

**Land at Gold Street
Cobham
DA12 3AA**

**Agricultural Prior Approval
Planning Statement
0431**

Contents

3	Introduction
7	Legal Framework: Part 6 Class A
14	The proposed development
23	Summary

Appendix A

Winery Scoping Report

Copyright Notice

© 2024 Work By Here Ltd, all rights reserved.

Material published by Work By Here Ltd is copyright of Work By Here Ltd and may not be reproduced without permission.

1. Introduction

The history

- 1.1 The application site is Gold Street, Cobham, Gravesend, Kent, DA12 3AA (*'the Site'*). The applicant and owner of the Site is Cobham House Vineyard Ltd (*'the Applicant'*). The estate comprises two sections of land straddling Gold Street. The agricultural estate extends to approximately 11.51 hectares of land in agricultural use, and some of which is already a planted vineyard and used for the purposes of viticulture. The remaining land is at the time of submission being planted with new vines. The entire land holding is shown on the accompanying drawings.
- 1.2 This application to Gravesham Borough Council (*'the Council'*) for prior approval follows 2 earlier such applications for a similar building and in the same site ref:20230899 (*'PA 1'*) and ref:20231258 (*'PA 2'*) (as described in more detail below). The applicant has instructed and retain Celina Colquhoun of 39 Essex Chambers to advise throughout this process. PA1 was refused following confirmation that prior approval was required and PA2 was approved following confirmation again that prior approval was required. PA 2 however was the subject of a judicial review challenge and the Council consented to PA2 being quashed.
- 1.3 The applicant now proposes to make a new application for prior approval for a refined winery building in a different location further to the south as acknowledgement of neighbours' concerns. Whilst the accompanying noise impact assessment demonstrates the northern location would be compatible with neighbours' amenity, the southern location ensures a large separation distance to those neighbours concerned.
- 1.4 Prior notification ref. 2023/0899 PA 1 was refused by the Council by notice dated 20 September 2023. The decision notice confirmed the development was reasonably necessary for the purposes of agricultural, but that prior approval for design and siting was required but could not be consented.
- 1.5 Whilst the relevant officer in his report confirmed that, as the development is an agricultural building no issues arise in respect of inappropriateness of this development in the Green Belt and that the "condition of the landscape is highlighted as poor with moderate sensitivity prior approval was refused on grounds that the proposal would harm the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Green Belt

and Istead Arable Landscape Character Area. The exact wording is set out below with emphasis added:

“Notwithstanding that the proposed development would meet the definition of development set out in Article 3, Part 6, Class A of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) and the building is considered reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture, it is considered that prior approval would be required for the siting and external appearance of the proposed agricultural building because it would be located in a very sensitive location within the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the Green Belt and the Istead Arable Farmlands Landscape Character Area.

On the basis of the information submitted, prior approval is refused for the siting and external appearance of the proposed agricultural building. This is because the proposed siting and appearance would be inappropriate and harmful to the landscape. As such, it is considered that the proposed development would be harmful to the openness and natural character of the surrounding Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the Green Belt and Istead Arable Landscape Character Area and contrary to Policies CS02 and CS12 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and Paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).”

- 1.6 The OR in terms of the design of the PA 1 buildings stated as follows the following:

“[...]

The proposal would still introduce a building onto currently undeveloped land in a rural location in the AONB which is wholly characteristic of the local landscape area within which it lies, comprising gently rolling open countryside. The building itself would have an industrial appearance by virtue of the proposed black metal cladding on the walls and roof, which is alien within the landscape and rural character of the area. The building would be sited at the apex of the hill and is currently open rural land, which would be replaced by the large building with [is] no screening or planting included to conceal the building which would stand out in the landscape, especially in the autumn/winter months when the deciduous trees behind have lost their leaves.”

- 1.7 The OR also sought to raise a number of considerations which do not arise as part

of an assessment of prior approval under Class A Part 6. These related in particular to impact on biodiversity and the impact of development at the site that was not the subject of the application but were assumed would occur. The OR for PA 1 stated:

“[...]

Furthermore, the building would require an access road and in all likelihood a surrounding hardstanding, the details of which have not been provided by the applicant. Therefore, it is for the applicant to demonstrate why the proposed building is required to be sited in this location and if so, how any adverse impacts to biodiversity would be mitigated. In the absence of this, there could be adverse impacts to biodiversity potentially contrary to Policy CS12 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (LPCS) (2014).

The application site is located some 82 metres to the west of Public Rights of Way reference NS190 (a footpath). It is unclear from the information provided where the proposed access road would be in relation to the PROW, however given the distance it is unlikely to be affected. Nevertheless, its proximity means that the proposed building would be visible to the general public.”

1.8 The applicant responded to this decision with an amended scheme which included different external materials and additional landscaping and screening (the details of which are set out below) and made the second application for prior approval PA 2. This application was considered acceptable and was consented.

1.9 The OR in carrying out the assessment for PA 2 in particular drew the following conclusions [emphasis added]:

“The proposal would introduce a substantial new building onto currently undeveloped open land in a rural location in the Kent Downs National Landscape which is wholly characteristic of the local landscape area within which it lies, comprising gently rolling open countryside.

The proposed materials being black timber weatherboard cladding on the walls and profile metal roof, are appropriate for the rural context and the dark colour would serve to screen the building against the backdrop of trees behind properties that front Gold Street. Moreover, as part of the proposal there would be planting to screen the building, this is proposed on the western boundary of the site and to the

south of the building itself. In addition, the vines will also have a screening effect to lessen the impact and views of the building from the surrounding area. Therefore, the more appropriate materials and screening hereby proposed are considered to have overcome previous concerns in the refusal application.

New buildings for agricultural purposes are not inappropriate in the Green Belt and in this location it is not considered that the proposal would harm the overriding open rural character or natural beauty of the landscape, by virtue of the positioning of the building, the proposed materials and screening. In these circumstances no objections are raised to the proposed siting.”

- 1.10 It may be noted that no issue or assumptions were raised with regard to the impact of any development that was not the subject of the application nor were other policy considerations as with PA 1.
- 1.11 The applicant was not notified that prior approval for the design and siting was required in advance of the decision notice being issued. A decision was issued on 3 January 2024 (PA 2 DN) which determined that *“prior approval for the relevant matters for the development of land as described” in the notice was both “required and approved”*.
- 1.12 As with PA 1 the Council chose to issue a decision which confirmed that prior approval was required and then went on in the same notice to confirm that approval was given.
- 1.13 This decision was challenged, as noted, by way of judicial review by a resident of a property to the north of the proposed building (Dr Minhas of Hevers Cottage). The principal basis of the challenge was that the resident had not been consulted before the decision was made preventing their concerns being considered by the Council before determining the prior notification.
- 1.14 The Council conceded the claim on the basis in effect that the final determination of whether to approve, following determination that such prior approval was required, should not have been made at the same time as the latter and in particular prior to the display of a site notice which in anycase would serve no useful purpose after the decision was already made. This was based upon “para A.2 (2)(iv) of Class A, Part 6 of Schedule 2 to the GDPO 2015”.
- 1.15 The Claimant in addition confirmed that he *“does not oppose...the proposed*

development in principle, but objects to the prior approval on the basis of the proximity of the proposed building to residential boundaries in a rural location that would have an impact on residential amenity”.

- 1.16 An indication of what is meant by the suggested impact on amenity is given in the claim namely the *“effectiveness of the backdrop of trees” said to be part of the garden of Hevers Cottage and “impact of the sitng [sic] of the proposed building upon (i) their own residential amenity – visual and auditory – (ii) the local area, including the footpath and (iii) the wider area”.*
- 1.17 It was noted that in relation to both PA 1 and PA 2 the Council had obtained views from Cobham Parish Council and the Dickens Protection Society. Cobham Parish Council sought to object on the basis that the GPDO procedures should somehow not apply (PA1) and that the building was *“inappropriate development in the Green Belt and AONB”* (see OR PA1 and PA2). The Dickens Protection Society also objected to the availability of permitted development procedures under the GPDO suggesting the application should be *“called in in order that the full impact of the proposal can be assessed”* and additional conditions imposed.

2. Legal Framework: Part 6 Class A

- 2.1 1.1. Part 6, Class A Sch2 GPDO provides as follows:

“A. Permitted development

The carrying out on agricultural land comprised in an agricultural unit of 5 hectares or more in area of—

(a) works for the erection, extension or alteration of a building; or

(b) any excavation or engineering operations,

which are reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture within that unit.

A.1. Development not permitted

Development is not permitted by Class A if—

(a) the development would be carried out on a separate parcel of land forming part of the unit which is less than 1 hectare in area;

(b) it would consist of the erection or extension of any agricultural building on an established agricultural unit (as defined in paragraph X of Part 3 of this Schedule) where development under Class Q or S of Part 3 (changes of use) of this Schedule has been carried out within a period of 10 years ending with the date on which development under Class A(a) begins;

(c) it would consist of, or include, the erection, extension or alteration of a dwelling;

(d) it would involve the provision of a building, structure or works not designed for agricultural purposes;

(e) the ground area which would be covered by—

(i) any works or structure (other than a fence) for accommodating livestock or any plant or machinery arising from engineering operations; or

(ii) any building erected or extended or altered by virtue of Class A, would exceed 1,000 square metres , calculated as described in paragraph D.1(2)(a) of this Part;

(f) the height of any part of any building, structure or works within 3 kilometres of the perimeter of an aerodrome would exceed 3 metres;

(g) the height of any part of any building, structure or works not within 3 kilometres of the perimeter of an aerodrome would exceed 12 metres;

(h) any part of the development would be within 25 metres of a metalled part of a trunk road or classified road;

(i) it would consist of, or include, the erection or construction of, or the carrying out of any works to, a building, structure or an excavation used or to be used for the accommodation of livestock or for the storage of slurry or sewage sludge where the building, structure or excavation is, or would be, within 400 metres of the curtilage of a protected building;

(j) it would involve excavations or engineering operations on or over article 2(4) land which are connected with fish farming; or

(k) any building for storing fuel for or waste from a biomass boiler or an anaerobic digestion system—

(i) ...

A.2.— Conditions

(1) Development is permitted by Class A subject to the following conditions—

...

(2) Subject to sub-paragraph (3), development consisting of—

(a) the erection, extension or alteration of a building;

(b) the formation or alteration of a private way;

(c) ...

(d) ...,

is permitted by Class A subject to the following conditions—

(i) the developer must, before beginning the development, apply to the local planning authority for a determination as to whether the prior approval of the authority will be required as to the siting, design and external appearance of the building, the siting and means of construction of the private way, the siting of the excavation or deposit or the siting and appearance of the tank, as the case may be;

(ii) the application must be accompanied by a written description of the proposed development and of the materials to be used and a plan indicating the site together with any fee required to be paid;

(iii) the development must not begin before the occurrence of one of the following—

(aa) the receipt by the applicant from the local planning authority of a written notice of their determination that such prior approval is not required;

(bb) where the local planning authority give the applicant notice within 28 days

following the date of receiving the applicant's application of their determination that such prior approval is required, the giving of such approval; or

(cc) the expiry of 28 days following the date on which the application under sub-paragraph (2)(ii) was received by the local planning authority without the local planning authority making any determination as to whether such approval is required or notifying the applicant of their determination;

(iv) where the local planning authority give the applicant notice that such prior approval is required, the applicant must—

(aa) display a site notice by site display on or near the land on which the proposed development is to be carried out, leaving the notice in position for not less than 21 days in the period of 28 days from the date on which the local planning authority gave the notice to the applicant; and

(bb) where the site notice is, without any fault or intention of the applicant, removed, obscured or defaced before the period of 21 days referred to in sub-paragraph (iv)(aa) has elapsed, the applicant is treated as having complied with the requirements of that sub-paragraph if the applicant has taken reasonable steps for protection of the notice and, if need be, its replacement;

(v) the development must, except to the extent that the local planning authority otherwise agree in writing, be carried out—

(aa) where prior approval is required, in accordance with the details approved;

(bb) where prior approval is not required, in accordance with the details submitted with the application; and

(vi) the development must be carried out—

(aa) where approval has been given by the local planning authority, within a period of 5 years from the date on which approval was given;

(bb) in any other case, within a period of 5 years from the date on which the local planning authority were given the information referred to in paragraph (d)(ii).

(3) The conditions in sub-paragraph (2) do not apply to the extension or alteration of

a building if the building is not on article 2(4) land except in the case of a significant extension or a significant alteration.

(4) Development consisting of the significant extension or the significant alteration of a building may only be carried out once by virtue of Class A(a).

(5) Where development consists of works for the erection, significant extension or significant alteration of a building and—

(a) the use of the building or extension for the purposes of agriculture within the unit permanently ceases within 10 years from the date on which the development was substantially completed; and

(b) planning permission has not been granted on an application, or has not been deemed to be granted under Part 3 of the Act, for development for purposes other than agriculture, within 3 years from the date on which the use of the building or extension for the purposes of agriculture within the unit permanently ceased, then, unless the local planning authority have otherwise agreed in writing, the building or, in the case of development consisting of an extension, the extension, must be removed from the land and the land must, so far as is practicable, be restored to its condition before the development took place, or to such condition as may have been agreed in writing between the local planning authority and the developer.

...”

2.2 Of principal considerations for the application of Class A Part 6 is the definition of ‘agriculture’ to which the development needs to be ‘reasonably necessary for the purposes of’.

2.3 In *Millington v Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions* [1999] 6 WLUK 374, the Court of Appeal considered the issue of whether the use of land for the processing of a crop so as to produce an identifiably different product after it has been removed from the soil is or is not, as a matter of law, the use of land for the purposes of agriculture. The question was an important one in particular because as a matter of law the use of land and any building used for the purposes of agriculture does not require planning permission as this does not amount to development.

2.4 Section s55(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provides:

“The following operations or uses of land shall not be taken for the purposes of this Act to involve development of land—

[...]

(e) the use of any land for the purposes of agriculture ... and the use for any of those purposes of any building occupied together with land so used.”

2.5 The case did not deal directly with agricultural permitted development rights under the GPDO but does specifically address whether wine making is an ‘agricultural use’ or not and confirms that grape growing and wine making is indeed agriculture.

2.6 It may be noted at this point that there has been no suggestion that the use of the land is not agriculture and that the building is not reasonably required for such use. The operational development involving the construction of such a building, which does amount to development that requires permission under s55(1), is therefore the only issue remaining.

2.7 In terms of prior approval procedures and the purpose of the GPDO the applicant would identify the following matters.

2.8 First, s 69A of the 1990 Act requires that any “prior approval application” with the details of that application be placed upon the same register as for other planning applications under s69 and the same goes for any determination by an authority in respect of that application.

2.9 Secondly, the Courts have determined that “*an application for approval of matters required by a condition in a planning permission granted either expressly or as a PD right in the GPDO 2015 is not treated as being an application for planning permission*”¹.

2.10 Thirdly, when considering an application for prior approval under neither s70 of the 1990 Act nor s.38(6) of PCPA 2004, requiring a determination to be made in

¹ See R (Rights: Community: Action) v Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government[2020] EWHC 3073 (Admin) [29].

accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise, does not apply although in the consideration of an application for prior approval although “*development plan policies may still be taken into account in so far as they are relevant to [such] decisions*”².

- 2.11 Fourthly, a prior approval process is a two stage process³ with the first stage comprising consideration of whether prior approval is required and if the authority determines that it is not required, it should notify the applicant accordingly. If the authority determines prior approval is required (and notifies the applicant such) there is then the second stage wherein the authority is to decide whether to give approval⁴.
- 2.12 Under Class A Part 6 the authority is given a period of 28 days to make the first stage determination (see Class A.2 (2) (iii) (bb) Part 6) but there is no period specified within which to carry out that second stage.
- 2.13 In case Smolas it was determined that it is not mandatory for an authority to comply fully with the second stage process by formally allowing a period of time to pass before finally deciding whether to consent to the prior approval or not “*if, in the particular circumstances, it was appropriate and procedurally fair to do so*” (Smolas [73]).
- 2.14 Under Class A Part 6 as noted there is no set period given for the second stage so the only relevant period is a total of 8 weeks from the date of the application for prior approval (see Art 7 (a) and (b)).
- 2.15 Fifthly, there are no requirements for any form of public consultation to be carried out following an application for a prior approval consent under Class A Part 6. The only requirement (other than the application be placed on the register under s96A) is that the applicant (not the authority) once it has received notice from the authority that prior approval is required at stage 1 must itself display a site notice (see Class A2 (2) (d) (iv)).
- 2.16 The only matters which the authority must have regard to beyond whether the proposed development accords with the limitations in Class A and A1 when deciding

2 See Rights: Community: Action [32].

3 See Murrell v SSCLG [2010] EWCA Civ 1367; [2012] 1 P & CR 6 [2011] J.P.L. 739 and R. (oao Smolas) v Herefordshire Council [2021] EWHC 1663(Admin);[2022] J.P.L. 402.

4 See above.

whether prior approval is required and if so whether it should be given are “*the siting, design and external appearance of the building*”.

3. The proposed development

The Viticulture Enterprise and Need for Building

- 3.1 The agricultural holding is newly formed as a separate unit. The applicant purchased the holding specifically for the purpose of a new viticulture enterprise.
- 3.2 To assist the applicant with this objective, Dr Alistair Nesbitt at Vinescapes Ltd, a company that specialises in vineyard and winery consultancy are retained to manage the existing vines and plant on the western section of land with new vines. Vinescapes will provide operational, strategic and research expertise to create an exceptional winery. Their winery scoping report (‘*WSR*’) accompanies this notification and is appended at Appendix A to this statement.
- 3.3 The WSR confirms that the holding will produce 60,000 bottles of premium quality traditional method sparkling and still wines by 2027 per annum. Smaller yields are expected starting in 2024 and these will rise over the intervening period. With around 9 hectares of the land in viticulture use, 61 tonnes of fruit per annum is expected. This means the winery will generate a requirement for about 890m² of floorspace for the purposes of grape receipt, processing and storage. Section 5 to the WSR goes on to provide a breakdown of the floorspace required by function which is expressed as an absolute minimum and also confirm the proposed building subject to this prior notification provides some head room for a cleaner separation of uses and future needs.
- 3.4 With expansion and improvement of agricultural activities on Site, comes the requirement for a new winery building.
- 3.5 The authority has to date not challenged that the use of the land would be agriculture and that a building is required for this enterprise.

The design of the proposed building

- 3.6 The applicant has taken into account the matters raised by the Council when

refusing PA 1 and redesigned the building taking into account the design philosophy considered in the Kent Farmsteads Guidance Part 4 Character Area Statement guidance authored by English Heritage, Kent County Council and the Kent Downs AONB.

- 3.7 The Site falls within the North Kent Downs NCA 119 (North Kent Downs) character area. Of note, is the fact that the land is one of the most intensely-cultivated arable areas in England. The guidance then goes on to explain that:

“Building types

[...]

In the chalklands and vales large barns were built for storage and processing of the grain crop, and related to yards where straw and the manure from cattle was trodden down and redistributed to fertilise the fields.

[...]

Barns, typically of five bays and including aisled barns, are mostly of 17th or 18th century date but with a high concentration by national standards of earlier examples. Barns dating from the 18th century or before tend to be fully aisled. This area has one of the major concentrations of aisled barns in the country.

Barns were aisled or more commonly provided with a lean-to shed to at least one side resulting in low eaves-lines, emphasising the mass of the roof over walling.”

- 3.8 In response to this guidance, the proposed barn subject the PA 2 and this revised location was / has been re-sized to ensure the external appearance mirrors historic aisled barn proportions. The external materials are timber weatherboarding which will be stained black so the barn merges into the treed landscape at the top of the ridge. Black is a common colour in Kent for such buildings and blends with greenery better than other colours. To address views from the nearby footpath an informal tree and shrub belt is proposed as part of the landscaping scheme which will be subject to condition. The intention is not absolute screening, but to break the views of the barn with trees. Although it should be understood that buildings aren’t necessarily to be hidden, but form part of the evolving cultural and landscape character of the area. Which is why the landscape character assessment goes to great lengths to assess

their role in the character of the area.

- 3.9 Whilst no concerns were raised by the Council in its decision to approve PA2 in relation to visual impacts upon any neighbouring land holdings it is acknowledged by the applicant that neighbours have concern for their amenity. As such, this submission is supported with a Noise Impact Assessment to reliably demonstrate that the business of growing grapes for the making of wine is a quiet and respectful operation. Both the northern (original location subject to PA 1 and PA 2 applications) and this southern location were assessed and modelled. Both locations are compatible with neighbours amenity, but voluntarily, the application is offering through this submission to relocate the building further south and away from neighbours.

The Building

- 3.10 The new winery building (*'the Proposal'*) would extends to 40m length, 16m depth to achieve 640m² of built footprint measured as a gross external figure. The internal floorspace by reason of a basement and first floor will provide 1,097m² of internal floorspace.
- 3.11 A small hardstanding around parts of the building increases the gross external footprint (the relevant measurement for the purposes of Part 6), whilst keeping well below the 1,000m² threshold.
- 3.12 The proposed ridge height of the new building measures 9.3m and the eaves 5.2m when measured from the lowest original ground level immediately adjacent to the building.
- 3.13 The cellar or basement is located solely below the footprint to the winery building and will act as a temperate stable area for ageing. This is proposed by the applicant to help control energy costs incurred through maintenance of the internal temperate environment and to minimise the overall external mass of the proposed winery building.
- 3.14 The applicant has considered the potential implications upon the public in terms of visibility from public roads and footpaths as well as nearby residents. The proposed landscaping and positioning allows for any impact the building might have to be carefully softened, and for the existing landscape to act as backdrop against which

the development is read.

- 3.15 The applicant as responded to the matters raised before by the Council in respect of the first building proposed PA 1. In terms of potential impact upon the wider landscape, whilst the Council's determination of this application is not against development plan policy and nation policy, the applicant has had regard to Paragraph 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('*Framework*') which requires that decisions should "*contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by "[...] a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan); [...]"*. The Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy ('*LPCS*') mirrors this requirement (despite pre-dating the Framework) and at paragraph 5.7.26 goes on to state: "*The overall landscape character and valued landscapes will be conserved, restored and enhanced. The greatest weight will be given to the conservation and enhancement of the landscape and natural beauty of the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and its setting. Proposals will take account of the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan, the Gravesham Landscape Character Assessment, and the Cluster Studies where relevant.*"
- 3.16 Placing the barn against the backdrop of hedges and trees forming a copse to the east side of Gold Street and the Gold Street and Batts Road junction helps provide a treed backdrop. It also maintains the largest area of usable field and factually stops the barn appearing isolated in the landscape. This location can then be screened with native planting as proposed and allow users of the PROW to navigate across the field and have views softened. Although it should be noted that the vines either side of the PROW will provide a significant screening effect. The overall scale of vehicle movements to the barn will be low and the existing field gate will initially be used to access the field and barn.
- 3.17 Locating the barn within the eastern land parcel was also discounted because views are long reaching and Batts Road is very limited in width presenting highway difficulties.
- 3.18 The applicant notes that the Council did not in approaching PA 2 seek to stray beyond the prior approval procedures and relevant matters to take into account. These include the suggestion that the building's impact needed to include aspects of development that are not the subject of this application, namely the vehicular access.

- 3.19 The main point here is the proposal is sensitively designed, is reasonably necessary for agriculture and will be screened using a landscape strip and the vines themselves. The prior approval process does not allow for the Council to mandate the theoretical 'best' location for the building, only judge, if the proposal is reasonably necessary. The proposal is clear that only the barn and a small hardstanding is sought and the proposed location is easiest for future access and screening. It is also the only alternative location to that proposed through PA 1 and PA 2.

Siting and Design – impact of the building

- 3.20 In designing the building the applicant has taken into account the potential for visual and landscape impacts and impacts upon the residents who live proximate to the site.
- 3.21 In addition in terms of amenity the applicant has had regard to potential noise impact and traffic issues within accompanying noise impact assessment ref. 231_01R_1-0_CWA. This report refers to the southern location proposed here as 'Site 2'. Site 2 would have no noise impact on proximate neighbours or the PROW.
- 3.22 In short the presence of the building and its design do not bring about any or any material harm to the public and those living close to the site. This is a rural area with a number of farms and agricultural enterprises and a balance approach is needed in locating the building to ensure that reasonable use can be made of this large field; the vines can be accessed and other effective existing screening can be obtained from existing planting as well.
- 3.23 The applicant has taken a careful and balanced approach to this development proposal and as such the overall form is much reduced from theoretical levels. This proposed development is a reflection of the characteristics of the surrounding area, and uses.
- 3.24 The site poses design challenges in a number of respects and the applicant has engaged in detail over a significant period of time on all aspects of the design to ensure it can slot neatly into the site. The design does this without harm to the wider landscape. It is clear, taking relevant policies together, that the principle of this winery development in this location is accepted subject only to screening it to assist in responding to the landscape.

- 3.25 The design does, of necessity, involve some inevitable trade-offs and the applicant has sought to limit the development, invest more in the structure and offer a compromise on location although does reserve the right to revisit the northern location if required by separate submission for prior notification. Any resultant impact should not be looked at in absolute terms and is a matter to be weighed in the balance against the key benefits of the development, mainly that of rural economic diversification.
- 3.26 The applicant has sought to address the concerns raised by the Council in respect of PA 1 and PA 2 and has taken into account issue of amenity related to siting and design that may be raised by those who live in the areas.
- 3.27 The response is a sensitively designed winery building which raises no or no significant amenity issues and does not have any unacceptable impact as a result of its design and siting.
- 3.28 The applicant remains open to further discussion on the proposal and any additional matters that may be raised by the Council to overcome residual concerns.

4. Part 6, Class A Legislative Tests

- 4.1 Quoted at length in this section is the legislative tests at Part 6 Agricultural and forestry, Class A – agricultural development on units of 5 hectares or more. Commentary is added where relevant to confirm, this Proposal complies and therefore should be considered by the Council as ‘permitted development’ as described below:

“Permitted development

A. The carrying out on agricultural land comprised in an agricultural unit of 5 hectares or more in area of—

(a) works for the erection, extension or alteration of a building; or

(b) any excavation or engineering operations,

which are reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture within that unit.”

- 4.2 This Proposal is for a building and hardstanding. The total footprint of the building

extends to 640m². The WSR at Appendix A is very clear on the floorspace needed for wine making. Part of the land is already used for viticulture. Vinescapes are retained to plant the west section of land. The land extends to over 11 hectares and around 9 hectares will be planted. These points in combination prove the Proposal is reasonably necessary for the purpose of agriculture in the unit.

Development not permitted

A.1 Development is not permitted by Class A if -

(a) the development would be carried out on a separate parcel of land forming part of the unit which is less than 1 hectare in area;

COMPLIANT: The agricultural unit extends to approximately 11.5 hectares and this parcel of land within the unit exceeds 1 hectare.

(b) it would consist of the erection or extension of any agricultural building on an established agricultural unit (as defined in paragraph X of Part 3 of this Schedule) where development under Class Q or S of Part 3 (changes of use) of this Schedule has been carried out within a period of 10 years ending with the date on which development under Class A(a) begins;

COMPLIANT: No Class Q or S development has taken place.

(c) it would consist of, or include, the erection, extension or alteration of a dwelling;

COMPLIANT: The proposal is for the storage and processing of the grape harvest within a purpose built agricultural building.

(d) it would involve the provision of a building, structure or works not designed for agricultural purposes;

COMPLIANT: The building is designed to provide for natural light. Wine making is a different form of agriculture and there is a requirement for consideration of the working conditions. The basement will maintain a consistent 12 degree temperature year round. Overall, the form of the building is a standard agricultural typology and relatively utilitarian in form. But a form that clearly can be used for the agricultural purpose intended.

(e) the ground area which would be covered by—

(i) any works or structure (other than a fence) for accommodating livestock or any plant or machinery arising from engineering operations; or

(ii) any building erected or extended or altered by virtue of Class A, would exceed 1,000 square metres, calculated as described in paragraph D.1(2)(a) of this Part;

COMPLIANT: The maximum footprint of the proposed building extends to 640m². The requirement here is for the ground area to be measured. That is not the same as the overall floorspace offer. Interpretation of specific words is important to understand what the GPDO means. Case law indicates that the plain English meaning of words should apply unless there is a specific definition of the term within the GPDO, i.e., the 'ground area' is only the actual area of ground covered, because there is no definition of 'ground area' with the GDPO. This means, within Class A, up to 1,000m² of ground area can be provided. The measurement is of the building and hardstanding, not including the basement. In this regard, the Proposal complies.

(f) the height of any part of any building, structure or works within 3 kilometres of the perimeter of an aerodrome would exceed 3 metres;

COMPLIANT: There are no aerodromes within 3 kilometres.

(g) the height of any part of any building, structure or works not within 3 kilometres of the perimeter of an aerodrome would exceed 12 metres;

COMPLIANT: The ridge height measures 9.3m above ground level.

(h) any part of the development would be within 25 metres of a metalled part of a trunk road or classified road;

COMPLIANT: The building is sited at a distance exceeding 25 metres from a metalled trunk or classified road.

(i) it would consist of, or include, the erection or construction of, or the carrying out of any works to, a building, structure or an excavation used or to be used for the accommodation of livestock or for the storage of slurry or sewage sludge where the building, structure or excavation is, or would be, within 400 metres of the curtilage of a protected building;

COMPLIANT: The proposal would not be used for the accommodation of livestock nor storage of slurry.

(j) it would involve excavations or engineering operations on or over article 2(4) land

which are connected with fish farming; or

COMPLIANT: Article 2(4) land is encompasses National Parks and the Broads. This site falls within neither designation and is not connected with fish farming.

(k) any building for storing fuel for or waste from a biomass boiler or an anaerobic digestion system—

(i) would be used for storing waste not produced by that boiler or system or for storing fuel not produced on land within the unit; or

(ii) is or would be within 400 metres of the curtilage of a protected building.

COMPLIANT: The proposal is not for the storing of fuel or waste and K(i) and K(ii) are not relevant.

4.3 The Proposal has been shown to comply with paragraph A1.

4.4 Conditions detailed within paragraph A.2 (1) confirm the development is permitted by Class A subject to the following.

a) where development is carried out within 400 metres of the curtilage of a protected building, any building, structure, excavation or works resulting from the development are not used for the accommodation of livestock except in the circumstances described in paragraph D.1(3) of this Part or for the storage of slurry or sewage sludge, for housing a biomass boiler or an anaerobic digestion system, for storage of fuel or waste from that boiler or system, or for housing a hydro-turbine;

COMPLIANT: The proposal is not designed for the purposes of accommodating livestock.

(b) where the development involves—

(i) the extraction of any mineral from the land (including removal from any disused railway embankment); or

(ii) the removal of any mineral from a mineral-working deposit, the mineral is not moved off the unit;

COMPLIANT: The proposal does not require any mineral extractions or deposits. The soil profile comprises chalk. This arising from the basement will be used as the foundation for the hardstanding and no export is expected.

(c) waste materials are not brought on to the land from elsewhere for deposit except for use in works described in Class A(a) or in the provision of a hard surface and any materials so brought are incorporated forthwith into the building or works in question.

COMPLIANT: No waste deposits are to be brought on to the land.

(2) Subject to sub-paragraph (3), development consisting of—

(a) the erection, extension or alteration of a building;

(b) the formation or alteration of a private way;

(c) the carrying out of excavations or the deposit of waste material (where the relevant area, as defined in paragraph D.1(4) of this Part, exceeds 0.5 hectares); or

(d) the placing or assembly of a tank in any waters.

is permitted by Class A subject to conditions

COMPLIANT: The proposal and this application process complies fully with the conditions.

5. Summary

- 5.1 Subject to the requirements of A.2 (2) (d) (i) which requires the developer to apply to the local planning authority for a determination as to whether the prior approval of the authority will be required. The Council have 28 days following the date of receiving the application to confirm their position.
- 5.2 The Proposal is of a size and design that is commensurate with the agricultural activities taking place within the agricultural holding and is considered necessary to meet the minimum storage requirements for the grape harvest produced solely within the holding.
- 5.3 It is clear that the Proposal will be fully utilised for the purposes of agriculture on the holding. The type and design of the agricultural building is one that is seen in the rural area and specifically follows design guidance for the area. Furthermore, landscaping is proposed to screen views to the south. The proposed location is considered optimal, because it is set against an existing tree line, rather than in an isolated field location elsewhere. The building and processes within fall within the definition of agriculture as confirmed by case law. For these reasons, the Proposal can secure prior approval.

Appendix A

Winery Scoping Report



Saturday, 12 August 2023

Winery Scoping Report – Gold Street, Cobham, Kent.

Client: Mr. Pallab Sengupta

Project: Winery scoping assessment and report. This report sets out the core production equipment and building scale requirements for the manufacturing of up to 60,000 btl. of premium quality Traditional Method Sparkling and still wine at Gold Street, Kent.

This report should be read in conjunction with '*Gold Street Wine production strategy*' which set out the winemaking strategy and space calculations.

Quote reference: VS286

Contents:

Section	Topic	Page
1	Executive summary	2
2	Methodology	2
3	Estate production outline	3
4	Wine production volumes	4
5	Building area requirements	5
6	Summary	7
7	Appendices	9-10



1. Executive Summary

It is estimated that Gold street could produce 60,000 bottles of premium quality Traditional Method Sparkling and still wine by 2027 with smaller yields expected in earlier production years (2024, 2025 and 2026) depending on vine development rate. After discussion with the client, we have developed proposed production splits as set out in Tables 1 and 2 (pages 3 & 4) and the product specification shown in Table 3 (page 5) which set out the target blends and volumes of the following product categories:

1. Blanc de Blanc – Premium quality Traditional Method sparkling made from three clones of Chardonnay, with barrel ageing and extended lees ageing of up to 5-years.
2. Classic Cuvée – Premium quality Traditional Method sparkling made from multiple clones of Chardonnay, Pinot Noir and Meunier, with barrel ageing and extended lees ageing time of up to 3.5-years.
3. Blanc de Noir - Premium quality Traditional Method sparkling made from multiple clones of Pinot Noir and Meunier, with barrel ageing and extended lees ageing time of up to 3.5-years.
4. Rosé de Noir - Premium quality Traditional Method sparkling made from multiple clones of Pinot Noir and Meunier, with barrel ageing and extended lees ageing time of up to 3.5-years.
5. Still Rosé – Premium quality still Rosé wine made from Gamay. A unique offering that will be the house's style point of differentiation within the market.

These blends and figures remain indicative for the purpose of scoping winery equipment and area requirements and may be subject to change depending on vintage variation, a winemakers production decisions and market preferences, but they are a realistic and desired indication of potential.

At 9ha in scale, fruit tonnage for sparkling and still wines from Gold street alone could be circa 61T. This could increase or decrease by circa 50% on a year-to-year basis depending on seasonal weather and disease conditions. Therefore, we have allocated floor, tank space and cellar space to account for such eventualities.

In total, we have calculated that the wine production facilities require an estimated 900m² of internal space. This will allow for grape receipt, processing, élevage and bottling, post bottle maturation storage and all the way through to dispatch.

Please note that the area requirement calculations herein do not include any public/commercial areas as these will be determined by the business proposition with regards to potential 'visitor' numbers and commercial offering. However, as previously discussed there is a great potential to integrate tasting facilities into the winery.

2. Methodology

Vinescapes have had various discussions with the client to determine an outline of the production goals, including vineyard hectareage per variety, production volumes, blends, ageing length and product ranges. This information was then used to calculate the space requirements of fully 'in-house' wine processing and cellaring capability for wine at Gold Street wines.



Firstly, we used the Estate hectareage (target 9ha for sparkling and still production), target blends and desired production percentage of each wine to determine the required vineyard area (ha) per variety. We also factored in expected yield per hectare (6T/ha for Gamay, for still production and 7.5T/ha for sparkling clones) and extraction rate (5hL/T for the Cuvée and 1.25hL/T for Taille, in sparkling wines, and 7hL/T for still) to give an indication of the hectareage per variety needed to achieve the overall production goal.

Once this was determined we used the expected yield (both total grape weight (T) and juice liquid volume (hL)) to determine press requirements (based on the desired quality and efficient press loads) as well as allocate tank space to each variety and the Cuvée from the Taille. This drives the requirements for the floor space in the pressing and fermentation sections within the Winery. We based the tank sizes on the production criteria in which we agreed to keep press fractions isolated for each variety as well as allow the separation of clones, where possible, or grapes with similar quality.

Additionally, we have also considered the phasing of production and have ensured the tanks (quantity and size) recommended for a large (61T) meet the end needs of the winery. This means that the space requirements can remain consistent from year to year until the winery is at full production. Because we have based the tank requirements on a +20% of production (for higher yielding years), the storage of reserve wine is also included in the space requirements, as this is not expected annually.

We have based our wine storage requirements on 75cl standard Champagne bottles plus.

3. Estate production outline

Hectareage (ha) currently under vine for wine production is 3.47ha (to come into production in October 2025) however, this will increase to a total of 9ha in the first phase of planting in May 2024 (to come into production in October 2026). The eventual winery production capacity requirement has been scoped for 61T of grapes (440hl) equating to 58,533 bottles in an 'average' year.

Based on the target yields (6T/ha for Gamay, for still production and 7.5T/ha for sparkling clones), extraction rates and specified product ranges, Table 1, below, outlines the estimated hectareage required per variety to achieve this goal. Please note that this is subject to change if any alterations are made to expected yields (T/ha and hl/T), blends or product ranges.

Table 1. Estimated hectareage per variety for 12 ha planting.

Variety	Estimated Hectares	Clones
Gamay	1.5	787
Chardonnay	1.21	76
Chardonnay	0.76	96
Chardonnay	0.3	95
Pinot Meunier	0.75	865
Pinot Meunier	0.75	977



<i>Pinot Noir</i>	0.50	777
<i>Pinot Noir</i>	0.50	115
<i>Pinot Noir</i>	1.375	386
<i>Pinot Noir</i>	1.375	521
<i>Grand Total</i>	9.02	

Production volumes are based on several unknowns and assumptions:

- The vineyards' performance (yields and quality) over time. If well managed, an average tonnage of 6T/ha for Gamay and 7.5T/ha for Sparkling clones, this is slightly higher than similar UK vineyards and would require appropriate investment and viticulture expertise of those involved to establish and manage the vines to achieve this yield consistently.
- We have forecasted for an average tonnage of 6T/ha for Gamay, with the intended style of production for the wine being a still Rosé. However, fluctuations in yields will be unknown due to the unique style of viticulture adopted for this process.
- The grape juice extraction rates are kept at 7hL/T for still Rosé production and 5hL/T for the Cuvee and 1.25hL/T for Taille. These may increase or decrease depending on the season, winemaking, and wine styles. We have also included storage tank space for Taille and Cuvee. The Taille fraction press in Traditional Method sparkling wine production typically contains unwanted particles and can contribute bitter and unpalatable flavours and aromas which are not suitable for producing high quality wines. The Taille can be sold for distillation. Storage tanks could be in the form of seasonally hired ISO tanks, in which case only extra floor space is required, or fixed tanks in which case both floor and capital investment is needed.
- Climate data for the vineyard locations shows good cool-climate viticulture suitability, however, seasonal variability and frost risks remain. We can expect the area to warm further over the next few decades facilitating a likely increase in average yields.
- There are significant (~30% but can be greater) inter-annual yield variations in UK vineyards due to weather variability. Wineries require the capacity to process extra [than 'normal'] fruit in higher yielding years, 2018 was a prime example of this, and 2019 another example.

4. Wine production volumes

The flagship product categories of the Estate will premium quality Traditional Method sparkling, made in three or four styles (Blanc de Blanc, Classic cuvée, Blanc de Noir and Rosé de Noir). We expect either the Blanc de Blanc or the Blanc de Noir to be the highest quality in the portfolio (TBC depending on the grapes), using the best quality grapes and juice. This is also reflected in the longer lees ageing and oak influence. Finishing (disgorging and labelling) of these wines can therefore be determined according to sales of other wine categories, consumer demand and how the wine is progressing in the cellar.



Table 2, below, outlines the production volumes and varieties used of each product range. This includes estimated annual production.

Table 2. Extended planting production scoping

Wine Style	Variety	Clones	Hectares (ha)	Tonnes/ha (T/ha)	Total Tonnes (T)	Cuvee (hL)	Taille (hL)	Total hL	Bottles
Blanc de Blanc	Chardonnay	76	1.21	8.0	9.7	48	12	61	
	Chardonnay	95, 96	0.53	8.0	4.2	21	5	27	
	Totals		1.74		13.9	70	17	87	11,600
Classic Cuvée	Chardonnay	96, 95	0.53	8.0	4.2	21	5	27	
	Pinot Noir	777, 115	1.00	8.0	8.0	40	10	50	
	Meunier	865, 977	0.5	8.0	4.0	20	5	25	
	Totals		2.0		16.2	81	20	102	13,533
Blanc De Noir	Pinot Noir	386,521	1.38	8.0	11.0	55	14	69	
	Meunier	865, 977	0.5	8.0	4.0	20	5	25	
	Totals		1.9		11.0	75	19	94	12,500
Rosé De Noir	Pinot Noir	386,521	1.38	8.0	11.0	55	14	69	
	Meunier	865, 977	0.5	8.0	4.0	20	5	25	
	Totals		1.9		11.0	75	19	94	12,500
Still Rosé	Gamay	787	1.50	6.0	9.0	63	0	63	
	Totals		1.50		9.0	63	0	63	8,400
	Grand totals				61	364		439	58,533

Wines made for Traditional Method sparkling can hold and even improve their quality when kept on lees in oak barrels, when correct storage conditions are maintained. We recommend the cellar be temperature and humidity controlled as well as being as dark an environment as possible (windowless, non-UV lighting).

Some winemakers may also hold wines on cork for future release, letting the wines settle after post bottling to let the wine components develop. The minimum recommended time is 6-months.

5. Building area requirements

The total winery area (m²) requirement is calculated based on the equipment specifications and operating space requirements detailed fully in the 'Gold Street Wine Production strategy' excel document. In Table 3, below, we have split the building area requirements into functional sections, each with its own set of activities and equipment needs. Further details including tank sizes and



quantities can be found in Appendix -1 & 2.

Table 3. Building area overview.

Building/Section	Activity	Estimated minimum area (m²).
<i>Receival</i>	Grape picking bin storage Bin washdown area Grape receival Coquard press (8T) (I/E - design dependant) 4T Pneumatic press Conveyor/hopper Crusher/Destemmer	~200
<i>Winery (Tanks)</i>	Tanks	~180
<i>Workable area</i>	Alleyways, areas for movement and winemaking production	~100
<i>Ageing / cellar</i>	Stillages	~110
<i>Barrel cellar</i>	Barrels	~125
<i>Bottling</i>	Bottling	~10
<i>Production (Post bottling)</i>	Disgorging Labelling/Packaging Stillages and bottles	~20
<i>Riddling</i>	Gyro-pallets TSR cages	~25
<i>Distribution</i>	Pallets ready for distribution on pallet racking	~100
<i>Store & dry goods</i>	Picking bins Winery equipment (pumps/hoses/tools) Filters Sundries Chemical storage	~100
<i>Lab/office</i>	Chemical analysis and staff office for 3-4 people	~20
TOTAL:		890m²

Receival requires circa 200 m² of internal and external footprint. Allowing for pressing areas (~30m²) a wash down area for grape picking bins (~13m²). Possible outdoor press for periods of busy times (~25m²). An additional external hard-standing area (100m²) is necessary which encompasses grape receival, wine despatch, as well as external machinery and plant storage. The hard standing area should be covered or partially covered for use in case of inclement weather.

The Winery requires circa 180m² of tank footprint area. Circulation and workspace can be determined according to the floor plan, but at least 2.5m alleyway will be required in between tanks as well as circulation and loading space for the presses. This section includes the fermentation and pressing areas, and winery storage.



The exact quantities of wine to be fermented or aged in wood (barrels etc) has not been specified so we have allocated nominal percentages of wine to go to barrel, which requires a barrel room of circa 125m² if barrels are in a stack of 4.

The Production section requires circa 160m² of working floor space. This includes the pre-/post-disgorging and labelling (~20m²), a bottling line (20m²), riddling (25m²) disgorging. We have also included dry good storage for both tirage and disgorging/labelling (~100²).

The Ageing Cellar section requires circa 110m² of temperature and humidity controlled, bonded storage. For sparkling wine, ageing length is an important consideration as this will affect the character, wine style and ultimately the value/price. Taking the different product ranges into account, the bottles will be stored for up to 5-years which requires significant floor space.

Additionally, we recommend a smaller area dedicated for one weeks' worth of labelled wine bottles (105,000 bottles on 83 Euro Pallets) on pallet racking (~100m²) as this is stored before despatch. Both areas will need to include a 5m alleyway for forklift manoeuvring which can increase or decrease depending on the model and type of forklift chosen by the management/winemaking team.

The final area will be determined once the equipment is laid out on a floor plan so that workable space and flow can be fully accounted for.

6. Summary

In modern and sustainable wine production, we expect to have efficiency and flexibility in space usage, adequate winery capacity, and adaptive production scheduling. Therefore, we have scoped the Winery, Processing and Cellar requirements with these three aspects in mind.

We have scoped the wine production process with a recommendation that all elements of wine production are maintained on-site and 'in-house' as opposed to outsourcing. In-house winemaking, bottling, processing and cellaring at this scale provides greater control over wine quality and the final product whilst reducing wine movements (and therefore cost). Having the facilities for processing and cellaring on-site also provides the winemaker with greater autonomy with regards to production scheduling as they are not reliant on contractors.

A range of tank sizes means that varieties, clones, and wine styles can be kept separate whilst allowing for maximum use of the space and funds available (larger tanks provide more storage and economies of scale).

Exact specifications and sundries will likely be determined by the winemaker/winemaking team subject to their own preferences and desired wine styles however, the equipment outlined in the '*Gold Street Production Strategy*' excel worksheet and in this document provides a comprehensive assessment of the space required for an appropriately equipped wine production facility.

The wine production and storage/ageing space requirements for Gold Street are significant, comprised of the Winery 180m²; Production 160m² and the barrel and ageing 225m², but not unlike facilities with similar production volumes. They will provide the necessary operating and processing space for high quality and efficient wine production along the various product lines specified.



Appendix 1

Full details of indicative area requirements by building and section

AREA	M ²	COMMENT
RECEIVAL (EXTERNAL & INTERNAL)	200	- Grape receival (can be moved throughout external and internal areas, weather dependant) - Scales (1m²) - Conveyor, Hopper (13m²) - Bin dumper (4m²) - Crusher (4.5m²) - Destemmer (2m²) - Grape bins drop off, storage, and washing (10m²) - Crate washer (3m²) 45 Dolav bins stored 4x high (55m²) - Includes workspace and manoeuvring - Pressing 4T Pneumatic press (9m²) 8T Coquard press (15m²) Covered receival area would mean presses could be placed outside - Turning space for tractors and lorries, despatch and overflow storage. - Compressor, gas bottles or N generator (10m²) - Plant – cooling units (20m²)
SUBTOTAL	200	
TANK SPACE	180	Stainless steel vessels for post alcoholic fermentation maturation and blending.
BARREL CELLAR	125	- Temperature & humidity controlled zone - Allows for circa 70x 228L barrels, stacked up to 4 high, with potential for vertical expansion. (100m²) - Includes workspace and manoeuvring
SUBTOTAL	305	
AGEING CELLAR	110	- Stillages 500bt/stillage Champagne bottle 600bt/stillage Burgundy bottle - Winemaking equipment store - Pumps - Wine hoses - Tools - Filters - Barrel washing equipment
STORE & DRY GOODS	100	- Cleaning store - Cleaning equipment - Sundries - Chemical store - Chemicals



	20	• Lab ○ Chemical analysis and testing • Office ○ Space for 3x person
SUBTOTAL	230	
PRODUCTION	50	• Packaging ○ Labels ○ Boxes ○ Corks ○ Screwcaps
	40	• Storage ○ Stillages & bottles ○ Overflow
DISTRIBUTION	50	• Finished wine ○ Wine cases ○ One week's worth of labelled wine bottles ○ 24 x 12 pallet racks
SUBTOTAL	160	
GRAND TOTAL: INTERNAL: & EXTERNAL:	~890m²	

Appendix 2

Indicative tank requirements by variety and press fraction for 9ha

HL	CHARDONNAY 76	CHARDONNAY 95 & 96	PINOT NOIR 777 & 115	PINOT NOIR 386 & 521	PINOT MEUNIER 865 & 977	GAMAY 787
CUVEE	48	42	40	110	60	63
Taille	12	10	10	28	15	0
Blends	60	52	50	138	75	63

Tank requirements per blend (hl)					
WINE STYLE	Total hL	Tank (hL)	Blend breakdown	Blend qty (hL)	Total blend
BDB	87	100	30%	26.1	11.4
CC	102	200	20%	20.4	8.9
BDN	94	100	50%	47	20.6
RDN	94	100	50%	47	20.6



ROSE	63	100	30%	18.9	8.3
------	----	-----	-----	------	-----

TANKS TOTALS (HL)				
<u>VESSEL</u>	<u>Material</u>	<u>Style</u>	<u>Vol (hL)</u>	<u>Qty</u>
STACKED - BASE TANK	Stainless steel	Closed top	15	4
TANK	Stainless steel	Variable capacity	50	5
TANK	Stainless steel	Closed top	100	8
TANK	Stainless steel	Closed top	200	3
BARREL	Oak	Oak barrel	2.28	70