

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 Allan Kydd

Address: 11D Station Road Inverkeilor Arbroath DD11 5RT

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I write to you in strong support for the above proposal.

As a qualified engineer and member of the Institution of Engineering and Technology, I pride myself on reaching educated conclusions based on knowledge and informed, proven, and objectively obtained facts.

It is disheartening to find that facts, which by definition cannot be argued, are being opposed by what is no more than opinion, hearsay, and personal disposition. I of course welcome debate and I welcome disagreement, however, I would implore those who may blindly disregard the facts presented in various documents within this forum, prepared by organisations who are contractually obliged to provide impartial and objective information based on sound factual evidence, to familiarise themselves fully with all knowledge available before documenting their opinion in a public domain.

Agriculture is a cornerstone of our societal history and I feel we must do all that is possible to ensure it is also our future. Farming families are having to diversify to protect their businesses and protect the industry that serves everyone in our society. As an ex-neighbour to Cononsyth Farms Ltd., their commitment to improving biodiversity and provision of sustainably sourced produce has always been apparent and this proposal in its entirety continues to do that. The planning and considerable thought process involved to ensure the introduction of a circular economy, further enabling sustainability and regenerative agriculture, into the proposal ensures a continued and commendable commitment to the environment.

The use of renewable and sustainable energies is being championed by our government and supported more by the population. This proposal, and the previous work carried out by Cononsyth Farms Ltd. is exemplary in showing the farming community how to increase sustainable food production, while minimising carbon emissions, but also maintaining local ecosystems which historically has been challenging.

Yours,

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 Charles Hargreaves

Address: West End, Bungalow Road Glusburn Keighley BD20 8QA

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: This planned development is too close to residential properties.

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 Daniel Moore

Address: 5 Prince Edward Grove Leeds LS126AX

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Too close to residential

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 David Lamont

Address: 16 Strathmore Avenue Kirriemuir DD8 4DJ

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:ALDP Policy DS2 Accessible Development is relevant regarding the selection of the U467 for access to the development site. The applicant has proposed mitigation in the form of passing places, widening of the junction with the B961, appropriate signage, and scheduled traffic to and from the site, while ignoring the problems referred to above and the increased noise and general disturbance to residents who use the road as their only convenient route south. No mention has been made about how the U467 will be made safe to walkers, cyclists and horse riders in the face of much larger vehicles and more traffic generally, using the road

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLANNING](#)
Subject: Objection to the factory farming of hens
Date: 09 June 2021 15:42:59

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://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
Denise Rimmer

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 Graeme Neill

Address: Grange Of Conon Arbroath DD11 3SD

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I write in support of the planning application for the free-range hen sheds at North Mains of Cononsyth

Farming has had to adapt to the public needs of high welfare and environmentally friendly local food and this diversification will provide what the consumer demands.

Free range hens in a high welfare system with access to the fields surrounding the sheds will produce a high standard of animal husbandry and produce for the growing free-range market replacing the outdated battery egg laying system.

On reading the application it is clear this proposal has been given much attention to detail in order to ensure minimal impact to the surrounding area - building colour, planting of trees, the use of renewable energy (lowering carbon footprint of agriculture).

Farming businesses in Angus must diversify in order to secure future sustainability and this state of the art egg production building will bring additional short and long term employment to the area.

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 Graeme Neill

Address: Grange Of Conon Arbroath DD11 3SD

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I write in support of the planning application for the free-range hen sheds at North Mains of Cononsyth

Farming has had to adapt to the public needs of high welfare and environmentally friendly local food and this diversification will provide what the consumer demands.

Free range hens in a high welfare system with access to the fields surrounding the sheds will produce a high standard of animal husbandry and produce for the growing free-range market replacing the outdated battery egg laying system.

On reading the application it is clear this proposal has been given much attention to detail in order to ensure minimal impact to the surrounding area - building colour, planting of trees, the use of renewable energy (lowering carbon footprint of agriculture).

Farming businesses in Angus must diversify in order to secure future sustainability and this state of the art egg production building will bring additional short and long term employment to the area.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLANNING](#)
Cc: [Ruari Kelly](#)
Subject: 21/00337/FULM
Date: 09 June 2021 00:53:34

Proposal- Erection of two 32,000 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

Case Officer- Ruari Kelly

I wish to object to this Planning Application for the following reasons.

SITE LOCATION

- Proposed site is on Prime Agricultural Land as verified to a resident on 2nd March by Hutton Institute and not of 'lower yield' as indicated by applicant. When and by whom was this land downgraded?
- Contrary to ALDP, this new development is on a greenfield site and will be built in isolation
- According to ALDP policy 'proposals on Prime Agricultural Land will only be supported where they are small scale'. This is a Major development of large scale and size, not small scale and of low profile, which will dominate landscape and prove prominent and intrusive.
- No indication/evidence of which brownfield sites have been explored and rejected.
- How long will it take for screen planting to take effect? Probably not in our lifetime.
- Has been indicated in Cogeo report that the development boundary was amended/enlarged to cover any land that could form part of the planning application in the future. Does this mean that future development is in the offing?
- **IE-** site is approved there is a group of like buildings and biomass nearby at North Mains which is fully serviced with existing access for all vehicles directly off straight length of road B961. Has this been considered as a more suitable access route and it would optimise use of existing resources and reduce the impact of the development on landscape and avoid using the unsuitable U467.

TRAFFIC, TRANSPORT AND AND ACCESS

Road U467 is unsuitable for the following reasons:

- It is a single narrow twisty road with many bends.
- As well as residents, the length of road from Cononsyth to Pitmuies, is also used by many people from side roads e.g. Fallady and Gardyne and the village of Guthrie.
- Broken culverts down the length of the affected road are hidden in the overgrown verges.
- Entry/exit of large vehicles on to B961 from U467 will block both carriageways and

as there is a rise in the road to the right approaching traffic will be presented with this danger.

- There is already extensive signage and road markings warning of danger of approach of bad bend and corner.
- There is a Crash Barrier on bend which indicates the danger and vulnerability of corner/junction.
- Have seen many accidents during our 46 years of residency. Most recent one occurred on 29th December 2020 which caused an area of drystone dyke to be knocked down near to Cononsyth Cottage.
- Two supply poles are placed at either side of entry to U467.
- A new entry (not existing as indicated in plans) has been formed to proposed site. To create this, a large area of drystone dyke was demolished to accommodate large articulated vehicles. This entry/exit will constitute a hazard to approaching traffic from the blind crest/ corner bend at Summerhill as it will present a side-on blockage of the single carriageway.

METROGUARD TRAFFIC SURVEY

- This was done on B961 (not U467) in a period of bad weather, when less traffic was on road and also when we were in complete lockdown and many people were working from home. Obviously a favourable result for applicant.

TREE AND HABITAT SURVEYS

- Both of these were done at year end when area of mature mixed woodland had already been cleared out by applicant and thereby no evidence seen of animal wildlife, flora and native plants etc. Therefore, negative effect of ecological value was presented.

WATER ENVIRONMENT

- Area of development is prone to flooding which will be exacerbated by run off from the concrete base and roof of sheds. Consideration of contamination due to outdoor chicken litter seepage.
- ALDP policy 'development proposals must not pollute surface/underground water source'. Great concern of contamination reaching Denton Burn/Vinny/Lunan with resultant devastating effect. (Recently the Denton has suffered from agricultural spillage of silage and biomass effluent.)

EMISSIONS

- NOISE-vehicle movement, livestock, extractor fans(24 hours 7 days a week).
- ODOUR-chicken litter and storage whilst awaiting spreading.
- AIR POLLUTION-Airbourne pollutants mixing with emissions from nearby biomass plant will further degrade air quality which in turn can cause health issues.

SUMMARY

- Cononsyth Farms have already successfully diversified but according to Angus Council's advice 'developer's record or reputation is not a valid planning representation'.
- This development will have a negative impact on a quiet and tranquil area.
- Assumption of approval by applicant, as preparation has already taken place e.g. construction of new entrance to proposed site, draining activity, large areas of drystone dyke removal to accommodate large construction/operational vehicles, reportedly egg contract already arranged.
- Adverse impact on environment, neighbourhood, amenity and safety of residents and others such as pedestrians, dog walkers, cyclists and horseriders who regularly use this road and which is of paramount importance.
- **IF** this application is successful, can we be assured that any road alterations will be done professionally and bearing in mind Council's financial constraints, the applicant will be responsible for the full cost of the reconfiguration of the U467 and at no cost to us the taxpayers.

Regards

Ian Grant

Southpark of Gardyne Cottage

DD8 2SR

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLANNING](#)
Subject: Objection to: 21/00337/FULM
Date: 08 June 2021 21:41:14

FAO Ruari Kelly, Case officer of Angus Council.

Re

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 wish to object to this application most strongly on behalf of North Lincolnshire Green Party.

As we move to life after lockdown, I wish to draw your attention to the negative impact of chickens kept in enclosed sheds.

There are many issues but as time is short, I am going to focus on the risks to human health.

Conditions in farms like this one up for decision today are perfect for mutating viruses and pose a severe pandemic risk.

Think about Chickens crowded more than 30 thousand to a shed! with little natural UV light which is nature's disinfectant.

Commercially raised broilers are genetically very similar which is ideal for the spread and mutation of viruses.

A new study commissioned by the RSPCA and World Animal Protection clearly shows fast-growing chicken breeds suffer from terrible health issues, such as painful heart, lung and bone problems, and many live their short lives in pain leading to very high levels of stress which lowers immunity.

A perfect storm of our own making! Are we going to learn nothing from COVID 19?

Avian flu has been infecting poultry on a regular basis. Since November last year there has been more than 25 outbreaks in the UK alone.

Whilst bird flu strains currently infect few people, as they mutate, the potential for a new pandemic increases.

H7N9 has killed 40% of people who it has infected - far more deadly than Covid-19.

Scientists are warning us that it is not a case of if, but when, the next pandemic occurs if we continue to farm animals like this.

The leading Virologist (Professor Yoshihiro Kawaoka) of the University of Wisconsin says: "If H7N9 viruses acquire the ability to transmit efficiently from person to person, a worldwide outbreak is almost certain..."

The World Health Organisation has said ... authorities have a responsibility for controlling – diseases transmissible from animals to humans through direct contact or through food, water and the environment.

Three out of every four new infectious diseases in people come from animals (WHO).

On top of the pandemic risk, the conditions in these sheds also result in the high usage of antibiotics. The World Health Organisation predict that infections that no longer respond to antibiotics will cause 10 million deaths a year by 2050. This could have been prevented

if we weren't using the majority of our antibiotics on intensively farmed animals.

If you approve this planning application today, I want to know how you can justify ignoring the warnings from scientists?

Please consider the local community and next generation when making your decision.

Thank you.

Regards

Jacqui Stirling

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 Jerri Will

Address: 1/11 Tinto Place Edinburgh EH6 5BG

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Miscellaneous

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this application. I find it an irresponsible use of quality land. Wasting good arable land in this way when there is more appropriate locations available, depreciating the area for the people who live there and negatively impacting the local environment would need to be offset by considerable benefits. This development does not bring any benefits to the community which it will impact.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLANNING](#)
Subject: Objection
Date: 09 June 2021 10:41:23

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:

Having lived next to a chicken raising factory in my childhood I strongly object to this proposal which will make the lives of Angus voters miserable for many miles around the site. The smell is unbearable. The welfare of the chickens will upset many residents.

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

Karen Pilling
Sent from my iPad

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 \(www.gov.scot\)](https://www.gov.scot/topics/health/avian-influenza)

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: Factory Farming
Date: 09 June 2021 06:28:54

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://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

Lisa Kellett

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: Miss michelle lewis

Address: 1 Heyford Avenue London Sw20 9jt

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer made comments neither objecting to or supporting the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: This is an unnecessary building and would have a huge, unnecessary impact on the local biological systems. The local wildlife would suffer immensely. Not to mention the huge pollutants and harmful chemicals which will be released into the air and further damage the area.

Application Reference: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

Submitted by: Mike Rushforth

Summerhill House,

Guthrie

FORFAR

Angus DD8 2SR

I **object** to the proposed development because it conflicts with the Strategy described in the ALDP “for a presumption in favour of sustainable development and promoting high quality development which minimises adverse impacts on the high quality environment of Angus”.

I object for all the reasons described below because the proposed development is not sustainable by any definition and will have an adverse impact on the amenity of multiple householders in the area.

Location (PV6) Best practice dictates that sites within 400 metres of residential accommodation should be avoided and sites downwind of residential areas should be chosen¹. The location selected by The Applicant places eight domestic properties within 400 metres of the buildings, four of which are located downwind of the prevalent south-westerly winds in the area. The remaining properties will be downwind of easterly winds which is the alternative major wind direction. There is no evidence presented that the applicant has investigated all possibilities for locating the buildings adjacent to existing developments or buildings on his property. It is impossible to identify any location on Cononsyth Farm’s property where it could have a greater impact on a greater number of local residents.

Angus Council advises ² that farm buildings should not be built in isolation but should form part of, or relate to, existing buildings. The location selected is remote from any other properties owned by the applicant and in fact there are 14 residential properties, not associated with farming, closer to the site than the nearest property owned by the Applicant.

Another implication of the location selected is the creation of a farm track and wide vehicle entrance east of the U467. In Autumn 2018, part of the dry stone wall on the U467 on the south side of Summerhill was destroyed to create a 3.5 metre wide entrance into the field south of Summerhill woods. This was to assist in forestry work, because previously the main access from this field to the U467 was a 4 metre field gate to the south. This had always been the main access point to the fields which are now described as part of the land on the west side of the Development Boundary.

During the week commencing 10th August 2020 (or thereabouts), the northern 3.5 metre entrance was increased in width to 30 metres with the creation of a hardcore entrance, which a local person pointed out could accommodate access by HGVs. The original application for this development (20/0638/PAN) was subsequently filed on the 25 August 2020.

There is now a major track used by large vehicles within two metres of the boundary of our property which seriously impacts our amenity due to the dust, noise and odour pollution (contra to Policy

DS4). I believe this track and entrance was created primarily to serve the proposed development and that this constitutes starting work on the development before planning permission has been granted.

Relocation of the proposed buildings to other sites to the south would associate the buildings more directly with Cononsyth Farms and would enable direct access from the B981 using existing access points and eliminating the traffic hazards associated with the requirement to use the U467.

Building on prime agricultural land (PV20): This development will irreversibly destroy many hectares of prime agricultural land. The claim by the Applicant that the site has a lower crop yield is irrelevant and not a material consideration; all Cononsyth Farm's land is assessed by the Hutton Institute as being consistently capable of producing high yields of a narrow range of crops (Grade 3.1).

The development does not meet the requirements of PV20. It does not support the delivery of the development strategy, it is not small scale, and there is no commitment to site restoration and therefore the proposal does not meet the planning requirements.

Water quality (PV14). . I am concerned about the large quantity of hen manure which potentially will be deposited on the ranges in an unmanaged manner and which will inevitably find its way into drainage channels and then our local burns and aquifers to the north of the site. Additionally, we have a well in our garden which we regularly use for water for our garden and our pets occasionally drink from the bucket associated with the well pump. I am concerned that the large number of chickens ranging freely will contaminate these water supplies accessed by our pets.

PV14 states that development proposals which do not maintain or enhance the water environment will not be supported. It seems doubtful that the development can even sustain water quality and certainly will not enhance it. Therefore, I believe that the proposal should be rejected.

Pollution I am concerned that this facility is an industrial unit which will cause pollution and mitigation procedures will need to be adopted to minimize impacts on local receptors. This comes back to my first objection that if best practice had been followed for site selection then there would be few, if any, receptors.

I have concerns about every form of pollution from this site: light, water, air (especially the fact that PM_{2.5} emissions are not being considered), noise. These issues will be the responsibility of SEPA but I worry that SEPA is grossly under-funded and will fail to ensure compliance. I believe that a development of this type, with the potential to pollute on a massive scale should include continuous monitoring systems for all forms of pollution. Additionally, electrostatic or some other form of filtration should be installed on all exhaust vents to reduce the increased concentration of particulates arising from the drying of the chicken manure. .

Amenity (DS4) "Development will not be permitted where there is an unacceptable adverse impact on the surrounding area or the environment or amenity of existing or future occupiers of adjoining or nearby properties." This proposed development will impact on the amenity of many households in the Gardyne area for many reasons including all forms of pollution and the visual impact of an industrial excrescence located in the heart of the Angus countryside, destroying long distance views of the beautiful Strathmore valley. The proposal should be rejected.

Sustainability Sustainable development means "*development which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs*"³". Covering

prime quality farmland with concrete is hardly giving future generations the opportunity to meet their own needs.

I believe that a more precise model for sustainable development is based on a balance between the economic, environmental and social aspects of the development. Angus Council also understands the importance of this balanced approach to sustainable development, because in all the meetings of the Development Council, they are guided by the following statement of principle⁴, which reads:

"This report contributes to the following local outcome(s) contained within the Angus Local Outcomes Improvement Plan and Locality Plans:

1. Safe, secure, vibrant and sustainable communities
2. A reduced carbon footprint
3. An enhanced, protected and enjoyed natural and built environment."

I have already explained why I believe that the proposal fails to meet 1) and 3) of these requirements and there is no way that this development can contribute to a reduced carbon footprint. The generally accepted GHG emission for free range egg production is 2.2 Kg CO₂_{equiv} per dozen eggs. Assuming a conservative value for laying efficiency of 90% for each of the 64,000 hens, it is a simple calculation to determine that the annual greenhouse gas emissions from this facility would be 4,282 tonnes of CO₂_{equiv}. This hardly helps Angus council move towards its target of Zero Emissions.

The Applicant tries to suggest that the development is sustainable because it will be part of some form of circular economy, where the feed is grown on the farm, the eggs are sold and the chicken manure waste is used on the farm to support growing the feed. This reduces the carbon footprint of the operation by reducing transport. Unfortunately, this argument fails on close inspection. The grains will have to be shipped off-site for milling and pelletizing, so in fact there will be a limited reduction in haulage. Also, it must be remembered that at least 30% of the feed is protein based, for example soy meal, which is usually imported from South America, which puts in perspective the claimed reductions in haulage miles which will be achieved by eliminating haulage between say Forfar and Cononsyth.

Regarding usage of the manure, 64k birds will produce 33,920 Kg organic nitrogen per annum, assuming 80% of excreta is deposited inside the houses⁵. The limit of Total Nitrogen which can be applied in this area for cereal crops is 180kg N per hectare per year, so if only organic nitrogen (in other words only animal manure) were used, this would require 188 hectares of land. However it is not common practice to use exclusively organic sources of nitrogen, and inorganic sources will also be used. If we assume a typical 50/50 ratio, then the land area requirement increases to 377 hectares.

Poultry manure is not suitable for all crops, so crop rotation will mean that probably less than 50% of the land is now available for poultry manure application, so the land requirement now becomes at least 754 hectares. This exceeds the area of land available at Cononsyth by a factor of at least x4 so only 25% of the manure produced will be used on site and the other 75% will have to be hauled off-site, with a consequent increase in the carbon footprint. This is where the sustainability argument used by The Applicant fails.

Although not a planning issue, The Applicant makes reference to the fact that they have potential contracts for egg supply for a limited period. It should be remembered that the British Free Range Egg Producers Association stated last year that there was already over-production of free-range eggs

in the UK, to the extent that some producers were selling their eggs below cost price for production. Although there is expected to be growth in the free-range egg sector, this could be met by improvements in productivity, rather than by building new farms.

According to the UK Egg Industry's figures, the UK was 89% self-sufficient in egg consumption in 2019⁶ and it is highly likely that, due to the growth of this industry in Wales in the past two years, the country will be approaching total self-sufficiency. There is therefore no pressing argument based on food supply security to justify this development.

In conclusion, the proposal fails to meet all the aspects of Angus Council's requirements for a sustainable development.

1. "Prevention of Environmental Pollution From Agricultural Activity." Scottish Executive, 2005, Chapter 13 Paragraph 13.14
2. Angus Council, Advice Note 1: Farm Buildings; [https://www.angus.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Farm buildings.pdf](https://www.angus.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Farm%20buildings.pdf)
3. Angus Council. https://www.angus.gov.uk/the_environment/sustainable_angus/sustainability_strategy
4. See Reports associated with Angus Council Development Standards Committee, usually at Agenda Item 2.
5. <https://www.gov.scot/publications/nitrate-vulnerable-zones-guidance-for-farmers/>
6. <https://www.egginfo.co.uk/egg-facts-and-figures/industry-information/data>

M. A Rushforth
Summerhill House
DD8 2SR
09 June 2021

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 Morag Malcolm

Address: Summerhill House Guthrie Forfar DD8 2SR

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this planning proposal on the following grounds:

- 1) Building on prime agricultural land. Loss of a large area of prime agricultural land with no commitment to restoration.
 - 2) Reduced bio-diversity. Fencing around the site will block natural wide-life corridors, thereby adversely affecting the bio-diversity of the area.
 - 3) Pollution. Damage to people and the environment:
 - a) Air - chicken waste and dust and vehicles;
 - b) Water - run-off from the chicken sheds and range entering water courses and subsequently Lunan Water;
 - c) Noise - from the shed and transport;
 - d) Light - from security lighting and transport;
 - e) Odour - from waste.
 - 4) Access. The proposed access to the site would be via the recently constructed track very close to the southern end of our garden. Despite the applicant's attempts to obfuscate about creating an industrial complex in the countryside, it will inevitably involve much coming and going of large vehicles servicing the site. If restrictions are imposed then we will end up having to police them by constantly having to complain to SEPA and the Council.
 - 5) Sustainability. The volume of chicken waste generated cannot possibly be accommodated on the fields owned locally by the applicant and will have to be transported elsewhere, causing even more pollution.
 - 6) Loss of amenity. We spend much time in our garden and hope to continue to do so without detriment to our physical and mental health.
- Site selection. A number of my objections could be alleviated by siting the sheds near the

applicant's existing industrial buildings eg. Bio-mass plant and consequently using the access points already in use. This would be much safer and it is difficult to see why this hasn't already been considered as a more convenient arrangement.

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: [REDACTED]

Address: 12 Kinclaven Gardens Murthly Perth PH1 4EX

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I wish to register my strong objection to this proposal. It seems that the poultry industry is intent on the destruction of land which becomes contaminated for any future use.

I am sure my comments will be reflected in other objections, both for this application and in other applications that may currently be considered in England and Wales too. The proposal is close to residential properties; removes prime agricultural land from use. The consideration for other sites, i.e. 'brownfield sites' seems not to have taken place. There will be a negative impact on the local environment and the community.

Further, it does not comply with the Angus Local Plan, page 9 of The Statement which states to "Protect the Health & Wellbeing of our people". Really?

Please redact my name from any public document.

From: [REDACTED]
To: PLANNING
Subject: 21/00337/FULM
Date: 08 June 2021 21:07:45

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://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

Nicola Hall

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLANNING](#)
Subject: Chickens
Date: 08 June 2021 21:34:17

Please reconsider the erection of the new sheds to be built. Barbaric, fuel and unnecessary. Thank you Pat Daykin

Sent from my iPad

From: 
To: [PLANNING](#)
Subject: Chicken farm
Date: 08 June 2021 21:08:18

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:

It seems ludicrous that we are even considering a proposal such as this in the midst of a pandemic that has claimed the lives of millions of people globally. Three out of every four new and emerging diseases in people, including Covid 19, come from animals. Factory farming is the perfect breeding ground for these diseases: huge numbers of animals kept in cramped and filthy conditions. We are only one mutation away from another pandemic that is likely to be far more deadly than the current one.

According to DEFRA, there have been 28 separate outbreaks of avian influenza in the UK since last November, and there are currently still many sites that are contaminated.

Antibiotic resistance is another major cause for concern. A third of antibiotics used in the UK are routinely given to farmed animals because of the conditions they live in. This recklessness will inevitably lead to a pandemic of its own, whereby simple infections in humans that currently cause little concern, will become deadly.

On top of this, the world is facing a climate and ecological catastrophe, and animal agriculture is one of the leading causes. For this reason alone, nationally and locally we should be transitioning to a 100% plant based system of food production.

Pig and chicken farms are particularly responsible for producing toxic chemicals

such as ammonia that contribute significantly to biodiversity loss, and the highly potent greenhouse gas, nitrous oxide.

It is puzzling that local authorities are being urged by central government to play their part in reducing the nation's greenhouse gas emissions, yet applications such as this one are still being considered. The Government's own advisers have said that, as a country, we need to reduce our consumption of animal products by almost half. How does this application for a chicken farm fit in with the Government's national carbon reduction policy?

Dealing with global hunger might be an issue that seems beyond the Council's jurisdiction, but it is a well documented fact that animals in agriculture are responsible for consuming huge quantities of food (often from ex-Amazon rainforest land) to produce very little in return just so people in affluent countries can satisfy their palate pleasure. In doing so, people in less fortunate parts of the world are left to starve.

My final point relates to the conditions that these timid little animals will be kept in. It is a fact that chickens value life as much as dogs, they possess a full range of emotions and have the capacity to suffer as much as dogs do. Chickens are routinely mutilated and kept in vile conditions, even in a so-called 'free range' situation. So please ask yourself the following question: would you be happy for dogs, perhaps your own pet dog, to be kept in circumstances such as this?

For the above reasons I urge you to find any grounds possible to reject this planning application.

Yours faithfully

Pete Richards
1 Barley Way
Horncastle
LN9 5SS

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLANNING](#)
Subject: FAO Ruari Kelly. Case officer Angus council. Objection to: 21/00337/FULM
Date: 08 June 2021 20:59:18

I object to the | 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 include information that has been meticulously researched by a third party and I include this echoing this stand point.

I am however highly sceptical that public voices matter when there is profit to be made. I'm also all but despairing in how factory farming can even be a thing these days and how planning is too often complicit in such cruelty, environmental damage and risks of disease. I call upon your collective conscience to prevail.

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-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
Mr R Hearn
11 Claremont terrace
York

Yo317ej

Sent from my iPhone

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 \(www.gov.scot\)](https://www.gov.scot/publications/avian-influenza-bird-flu/pages/12.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.

Yours faithfully

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLANNING](#)
Subject: SMALL CLAIMS COURT
Date: 09 June 2021 08:57:50

Hello,

I am writing to object your FRAMING.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xdOuA8Razl0>

THIS IS VILE and criminal and you are feeding people pure poison with poison fed feed given to chickens.

I have purchased from you and fed this food to my family - and will be taking you to court if this continues.

--

Head Coordinator

Sandra Daroy

www.3and9film.com

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLANNING](#)
Subject: Objection to 21/00337/FULM FAO Ruari Kelly
Date: 09 June 2021 12:32:55

Dear Planning Committee,

I object to the planning application 21/00337/FULM for a hen processing facility.

Surely in these times of climate and environmental crisis, such a project should be rejected.

- 1) Animal agriculture is now thought to be responsible for 87% of greenhouse gas emissions.
- 2) While people starve, food is grown and fed to animals, thus wasting land, protein, water, calories and resources which could be used to feed people directly. About a third of the world's grain harvest is fed to animals. Up to 90% of the protein and calories which are fed to the animals is lost in their growth.
- 3) Feed for hens is grown on rainforest land, causing extinction of species and environmental damage.
- 4) The next pandemic will probably be worse than the present one, and will probably arise from animal agriculture.
- 5) Do you realise that our health is jeopardised by antibiotic resistance? Farms with so many animals will use antibiotics on them, which will remain in the product.
- 6) There are laws which prohibit people from chopping bits off animals without anaesthetic, unless they are farm animals.
- 7) The 'free range' designation is not a guarantee of animal welfare, environmental welfare or a healthy food.
- 8) And all this harm for a product which is unhealthy. There is overwhelming scientific evidence that meat and dairy is a major contributor to the nation's ill health.

Please reject this application.

Yours sincerely, Virginia Bell 2 MK6 4LP [REDACTED]

Gardyne Castle

Angus,
DD8 2SQ

9th June, 2021

Dear Mr. Kelly,

Planning Application 21/00337/FULM

We do not object to the proposal, however in the interests of environmental protection (specifically in relation to Policy PV5) would request that a planning condition be imposed requiring the monitoring of the condition of the adjacent Denton Burn prior to the commencement of work and as a continuing obligation. We believe this is consistent with the requirements of Policy PV14.

Description

The proposed development naturally drains into the course of the Denton Burn, which lies to the north of the application site, and runs in a generally north east direction. It joins the river Vinny approximately 1.5 miles north of the application site. Over much of this distance my wife and I own both banks of the Denton Burn.

The Denton Burn provides a first class natural habitat for wildlife. We seek to manage the watercourse to improve its environmental value. For much of its length it is protected from agricultural runoff by wooded or uncultivated margins and provides a clean gravel bed. Amongst many other species the burn provides a habitat for trout and spawning salmon, dippers, kingfishers and innumerable invertebrates. The burn is a crucial element of the ecosystem of the surrounding woods.

Salmon (*Salmo Salar*) and Kingfishers (*Alcedo Atthis*) are protected species in Scotland. LDP Policy PV5 requires the Council to assess development proposals which are likely to affect protected species for compatibility with the appropriate regulatory regime.

Historic Pollution

Despite its apparent protection, the burn has been subject to repeated pollution from neighbouring uses, most recently a catastrophic leak of digestate from Backboath Farm (which killed almost every fish in the burn as far downstream as the Vinny), and the deliberate discharge of sewage into the watercourse, which led to a prolonged infestation of sewage fungus in one of the burn's main tributaries.

Despite being notified as the incidents were occurring, SEPA was unable to take any meaningful action to repair the damage done by these incidents, and appeared unable to take any meaningful action against the polluters to prevent repetition of the incidents.

Preventing / Mitigating Future Pollution

We are therefore concerned that another potential polluter is proposed for the watercourse. We do not doubt the sincerity of the applicants in their desire to protect the environment, and they have gone to considerable trouble to demonstrate to us the protective measures which are proposed. However, given the nature of the potential pollution of the watercourse, a failure of the protective systems (as occurred in last year's accidental discharge of digestate from Backboath Farm) would only become apparent after the damage

had been done. Regrettably SEPA have shown themselves to be relatively powerless in dealing with even such catastrophic incidents once the damage is done.

LDP Policy PV14 (Water Quality) states that “development proposals which do not maintain or enhance the water environment will not be supported. Mitigation measures must be agreed with SEPA and Angus Council.” The policy therefore acknowledges that the Council must be involved in the protective measures, not merely pass on responsibility to SEPA.

We therefore see no reason that a planning condition requiring the establishment of a survey programme prior to commencement, measuring the base condition of the water in the burn, and encompassing regular monitoring of groundwater and the water within the watercourse should not be imposed. It would be a relatively minor cost in relation to such a significant enterprise, and would ensure protection of an unusually valuable natural resource.

Yours sincerely,

William Gray Muir