

Dear Sirs,

Please find our objection to the above appeal to your office.

Our objection re-iterates our objection to the Planning Committee from WCBC (who refused the application) – please see attached documnetation.

The objection is based on the guidance from the original inspector (Kay Sheffield) who gave her reason for over-ruling the original planning refusal by WCBC as:

“that much consideration was given to the living conditions of local residents in particular the movement of vehicles in entering and leaving the site as well as manoeuvring within it which would have the potential to disturb local residents”.

Our understanding is that no legislative changes have been made with regard to animal welfare since this decision and therefore suggest that the applicant’s appeal should be rejected.

Jim Thompson
Systems Developments Limited

**Swn Y Nant
Bronwylfa Road
Legacy
Wrexham
LL14 4HY**

25th 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 for variation which relate to conditions imposed on planning permission granted to erect barn egg laying units at the address referred to above.

The conditions were imposed initially by the inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers when considering an appeal against the refusal of planning permission for the erection of the first unit. These conditions were subsequently applied by Lawrence Isted, Head of Environment and Planning on granting permission for the erection of the second unit.

As stated by the original inspector (Kay Sheffield) the reasons given in allowing the appeal was that much consideration was given to the living conditions of local residents in particular the movement of vehicles in entering and leaving the site as well as manoeuvring within it which would have the potential to disturb local residents.

We assume that the operation of the first egg barn has run successfully since 2015 under the original planning conditions and therefore see no reason why these variations are now necessary.

Any animal welfare rights concerns would have been known at the time of granting the original planning consent when the vehicle movement conditions were applied to the consent so this cannot be a valid argument for the variation request.

By granting the applications this would allow vehicle movements during the night. This would result in increased noise during the night which is wholly unacceptable and is in complete contrast the original planning consent which (as stated by Kay Sheffield) took into account the living conditions of local residents.

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. We 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.

We therefore wish to object to the variations and request they be rejected by the planning committee.

Yours Faithfully,

Jim Thompson.