

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sent: 22 August 2026 13:54
To: Maya Cullen <Maya.Cullen@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Subject: 3/2026/0587 - Objection

⚠ External Email

This email originated from outside Ribble Valley Borough Council. Do **NOT** click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and are sure the content within this email is safe.

Good afternoon Ms Cullen,

I am writing to object to planning application 3/2026/0587. My [REDACTED], resides at [REDACTED] one of the properties [REDACTED] to the proposed lagoon. It is also my [REDACTED], and I [REDACTED], including over [REDACTED] and at [REDACTED]. My objections are as follows:

1. Odour Impact on Nearby Dwellin

1. Odour Impact on Nearby Dwellings

The applicant's own Odour Assessment confirms that Walker Fold properties are among the closest sensitive receptors to the site such as The Cottage at 140m, The Old Barn at 156m, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] all classified as "High Sensitivity" under IAQM guidance.

The assessment's "negligible impact" conclusion depends entirely on the fixed floating cover achieving its assumed odour reduction, and cites a wide range (61–90%) from AHDB rather than a conservative worst-case figure. I would ask the Council to require independent verification of the cover's performance and ongoing maintenance obligations, rather than relying solely on the applicant's assumptions, and to secure this by planning condition.

Furthermore, the SCAIL dispersion modelling report submitted with this application is only available on the planning portal as scanned images rather than machine-readable text, making it very difficult for residents to scrutinise the underlying predicted odour concentrations at specific Walker Fold properties. I would ask the Council to ensure this data is made available in an accessible format so that the technical basis for the "negligible impact" conclusion can be properly reviewed by affected residents before determination.

2. Seasonal Odour Impact

The applicant's own data shows odour emission rates double in summer compared to winter (3.6 vs 1.8 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^2/\text{s}$). This is precisely when residents are most likely to have windows open and spend time outdoors in gardens, so any shortfall in the cover's performance would cause the greatest inconvenience at the time it is least tolerable.

3. Personal Health Sensitivity

As someone who [REDACTED], [REDACTED] more sensitive to airborne irritants during the spring and summer months, which is also when the assessment shows odour emissions are highest. Any additional odour burden during this period would compound existing discomfort and further limit my ability to use my garden or keep windows open.

4. No Statutory Regulation of Cover Maintenance

The report itself acknowledges there is currently no legal requirement for dairy slurry stores to be covered, and that mandatory retrofit rules were withdrawn by Defra. This means the odour mitigation this application relies on is voluntary and unenforced beyond any planning condition. I would ask the Council to impose a binding condition requiring the fixed cover to be maintained in good working order for the lifetime of the lagoon, with a mechanism for enforcement if it fails or is removed.

5. Water Pollution Risk

Notwithstanding the site selection process referenced in the application, earth-banked lagoons carry an inherent risk of seepage. I would ask the Council to confirm that the Environment Agency's assessment of soil permeability and lining specification has been fully reviewed and is satisfactory before any approval is granted.

6. Traffic and Highway Safety

The lagoon will be filled and emptied by tanker and umbilical pumping systems, generating additional heavy vehicle movements on Chipping Road and Walker Fold, both narrow rural roads. I would ask LCC Highways to confirm the frequency and routing of these movements. There is arguably, already, an excessive amount of traffic in the general area relative to the infrastructure demands/projections when it was constructed.

7. Cumulative and Long-Term Impact

The assessment addresses normal operating conditions but I would ask the Council to consider the impact during agitation, cover failure, or maintenance periods, when odour and noise impacts on nearby High Sensitivity receptors would be greatest.

Please confirm receipt of this objection. I am contactable via this email address.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]