

Dear Sirs,

I write with regard to the above appeal. In opposition thereto I would refer you to my letter of objection to the applicants initial application, a copy of which please see attached.

The applicants grounds of appeal appear to rely mainly on the RSPCA information sheet issued in June 2008, in respect of the catching of poultry. I would submit that the reference thereto is merely an observation and not a specific

requirement. Considering that the conditions which the appellant seeks to vary were imposed by the Planning Inspectorate it would not seem logical to now reverse the decision for the reasons relied on.

In the circumstances therefor I would submit that the appeal should be rejected.

Yours faithfully,

John Richards.

Sherwood
Bronwylfa Road
Legacy
Wrexham
LL14 4HY

24th September 2018

For the attention of Philip Forster
Wrexham County Borough Council
16 Lord Street
Wrexham

Application for variation of condition No 8 of appeal decision APP/H6955/A/14/2228984 and No 7 of planning permission P/2017/0053 to seek an exclusion to vehicle movements timescales for bird delivery and collections to enable this operation to be undertaken 24 hours per day and relaxation of the bank holidays restriction Talwrn Farm, Talwrn Road, Legacy, Wrexham.

(Your ref P/2018/0723 & 0724)

Dear Sirs,

I wish to object to the above applications which relate to conditions imposed on planning permission being granted to erect barn egg laying units at the address referred to above.

The conditions were imposed initially by Kay Sheffield BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI, an inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers, when considering an appeal against the refusal of planning permission for the erection of the first unit and which were subsequently repeated by Lawrence Isted, Head of Environment and Planning on granting permission for the erection of the second unit.

It is obvious from the reasons given in allowing the appeal that much consideration was given by Kay Sheffield to the living conditions of local residents and in particular the impact the movement of vehicles, in entering and leaving the site as well as manoeuvring within it would have, resulting in these particular conditions being imposed.

The conditions imposed in this respect were for a specific purpose namely to protect the welfare of local residents. I would stress that these conditions were imposed on granting permission to erect the first unit and to the envisaged movement of vehicles in that regard, which no doubt will have increased two fold, or more on the erection of the second unit thereby compounding the problem and consequently are even more pertinent in the circumstances.

One supposes however that the operation of the units has been successfully conducted in compliance with the conditions imposed and begs the question therefore why a variation would be necessary.

I would question the timing of the application since surely the “facts” on which the applicant relies would have been available at the time of the initial application for planning permission and could have been fully considered by the inspector on the appeal. A further opportunity would have arisen on the subsequent application in relation to the second unit but this did not happen.

Granting the applications would give the applicant carte blanche to move vehicles at any time of the day or night, not only for the delivery and collection of birds but for other disassociated purposes to the detriment of the local community. Further this operation during all hours of darkness would also, in view of the lighting required, impact on the environment and the community.

There would appear to be no stipulation in the “Code of Practice for the welfare of laying hens and pullets” for when the catching and transportation of birds must be carried out. I would submit therefore that this exercise can be carried out in compliance with the conditions already in place and which would appear to have been successfully achieved since they were imposed.

Consequently I would submit that a variation to those conditions would not be appropriate in the circumstances and that the applications in that respect, for the reasons set out aforesaid, should be rejected.

Yours Faithfully,

John Richards.