

Comments for Planning Application 22/01221/PLF

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/01221/PLF

Address: Land South East Of Thirtleby Lane Bridge Thirtleby Lane Coniston East Riding Of Yorkshire HU11 4LL

Proposal: Siting of a static caravan for occupation by an agricultural worker in connection with an existing pig unit known as Line Farm

Case Officer: Mr Tim Williams

Customer Details

Name: Ms J TURNER

Address: Spacey Field Farm, Meadow Lane, Thirtleby, East Riding Of Yorkshire HU11 4LL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:

Application 22/0122/PLF seeking permission for the siting of a static caravan in connection with the adjacent livestock buildings

This Planning, Design and access statement states that it is for an agricultural worker to look after the pigs on the adjacent livestock unit. It states the buildings are 2000 pig unit (1999) rearing pigs from 35/ 40kg to 110kg. It says the pigs come in 400 at a time and suggests it can get 4.2 batches through per year.

However the original application 19/00640/PLF approved in July 2019 and built in the summer of 2020 clearly states on the Planning, Design and access statement, which forms part of the approved permission that this unit is for pigs 7kg to 110kg (weaners to bacon). It states that the quantity of pigs is 1250 pig places with 2 -2.2 batches per year. It also submit a full record of estimated vehicle movements of both tractor and trailer and HGV movements after concerns where raised over the extra traffic on the single track roads. It also states that the hardstanding, turning would be permeable to allow surface water to percolate through to the sub-strata. However this is now all concrete which is NON PERMIABLE.

Original application 19/00640/PLF planning ,design access statement reads as follows:-

8.2 the permeable hard surface will allow surface water to percolate through the sub-strata.

8.3 concrete passageways - dirty water to an underground tank as shown on the plans and then tankered away to be spread on land as fertiliser.

11.5 stock management - from Sproatley Grange

11.6 stocking -about 1250 pig places (7kg/lw to 110kg/lw) with 2 -2.2 batches per 12 months

11.7 vehicle movements per 12 months

* approx 74 tractor/ trailer manure to land 40 public road

- *approx 40 tractor/ trailer leading straw to site 30 public road
- *approx 4 HGV inward deliver of weaners 2.2 times Total 9 public road
- * approx 10 outwards of bacon pigs 2.2 times Total 22 public road
- *average 1.5 HGV inwards feed per week Total 78 public road

12.2 farmyard manure - it is estimated that some 740 tonnes of farmyard manure will be produced annually. The farmyard manure will be hilled on land edges in green RBF2 and at the appropriate time of year spread as fertiliser, thereby reducing the amount of manufactured fertiliser needed to grow arable crops.

This new application states that the unit has been run on an experimental basis being unmanned but suggest that this has had a detrimental effect on the livestock with poor mortality. Yet the original application states clearly that it can be run from Sproatley Grange just the same as Roe Hill was until someone else took majority control in October 2019.

The notice of decision for the original application states in number 6

The development hereby approved shall be operated in accordance within the details of the Planning, Design and access statement and water management plan accompanying the application.

- Applicant satisfied of their ability to run the unit remotely
- Applicant applied for weaners to bacon, now running stores to bacon, details have changed in very short space of time suggesting never was for what was applied for and approved
- Applicant fully aware of remote location when asking for permission for it to be built. Applicant already had experience of remotely running a business of this type having a unit not 1 mile away from this one again in a remote location but been running it since 2016 to October 2019 when someone took majority control.
- The applicant clearly stated that the need for a dwelling on this site would NOT be required.
- The applicant suggests that due to the remote location has had acts of trespass and vandalism, however the applicant was fully aware of the location when plans were originally submitted. This development has large 7-8 foot gates locked at the front, further gates between the 2 buildings, sensor lighting and CCTV, this surely is sufficient deterrent.

This planning , design and access statement suggests that when the pigs arrive in careful management is required to encourage the pigs to find both food and water, however, pigs of 35/40kg are robust and well established with a very keen sense of smell and are able to locate food and water quite adequately unaided.

Again it goes on to state about the ideal temperature of between 15 to 18 °C. And that this is obtained by manually operating the shutter doors. I appreciate that in a purpose build pig building that is fully temperature controlled and pigs are kept in pens of 25 to 30 that this works. But these buildings are general purpose agricultural buildings with concrete section walls and yorkshire boarding above. It is impossible to keep the temperatures stable between 15 to 18 °C throughout the year in this type of building. The large pen quantity and through air movements cause too much fluctuation in temperature. Imagine -10° outside with a strong North wind, the internal temperature even with the doors closed will be lucky to be much above freezing.

Baiting and vermin prevention forms part of British Assured so a plan must be in operation. All

feeds hoppers require suitable lids as per British Assured and RSPCA freedom Assured so vermin should not be able to access the feed supply.

Short notice of loading pigs is a rare occurrence. Usually you have at least 24 to 48 hours notice, any less just doesn't happen due to transport organisation etc.

Great detail is entered into regarding Animal welfare act 2006, duty of care farm animal welfare Council five freedoms, farm management pocketbook 52nd edition.

The five freedoms is RSPCA and the buildings along with bedding and food fulfil these five freedoms. Duty of care for any animal is common sense, however none actually state that someone is required to be on site 24/7. What it does say is that a suitably qualified person should be available 24/7. Being available can be at the end of the phone for advise and reassurance. Most Bed and Breakfast pig companies have a fieldsman who is available 24/7 for this purpose. The farm management pocketbook 52nd edition relates to costings. Great detail is entered into in the planning design and access statement regarding costings of labour referencing this book. However the figures used are for manually feeding pigs labour input. This does not happen on this site by their own admission these pigs are fed via an automatic augur feeding system. Therefore no manual feeding is required. The pigs on this unit should be check twice per day as stated in RSPCA freedom foods. The checks are for good bedding, clean water, good food supply and pig health. No more than 2 hours per day at the most. Say maximum 60 hours per month. This does not equate to the need for a full time worker on this site.

This business does not require a full time worker to be present on site 24/7. No one has taken majority control, it has not been established for 3 or more years.

The static caravan show no foul water store or drainage. It states toilet waste is to be emptied by appropriate companies but no reference is made to dirty water, from a shower, washing of clothes general washing if pots and other personal hygiene. Where is this water to go?

Similarly who is this agricultural worker that works on site 24/7 because at present it is only checked on a daily basis, surely if they work on site all day they should be there all day now but this is NOT the case.

There is not a functional need for a full-time worker to be readily available on site most times in order to meet the welfare of the livestock.

Other dwellings may be available in Coniston or Sproatley capable of satisfying this need.

The unit has only just been built and although it is part of a well and long established financially sound farming business has yet to prove so, because within a very small time frame this business has changed from its original application.

I do not believe that this proposed development complies with the planning policy.

