

North York Moors National Park Authority Planning Committee Site Visit

Public Minutes of the site visit held at Calfthwaite Farm, Cloughton on 03 July 2015

Present:

National Park Authority Members:

Mr J Bailey, Mr M Bowes, Mrs J Frank, Mrs A Fisher, Mrs E Dent and Mrs H Moorhouse

National Park Authority Officers:

Chris France, Helen Webster

Other Attendees:

Applicant:	Alan Temple
Agent:	Keith Warters
Parish Council:	Cllr Geoff Hill
SBC Environmental Health:	Graham Middleton, Ann Elmore
Objector:	Mr and Mrs McQuade

Apologies:

Mr T Sanderson, Mr D Chance, Mr D Hugill, Mr A Scott, Mr J Walker, Mrs C Patmore.

Minutes:

A brief history of the site and its development was given to Members by Mr France who then introduced the four applications under consideration. Mr France explained that the reason for the site visit was for Members to better understand the relationship between the development and the neighbouring residential property, assess the suitability of the buildings for livestock and to assess the impact of the buildings on the wider landscape.

Some discussion took place with regard to the impact of the farming operation upon the neighbouring residential property and the proximity of the livestock buildings to the objector's property was identified as the main issue. Members identified that there was an existing buffer of young trees between the building and the neighbouring boundary and the submitted landscaping plan proposes to extend this. Officers confirmed that the proposed landscape plan consisted of a number of trees consisting of a mixture of three species. Members sought clarification as to whether the main impact was a visual impact or noise and smell nuisance as the proposed landscaping plan would only address visual concerns.

Graham Middleton (Scarborough Borough Council Environmental Health Officer) advised that the change in enterprise will reduce but not eliminate noise and smell issues. It was difficult to judge but ideally it would be preferable to have the livestock further away. He also explained that their role was more concerned with monitoring and problem solving rather than dealing with the potential of nuisance in advance. He did confirm that the EHO team has received complaints from further afield than the objectors property. Members asked if there had ever been a point in time where the operations at Calfthwaite Farm have constituted a statutory nuisance. The Environmental Health Officer advised that there was likelihood but a notice has not been served.

In response to the questions raised over the location of the buildings, Mr France offered a policy response and explained that the buildings complied with the requirements of Development Policy 12 (Agriculture), on the basis that they were closely related to existing buildings within the unit, the application proposed a landscaping scheme and their design was consistent with agricultural need and function.

Members requested to inspect the buildings as they recalled the quality of building no. 5 being questioned at the last meeting and clarification was sought as to whether the feed bins were required for the new sheep and cattle enterprise. The applicant invited members into the buildings and advised that one feed bin had sheep feed in and the other was used to store cattle feed. The applicant's agent confirmed that they would be prepared to paint them if necessary.

Members asked the applicant to explain how manure was dealt with and Mr Temple confirmed that both cattle and sheep were bedded up on straw and then the sheds were mucked out and the waste material was spread directly on the fields. He continued to explain that the smell talked about previously was in association with the pigs which do not form part of these applications. Mr France confirmed the recommended conditions in relation to disposal of manure which are detailed on the committee reports.

Members asked whether pollution was a problem and the Environmental Health Officers confirmed that they have not been made aware of any such issues. The applicant confirmed that the straw bedding soaked up any waste water from the livestock.

Members questioned the stability of the land upon which building no.5 is situated as the pictures shown at the Committee Meeting showed it close to the edge of a steep embankment. The applicant's agent confirmed that the landform has not been altered; the shed has been designed to fit on the available space.

Towards the close of the meeting, the final discussions were concerned with the visual impact of the development, particularly from the objector's property and further discussion took place regarding the proposed landscaping and whether semi-mature trees were required to be included in the landscaping plan. Members considered that an improved boundary fence would be required if cattle were going to be in the yard. Member's assessed the site from the neighbouring property and questions were raised in connection with drainage problems. The objector, Mr McQuade advised that drainage has always been an issue but the applicant's actions have made it worse. The applicant's agent advised that the buildings were not contributing to the drainage issues and therefore should not be considered as part of the application.

There being no further questions, the meeting was closed at 11:29am.