



**RSPCA standards justification**

# **Laying hens**

# Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Food and Water</b>	<b>2</b>
Food	2
Water	2
<b>Environment</b>	<b>3</b>
Floor and litter	3
Verandas	3
Lighting	4
Natural daylight	4
Space requirements and flock size	5
Air quality and thermal environment	6
Nest boxes	7
Perches	7
Multi-tier	8
Environmental enrichment	9
<b>The range</b>	<b>10</b>
Management	10
Popholes	10
Natural cover and range enrichment	11
<b>Management</b>	<b>12</b>
Inspection	12
Pullets	12
<b>Health</b>	<b>13</b>
Health and welfare monitoring	13
Mutilations	13
<b>Slaughter / killing</b>	<b>15</b>
Shackling	15
Gas killing	15
<b>References</b>	<b>18</b>

## Introduction

This document provides the rationale underpinning the setting of certain, key standards within the RSPCA Welfare Standards for Laying Hens. As such, this document provides the justification behind the setting of such standards.

Not all standards are covered within this document, as either further explanation is not required, e.g. the justification is clear within the standard itself, or the standard is based on a legal requirement. However, those standards that go above legal minimum requirements and could be set at a range of levels are generally included.

Justifications are not exhaustive, but are typically representative of the evidence base (where this exists) for that issue.

In some cases, a summary of the full standard wording has been provided. Therefore, please refer to the RSPCA Welfare Standards for Laying Hens for the full standard wording.

References to legal requirements relate to domestic legislation.

# Food and Water

## Food

---

- **Feeder space: 5cm of (actual) linear track (10cm single side) or 4cm of circular feeding space must be provided and must be accessible for each bird.**

This standard has been in place for over 20 years and was based on a combination of experience and observation at the time of developing the first set of standards for laying hens. The same requirements were introduced into European legislation (1999/74/EC, 1999) (for all alternative (non-cage) systems from 2002. Research (Sirovnik et al., 2018) suggests reduced feed space results in increased competition, reduced feed intake and increased aggressive interactions. As a minimum standard, it is thus expected that producers would review their feeding regime, including feed access where evidence on-farm suggests feed space / access is insufficient.

## Water

---

- **Drinker space: The minimum number of drinkers which must be provided is as follows:**
  - a) **nipples, 1 per 10 hens; cups, 1 per 10 hens; circular trough space (including bells), 1.0cm per hen; linear trough space, 2.5 cm per hen;**
  - b) **never less than 2.**

These standards are in-line with legislation (1999/74/EC, 1999) and practical experience on-farm suggests drinker access is sufficient to allow birds ready access to drinking water. Hens drink at certain times, e.g. prior to egg laying, therefore the position of drinkers may be particularly important; in practice drinkers are often placed directly in front of nest boxes.

## Environment

### Floor and litter

---

- **Litter access: Birds must have access to litter within 24 hours of placement.**
- **Litter quality: Litter must be dry, friable and of a suitable particle size.**
- **Litter depth: The litter must be a minimum depth of 5cm, increasing to a minimum of 10cm by 2 months.**

The standard(s) was introduced over 20 years ago.

Good quality litter promotes bird activity and enables some important behavioural needs and priorities including dust-bathing, pecking and scratching (Rodenburg et al., 2005). Frustration and a redirection of foraging behaviour to other birds' feathers (injurious pecking) can be caused when litter access is restricted (Nicol et al., 2003) or the condition of the litter is poor (Green et al., 2000); lack of litter or poor quality litter is therefore a welfare concern. There is evidence that both particle size and litter depth plays an important role in dustbathing behaviour – considered a behavioural need (Weeks & Nicol, 2006) - with smaller particle sizes and deeper substrates resulting in more satisfactory dustbathing behaviour (Moesta et al., 2008). A greater depth of litter may also help to dilute the faecal contamination of litter, helping to maintain it in a hygienic and friable state.

### Verandas

---

- **Verandas must be installed on all barn buildings by no later than 1st May 2030.**

This standard was introduced in 2025.

Verandas provide many benefits for bird welfare by encouraging ranging (in free-range systems), improving litter quality in the main house, providing more space, providing natural light, and providing free-range birds with a more biosecure semi-outdoor area during periods of mandatory confined housing (e.g. during Avian Influenza housing orders). These factors can have indirect positive welfare impacts on flocks, such as reducing injurious pecking.

Exposure to direct natural levels of UVB wavelengths can ensure the production of vitamin D3. This promotes absorption of calcium, which may help improve bone strength.

The RSPCA strongly encourages verandas to be installed on all free-range buildings. The RSPCA Farm Animals Department is currently undertaking an in-depth review of this. Depending on the conclusion of this review, a phase in date for the installation of verandas on all buildings may be set.

See: [Veranda justification document](#).

## Lighting

---

- **Light levels: A minimum illumination of 20 lux is required in the ‘activity’ areas of the house, including the litter and the feedtracks.**

The minimum illumination required was increased from a minimum of 10 lux throughout the house to a minimum of 20 lux in activity areas in 2017.

Visually mediated behaviour such as feeding and exercise are increased in brighter conditions (Boshouwers & Nicaise, 1993; Prescott & Wathes, 2002). The requirements for a minimum of 20 lux in ‘activity’ areas of the house, therefore encourages these behaviours in areas where they should occur, whilst allowing for lower lighting levels in areas where they are preferred, e.g. the perches for resting and preening behaviour (Davis et al., 1999). This higher light level also allows lighting to be reduced as a management tool in the event of an outbreak of injurious pecking, whilst still maintaining light levels sufficient to encourage foraging behaviours and the maintenance of good eye health.

- **Dusk periods: artificial lighting must be switched off in a stepped or gradual manner to allow the hens to prepare for darkness.**

The standard(s) is in line with legislation.

Dusk periods enable birds to locate appropriate roosting spots and stimulates feeding behaviour (Savory, 1980) prior to roosting, preventing hunger during the nighttime period. A short dimming period (less than 15 minutes) is shown to provide sufficient preparation time in experimental studies (March et al., 1990; Olsson & Keeling, 2000). This dimming period is not specified within the RSPCA welfare standards as different periods may be needed in different housing systems; as written, the standards require that a level of outcome assessment takes place to determine what is appropriate on a given unit.

## Natural daylight

---

- **For barn production: natural daylight, corresponding to at least 3% of the total floor area of the house must be installed by no later than 1st May 2032 for existing buildings and in all new houses built from 1st October 2025.**
- **For free-range production: natural daylight openings must:**
  - a) correspond to at least 3% of the total floor area of the house
  - b) be installed at the time of an internal refurbishment
  - c) be installed by no later than 1st January 2035
  - d) be provided via the installation of windows for buildings that undergo a structural refurbishment or are built from 1st October 2025.
- **For flocks placed from 1st October 2025, natural daylight must be provided via all popholes within the building when birds need to be housed during the natural daylight period.**

These requirements for natural light were introduced in the 2025 version of the standards, although producers are given a phase-in period to implement this requirement. See [natural daylight justification document](#).

There are numerous benefits to providing laying hens with natural light:

- a) Vision - Laying hens have well developed vision and, like ourselves, it is their dominant sense and has evolved for use in brightly lit conditions. In particular, they have well developed colour vision, which has been determined from a variety of behavioural and physiological tests (summarised in Prescott et al., 2003). However, a high light intensity is required for this visual system to work well. The intensity of natural light is many orders of magnitude brighter than the artificially lit environments of poultry houses where the maximum lighting levels are often 20 lux. Further, natural light provides the full spectrum of light, including UV light. Therefore daylight is necessary for chickens to utilise this sense to its full potential.
- b) Preference - Recent research has found that hens show a preference for UVA/UVB light compared to white light/commercial lighting (Rana et al., 2021; Wichman et al., 2021). These preferences for light change with age and with the type of behaviour being performed. Usually, behaviours which require visual acuity are performed under bright light and those such as resting and preening in dimmer light. Therefore spatial variation in light provision is also important, which can be provided within houses with windows, whereby the environment naturally becomes darker lit towards the centre of the house.
- c) Behaviour - Under UVA lighting conditions laying hens have been found to perform more positive behaviours such as foraging, ground pecking and preening (Maddocks et al., 2001; Rana et al., 2021), especially under lower light intensities. Laying hens provided with supplementary UV lighting (18-72 weeks) were found to have lower stress (determined by CORT levels, bilateral asymmetry and heterophil:lymphocyte ratio) and fear levels (measured using tonic immobility and inversion) (Sobotik et al., 2020).
- d) Feather damage and keel fractures - Better plumage cover was also found when natural daylight was provided (M. Bestman et al., 2019) and the absence of daylight between 7 - 17 weeks of age was a predictor of feather loss during the laying period in organic flocks (M. Bestman et al., 2009). Another study identified the absence of daylight as a risk factor for keel bone damage in organic flocks (Jung et al., 2019), this was thought to be a result of increased collisions due to poor visual perception.
- e) Range use - Providing windows in the roof or walls of the shed will increase the light intensity inside the house and allow UVA wavelengths, providing hens with more external cues that may promote range use. Bestman et al (2019) reported that a larger amount of daylight inside the house was related to greater range use. In free-range laying hen flocks the range is often not well utilised, with some research reporting range use rarely exceeds 50% of the flock (Pettersson et al., 2016). The importance of promoting laying hens range use has been well studied, Nicol et al (2003) reported a nine-fold reduction in the risk of feather pecking in flocks that utilised the range on sunny days.
- f) Stock-keepers - Stock-keepers have reported that they prefer working in a naturally lit environment as they can manage and inspect the birds more clearly. Many also report that natural light helps with the cleaning of the shed at the end of the flock, enabling the operator to inspect more thoroughly whether the house has been effectively cleaned and disinfected.

## Space requirements and flock size

---

- **Stocking density: stocking density must not exceed 9 birds/m<sup>2</sup>.**

The standard(s) is in line with EU legislation.

Limiting stocking density helps to ensure birds are able to carry out their normal behavioural repertoire and move around the shed, accessing resources such as perches, feeders, drinkers and nest boxes with minimal difficulty or competition.

Much of the research regarding the impacts of stocking density on welfare indicators such as plumage condition and mortality - in both commercial and experimental studies – provides mixed results (Huber-Eicher & Audigé, 1999; Nicol et al., 1999, 2006; Zimmerman et al., 2006). It is not clear, therefore, whether stocking densities below the current legal maximum would benefit animal welfare. It is suggested that management may be more important to welfare than lower stocking densities (Nicol et al., 2006). However, this may also be influenced by requirements for different resources, such as environmental enrichment provisions and raised perches, where a lower stocking density allows for greater provision without crowding. A reduced stocking rate can also help to reduce disturbance of key behaviours such as resting and dustbathing and to better enable escape behaviours.

More recent research shows that providing the birds with additional space, i.e. placing 5, 6 or 7 birds per square metre compared with 10 birds, has been shown to improve many environmental parameters of welfare importance, including litter and air quality (ammonia and carbon dioxide) in the house and a number of production parameters (Kang et al., 2016).

The RSPCA currently permits a maximum stocking density of 9 birds per square metre but will continue to review this in light of new evidence.

- **Flock and colony size: the maximum flock size for barn hens is 32,000 birds and 16,000 for free-range. In both systems, flocks over 6,000 birds must be split into colonies of not more than 4,000 birds.**

The standard(s) was introduced over 20 years ago.

Maintaining smaller colony sizes within a flock helps to ensure even access to resources, such as feeders, drinkers, nest boxes and perches and prevents crowding in areas of the shed. Flock inspections should be facilitated by smaller colony sizes as birds are contained within a smaller area and sick or ailing hens are less likely to be missed by the stock keeper.

Limiting flock size reduces the impact of any disease incursion in terms of bird numbers affected and research shows that greater flock sizes (>30,000) are more at risk of Salmonella infection. In the case of free-range flocks, limiting the flock size helps to ensure good access to a suitable range, for example by ensuring that the range is within a suitable distance from popholes.



## Air quality and thermal environment

---

- **Aerial contaminants: Aerial contaminants must not reach a level at which they are noticeably unpleasant to a human observer.**
- **Thermal comfort: Hens must have access to a thermally comfortable environment at all times.**

Exposure to dust, gases and airborne pathogens present in laying hen housing can have negative impacts on the health and wellbeing of the hens. Temperature and humidity have direct influences on birds' welfare but also affect levels of aerial contaminants, so it is important that both are monitored and controlled.

Chronic exposure to raised levels of atmospheric ammonia has been shown to reduce levels of certain behaviour including feeding, preening and resting (Kristensen et al., 2000), cause damage to eyes and respiratory tracts, increase susceptibility to disease and secondary infection and increase the risk of keratoconjunctivitis (blind eye) (David et al., 2015; Kristensen & Wathes, 2000). The current chronic exposure limit of ammonia for human health and safety of 25ppm is cited by Defra as a maximum level for poultry (Defra, 1994), although hen preference tests suggest that lower levels are aversive to hens (Kristensen et al., 2000).

The RSPCA therefore recommends that levels are kept below 20ppm.

The human chronic exposure limit for CO<sub>2</sub> of 3000ppm is a requirement for broilers in the EU Directive for chickens kept for meat production (EC/2007/, 2007) and is the level recommended in the RSPCA welfare standards for hens. No requirements are provided in the EU legislation for laying hens.

Dust may compromise the health and welfare of hens (David et al., 2015). The RSPCA provides recommendation that inhalable dust levels are below 10mg/m<sup>3</sup>.

## Nest boxes

---

- **Nest box provision: Hens must be provided with enclosed, draft free nest boxes at a rate of 1 per 5 hens if individual boxes, or 1m<sup>2</sup> of nesting substrate per 120 hens for group nesting.**

Hens are highly motivated to lay their eggs in a private, secluded nesting location (Cooper & Appleby, 2003). At least one nest for every seven hens, or at least 1m<sup>2</sup> of nest space for a maximum of 120 hens for group nesting, must be provided under the EU Directive; the RSPCA goes beyond this in the case of individual nest boxes, where competition may be greater than for group nest boxes.

- **Nest box lighting: Nest box lighting must be limited to the morning and initial nest box training; and may be used only temporarily as a management tool.**

The use of nest box lighting has been associated with both vent pecking and feather pecking (Green et al., 2000) and thus, whilst the standards limit the use of nest box lighting, it is recommended that they are not used at all where possible.

## Perches

---

- **Perch provision: At least 8cm raised perch must be provided per hen, with 15cm per hen recommended.**

The standard was introduced in 2017.

Provision of perches for daytime use allows resting birds and subordinate birds to separate themselves from active or aggressive birds, respectively. Provision of perches for daytime use can therefore help to reduce feather loss from injurious pecking. During the day, only a proportion of birds will utilise the perches. The minimum 8cm requirement in existing flat deck systems aims to provide sufficient perching space for the number of birds choosing to perch at any one time during the day. At night, hens are motivated to seek high roosting spots and will do so when given the opportunity. To allow all birds to roost at night, a minimum of 15cm raised perch provision per bird is necessary. Birds provided with this level of provision have been shown to have reduced stress, reduced fearfulness and improved body condition. Therefore, to ensure maximum welfare benefit to the birds, the RSPCA strongly recommends that a minimum of 15cm is provided wherever possible. However, it is recognised that it may be challenging to retro-fit 15cm of well-positioned raised perch space (see below) per bird in some existing systems.

- **Perch positions: Raised perches (retro-fitted after 10th August 2017) must:**
  - a) **be at least 30cm apart from each other in all directions**
  - b) **have no more than 80cm distance between the perch and the next available landing surface/approach aid**
  - c) **have a vertical distance of at least 45cm and not more than 60cm from the slats to the first perch**
  - d) **be positioned no more than 45 degrees to adjacent perches (measured at the horizontal plane)**
  - e) **have at least 45cm clear space above the perch to allow birds to stand in a normal upright position**
  - f) **not be sited directly above one another, i.e. in a vertical plane (ladder formation), unless intermediate perches are provided to allow birds free access**
  - g) **be fixed and not free swinging.**

This standard was introduced in 2017.

The design and placement of perches is very important in helping to reduce the risk of keel bone damage.

**The distance between perches/the landing surface/approach aid of between 30-80cm (a & b):** the ability of hens to navigate perches is negatively affected by increasing the distance between them (Moinard et al., 2004; Scholz et al., 2014; Scott & Parker, 1994); distances greater than 80cm are associated with increased clumsy landings, misses and refusals to jump (Scholz et al., 2014). Clumsy landings are thought to increase risk of keel bone damage. Legislation requires that perches are at least 30cm apart (1999/74/EC, 1999).

**Minimum distance of 45cm from the first slat (c):** this standard represents a balance between meeting the birds' preference for high resting places (Brendler & Schrader, 2016; Schrader & Müller, 2009; Struelens & Tuytens, 2009), the need to separate resting birds from the rest of the flock (to prevent pecking) (SRUC, 2007) and the birds' ability to access / dismount perches with ease (EFSA, 2015). Poor landings are shown to increase when the vertical distance a hen has to travel between perches is greater than 50cm (Cooper & Appleby, 2003) and both the incidence and severity of keel fractures can increase with increased perch height (Wilkins et al., 2011). EFSA's Panel on Animal

Health and Welfare recommends a minimum perch height of 60cm (Schrader & Müller, 2009), although they suggest that 'small sized steps' of around 40cm will help to make the perches more accessible. SRUC (2007) recommends the vertical height of the first perch is 45-60cm from the surface to which it is secured with perches spaced adequately apart. Perches should be designed to allow birds to perch high enough that birds below cannot peck at them (Brendler & Schrader, 2016).

**Angles between perches of less than 45 degrees (d):** this helps prevent poor landings and is particularly important for downward jumps (Brendler & Schrader, 2016; Scholz et al., 2014). Several studies and reports (Brendler & Schrader, 2016; Schrader & Müller, 2009; Scott et al., 1997; Scott & Parker, 1994) recommend angles of less than 45 degrees between perches, with the proportion of successful jumps increasing as the angle is reduced (EFSA, 2015; Green et al., 2000).

**No ladder formation perches (f):** ladder formations (where perches are positioned directly above one another) are difficult for hens to navigate and may increase the risk of poor landings.

**Fixed perches (g):** free swinging perches may be more difficult to land on and increase the risk of poor landings or falls. Some movement (i.e. where perches are not rigidly fixed) may help to reduce the impact of landings.

## Multi-tier

---

- **Stocking density: The maximum stocking density must not:**
  - a) not exceed 9 birds/m<sup>2</sup> usable area;
  - b) when calculated at floor level, not exceed 15 birds/m<sup>2</sup>.

The maximum stocking density (SD) remains 9 birds/m<sup>2</sup> of usable area in multi-tier systems, as per flat deck systems, however, there is an additional requirement that the SD at floor level is limited to 15 birds/m<sup>2</sup>. This ensures a good balance between the levels of slatted area and litter area provided to each bird and ensures a good number of birds can access the litter at any one time.

By limiting the stocking density on the litter, we prevent overcrowding at certain times of day when hens are most motivated to use the litter. Dustbathing for example has been shown to peak in the late morning and mid afternoon and varies between flocks; crowding on the litter may occur at this time and is a risk factor for piling (Campbell et al., 2016b). More hens have also been observed in the open litter area during the afternoon than at other times of day (Campbell et al., 2016a).

- **Tier heights: Tier heights must not exceed 2m, unless a) a walkway is incorporated enabling a stock person to walk unhindered along the full length of the tier to inspect the birds, and b) intermediate tiers allow hens access to the floor without descending directly from a tier greater than 2m.**

The standard was amended in 2017 to allow higher tiers with walkways.

Tier heights are limited to 2m to ensure birds can be properly inspected and reached in the case of birds requiring further attention, to ensure catching can be carried out safely, and to limit the height from which birds can descend to the floor with the aim of minimising subsequent injury. In 2017 a new standard was introduced to allow tiers higher than 2m but with the proviso that

- a) a stock-keeper walkway is included in the design of the system, enabling full access to birds anywhere in the system and
- b) that birds cannot directly descend to the floor from this level.

This is also the maximum number of levels that can be provided directly above one another in rearing systems.

- **Number of tiers: The maximum number of tiers directly above one another must not exceed 2.**

In order to achieve a maximum tier height of 2m, with sufficient head height within and underneath the system and perches allowing hens to stand in a normal upright position a maximum of 2 tiers becomes ideal. It may be possible to design a system within these requirements with an additional tier, however it may result in crowding and hindrance of movement through the system. Crowding can result in injury (hens being pushed from the system / perches), injurious pecking and discomfort.

## **Environmental enrichment**

---

- **Enrichment provision: For every 1,000 birds there must be at least 2 items of environmental enrichment in the house, which must:**
  - a) **be permanently available to the birds;**
  - b) **include some destructible forms of enrichment.**

The standard was strengthened in 2017 to require destructible forms of enrichment. The inclusion of environmental enrichment has been shown to improve hen health and welfare by encouraging activity and decreasing the risk of injurious feather pecking (Featherwel, 2013). A variety of sufficient items, which are safe for bird use, should be appropriately placed throughout the unit to promote activity and interest and provide all birds with an opportunity to explore them. Examples of environmental enrichment include hanging knotted rope/string, pecking blocks, vegetables and plastic bottles with coloured water, straw bales and plastic-wrapped bales of shavings. Supplying a variety of such items and regularly changing them is strongly recommended to help maintain interest. The provision of manipulable or destructible enrichment has been shown to be particularly beneficial in helping minimising injurious feather pecking (Daigle et al., 2014). Breeze blocks are not advisable for pecking due to the nature of the ingredients, but blocks made with feed may be used. Rope/string can be suspended or attached to posts at hen head height and it is recommended to knot it near each end to prevent the entire rope from fraying. Providing safe refuges, resting areas and visual barriers can help further. This can be in the form of perches, straw bales and areas of varied heights.

Acceptable forms of destructible pecking enrichment include: whole small straw bales added to the litter area; suspended haynets filled with: straw, hay, alfalfa blocks, egg trays or other suitable material; pecking blocks; brassicas; knotted rope/string. Adding straw or hay bales to the littered area can provide several benefits in addition to providing foraging opportunities (Campbell et al., 2016a) such as helping to improve litter quality, providing refuge areas, encouraging comfort behaviours and aiding access to popholes.

# The range

## Management

---

- **Range management: A range management plan must be in place and reviewed annually. The range area must be actively managed in order to encourage birds outside, away from the popholes and to use the area fully. Poached/muddy/worn areas and any build up of parasites or disease must be managed and prevented.**

An outdoor range area can add a greater level of complexity to the birds' environment (Knierim, 2006) encouraging natural behaviours, such as foraging and dust-bathing (Gilani et al., 2014). Range provides hens with additional space for activity and movement; exercise has been shown to increase bone strength (Nørgaard-Nielsen, 1990; Whitehead, 2004). In addition access to range provides hens with natural light. However, these benefits can only be realised if the range is well managed.

The range needs to be actively managed to encourage birds to go on to and to make full use of the outdoor area (Featherwel, 2013)(see Shelter, Shade and Natural Cover), and to minimise any health and welfare problems, such as disease and predation. Due consideration should be given to how the shape of the range could affect how evenly the hens use the total range area. More even use of the range will help to spread the manure burden and thus the risk of parasites and infection. Full use of the range also helps to prevent overuse of areas, which may become less attractive to hens.

Having well-drained areas outside of the popholes is important to help maintain litter quality indoors; litter quality within the house can be affected during wet weather, for example, but this can be managed (Daigle et al., 2014).

## Popholes

---

- **Access to the range: Where birds are intended to be kept for free-range purposes, they must be given access to the range:**
  - a) **within 3 weeks of entering the house at the latest;**
  - b) **in any case from 21 weeks of age at the latest. Popholes must be opened no later than 9am (or no later than 12pm for birds aged under 21 weeks).**

In order to market eggs as free-range, except during severe weather, hens must have continuous daytime access to the range and the maximum stocking density must not be greater than 2,500 hens per hectare of ground available to the birds or one hen per 4m<sup>2</sup> at all times (EC589/, 2008). The RSPCA further specifies that birds must have access within three weeks of arriving in the laying shed, and never later than 21 weeks of age. Hens are typically transferred to the laying shed between 15-18 weeks of age. Research suggests the younger birds are when they first have access to the range, the better they will use the range once given access (Janczak & Riber, 2015).

- **Pophole design: For flocks of over 1,200 birds each pophole must be at least 45cm high and 2m wide and must be evenly distributed along the line of access to ensure that all hens have ready access to the range.**

The range must be readily accessed for birds to make good use of it (for benefits see 'Range management'). Wide popholes, evenly spaced along the length of the shed help to maximise their use. Continuous daytime access complies with legislation for the marketing of free-range eggs, but is also necessary to ensure the range is accessible in a consistent manner; birds with experience of accessing a resources such as the range would experience frustration if this opportunity were taken away.

## Natural cover and range enrichment

---

- **Natural cover: Canopy forming trees, shrubs or other plants must be present on a minimum of 5% of the range increasing to 20% by 1st May 2027.**

The standards were introduced in 2013 and revised in 2025.

Research and experience shows that natural cover, particularly trees, can help encourage birds to use the range (Nicol et al., 2003), which in turn can help in range quality management. Use of the range is associated with a reduced risk of injurious pecking (Green et al., 2000) and reduced feather damage at 50+ weeks (M. W. P. Bestman & Wagenaar, 2003). Hens prefer to stay close to structures providing shelter and shade (Nagle & Glatz, 2012; Zeltner & Hirt, 2008) and canopy cover from trees, planted at a rate of 5%, has been shown to help reduce plumage damage (Bright et al., 2011). Natural cover may include trees, shrubs and semi-permanent vegetation that can easily be established and removed, such as artichoke and kale to enable those with mobile sheds and those on rented land to comply with the standards where they have additional restrictions in place.

The standard has been increased to 20% natural cover by 2027. Following positive feedback from many producers and retailers in providing more natural cover on the range this has been increased. Research shows a correlation between canopy cover and reduced feather pecking (Bright et al., 2011) and improved egg quality with increased canopy cover on the range (Bright & Joret, 2012).

<https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/media/1792/role-of-trees-in-poultry-farming.pdf>

<https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/media/1796/tree-planting-for-poultry.pdf>

- **Range enrichment: facilities to allow dustbathing, foraging and / or perching must be provided on the range in at least 2 areas and at a rate of 1 area per 2000 birds.**

Free range hens use the range more when the outdoor environment is enriched and enrichments can encourage birds to make use of the whole range area when they are well placed throughout the range. The use of forage sources (including hay bales) were the most successful method on-farm to attract birds into the range followed by shelterbelts and artificial shade (Zeltner & Hirt, 2008).



# RSPCA.

Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals

Parkside, Chart Way, Horsham RH12 1GY ■ 0300 1230 100

[rspca.org.uk](https://rspca.org.uk) [facebook.com/RSPCA](https://facebook.com/RSPCA) [twitter.com/RSPCA\\_official](https://twitter.com/RSPCA_official) [@instagram.com/rspca\\_official](https://instagram.com/rspca_official)

[tiktok.com/@rspca\\_official](https://tiktok.com/@rspca_official) [linkedin.com/company/rspca](https://linkedin.com/company/rspca)

The RSPCA helps animals in England and Wales ■ Registered charity no. 219099

The RSPCA only exists with the support of public donations

© RSPCA 2025. All rights reserved. This material must not be reproduced or used in any manner whatsoever without the express written permission of the RSPCA.

Cover image: RSPCA Assured ISBN: 9780901098160