

r-me

7/10 lcc. - NO OBJECTION RECOMMENDATIONS MADE

Scrayingham Parish Council
06/10/2014

RYEDALE DM

Dear Sirs,

- 7 OCT 2014

Excavation of clay-lined slurry lagoon

**DEVELOPMENT
MANAGEMENT**

Poplar House Farm, Leppington Lane, Leppington, Malton North Yorks YO17 9RL

Ref. No: 14/00950/MFUL

In respect of Mr & Mrs Woods' application to establish a slurry lagoon at Poplar House Farm, we have had the opportunity to review the relevant documentation provided by Ryedale district council and also to hear from Mr and Mrs Wood who attended and were invited to speak at meeting of the Parish Council on 01/10/2014. Furthermore, we have also heard the views of some residents of the village in connection with the proposed development.

Prior to the meeting, Mr and Mrs Wood have been inclusive in the process of making the application, inviting Parish Councillors and other villagers to see their plans. This has assisted the process and we welcome this approach. At the meeting, Mr Wood explained the various aspects of farm operation, slurry storage and distribution of slurry over the fields. He also went on to provide reassurance over aspects of the proposed slurry management regime. This was in response to concerns voiced to the Parish Council by a number of parishioners, that establishment of the lagoon might adversely impact the village, bringing odour and flies and associated risk to health and wellbeing.

Residents had been invited by Ryedale's Environmental Health Officer Ailish Lilley a few days earlier to inspect a similar lagoon at a nearby farm. The lagoon holds the waste of a dairy herd of approximately double the size of that of Mr and Mrs Wood. Russ and Linda Scott had had the opportunity to attend the lagoon while its contents were being agitated and they reported that the odour was only significant in the area where it was held by the light wind and there was no presence of large numbers of flies. As the lagoon is similar to that proposed for Poplar House Farm, a conclusion could be drawn that the new lagoon might not emit strong odours other than when being agitated.

Mr Wood went on to make the following points which we believe were relevant to the application:

- The net impact of this dairy operation is no greater than the previous total operation in the village, and as all the operation is on one side of the village, at Poplar House Farm, this has reduced the requirement to use the village main street and access roads for the transportation of waste.
- Using the lagoon to store slurry negates the requirement to deploy large amounts of straw in the sheds, which then needs regular disposal via road.
- The lagoon's close proximity to the sheds reduces the effort to move slurry into it. If the lagoon were to be situated further away a pump would have to be deployed to move the slurry and this would have noise and energy implications.

- The consistency and lack of permeability of the earth in which the lagoon is to be dug means there is no risk of the slurry polluting the nearby watercourses.
- The contents of the lagoon had to be stored for a minimum of 6 months and it would only be dispersed on to the fields a good distance away from the village on an annual basis.
- Mr Wood advised that the prevailing wind should take any odours away from the village and that when slurry agitation and dispersal takes place he will ensure that this will only be carried out when the wind is in a favourable direction.
- He also advised that in the process of being emptied, then refilled, the lagoon's exposed bed and sides would not provide a habitat for flies. He also indicated that once a crust had formed on the surface of the slurry, this would not be attractive to flies.
- There are guidelines to indicate that lagoons should be covered but it was not the intention to cover this one on the basis that covers were difficult to maintain and could lead to a concentration of odour, as experienced by Boundale Farm in Leavening.

To summarise, Mr Wood is of the view that the lagoon will not adversely impact the village for the reasons given above and also that the overall impact of his farming operation on the village in terms of traffic and waste disposal has actually been reduced.

The view of the Parish Council is that this application has been conducted in an inclusive way and all necessary parties have been consulted with a good level of information provided throughout. We are not in a position to speculate over the future status of the lagoon; consequently, we have no objection to the application in line with our aim of supporting local businesses for the good of the community.

Our recommendation for approval does carry the following proviso:

1. As Mr Wood has changed his waste management strategy for a proportion of the herd very shortly after he proposed a different regime in his recent application, we would not expect any further changes to either stated policy or volumes of waste.
2. The Environment Agency and Ryedale Environmental Health should review the installation after an appropriate period of time to ensure that the environment is not being adversely affected, and should continue to undertake reviews on a regular basis
3. If the lagoon is found to affect the village with odour and flies that action is taken quickly on Mr Wood's part to mitigate this problem.
4. The arguments that the Parish Council have accepted are based on the premise that the operations on the farm are a) confined to the areas at the West side of the farm away from the village and b) that the size of the operation is not significantly increased beyond the figures previously provided, given that they are used as an argument to support the current application.

Yours faithfully,

Scrayingham Parish Council 06/10/2014