



RBWM Planning and Property Services  
Town Hall  
St Ives Road  
Maidenhead  
SL6 1RF

17 June 2023

### Planning Application 23/01232/FULL - Butchery in Coningsby Lane

It has been very difficult to discern the reason for a brand new Application and number. It seems that RBWM Highways raised a question concerning visibility at the entrance to the site. Are they now happy with the adjustments ? How does that justify a brand new planning number ? Can we be reassured that this is not simply a tactic to isolate all the existing comments and objections already made referencing the previous application 22/03405/FULL ? Can we have confidence that ALL those points raised in objection to 22/03405/FULL will be considered as still relevant to this new application ?

Please note also that the Agent's assertion that any objection including the word "**Abattoir**" should automatically be ignored should itself be ignored. It is ludicrous to suggest that because an objector might mistakenly use the word "**Abattoir**" instead of "**Butchery**" that the points contained within the objection as a whole are therefore invalid.

Even if RBWM Highways are now happy with the visibility splay at the entrance to the site there are MANY questions relating to this situation which need answers :

**1** - What is the exceptional reason, overriding need, or circumstance which justifies such commercialisation and Industrialisation of a GREEN BELT location ?

**2** - The business plan seems highly suspect. The quantity of animals capable of being raised on the site cannot possibly be sufficient to supply the needs of the described butchery operation as a viable business. The assumption is therefore inevitable that animals will need to be sourced elsewhere to sustain throughput. This rather conflicts with the claim that the cold storage and butchery operation are merely an extension of the existing agricultural business. This is in fact a **CHANGE OF USE** and should at the very least be treated as such. The so-called agricultural business being referred to has not existed until now as all previous use was equestrian and permissions were granted for the care of **ALPACAS**. The extension of the use of the site beyond what can actually be raised on site suggests that a covert attempt is being made to establish a new commercial and industrial operation on a **GREEN BELT** location.

**3** - There appears to have been no honest attempt to present an analysis or quantification of the inevitable increase in the volume and weight of traffic along this narrow country lane. The extra heavy vehicle traffic required to handle additional animals from elsewhere seems not to have been considered at all. This Lane is used 24/7 as a quiet lane leisure facility and access to public footpaths and bridleways such as Green Lane by local families with prams and children in push chairs, dog walkers, cyclists, horse riders etc. and is a highly valued asset to the Community. The lane itself is merely a spray of tarmac over the packed earth it once was - certainly not ever built to accommodate heavy vehicles. The coming and going of heavy trucks bringing rubble and

soil onto the site to raise the surface level have already damaged the entrance and ditch which is indicative of the sort of wear and tear this will inflict. When may the Community expect to see a realistic report on the likely frequency and weight of traffic which will be needed to make this a viable business proposition ?



**4** - Whoever has been developing the site has had to resort to channeling and pumping excess water into the ditches around the site. This threatens to potentially overwhelm parts of the entire drainage route to the Fifield Road in times of heavy precipitation and it's aftermath. We were told at the time of the earlier original applications for this site that there is no excess water problem in this area and therefore it does not need to be considered. The Agent has constantly made this claim although he has personally been involved in the past with local sites (including on just the other side of Coningsby Lane !) where this has been very much a repeated issue. As we have been intimately concerned with this very subject since 2009~10 we know this to be foolishly blinkered. The land in this spot as a simple green field site was always prone to extremely soggy conditions but now there has been a huge increase in the hard surface run-off. From the photos and observing reality it looks as if the misdirection has resulted in the problem being ignored in the planning and consequently water is now being trapped in place by the hard standing and buildings making the problem even worse. Yet there seems to be no study of how this matter will be managed in the long term. When can the Community expect to see such a study or report ?

**5** - Apologies if this has somehow been missed but there still does not appear to be any attempt to explain how waste materials from this operation are to be managed. Is it expected that the product from 35 animals will all simply dissipate into the grazing area available ? If any animals are to spend time inside the new barns - particularly when the land is flooded - how will the slurry be dealt with ? Will it be spread over the open areas or collected and somehow stored for

periodic removal in even more heavy vehicles ? If no animals are expected to spend time under cover then what are the barns to be used for ? All the same questions apply to the management of waste from the butchery process. How will the smell be managed ? How can there be a guarantee that none of this will ever find its way into the main field drainage running right alongside ?

**6** - Electricity utility contractors have recently been digging up the lane to lay a new 3-phase supply to the site. What kind of **GREEN BELT** site requires a 3-phase electricity supply ? It is only a fairly substantial industrial operation that requires 3-phase these days. This inevitably raises the question of the continued legitimacy of the Agricultural status of this entire project ? But the other interesting question is ... how confident a gambler does somebody need to be to squander such financial resources on a project that has not yet had permission to exist ?

**7** - Perhaps the most important question of all concerns finding some kind of justification for the destruction of a green country ambience or atmosphere which has so far managed to survive amidst the encroaching pressures from all sides of spreading swathes of concrete. Is there really such a dearth of existing sites with more suitable traffic access capable of accommodating an operation like this that it becomes necessary to allow yet another transparent scheme to turn a green field site into a brown field one ?

Please help the Community to resist the constantly repeated pressures to exploit this diminishing green resource and **REFUSE** this application.

Thank you.



Rod Lord  
**OGAFCA** Environment