pages/2.aspx)

On 18 February 2021, the National IHR Focal Point for the Russian Federation notified WHO of detection of avian influenza A(H5N8) in seven **human** clinical specimens. These are the first reported detection of avian influenza A(H5N8) in **humans**.

<https://www.who.int/csr/don/26-feb-2021-influenza-a-russian-federation/en/>

If we just look at the past 100 years of influenza pandemics, epidemics, and control strategies then the question must be whether another pandemic like the 1918 Spanish influenza, with such a deadly and disruptive impact on society killing 50 million people, is possible?

The answer is yes: it is not only possible, but it is just a matter of time.

It is important to note that there are concerns from many people in the UK of another impending pandemic of which a factory farm could well become the cause with their overcrowding and unhygienic conditions. Why on earth would a planning application for another Intensive factory farm even be considered at this time?

It is a massive risk to consider introducing an industrial chicken farm on such an enormous scale, **64000** birds, with high population densities and genetically homogenous birds. Given the known propensity for low pathogenic viral strains to mutate into high pathogenic strains amongst poultry flocks, and potential to become more easily transmissible to other mammals, it is not scaremongering to treat this development as an ongoing risk to human health.

It is noteworthy that the H5 group of highly pathogenic influenza viruses were never reported in humans before the mid-1990s; now they are found in humans in several countries every year.

The World Health Organisation (WHO) has said "... authorities have a responsibility for controlling zoonoses – diseases transmissible from animals to humans through direct contact or through food, water and the environment. An estimated 75% of emerging pathogens are of zoonotic nature".

Scientists estimate "that more than 6 out of every 10 known infectious diseases in people can be spread from animals" (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention <https://www.cdc.gov/onehealth/basics/zoonotic-diseases.html>)

Please consider this list of UK Government zoonotic diseases. It is a long and frightening list. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/list-of-zoonotic-diseases/list-of-zoonotic-diseases>

To exemplify this further, listed UK diseases linked to just chickens (there are similar lists for other farmed species) include:

- Avian Flu (Animal influenza)
- Campylobacteriosis
- Psittacosis
- Salmonellosis

ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE

THE WHO states "Antibiotic resistance is one of the biggest threats to global health, food security, and development today." (<https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance>)

and "If no action is taken - warns the (UN Ad hoc Interagency Coordinating Group on Antimicrobial Resistance) – drug-resistant diseases could cause 10 million deaths each year by 2050 and damage to the economy as catastrophic as the 2008-2009 global financial crisis. By 2030, antimicrobial resistance could force up to 24 million people into extreme poverty. Currently, at least 700,000 people die each year due to drug-resistant diseases, including 230,000 people who die from multidrug-resistant tuberculosis. More and more common diseases, including respiratory tract infections, sexually transmitted infections and urinary tract infections, are untreatable; lifesaving medical procedures are becoming much riskier, and our food systems are increasingly precarious".

<https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/29-04-2019-new-report-calls-for-urgent-action-to-avert-antimicrobial-resistance-crisis>

The WHO also state "Antibiotic resistance occurs naturally, but misuse of antibiotics in humans and animals is accelerating the process." (www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance)

The Soil Association says (www.soilassociation.org/reducing-antibiotics-in-farming/)

"Farm animals consume one-third of all antibiotics in the UK and it is intensive farming systems that use drugs at unnecessarily high levels, putting human health at risk."

"The routine use of antibiotics in intensive farming systems is driving this problem. Drugs are given to animals as a preventative measure - before they show signs of illness - to compensate for animals being housed in cramped, unsanitary conditions where infections spread fast. Intensively reared pigs and poultry account for 79 % of UK farming antibiotic use"

Looking holistically, what is more important, planning rules, another factory farm or people dying?

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

The short-term benefits of employment and meat production are outweighed by the environmental impact that it will have on the local area which is already facing a climate emergency. What we eat has a huge impact on the environment and has potential to cause disease and pandemics so applications should be considered in line with our broader responsibilities to protect future generations.

Furthermore, the Government sees Local Authorities as central to delivering its CO₂ emission targets yet more and more intensive farming applications are going through planning departments across the UK. It is important to recognise the significant impact just one factory farm will have on the pollution and environment of the local area.

To quote DEFRA 2007 - "The production of food from animal agriculture is a significant source of emissions in the UK, especially the production of GHGs and pollution of water sources. For pigs and poultry, the main pollutants are ammonia and N₂O. Nitrous oxide (N₂O) has 296 times the Global Warming Potential of CO₂ and ammonia (NH₃), contributes significantly to acidification of rain and soils. The agriculture sector accounts for around 37%, 66% and 88% of total UK emissions of CH₄, N₂O and NH₃, respectively (NAEI, 2007), nearly all of which is derived from livestock production."

(<http://sciencesearch.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=14662>)

If the science was clear in 2007, why are planning applications for intensive livestock units still being approved when the Government sees Local Authorities as central to delivering its CO₂ emission targets?

"Ammonia and nitrogen pollution, mostly from agriculture, is harming more than 60% of the UK's land area and affecting the most sensitive habitats, according to a DEFRA report. Ammonia pollution also effects species composition through soil acidification, direct toxic damage to leaves and by altering the susceptibility of plants to frost, drought and pathogens. At its most serious, certain sensitive and iconic habitats may be lost"

(<https://www.endsreport.com/article/1588258/ammonia-pollution-harming-60-uk-land-area>)

LOCAL IMPACT and SITE-SPECIFIC INFORMATION

On the Angus Council Website there are various statements that the council has committed to which this type of development actively goes against, below are just a few excerpts:

We support the principle of sustainable development and are committed to improving the quality of life for present and future generations in Angus. By a process of integrating responses to environmental, social and economic issues the council will help to maximise human welfare while enhancing the environment in Angus.

We will seek to:

- *promote a sustainable approach to land and habitat management.*
- *protect and enhance local biodiversity.*
- *encourage a sustainable managed approach to public access to the natural environment.*

We will seek to:

- *reduce local pollution of air, land, water and to reduce the incidence of noise and light pollution.*

We will seek to:

- *conserve and enhance the historic and cultural heritage of Angus and the local characteristics of the towns and villages.*
- *encourage design in new or regeneration developments which will improve access for the disabled and create an environment free from the fear of crime.*
- *ensure that new developments are in line with sustainable development priorities in regard to location and design.*
- *conserve and promote a network of greenspace within the built environment which links to the surrounding countryside through a footpath network.*

The documented discussions from the Angus Council Development Standards Committee 15 Sept also mentions:

In this case the proposed development would involve the loss of prime agricultural land (Policy PV20); it would introduce a use that could generate odour and noise in proximity to existing residential uses (Policy DS4); it would have impacts on the landscape (Policy PV6) and it is located in an area where SEPA flood maps indicate there is a flood risk (Policy PV12 and 15).

Animal agriculture does not protect wildlife – quite the opposite – as this 2019 Defra report illustrates:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/834432/evidence-compendium-26sep19.pdf

“Biodiversity - Farming practices can have many impacts that can lead to a reduction in wildlife biodiversity (including loss of habitats and food sources). The UK farmland bird index, an indicator of the state of wildlife generally, has fallen to less than half its 1970 value”.

According to Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences - since humans became farmers, just 17% of wild mammal species remain (from mice to elephants).

As the site is relatively close to a number of residential properties this development can only have an increased negative effect on the local residents, in particular noise, odour, pollution and disease.

A chicken farm of this size will produce enormous amounts of faecal matter, much of which could be deposited on the outdoor ranging areas and from there into the local watercourses and river habitats.

GLOBAL HUNGER

The impact of factory farming also goes beyond the local environment to global food poverty and UK food insecurity. The Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations predicts that by 2050 world meat production will have almost doubled global warming, pollution, deforestation, land degradation, water scarcity and species extinction all increasing as a consequence.

850 million people go hungry every day. Animal agriculture uses 83% of farmland but only produces 18% of calories (Joseph Poore, Oxford University).

“We already produce enough to feed the world. It’s overconsumption – especially of animal protein by the global middle class, inequality, waste and inadequate production/distribution systems - that stands in the way of enough food for everyone and space for wildlife. To feed the world in a way our one planet can sustain, we need to consume and produce food differently”. (Worldwide Fund for Nature. Appetite for Destruction)

ANIMAL SUFFERING

Another reason for my objection is that I do not feel this application for a factory farm represents current public opinion. In a recent survey 85% of the public were against Factory Farms.

In addition, Defra 2019 reported that a survey showed that 78% of people felt it was “very important” to protect the welfare of farmed animals and that 82% said farmers should be rewarded for offering animals higher welfare standards.

Although the current animal welfare laws in the UK are slim I feel it is morally wrong to subject sentient animals capable of fear and misery to overcrowding, unhygienic conditions, large scale antibiotic use, mutilations without anaesthetic and no chance of a normal life. Factory farms like these result in close confinement

aggression and arguably completely prevent any sense of normal behaviour as defined in the Animal Welfare Act 2006.

Whilst I appreciate that animal welfare is not a planning consideration, I would like to draw your attention to the recent Animal Aid investigation into another unit where the group exposed some terrible conditions. Footage showed hens with extensive feather loss, injured birds and several dead and decomposing birds left among the living. Conditions were extremely dirty with heavy dust and faeces accumulating. A very small percentage of the birds were outside 'ranging' during the daytime, this may be attributed to crowding and social hierarchy which prevents birds accessing pop holes. Some hens may never range outside. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O7Ish7cMOXA&list=UUQU-2dlbbNDhtW7rHr3RG2g>

Two sheds are proposed for the purpose of accommodating 32,000 laying hens each, totalling 64,000 hen capacity at the site. In light of this, we really must question whether the health and welfare of an even larger population of birds can possibly be effectively monitored generally or safeguarded in an emergency situation. And more widely question whether such huge scale, vertical farming with many thousands of hens, can really constitute 'free-range'.

Whilst sadly not a legal consideration it most certainly should be a moral one.

Plant based diets are gaining favour with the public as people of this country are recognising that they have been eating diets that are poor for their health and the links meat consumption has to cancer and cardiovascular disease. Vegans and vegetarians look set to make up a quarter of the UK population in 2025 and with vegetarian and vegan product sales expected to increase to £658m by 2021 it begs the question is another factory farm really right for this community?

SUMMARY

The future looks grim.

- More pandemics.
- A climate raging out of control.
- Environmental damage.
- Biodiversity loss.
- Global food poverty and UK food insecurity.
- Antibiotic resistance - antibiotics used to keep animals in cramped, unhygienic conditions alive until slaughter.
- Animal mutilations without anaesthetic and no chance of a normal life.

The science is clear. Factory farming of animals is a leading cause of all the above.

With this in mind, I write to ask you to protect today's children, from serious problems that will dominate their future if we do not act now. Not just pandemics but the climate crisis, environmental problems, antibiotic resistance..... it paints a horrifying picture.

The climate crisis is here but the greatest impacts of it will be felt by our own children. Biodiversity is being lost, environments destroyed, soil quality diminishing. Pandemics are already a threat and antibiotic resistance is growing.

I OBJECT strongly to this application on the above grounds.

Yours faithfully,
Vivian Moreira