

Ceredigion County Council Planning Application A211093

Twin Broiler Units at Ty Nant, Tal-y-bont

Re-submitted 2022

# OBJECTION

from CPRW



**The Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales  
Ceredigion Branch and National Office**

**Agent: Geoffrey Sinclair**

Glebe House Martletwy Narberth Pembrokeshire SA67 8AS  
Grid reference SN 034 108 OS Landranger sheet 158

Telephone 01834 891331  
[geoffrey.eis@btinternet.com](mailto:geoffrey.eis@btinternet.com)

**Date: 20th February 2022**

This Objection is based on a submitted detailed Critique of the  
Environmental Statement for this application  
**and should be read in parallel with it.**

CPRW is disheartened by the confused, out-of-date and misleading content of this statutory document. It is full of irrelevant and illogical detail. Material updates to the previous 2019 application are often skin-deep, indicating current documents by title only without adopting or including their revised text. Nowhere is this more common and more misleading for decision makers than in relation to PPW11 rather than PPW10.

The main modification since the 2019 application – to haul the manure to an Anaerobic Digester at Penparc instead of spreading on the farm fields – requires accurate re-scoping to include vehicle movements transporting the broiler manure to and returning from the AD facility at Penparc.

Impacts on local properties are inadequately and inaccurately assessed. This has been addressed by CPRW in its Technical Critique **Appendix A** which finds considerable adverse effects on two nearby properties, one at only 20m from the proposal.

Landscape and visual impacts have been assessed by a defective selection of viewpoints, and without any photographic evidence.

There is no mention of the many areas of Open Access land readily seen on the OS map extracts and providing links to linear public routes. There is no systematic reference to the narrow local lanes, full of charm and interest, used in addition to local residents by walkers, cyclists, and small numbers of leisure motorists - and now potentially prey to an unprecedented and unjustified level of HGV traffic.

As noted above, the ES is characterised by flawed and inconclusive assessments notably on the landscape and visual impacts of the proposal. This is an untouched intricate area of rural Ceredigion vulnerable to the introduction of proposals of this type.

The fundamental point is that there is no locational imperative or justification to allow or encourage quasi-industrialised intensive developments of this nature to be located in the relatively remote heart of rural upland landscapes, and subject to an existing range of protective designations. The logical location for intensive livestock units - which do not have a farm-based requirement for their raw material on the chosen site - is nearer to both the supply of raw material and the demand for exported broiler meat. They have no planning justification in areas of this type, and – other than for applicants and employees – have no compelling benefits when assessed objectively and in terms of their environmental impacts.

CPRW therefore formally **objects** to the proposal on the following grounds and requests that it be **REFUSED** consent.

Policy DM06: High Quality Design and Placemaking because the size, nature and content of the proposed operation is inconsistent with its unspoiled rural and sensitive location - and lack of justification for the proposed site.

Policy DM10: Design and Landscaping because it will not respect the natural character of the site and is thus incapable of fitting in to a suitable landscaping scheme - and lack of justification for the proposed site.

Policy DM14: Nature Conservation and Ecological Connectivity because the scheme fails to promote or enhance biodiversity or ecological connectivity in an area where these attributes are key components -and lack of justification for the proposed site.

Policy DM15: Local Biodiversity Conservation for similar reasons - and lack of justification for the proposed site.

**Policy DM17: General Landscape** because of its significant adverse effect on the qualities and special character of the landscape and its enjoyment by the public - and lack of justification for the proposed site, especially due to the factors identified in the policy as

1. causing significant visual intrusion;
2. being insensitively and unsympathetically sited within the landscape;
3. introducing or intensifying a use which is incompatible with its location;
4. failing to harmonise with, or enhance the landform and landscape;

**Policy DM18: Special Landscape Areas (SLAs)** because of its scale and nature - and lack of justification for the proposed site.

Policy DM19: Historic and Cultural Landscape because of its scale and nature, - and lack of justification for the proposed site.

In more general terms., the proposal in this isolated and sensitive location accessed by a narrow single track rural road for this form of agricultural diversification is simply **the wrong development in the wrong location**. There are no farm or socio-economic reasons for it to proceed against the policy conflicts set out above.