

Cawingredients – Community Liaison Group – Minutes

27 July 2022 7.00pm – Leeming Bar, Community Hub

Attendees:

Gerald Jennings - Chairman	John Board - Cawingredients
Cllr Carl Les – Elected Ward Member Bedale Ward	John Coultas – Architect on behalf of Cawingredients
Peter Jones - Development Manager, Hambleton District Council	Sam Deegan – Planning Consultant on behalf of Cawingredients
Sue Darbyshire – Resident	Laura Pinder - Secretariat – Social Communications
Matt Sawyer – Resident	

1. Welcome and apologies

Gerald Jennings(GJ) welcomed attendees and introductions were made. Apologies were received from Cllr John Weighell, Cllr Jackie Kennedy, Rab Hastie and Laurence Beardmore.

2. Minutes of last meeting

- Clarifications – Minutes record: *JW and PJ stated that there can be some deviation from the Local Plan in certain circumstances, but that they too felt that keeping traffic away from residential properties is the right approach.*

Clarification: *JW stated that there can be some deviation from the Local Plan in certain circumstances.*

- Matters arising – Site visit. John Board (JB) invited a group of members (no more than six) to visit the perimeter of the site ahead of the next meeting. This will be at 6.00pm on Thursday 18 August 2022.

ACTION Laura Pinder (LP) to confirm those attending site visit

Matt Sawyer (MS) asked about the consultation summary outlined in the minutes of the last meeting. He asked have any more responses been received to the consultation and what additional communications (e.g. emails) have been received. LP advised the consultation webpage was closed on 30 June and no further emails have been received.

ACTION LP to circulate the consultation update from the previous meeting

MS asked for clarification around the current site's operating hours. This was confirmed as 24/7 operations.

Peter Jones (PJ) outlined the difference between some operational restrictions from the Council's Environmental Health Officer and some from the Environment Agency.

ACTION PJ to confirm licensing/planning restrictions

MS queried wording around highways access matters discussed at the last meeting, and the opportunity to 'deviate from the Local Plan'. The group discussed examples of where this may be the

case in very particular circumstances and Sam Deegan (SDeegan) explained the context within which the Local Plan access was discussed.

A summary document of employment benefits was tabled at the meeting.

MS queried the average salary of Cawingredients staff as outlined in the document and asked whether this was the mean, median or mode. MS asked for clarity on the above.

ACTION - SDeegan to provide a more detailed overview of average salaries

3. Update on Planning Application

SDeegan gave an update on the planning application. He advised that the initial highways access planning application was submitted to Hambleton District Council on 12 July 2022.

SDeegan clarified that the Department for Transport (DfT) have confirmed that access can be taken from the A684 as long as journey times are not affected. SDeegan outlined that DfT will be a statutory consultee on this application.

SDeegan outlined that the transport consultants working on the application (Fore Consulting) have been focussing on not adversely affecting journey times. They have developed drawings for a 'ghost' junction which provides markings in the centre of the existing carriageway, shaped and located so as to direct traffic movement. This means east/west traffic not turning off the A684 does not need to stop to allow others to turn. The drawings were tabled and discussed.

The highways planning application can be found here: <https://planning.hambleton.gov.uk/online-applications/> using the reference number 22/01621/FUL.

GJ asked whether it is expected to have had comments back from North Yorkshire County Council Highways before the next meeting of the CLG. PJ hoped so and hoped some feedback will have been received.

MS asked whether east/west travelling traffic will be affected by low sun, particularly in the autumn/winter when approaching the proposed new junction into the site. SDeegan outlined the visibility splay shown in the drawings and that this, as well as all safety matters, was considered when developing the proposals. NYCC will consider safety when assessing the proposals.

SDarbyshire asked about the length of the ghost junction, and could it accommodate more than one HGV waiting to turn into site?

JC suggested that the ghost junction was of such a length that four HGVs could be accommodated.

LP asked what the next eastbound infrastructure would be?

The group stated over the brow of the hill is a further roundabout.

GJ suggested we keep highways as a topic for discussion at future meetings.

PJ explained that the siting of the junction is mindful of the culvert further to the east of the proposed access.

GJ suggested inviting Fore Consulting (transport consultants) to the next meeting. The group agreed that if there had been sufficient progress in discussions with NYCC Highways then it would be helpful to invite the transport consultants to attend and discuss highways matters, otherwise they should attend the following meeting.

GJ asked about the determination period for the application and was advised there is an 8-week target determination period for the highways application.

LP asked about timescales for the factory application. SDeegan advised there is a target submission date of early September for the factory application.

4. Revised Site Masterplan

JC tabled the revised masterplan based on the consultation events and the first meeting of the CLG.

GJ asked for clarity on timescales of the build-out of phase one and phase two.

JC explained that a number of production lines will be introduced in phase one and that that is expected to take between 5 and 15 years to be achieved, at which point, phase two will be built out.

GJ asked for clarity on the application being submitted in September, will this include both phases? JC advised yes.

JC advised that the feedback received from the acoustician suggested that a 4-metre high structure would provide sufficient acoustic abatement. JC explained that this could be achieved either through a bund or using fencing or a combination of both. JC explained that this could also be planted, to provide visual screening, but that trees don't provide any acoustic benefit.

JC then tabled drawings showing the proposed planting and how this could grow over time.

A discussion was held to provide clarity on distances from nearest properties within the revised drawings.

SDarbyshire asked about topography and suggested that as her garden falls away into a dip, her property and neighbours would not see the full benefit of the 4m high structure.

JC advised that the acoustician had stated that 4m would be sufficient to provide adequate noise abatement, but that didn't mean the structure couldn't be higher in places. There was a discussion about gradient, water runoff etc.

The group discussed trees, including ensuring there is leaf cover outside of the summer months. MS asked to see visualisations of winter planting.

ACTION – JC to table summer/winter visualisations from landscape architect at next meeting

SDarbyshire asked about trees being retained. JC advised that trees will be retained where possible, and a discussion was held around proximity of trees to proposed bunds/fencing.

JC outlined that all drainage will be dealt with within the site and that there is no need to utilise the western area of the site (across Low Street). There was a brief discussion around access onto this area, footpaths, cycle access and the necessary agreement required to ensure ongoing maintenance of the site.

Carl Les (CL) stated that no authority (County, District or Parish) will want to take on responsibility for the land and its maintenance.

PJ outlined that there are options for a legal document to ensure the area is maintained (e.g. s.106, planning conditions).

MS asked what would happen to this land if Cawingredients went bust. PJ explained that a legal document, for around 30 years, would be appropriate. JC stressed that Cawingredients is established in the community and sees its long term future in Leeming Bar. He stated that there is an appetite to make the factory site and the western area work.

MS asked about vehicular movements. JC explained that Cawingredients would like to secure full perimeter access but that all vehicular activity (loading, car parks etc.) has been moved to the north east and eastern side of the site.

MS asked about access to the southern part of the Local Plan allocation, which is not being brought forward as part of Cawingredients' plans. MS suggested that the Local Plan had been clear that access to this allocated site needed to be off the A684, and that therefore meant the southern part of the allocation couldn't be accessed without crossing the Cawingredients site.

JC explained that Cawingredients has no interest in developing the southern end of the allocated site, nor would they permit access from their site into the southern site(s).

CL was thanked for his attendance and left at 8.30. He stated that he was pleased to have joined the meeting but that his preference for the site would have been to have brought it forward as an industrial estate for SMEs.

5. Key themes – building height/massing – JC outlined that the building will vary in height from around 14.7 metres on the western elevation to nearer 16 metres on the eastern elevation as the land levels drop. This was in order to be effective operationally i.e. HGVs would dock immediately up against the building.

Building appearance – JC stated that Cawingredients would like to repeat the colours/cladding of the existing factory.

SDarbyshire suggested that those colours/materials wouldn't blend well with the field the factory will sit on.

PJ stated that the existing factory was designed to blend well into its surroundings (the sky) which it does well, but requested alternative elevational proposals for this site.

LP asked about the option of a living/green wall which was raised at the last meeting. JC replied that wouldn't be suitable for a drink manufacturing facility with the possibility of wildlife entering the factory.

JC agreed to take comments back to Cawingredients and bring visualisations to the next meeting.

ACTION – JC to bring visualisations to next meeting

Drainage – JC explained that the drainage engineer supporting the project will work to ensure water is discharged from the site at an agricultural rate. The team is currently looking at foul water drainage and this work is ongoing.

There was a discussion around existing domestic septic tanks which back onto the site and currently, water is discharged from them into the field. It was agreed that this would be looked at by the drainage engineer. MS asked whether those septic tanks could be connected to the proposed factory's system.

ACTION – Drainage engineer to address issues raised in advance of submission of planning application and JC to bring proposed drainage strategy to the next meeting

GJ asked about lighting and asked that this be added as a topic of discussion at future meetings.

SDarbyshire asked about size of the factory buildings which had changed from the drawings shown at the public consultation.

JC explained that the sizes of phases one and two had changed slightly but that the overall footprint of the building remained the same. JC confirmed that the proposed building line of phase two had not moved closer to residential properties.

PJ made a point of clarification around noise sensitive receptors and advised that noise is monitored both at the nearest receptor (i.e. a building) and at the boundary (i.e. at a garden boundary).

MS asked about construction hours and how this would be managed? SDeegan stated that the site will operate 24/7 but the construction of the site will be restricted to Monday-Friday. The restrictions will be set out in a construction management plan that will form part of the planning submission pack for the factory planning application.

MS asked whether acoustic measures (e.g. bund/fencing) would be put in place first on this site. The team confirmed it would.

SDarbyshire asked about car parking numbers. JC advised it has been slightly reduced to around 260/270 and the group showed concern around this number of cars entering/leaving site. JB outlined that the car park capacity was in order to allow for shift change, so the oncoming shift could arrive and park comfortably, then the outgoing shift would leave.

ACTION – JC/SDeegan – Draft Parking Plan at next meeting

MS asked about loading and unloading as part of phase two and whether loading bays would be required on the western elevation of the building. JC and JB explained that once phase two comes online, an internal corridor would service the factory from the eastern elevation.

8. Feedback from members (All)

No feedback.

9. Date of next meeting (All)

Thursday 18 August 2022 – site visit at Cawingredients at 6.00pm followed by meeting at Leeming Bar Community Hub at 6.45pm.

10. AOB (All)

None.