



By email

02nd September 2026

Opposition to Planning Proposal at Plane Tree Farm, Chipping Road, Chaigley, BB7

3LT

Ref: 3/2026/0587

Dear Ms Cullen,

I am writing to oppose to the above planning proposal for the erection of a slurry lagoon close to the residences of Walker Fold. My objections are outlined below.

Firstly, the proposed location is not in keeping with the Council's own planning policy relating to the area's AONB status, particularly the requirement that the landscape and character of the AONB should be preserved, conserved and, where possible, enhanced. The large earth bunds, wire fencing and gates will be visible from several viewpoints. This impact is exacerbated by the elevated position of the site and is wholly at odds with the special and historic character of the well-preserved and attractive hamlet of Walker Fold. The visual impact of the overground pipes used as part of the lagoon's pumping system, which appear to need to run some distance across fields, also does not appear to have been considered. Together, these elements would have a direct and negative visual impact on the character of this hamlet, which has previously won national awards for its attractiveness.

Secondly, the noise impact of the pumping system used to fill and aerate the lagoon, as well as to spread the slurry, does not appear to have been considered. Due to the topography and elevated position of the proposed site, a high-powered pump is likely to be required. There are no details about how the pump would be operated, for example whether it would be powered by a diesel engine, the hours during which the pumping system would operate, or the noise levels it would generate. These are crucial considerations in determining the extent of potential noise pollution for the houses in close proximity to the proposed lagoon site. The negative impact of increased noise on the character of Walker Fold and its surrounding landscape is considerable, particularly in an AONB.

Thirdly, the public health concerns regarding emissions from the lagoon have not been properly considered. The odour assessment states that floating covers on the lagoon reduce odour emissions by between 61% and 90%, and, on that basis, concludes that the impact of odour would be "negligible". However, there is no assessment of how emissions at the lower end of that range — 61%, a difference of 29 percent from the

upper estimate — could legitimately be described as negligible, especially when the nearest property is only 156 metres away. The potential impact includes known adverse health effects associated with slurry lagoons, particularly for those with respiratory illnesses, including a resident of this household.

On these grounds, I ask that you consider refusing the planning proposal above.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] >
Sent: 27 August 2026 17:06
To: Planning
Subject: Planning application 3/2026/0587 Slurry lagoon

⚠ 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.



Your ref: 3/2026/0587
Planning Proposal at Plane Tree Farm, Chipping Road, Chaigley, BB7 3LT

Dear Ms Cullen,

I am in receipt of your letter of 14 August 2026 (Planning Application No: 3/2026/0587). I live in Walker Fold and object to the location for the construction of the proposed slurry lagoon, on several grounds:-

Firstly, Chaigley is a designated AONB. The presence of the proposed lagoon is an intrusion to residents, walkers, cyclists and the area as a whole. Views to and from Longridge Fell will be compromised. There are long-established walkways within the area. These and the views surrounding them must be preserved. Protection of an AONB landscape must be maintained. Residents have worked tirelessly and mostly at their own expense to ensure that Walker Fold is presented in the most attractive way. We have been winners of the Best Kept Hamlet award on more than one occasion.

Secondly, there is plenty of video and photographic evidence, in our records, of previous floods in the fields, along the road and into residents' drives and gardens. More or less an annual event and particularly regular over the last 6 or 7 years. The area affected runs from Chadswell Hall - where there was a serious landslide resulting in a prolonged road closure - as far as Barrack's Farm. The planning application does not show any reference to how historic flooding can be avoided.

Thirdly, Chipping Road is very much a rural road and where heavy plant and large agricultural vehicles are travelling in opposite directions, there is obviously insufficient passing space. The size of this construction will put too much pressure on the traffic flow as well as threaten the safety of walkers and cyclists; there are no pavements along this stretch of road. Cycling is a most important contribution to tourism here. There are big cycling races both at local and national level; they take place frequently throughout the entire year. Aside from races, the road is greatly favoured by cyclists in general, any prolonged building works will inevitably interfere with the normal flow of traffic and will add risk to users.

My final point raises the question of public health. Proximity of a slurry lagoon will be more than just unpleasant to those out and about and in their gardens. Often it is unwise to hang out laundry for obvious reasons.

And for those who have lung conditions -asthma in particular - the proposed site of the lagoon is way too close to properties on both sides of Chipping Road. I note that there is no mention of the houses on the side of the road

opposite to the proposed site [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

With these highlighted concerns, I have to suggest that the proposal of this slurry lagoon construction is environmentally, visually and sustainably representative of insensitive over-development and should, therefore, be rejected.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Dear Planning Officer,

I am writing to object to planning application **3/2026/0587** for the proposed slurry lagoon.

I understand the farms need for slurry storage and I am not objecting to the principle of additional slurry storage. My concern is whether this particular location is appropriate, given its proximity to a significant number of residential properties, neighbouring land regularly used by children, flooding risks not considered & the site isn't remotely close to the farm's core operations.

Choice of location and alternative sites

The applicant's own Odour Assessment identifies seven residential properties within approximately 184m of the proposed lagoon, with the closest approximately 140m away. These properties are identified as high-sensitivity receptors.

The Design and Access Statement describes the agricultural holding as approximately 57 hectares of owned and rented grassland. Given the size of the holding, I would expect the application to provide a clear explanation of why a location so close to a cluster of residential properties represents the most appropriate site.

I appreciate that locating a slurry lagoon is constrained by a number of factors and that not all parts of the holding will necessarily be suitable. The application explains that investigations have considered soil permeability, groundwater and drainage, and that an alternative site adjacent to Moss Plantation was discounted because of groundwater and nearby drainage ditches.

However, I cannot see evidence of a broader assessment of alternative sites across the holding, particularly one which considers distance from existing residential properties, public access and neighbouring land uses as factors in site selection.

Rejecting one alternative site for environmental reasons does not demonstrate that the currently proposed site is the most appropriate location when residential amenity and safety are also taken into account.

I would therefore ask the Council to establish what other locations across the holding were considered, what criteria were used to compare them, and whether technically suitable locations exist which would provide greater separation from neighbouring homes and public access.

Safety and public access

I also have concerns regarding the proposed safety arrangements because of the particular surroundings of this site.

There are children who regularly play in the neighbouring field, only a few metres from the proposed development, and a public footpath (FP0303030) also runs through the adjoining field.

The proposed lagoon uses a floating cover over the slurry surface. I understand that the primary purpose of this cover is to mitigate emissions and odour, rather than to provide protection against somebody entering or falling into the lagoon. I therefore do not believe the existence of a floating cover should be relied upon as a safety measure.

Given the depth and nature of the proposed facility and its proximity to land accessible to children and users of a public footpath, I would ask the Council to satisfy itself that the proposed fencing, gates, slurry cover and access-control arrangements are adequate to prevent unauthorised access.

This also reinforces my concerns regarding site selection. If alternative locations are available which provide greater separation from residential properties, public access and neighbouring land regularly used by children, I believe those alternatives should be properly considered.

Pig-fattening enterprise and intended use of the lagoon

I would also like clarification regarding exactly what material the proposed lagoon will be permitted to receive.

The Odour Assessment states that the lagoon will store cattle slurry from the 120-head milking herd. However, the Design and Access Statement also identifies a contract pig-fattening unit as part of the farming enterprise.

This distinction appears particularly important because the applicant's own Odour Assessment differentiates between cattle, pig and poultry odours and assigns cattle a lower offensiveness weighting than pig odour.

I would therefore like clarification as to whether pig slurry, manure or other waste associated with the pig enterprise could ever be stored within this lagoon.

This concern is made worse by the fact the proposed slurry lagoon is over 6 times the current slurry capacity of the farm which makes you question why? Framework policy N4 states proposed developments with protected landscapes should be limited in scale and extent, which this planning application works in contrary to.

If the assessment of odour impact has been undertaken solely on the basis that cattle slurry will be stored, I believe that restriction should be explicitly confirmed and, if permission is granted, secured through an appropriate planning condition.

Residential amenity and odour

More generally, I remain concerned about the effect of locating a slurry lagoon so close to numerous existing homes.

While the proposed floating cover should reduce emissions, the Odour Assessment itself cites a very broad range of 61–90% reduction in odour emissions from floating covers before concluding that emissions from the proposed covered lagoon will fall within the "negligible" category.

Given how heavily the assessment's conclusion appears to depend upon the effectiveness of the cover, I would like the Council to be satisfied that the particular cover proposed will achieve the level of mitigation assumed and that this mitigation can be secured and maintained throughout the operational life of the lagoon.

Also, CS Policy DMG1 requires proposals to not adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area. When considering the location of the proposed site, the close proximity to the nearby hamlet & the distance of the proposed site from the farm, it certainly feels the farm is benefiting from the increased operational/commercial capacity without experiencing any of the adverse impacts of the slurry lagoon, passing those adverse impacts onto local residents exclusively.

Impact On Landscape

I have serious concerns over the impact that this slurry lagoon will have on this area of outstanding natural beauty, The proposed site will be positioned at the foot of Longridge Fell and at the top of a hill. I'm not satisfied that the planning application properly explains the topography of the proposed site.

The size of the slurry lagoon has been vastly understated in the application. The application explains it will no more than 2 metres above ground level, however the design cross section shows the embankment facing the hamlet to measure a height of 3.5 metres due to the ground sloping away which would be combined with a 1.55 metre fence on top, resulting in an overall height of 5 metres, further extrapolating the impact on the landscape.

From my perspective, I don't feel these proposed plan aligns with the Key Statement EN2 as it works in opposition to protecting, conserving and enhancing the landscape.

Conclusion

Although I can see, from a top level view, that a significant amount of reports have been compiled within this planning application, when you actually dig into each of them, there are significant flaws & convenient conclusions for the application, which aren't supported by the detail. In the application there is little-to-no consideration for residential amenity, public access which I believe is a complete oversight and a serious concern with the planning application.

The applicant's own Design and Access Statement quotes Policy DMG1, including the requirement that development should not adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area.

Given the size of the agricultural holding, the concentration of residential properties approximately 140–184m from the proposed lagoon, the proximity of neighbouring land used by children and a public footpath, and the unanswered question regarding the pig-fattening enterprise, I do not believe the application provides sufficient evidence to demonstrate that this particular location is the most appropriate one available.

I therefore object to the application on the basis that the proposed site would have a detrimental impact on the local landscape, little-to-no consideration for the nearby community, concerning the conclusions of the reports don't align with the findings/methodology conducted & the potential safety concerns we have for our children, of which no consideration has been rationalised in the application.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

To whom it may concern,

This letter is to state my objection to the planning application: 3/2026/0587. My objection stems from three core concerns, the safety of the proposed site location for the slurry lagoon, the adverse impact on the landscape & the detrimental impact on the residential amenities.

Key Concerns

Proposed Site Safety

Due to the close proximity of the proposed site of the slurry lagoon to the neighbouring hamlet (10 properties within 184 metres), I don't believe the application makes any reference to the potential safety concerns.

Only recently, in the national news, I saw that two adults died in a similar slurry lagoon. The application makes no reference to safety which is seriously concerning for me personally as I have three children who regularly play in the adjacent field, not to mention the slurry lagoon being positioned next to a well-used public footpath (FP0303030).

I ask the council to consider the safety of the proposed site location in relation to the neighbouring community & seriously question the applicant for why no risk assessment has been provided.

Adverse Impact on Landscape

The proposed slurry lagoon undoubtedly has a negative impact on the landscape and would work in contrary to the intentions of the policies set out by the council (Framework Policy N4).

The position of the slurry lagoon is at the foot of Longridge Fell and at the top of a sloped field. I don't believe the application properly explains the topography of the landscape and I have serious concerns about how pronounced the lagoon will be in the protected landscape. The height of the side of the lagoon facing the hamlet has been vastly understated in the application. The cross section drawing explains that it will be 3.5 metres above ground level, with a 1.55 metre fence on top, however elsewhere in the application it says it will be no more than 2 metres above the ground, a clear discrepancy in the application.

I'm not a technical person but I do have some concerns over the close proximity to a stream, within 100 metres. At times, this stream is a torrent & as the slurry lagoon isn't a fixed cover, I have concerns over flooding risks, not to mention the materials in the lagoon. The local water course should be properly understood before the application can be considered.

Detrimental Impact Residential Amenities

A key element of this application is the odour assessment which I believe, from my research is drawing conclusions which aren't supported by the detailed report. The report implies a

negligible impact of odour on the residents. However, if you apply their own calculations, the smell would be 25 times higher than the moderate level of 3, when standing on the bank of the slurry lagoon.

This inconsistency is really concerning as our property is closest to the lagoon and I feel the report conclusion understates the impact to the benefit of the applicant.

There are also other concerns within this topic which needs consideration:

- Slurry Lagoon mentions cattle only, but elsewhere in the application it mentions a large scale pig fattening enterprise. What exactly is the lagoon being used for?
- The slurry lagoon is 6x larger than the current slurry lagoon. Why so excessive?
- The location of the proposed site is on the boundary of their farm land which is the closest point to unrelated residential properties. Wouldn't it make sense for the slurry lagoon to be positioned close to the farm operations instead of using over ground pipes to service a slurry lagoon over 450 metres from the farm (10 residents within 184 metres).

Conclusion

In conclusion, I have some strong concerns over the impact on the landscape, the lack of consideration for residential amenities and the missing risk assessments associated with the safety of the slurry lagoon proposed, especially when positioned so close to a local community.

The report, to me, draws unsubstantiated conclusions throughout. It understates the impact on the residents positioned close to the proposed site, especially in consideration to odour but also how pronounced the slurry lagoon will be, in consideration with the topography of the landscape.

I understand the farm needs to be make investments into such schemes as slurry lagoon's however why would the applicant position it on the periphery of their boundary, so far away from the farms operations. The location seems to only adversely impact the local hamlet and not the farmer.

Therefore, due to the above points raised, I write to object to this application.

Kind Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] >
Sent: 30 August 2026 17:32
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to Planning Application 3/2026/0587 Plane Tree Farm Chipping Road
Chaigley BB7 3LT

⚠ 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.

I am objecting to the planning application for the following reasons:

1. There is an existing slurry pit on the farm. Why not extend the site?
2. Walker Fold residential dwellings are within 450m of the proposed slurry lagoon.
3. Plane Tree Farm is situated at 454m away from the proposed site!
4. Vulnerability to rainwater build up causing the lagoon to overflow/ situated on a slope which would increase the risk.
5. Odour emissions/pig and cattle waste strong smelling
6. No pumping system/ how is waste transferred to the lagoon? It has to cross a road by the farm.

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 August 2026 13:32
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to Planning Application 3/2026/0587 Plane Tree Farm

⚠ 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.

I wish to object to the above on the following grounds:-

1) Odour

The smell from the slurry lagoon will have an impact on all the residents of Walker Fold.

2) Location of Slurry Lagoon.

The lagoon is situated at the furthest point away from the farm but very close to the residential properties in the hamlet of Walker Fold. In fact 150 metres from the nearest property but 450 metres from the farm.

3) AONB

The proposed lagoon together with ancillary fences, bunding, pipe work and man made track will clearly be visible in an area of outstanding natural beauty.

4) Existing Slurry Pit

The farm already has a slurry pit which could be extended which would avoid the controversy currently taking place.

5) Foot Path

The lagoon is near a public footpath.

6) Lagoon Cover

The application states a floating cover which will not prevent run off and contamination in times of heavy rainfall.

7) Water Course

The proposed lagoon is situated close to a water course.

Regards

[REDACTED]

Ms Maya Cullen,
Planning Department,
Ribble Valley Borough Council,
Church Walk,
BB7 2RA,

29.08.2026

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED],

Re: Planning Application No: 3/2026/0587.

Dear Ms Cullen,

I am writing regarding Planning application No: **3/2026/0587**, the building of a Slurry Lagoon in a field above Walker Fold Barn.

As I [REDACTED] and regularly visit and [REDACTED]
[REDACTED], I can see the negative impact that such a development will have on the local landscape.

Firstly, the size of the slurry lagoon will be an eyesore to the local residents and walkers on the fell. As a child, I enjoyed regular walks up the fell to admire the unspoiled views of the valley below, which will be affected by the proposed development.

I also object to the plans due to the impact it will have on the residents of Walker Fold. For example, when I visit Walker Fold, I regularly see clothing hung on washing lines. If this development were to go ahead, it may make residents think twice about putting washing out as the additional odours from the slurry will linger on clothes. Nobody should be stopped from doing this as it's an environmentally friendly and economically beneficial activity.

Also, from growing up in such a lovely neighbourhood where everybody looked out for each other, I learned that there were many avid gardeners in residence. Surely, such a development may have an impact on the quality of the surrounding soil, particularly if any leaks occur. As a result, it may affect any produce grown. In a cost-of-living crisis where fruit and vegetables are becoming increasingly more expensive, residents may see vegetable patches as a way of saving them money.

Finally, from regular contact with my parents, it seems that, as elsewhere, flooding in Walker Fold is happening more frequently. On one occasion, my parents regaled me with details of how the whole neighbourhood was out clearing leaves and debris from the drains in order to stop the flooding. Surely, the slurry pit will increase the likelihood of flooding and the production cycle and any potential leaks would entail components being discharged into local water sources,

namely the stream that runs through the garden of Rose Cottage. This stream ultimately runs into the River Hodder. Both my sisters and I spent many an hour playing happily in the stream as my nieces and nephews do now.

As can be gathered from above, I object to this plan due to the damage it will cause to the environment and to the lives of its residents. Thank you for taking the time to read my letter.

Yours sincerely,



risk of leakage. No leak detection system appears to have been mentioned in the application.

- the proposed site at present affords magnificent views of the fell and surrounding landscape and forms an essential part of this National Landscape area. The slurry lagoon at a potential height of 5.5 metres would materially affect this. From the bottom of the hill near the hamlet, looking up, I understand that it would increase to 25 metres from land level.

- the area in question is also an important one for wildlife including badgers, deer and birdlife. The location of the proposed slurry lagoon would impact on the only area available as a public amenity. There is a footpath nearby used by the local community and other walkers- it is not possible to walk on the road due to a lack of pavements and heavy traffic including farm vehicles. There is also a swing and a bench used by residents and their families including our own grandchildren.

- no reference has been made in the application's odour assessment to pig slurry even though there are 550 pigs at the farm. The odour from these pigs is already evident particularly when there is an easterly wind, but I understand that pig slurry is particularly noxious and extremely unpleasant. This would greatly impact on Walker Fold residents. Whenever the weather permits, I try to dry washing outside – for environmental and economic reasons – this would clearly not be possible in those circumstances.

- I would question the justification for such a large increase in capacity. Would this be used by other farms? This would result in an even greater number of vehicles transporting slurry in the area.

In summary, for the reasons stated above, I would ask that the application for the slurry lagoon to be placed on this site be

rejected in favour of a more suitable location north or south of
Plane Tree Farm.

Yours sincerely,

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature.

A black rectangular redaction box covering the name.

29.08.2026

from same address as previous

Maya Cullen,
Planning Department,
Ribble Valley Borough Council,
Council Offices,
Church Walk,
Clitheroe,
Lancashire,
BB7 2RA.

[REDACTED],
[REDACTED],
[REDACTED],
[REDACTED],
[REDACTED],
[REDACTED]

28th August 2026

Dear Ms. Cullen,

Letter of objection concerning Planning Application No: 3/2026/0587.

Location: Plane Tree Farm, Chipping Road, Chaigley, BB7 3LT.

I am in receipt of your letter, reference 3/2026/0587, dated 14th August 2026 and received via post on Monday 17th August 2026, notifying me that I had 21 days in which to make a representation in writing. I had no previous knowledge of this application.

As a result, residents of Walker Fold had to contact the Parish Council immediately to present our concern that evening at their monthly council meeting. Our RVBC Councillor, Jan Alcock, happened to be present and was concerned that she had not been notified of this planning application.

My personal objections to this planning application are as follows:

1. Site location.

This location is on land at the furthest point from the farm and is positioned extremely close to residences of the majority of Walker Fold residents. The topography of the site means that the slurry lagoon, including its security fencing will be in view of the nearest residents.

The size of the lagoon appears to be in excess of the amount of cows on the farm which are not dairy cows, but cows being fattened ready for auction.

The soil tests undertaken and tested appear to be totally inadequate.

There are water courses, not referred to in the application, but shown beginning just east of 'Moss Plantation' on the site location plan, running just north of the intended site. This area is populated by alder trees, being one of the most resistant to flooding (see reference below) which should be an indication, along with the name 'Moss Plantation', of how much water is already in that area.

Our only common amenity area available for children and walkers away from the road is very close by and will be seriously affected.

There is evidence of badger sets in the area. They could be quite capable of damaging the lagoon by burrowing through the banking and lagoon liners.

The proposed trees on the plan will in time develop roots that could disrupt the lagoon causing it to leak.

There is no mention of qualified lagoon builders or annual maintenance inspection carried out by an independent body.

No evidence of a risk assessment of the area, including a leak detection system has been included.

2. Odours.

No reference to pig slurry appears to be included. Considering there is mention of 550 pigs in the application I believe there is a gross underestimation of the odours released into the air in the calculations. Due to their diet the amount of ammonia and hydrogen sulphide released into the air has not been considered and may be up to 25 times more than the allowance.

3. Flooding.

The water course mentioned in Point 1 feeds directly into the brook between Walker Fold House and Walker Fold Manse which enters a culvert to go under the road. I have photographic evidence of the culvert not having the capacity to take all the water, creating fast flowing water coming across the road causing potential flood damage to properties in that area. I have lived here for 40 years and have become increasingly aware of the potential danger possibly caused by climate change and the increased regularity of such occurrences. The last flood caused large amounts of debris to collect on the road, which to keep the road open, local residents had to physically shovel it off the road taking several hours and under appalling weather conditions.

Any increase of potential contaminated fluid from the lagoon could further exacerbate the situation and even cause health issues.

4. Above ground pipes.

There is mention of 2 pipes, presumably an infeed and outfeed, to the lagoon. If these are to be connected to the farm, I see no mention as to how this is to be done in the plans. Also, as the lagoon appears far greater in size than for its current use does this mean that other farms will be using it, hence a further increase of slurry tanker traffic in the area. Residents have, already, for years experienced unrepaired sections of the road.

5. Actual approval.

I do not see that the Environment Agency has given any approval. They have suggested that, should other materials be used, the slurry lagoon could be sited elsewhere. Why has this not been explored? Presumably the applicant, Andrew Bullock, will require an approval permit from the Environment Agency prior to starting any work.

These are just some of the many objections that could be raised and therefore I would be happy to meet up with yourself and representatives of the Environment Agency on or near to the proposed site to discuss in further detail. Can you confirm if someone from the RVBC and Environment Agency have visited the site before the planning application was completed?

I hope this letter clearly lays out why the slurry lagoon must not be located anywhere within the vicinity of the hamlet of Walker Fold.

Yours sincerely,



[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] >
Sent: 28 August 2026 11:48
To: Planning
Subject: Planning application No 3/2026/0587 Plane Tree Farm Slurry Lagoon
Attachments: 25E2DA13-3754-4F4A-944F-FBC7F7E6AECF_1_201_a.jpeg; 1549BFF3-E524-4385-B893-58E6770B189D.heic; D303659E-39CD-4A16-9D53-A498307C437C.heic; 1DD6262C-9C1B-43C1-8E55-113C1E4E6AD3.heic; 712645C1-8B6B-4D12-81A8-BF8ACDC77F6B.heic; slurryplanletter.docx

 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.

Dear Maya

Please find attached my letter objecting to the above. In addition I have attached a screen shot 25E2 which is a google satellite image upon which I have marked the public footpath as shown on OS and also the local circular walk and amenity area enjoyed by children, teenagers and adults (me personally for nearly 50 years). The application states there are no footpaths near the location. I am also enclosing a sample of photos from this area showing the swing used, a den and a mountain bike trail.

Thanks for your attention

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Contact Centre (CRM) <contact@ribblevalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 05 September 2026 10:46
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application Comments - 3/2026/0587 FS-Case-871408658

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED],
Lancashire

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference No.: 3/2026/0587

Address of Development: Plane Tree Farm, Chaigley

Comments: I understand the predicament of the Applicant in having to make arrangements to comply with current environmental statute and guidance on slurry storage and spreading and the costs that will involve.

At the same time I also understand the concerns of those residents who would be most closely affected by the well recognised issues related to the location and storage of farming slurry in lagoons.

I can see that other comments have covered issues such as the immediate visual impact and public access.

Might the following alternative approach address some of the recognised environmental concerns should an enclosed, fixed roof slurry tank be utilised as opposed to an open lagoon and then be sited closer to the farm?

I realise that the initial cost of an enclosed tank might involve extra cost above an open lagoon but might mitigate some the necessary additional environmental management arrangements involved with a lagoon along with the potential for dealing with any contamination event. Also, there are the reported potential for complaints that seem to accompany the use of slurry lagoons close to residential dwellings that can't be easy to live with for all parties.

1. Is an enclosed tank feasible to replace the proposed lagoon? Perhaps this could be relocated close to Plane Tree? (This would benefit the farm residents, and the fewer residential dwellings in the vicinity of the farm, in relation to the odour etc issues).

2. If feasible - An above-ground tank might be used in areas where a lagoon may not be appropriate. This option may be more expensive than earth-banked lagoon but may attract a larger grant?

3. I understand from limited research that the benefits between lagoon and enclosed tank may address:

* Rainwater Management: Tanks exclude ambient rainfall if covered, (we're in a high rainfall region) whereas lagoons catch direct rain, which increases total liquid volume and fills storage faster.

* Emissions Control: Enclosed tanks or fixed-roof systems reduce ammonia emissions and retain

more nitrogen than open lagoons.

- * Footprint: Tanks take up much less surface area and land than large earth-banked lagoons.
- * Regulations: Tanks must still comply with the standard SSAFO (Silage, Slurry, and Agricultural Fuel Oil) rules.
- * Tanks require a smaller freeboard (300 mm) compared to earth-banked lagoons (750 mm).
- * A tank may still attract regional grant funding (like the Slurry Infrastructure grant)?

My apologies for posing these questions as much of the above would be in the gift of the Applicant and of course, may well be subject to the availability of adequate grant aid.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

31.08.26

Planning Application No 3/2026/0587

Dear Ms Cullen,

I am writing as a resident of Walker Fold in opposition to the proposal of the construction of an earth banked slurry lagoon by Andrew Bullock of Plane Tree farm.

Having studied the submission, I would like to highlight and question a number of misleading claims.

The information submitted in the initial planning permission application by John Metcalfe claims, under site visit, that the site cannot be seen from a public road, public footpath, bridleway or other public land.

Furthermore, it is repeated in the design and access statement 2.7 which states that there are no public rights of way within this site or nearby. This information is incorrect. I walk my dog daily in the area directly adjacent to the proposed location. I do this because it is the only safe, flat space locally to exercise a dog. Walker Fold is positioned on a road of national speed limit with no footpath.

The odour submission would directly impact my walk because of its close proximity. The type of slurry is also misleading. The odour assessment refers only to cattle slurry and having spoken to Andrew Bullock on the 21/08/26 it was confirmed that the proposal would also be utilised for pig slurry. Pig slurry is known to produce a higher overall odour mission and therefore challenges the odour assessment conclusion that the impact of the lagoon on residences will be insignificant.

The adjacent area is not only identified on the map as Moss plantation but also home to an Alder woodland, often referred to as a wet woodland or Alder-Carr. Moss thrives in

damp conditions where soil remains waterlogged likewise an Alder-Carr thus suggesting from a groundwater vulnerability perspective that this will be an issue.

I note from Environment Agency correspondence that the initial proposal, further east from our hamlet, was not rejected. It indicated that an alternative design or location should be considered because of groundwater vulnerability. There is no evidence to suggest that a new design has been considered. If the Lagoon had been in the original location, we would not be raising objections to the application. The most recent correspondence 06/05/25 does not confirm that the new site in question has been approved as stated in the design and access statement

2.4 a further inquiry regarding the chosen site was found to be acceptable providing soil samples were acceptable.

The information regarding the soil sample testing is not comprehensive enough to provide the information to make an informed decision. The laboratory sample description sheet states sample depths at 0 metres based upon "B" (large disturbed (bulk)sample). There is no confirmation, therefore, as to the depth of the samples which have been tested in line with the guidance and advice provided by the EA prior to application. The submission states that the test holes were excavated to 4 metres with samples taken at approximately 1 metre depth intervals for laboratory testing, however, only 5 laboratory samples were provided in terms of results which equates to 1 sample per test hole which does not match with the test hole approach stated within the overall submission.

In conclusion, it is impossible to make an informed decision as to whether planning permission should be granted. The proposal is unacceptable because of the discrepancies and factual inaccuracies in vital areas.

Yours faithfully,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

* +x7 photos not uploaded online
but added to planning file.

01 SEP 2026



28th August 2026

Dear Maya Cullen

**Planning Application No 3/2026/0587
Construction of an earth bank slurry lagoon
Plane tree farm, Chaigley**

I am writing to object to the above proposal on the following grounds.

The proposed location is not compliant with the Council's policy that developments in the Forest of Bowland National Landscape should acknowledge the area's special qualities by the size, design, materials, landscaping and siting.

The slurry lagoon is very large (60x25 metres) and with the banking and metal fence atop, I consider that it will greatly impact on the existing landscape. The submission states that "the lagoon will have no detrimental impact on the character of the area". I feel this is not correct.

The proposed location is 400 metres away from the existing slurry storage facility and farm for no apparent reason (the furthest point in fact). It is however only 140 – 184 metres from 9 residential properties. There must be several more suitable sites or even consideration given to enlarging the existing storage facility.

The proposed location is near to a public footpath (although the application says that there is not one) which is often used by hikers and rambling groups heading for the top of the Fell. There is also a closer circular footpath frequently used by local families which runs alongside the site. I personally have taken family and visitors to this area for nearly 50 years. This is the only safe walking area for Walker Fold residents as the main roads have no footpaths or speed restrictions. It has also been popular for many years with children. There is a tree swing, mountain bike trails and dens. There are no play facilities for several miles. I feel that the location of the lagoon in such close proximity, with an inevitable odour, would make this a very unpleasant and unfair impact on a whole range of people who currently enjoy this space. I have attached a satellite photograph which illustrates the footpaths and local amenity area.

The lagoon is located relatively close to my and eight other properties. I have serious concerns about the odour and its impact on our quality of life outdoors. Pig slurry which is

particularly unpleasant is to be included, according to the applicant, as well as dairy slurry. I do not think this has figured in the odour calculations. There is scant information on the floating cover or the heightened smells from maintenance and aeration.

The submission claims “the proposed development will not impact on neighbour amenity “– this is completely erroneous.

The proposed location is very close to streams despite the application suggesting otherwise. We have several photographs of the stream in flood. One can note the number of wooden foot bridges built on the circular walk to cross streams. There has clearly not been a proper assessment of the watercourses which all flow into the River Hodder. There is also potential for catastrophic pollution from possible leakage and overtopping.

I am attaching a few photographs to illustrate my points particularly around impact on public amenity.

I have also looked at relevant RVBC core strategies. As a minimum there are elements in DMG1/DMG2/DME3/DME6 which are at odds with the proposal.

Finally I think you should carefully examine the Environmental Agency input as I feel it is misleading to assume that this is the only suitable site. The EA does not state that this is the case. In my opinion taking account of how the land on the farm “behaves”, I think there are several options which should be explored resulting in a situation which is acceptable to residents in Walker Fold and the applicant.

Thank you for taking time to consider my points and I hope that you will find that there are good reasons to reject the proposal as currently presented.

