

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Development and Conservation Control Committee 13th May 2005

AUTHOR/S: Director of Development Services

**S/2412/04/F - Cottenham
Erection of Livestock/General Purpose Farm Building, Causeway Farm, Smithy Fen
for Mr and Mrs R Jones**

**Recommendation: Approval
Date for Determination: 28th February 2005, (Major Application)**

Site and Proposal

1. Causeway Farm consists of a group of barns on the south-western site of Lockspit Hall Drove, 300.0m beyond the humped back bridge, and facing the Setchel Drove junction.
2. The full application, received on 29th November 2004, proposes the erection of a livestock/general purpose farm building 22.0m to the south-east of the adjacent barn.
3. The barn would be 23.0m x 50.0m x 9.0m high and clad with Yorkshire boarding and box profile cladding.

History

4. Members may recall an outline application for an agricultural dwelling being presented to the September (item 4) and December Committees (item 12), this was refused for the reasons that:
5. The proposal is contrary to Policies P1/2 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Planning (2003) and HG16 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2004) in that a clear, existing functional need has not been put forward to justify a second agricultural dwelling on this farm holding.
6. Notwithstanding the above, the proposed site is poorly related to the existing and proposed farm buildings.

Policy

7. **Policy P1/2** of the Structure Plan 2003 restricts new development in the countryside to that which is essential in a particular rural location.

Consultations

8. **Cottenham Parish Council** "approves" the application.
9. **The Old West Internal Drainage Board** has no objections to soakaways or attenuated to existing Greenfield rates of run off prior to discharge to an open watercourse. Such a condition should be imposed on any consent.
10. **The Environment Agency** originally objected to the application as no Flood Risk Assessment had been submitted. The applicants have subsequently commissioned

such a document whereby the Agency has now withdrawn its objection. In arriving at this view the Agency has asked for two conditions to be imposed, - one that the minimum floor level should be 300mm above ground level, the other that drainage details be submitted.

11. **The Chief Environmental Health Officer** has no objections.

Representations

12. The Cottenham Village Design Group is generally opposed to new building outside the village because of the disruption to the open character of the landscape.
13. Here, there may be a strong need for such a building, but it appears to be poorly integrated with the existing buildings. More details should be submitted.
14. A resident further down Lockspit Hall Drove (Fenleigh Farm) objects for the reasons:
- Site chosen is on arable land and away from other buildings
 - Materials not sympathetic
 - Impact on the countryside
 - Is there a need for a building of this size bearing in mind others on the farm?
 - The viability of the cattle enterprise should be assessed first based on the other, recently constructed barn.
 - If there is a slump in the beef rearing market there may be an application for a change of use to industrial which would have a huge detrimental effect on the fen.
15. Agents for the owner of Turks head Farm, to the south east, object for the reasons:
- No statement of need has been submitted by the applicant as to why such a large building is required, what “general purposes” are, or the breakdown between need for livestock and other purposes.
 - The position chosen appears rather arbitrary, poorly related to other buildings.
 - Problems of noise pollution and odour nuisance, given that the building will be 85.0m from my client’s curtilage and 90.0m from the house itself. Reference is made to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 which states that livestock buildings within 400.0m of another property require consent.
 - Prevailing winds will blow from the barn towards my client’s house
 - Impact on the countryside.

Planning Comments

16. The main issues for this application are need, siting, effect on the area and effect on Turks head Farm.

Need

17. The applicants farm a total of 124 hectares of which 102 ha is owned; the remaining 22 ha are held on a variety of tenancy agreements.
18. In 2003 the majority of the land was used for a variety of arable crops; in addition there were 120 calves for growing on. This building, together with that recently completed (planning application approved under delegation), will enable the number of calves to increase to 275-300 per annum.

19. The calves/cattle are fed on home grown cereals, with some concentrates brought in. 330 tonnes of cereals would be required to feed 275 head of cattle, 564 tonnes is cropped at present. Dependant upon the time of year, the building will fulfil different functions at different times i.e. young calves under cover or grain storage.

Siting/Affect on Area

20. The building will be 22.0m from the adjacent barn. Whilst it would, perhaps, be preferable to site the building nearer, it allows flexibility of use, and access around the building. Should the need arise there would be scope for a lean-to to be built. The gap in between the two barns also means that, when viewed from the roadway or even over a greater distance, there would be an element of space to break up the combined bulk of this group of buildings. I agree that it will be visible in the fen landscape but it is a traditional agricultural building, not dissimilar to others in the area, and is, after all, what one expects to see in the countryside.

Affect on Turks Head Farm

21. The barn will be visible from this property, sited 85.0m - 90.0m to the north west. Prevailing winds are from the south-west.
22. Legislation was tightened ten years ago with regards to the siting of livestock buildings but the 400.0m threshold does not mean anything within this limit should be refused. It precludes Livestock buildings being erected under permitted development rights. Merits have to be considered by way of a planning application.
23. Members will note that the Chief Environmental Health Officer does not raise objections to the proposal.
24. For the above reasons I am able to support the application and recommend approval.

Recommendation

25. Approval, as amended by letter and Flood Risk Assessment dated 14th March 2005, reference FRA02/3_jed., subject to:
 1. Standard Condition "A" - RC "A"
 2. SC51 Landscape Scheme RC51.
 3. SC52 Implementation of landscape scheme RC52.
 4. SC5 materials "walls and roof" RC5a)ii)
 5. The minimum ground floor level of any building involved in the development must be at least 300mm above ground level unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Reason - To provide reasonable freeboard against extreme flooding.
 6. Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of pollution control of the water environment, which shall include foul and surface water drainage, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Authority. The works/scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans. Reason - To ensure a satisfactory method of foul and surface water drainage and to prevent the increased risk of pollution to the water environment.

Informatives

Reasons for Approval

1. The development is considered generally to accord with the Development Plan and particularly the following policies:
 - **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003:**
P1/2 Development in the Countryside
2. The development is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the following material planning considerations which have been raised during the consultation exercise:
 - Need
 - Siting
 - Detrimental impact on adjacent property.

General

+

1. Where soakaways are proposed for the disposal of uncontaminated surface water, percolation tests should be undertaken, and soakaways designed and constructed in accordance with BRE Digest 365 (or Ciria report 156), and to the satisfaction of the Local Authority. The maximum acceptable depth for soakaways is 2 metres below existing ground level. If, after tests, it is found that soakaways do not work satisfactorily. Alternative proposals must be submitted.
2. Only clean, uncontaminated surface water may be discharged to any soakaway, watercourse or surface water sewer.
3. Any culverting or works affecting the flow of a watercourse requires the prior written Consent of the Environment Agency under the terms of the Land Drainage Act 1991/Water resources Act 1991. The Environment Agency seeks to avoid culverting, and its Consent for such works will not normally be granted except as a means of access.
4. Notwithstanding the above, the proposed development is adjacent to a watercourse, and may produce contaminated water/slurry from use as storage/livestock building, therefore suitable drainage must be in place. Specific details of surface or foul water drainage would be required were planning approval forthcoming
5. Surface water from roofs must be directed to an approved existing surface water system and not to any slurry storage facility.
6. Dilute effluent such as dirty yard water, run-off from solid manure stores in yard and washing from buildings/yards used by livestock is considered to be slurry under the Control of Pollution (Silage, Slurry and Agricultural Fuel Oil) Regulations 1991, as amended.
7. Where applicable, slurry storage should comply with the requirements of the Control of Pollution (Silage, Slurry and Agricultural Fuel Oil)

Regulations 1991, as amended. These Regulations apply to all installations constructed, substantially reconstructed, or substantially enlarged after September 1991.

8. In the event that disposal to foul sewer or slurry storage is not possible, any other contaminated surface waters (not defined as slurry under the above Regulations) should be stored within an adequately sized sealed system in accordance with the MAFF "Code of Good Agricultural Practice form the Protection of Water" for subsequent off-site disposal.
9. All foul sewage or trade effluent, including cooling water containing chemical additives, or vehicle washing water, including steam cleaning effluent shall be discharged to the foul sewer.
10. All drums and small containers used for oil and other chemicals shall be stored in bunded areas which do not drain to any watercourse, surface water sewer or soakaway.
11. Vehicle loading or unloading bays and storage areas involving chemicals, refuse or other polluting matter shall not be connected to the surface water drainage system.
12. Any liquid fertiliser storage facilities must be sited in properly constructed bunded areas of sufficient capacity to avoid contamination of any watercourse, surface water drains or water source in the event of spillage, and shall comply with the fertiliser Manufacturer's of Fluid Fertilisers.
13. Any granular fertiliser storage must be sited, preferably in a covered area, to avoid contamination of any watercourse, surface water drains or water source in the event of spillage.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003
- Planning file Ref. S/2412/04/F and S/1093/04/O.

Contact Officer: Jem Belcham – Area Planning Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713252