

OBJECTION

Line Farm, Thirtleby

Land south east of Thirtleby Lane Bridge Thirtleby Lane Coniston ERYC

Siting of static caravan for occupation by agricultural worker in connection with existing pig unit
Beadle

App No 22/0122/PLF

As a resident of Thirtleby it seems to me that this is following the same pattern as Roe Hill whereby planning was granted but a permanent dwelling was erected instead of a temporary one thereby breaching planning regs (and this is still subject to investigation). It seems to me that if planning was passed in this (new) instance the council would in all probability have the same thing happening all over again.

I would like Planning to look into the following observations I have made:

The type of pigs stated as being reared in this particular application is different to that stated in the original planning for the pig unit – and one wonders if the buildings are suitable; also I thought the planning was passed originally due to restrictions being exactly as that stated in the Notice of Decision letter and the conditions thereto – yet the type of pigs proposed in this application is not the same.

I believe the number of pigs of the size stated now to be kept do not constitute large enough to justify the housing of ONE worker; for this I have studied the RSPCA recommendations on the subject, have calculated the floor area of buildings available and divided by the recommended area each pig should have for welfare reasons; viz 1836 on the floor area divided by 1.72 pigs/m (for 7-110kg). I believe this is not sufficient in number to justify a dedicated worker. I would like Planning to confirm this is correct (as Planning should not be justifying cruelty of overcrowding of these animals). On the other hand this amount may be inflated merely to justify the housing of a worker (and therefore a reason to allow a temp dwelling – subsequently leading to the construction of a permanent dwelling, thereby inflating the value of this property).

I am VERY concerned about the positioning of this dwelling (should planning be granted) in relation to a main dyke/drain which services the whole of the area. In the first place we live in a Nitrate Vulnerable Zone and must comply with Regulation 5(3)(b) of the Nitrate Pollution Prevention Regulations 2015 (which is for an area at risk from agricultural nitrate pollution). This is pollution not only from agricultural activity but also from septic tanks. The area this farm covers together with the proposed positioning of this temporary dwelling is very restricted and right up against this drain - and I believe foul water containing nitrates from the development will inevitably leach through the ground (through run-off caused by rainfall) and therefore find its way into the drain (to be subsequently carried onwards downstream to threaten waterways further down the line). This is a very important issue right now; only recently being featured on TV's Country File as being a big issue – so please do look into this. Very worryingly there is acres of impermeable concrete surrounding the farm buildings which, once rained on, water MUST inevitably run off onto the surrounding ground taking all manner of pollutants with it. To add a septic tank to this is surely dangerous. I would ask Planning to visit the site to verify what I say as the plan submitted on paper does not show just how congested the site is, adjacent to the drain.

There is plenty of available residences to house a worker, should this be deemed necessary – but my view is that this whole enterprise is managed so far quite successfully from Sproatley Grange not 10 minutes' drive away incorporated a visit to Roe Hill at the same time situated just the other side of Thirtleby. And if the (illegal) house at Roe Hill DOES have retrospective planning granted, surely

the 'worker' living there could service this development quite easily and efficiently. Surely TWO dwellings are not necessary to look after these 2 tiny farms situated so closely together (and neither have the numbers of livestock to justify it anyway). Poor forward thinking must have taken place when the farm was originally planned for if it could not be seen (owner has many years' experience of this business) that the running of it would be problematic and I really don't think this is the case – the real reason is purely a financial one being justified howsoever it can be.

As to the place being vulnerable to vandalism and trespass - this is very unattractive site being surrounded by metal pointed fencing with large gates at front – it really does bring down this previously pretty hamlet being the first thing you see on the approach. It is also covered by cameras clear to see, so I cannot see how this could be a problem. It is situated on the edge of a bridle path and is unsightly and not good to ride past.

Anyone can find out right now that the pig business is not in a healthy state and therefore I would have thought that having a worker housed both at Roe Hill AND at this property is not surely viable; the reason restrictions should be imposed is because if this business fails, what then happens to the premises and what is the impact on Thirtleby once Planning has no control of how these developments are utilized. I would ask Planning to verify that the business is actually viable by seeing AUDITED accounts to prove this (and not just figures submitted by a hopeful owner merely to justify this temporary dwelling - which proves nothing). It appears to me that the applicant is claiming it is a viable business so qualifies to have a 'home' – but also claiming the business WOULD be viable if it had a dedicated worker in occupation. So the way to establish this is its viability on paper by scrutiny of AUDITED accounts that have been presented to HMRC, not on figures claimed by the applicant.

In BF1 Planning Design and Access Statement, all that is stated re pigs' arrival, early housing, temperature control, vermin etc – all this is nothing new and would have been known and been taken into account at inception by experienced keepers and has been (successfully) managed to date – so suddenly its noticed that a resident worker is needed but this is obviously not the case.

In short – I believe :-

There is no justification for a full time worker at this farm

- it is not big enough (not enough head of pigs to warrant a resident worker)
- the Roe Hill farm will be looked after by a worker which will have plenty of time to service this one too, situated so closely together
- the business is not viable enough to support a stand alone worker
- the business is not yet proved viable for ongoing longevity
- there is concern that this development will follow the same lines as Roe Hill whereby a permanent building could be built causing Planning trouble and expense
- the amount of pigs looked after here that WOULD allow for a stand-alone worker would be housed in such a way as to be in breach of animal welfare (by their own admission in writing there is already evidence of this (used to justify needing a worker) of 'fighting, bullying', tail biting etc – *signs of overcrowding*. You need to check this mortality loss in the accounts, which must render the business unviable. They cant have it both ways.

Finally, the static caravan is ugly and unsightly (and the first thing people would see when approaching Thirtleby) - adding to the insult the residents have had to endure from the state of this site thus far.

Surely Planning cannot allow for this caravan to be sited here, for all the reasons above.