

Sam Till

From: Clerk, Escrick Parish Council <clerk@escrick.org>
Sent: 15 March 2017 08:52
To: Sam Till
Subject: NY/2016/0251/FUL

Re: Change of use of part of the former coal mine site to create a waste transfer for construction and demolition wastes, installation of a weighbridge, a skip storage area, portable amenity cabin (30 sq. metres) and the provision of car parking spaces at former Stillingfleet Mine.

Dear Sam,

I am writing on behalf of Escrick Parish Council and would like to submit the following response to the application above.

Escrick Parish Council strongly objects to this application, and fully supports the representations made by Stillingfleet Parish Council and Kelfield Parish Council.

Specifically, we would like to highlight:

1. The original consent for the Stillingfleet Mine contained a condition that the site should be returned to agricultural use once the mining operation had finished. That condition has never been revoked therefore further site development should not be permitted to take place until that issue has been resolved.
2. The proposal is considered to be a large scale industrial activity and should be assessed against the relevant policies of the Selby District Core Strategy and the emerging Local Plan due to the fact that the proposed development is outside the development limits of Stillingfleet and in open countryside. Clause 6.35 of the Selby District Core Strategy states: ‘The former mine sites at Stillingfleet and Wistow are remote and are not considered suitable for re-use for large scale industrial activity’. Whatever the scale of the current proposals (which we know must be considered on their merits), we understand that any approval now would set a precedent for the determination of future expansion proposals and consider this piecemeal approach to seek to overturn and undermine recently adopted policy to protect the local environment is unacceptable.
3. Furthermore, we note that there was no reference to the use of this site in the recent NYCC Minerals and Waste Plan consultation and the site is not proposed as an allocation for the proposed use outlined in this application. Therefore the application is also contrary to the recently approved policy proposals of both NYCC and City of York Council and should be refused on this basis.
4. The storage of 75,000 tonnes of waste (including liquid waste) is a cause for considerable concern. Despite being contrary to policy and harmful to the local environment, if the application were to be approved, enforceable conditions must be attached to ensure adequate safety measures are incorporated into the scheme in order to prevent contamination of the atmosphere, soil and water courses.

On the same basis, no hazardous waste must be allowed to be stored or processed on site and, if the application were to be approved, this must be conditioned and strictly monitored and enforced.

5. The application should be also refused due to the unacceptable impact on the amenity of nearby residents. We are concerned that noise from the operation of the site (including a crusher) would have an undesirable impact on the occupants of nearby residential properties.
6. The application should be also refused due to the unacceptable impact on the local highway, in particular the A19 which is extremely busy throughout the day causing impact for many villages along its route. We are extremely concerned about the impact that the 50 HGV movements every day will have on the local highway network including the noise that will be generated by this traffic. NYCC will already be aware of the problems crossing the A19 in Escrick village to access local services, including public transport and the doctor's surgery and church, and an additional 50 HGVs passing through the village at speed will further exacerbate this problem. The application, were it to be approved, should be conditioned (with enforceable Travel Plans in due course) to prevent HGVs travelling through Stillingfleet and other villages on the B1222 or routing via Cawood Bridge, although it is appreciated that this would have implications for the A19 (which is a higher road in the transport hierarchy). It is important that an acceptable Travel Plan should be submitted, consulted on and agreed and conditioned prior to any consent being issued.
7. On this same basis, the highways impact of the proposals must also consider the combined effect of traffic from this application with other approved applications not yet implemented and the other strategic waste sites already proposed as allocations in the recent NYCC Minerals & Waste Plan consultation. These include the anaerobic digester at the former North Selby Mine site and the large site at the former Escrick brickworks, both of which, if developed as proposed, would have massive traffic implications.
8. Given the large extent of the proposed waste sites within reasonable proximity of where construction waste is sourced, no good grounds have been shown to override the recent Waste Plan which does not specify this site as an allocation and there is therefore no need for an additional separate waste 'feeder' transfer station. . Therefore we consider that this application is unnecessary and contrary to policy and should therefore be refused.

Regards,

Helen Guest

--

Helen Guest

Clerk/RFO

Escrick Parish Council