

Cawingredients – Community Liaison Group – Minutes

5 September 2022 6.00pm – Leeming Bar, Community Hub

Attendees:

Gerald Jennings – Chairman	John Board – Cawingredients
Paul Irwin, Fore Consulting (Transport – guest)	John Coultas – Architect on behalf of Cawingredients
Paul Brownlow, Dudleys Engineers (Drainage – guest)	Sam Deegan – Planning Consultant on behalf of Cawingredients
Sue Darbyshire – Resident	Racheal Johnson – Secretariat – Social Communications
Jackie Kennedy – Parish Councillor	Laurence Beardmore - President, York & North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce
Matt Sawyer – Resident	

1. Welcome and apologies

Gerald Jennings (GJ) welcomed attendees and introductions were made. Apologies were received from Rab Hastie, Cllr Carl Les, Cllr John Weighell, Peter Jones and Laura Pinder.

2. Minutes of last meeting

MS gave thanks for the LDI methodology and noted that the word “receptor” on page 2 could be updated to a more human phrase.

SD advised that the timescales around the planning application would be discussed as part of the meeting.

MS asked if there would be ongoing monitoring of noise levels. SD advised that there is unlikely to be a planning requirement for this but would discuss the appropriateness with the noise consultant and respond by email on whether this would be feasible.

JC provided feedback on the cladding colour following discussions with Cawingredients. Cawingredients’ owners have acknowledged the strength of residents’ feelings about the previously proposed colour and have agreed to change the colour of the cladding from grey to green. JC shared draft drawings of the proposed new elevations. JC is to draw up some new elevations and make them available to CLG members.

MS welcomed this change of colour and would relay to residents.

SD confirmed that the drainage site visit took place. An update on drainage would be provided by PB as part of the meeting.

SD drew attention to the lighting impact assessment, which is being worked up fully. A draft was circulated to members of the CLG and been shared planning officers at the Council. A full version will be shared once the report is complete.

3. Update on planning applications

SD noted the previous intention to submit the planning application on 9 September. This is no longer the case due to clarifications requested by national highways relating to the access road planning application. There is currently no fixed proposed date for the planning application as the additional information requested on the highways application will take some time to assemble.

JC advised that timescales are likely to shift by one month.

4. Transport update

PI noted that the national highways clarifications are relatively routine and that Fore Consulting will be submitting their responses next week. This is likely to extend timescales by one month.

PI shared a map illustrating the updated access proposals, which meets DfT design standards. A road safety audit of the designs has been undertaken by an independent consultant and submitted with the application. MS queried levels of visibility. PI confirmed that the designs meet the necessary visibility requirements and have been assessed by the auditor. A few minor technical queries have been raised, which Fore Consulting is addressing. The drawing will be updated to reflect this but the impact for road users is unlikely to be affected.

PI advised that once clarification responses have been submitted to National Highways, either a “no objections” response will be issued or they may set certain conditions relating to issues such as noise, dust etc during the construction.

SD clarified that DfT are not in fact a statutory consultee on the application itself as the proposals will have no impact on through traffic journey times.

PI is expecting a response from National Highways within 2-3 weeks of the additional information being submitted.

NYCC is the highways authority and has requested a number of clarifications. These are also minor and conclude, overall, that the proposals do not impact journey times on the by-pass. The Council has made some points about safety, however these are covered in the road safety audit. Comments have also been made about HGV routing suggesting that HGV access should not be permissible from the east (i.e. from Northallerton). PI advised that this is unrealistic but that the majority of traffic is expected to come from the west.

JC requested clarification on the 278 agreement, which the authority requires for works to take place on behalf of the developer.

MC queried cycle access as part of the highways proposals. PI advised that there is no cycling provision on the bypass currently, which is a high-speed road, and therefore it is not feasible for Cawingredients to fund this. PI confirmed that cycling access to the site will be via Low Street, from the populated area.

JC advised that following the previous meeting plans have been updated to incorporate space for a pass-activity pass and cycle access.

In response to issues raised at the last meeting in relation to HGVs waiting, PI confirmed that the full length of the deceleration lane is 90 metres, which could hold four HGVs. The designs have taken into account deceleration and acceleration up to the brow of the hill.

In relation to concerns raised about sunlight on the brow of the hill, PI confirmed that the designs exceed visibility requirements.

JK expressed concern about HGVs breaching the 7-tonne weight limit currently within the village, and that HGVs accessing the new factory might compound this.

GJ asked if there is a travel plan associated with the application. PI confirmed that there is, and it has been drafted and is almost ready for submission. The plan is intended to inform employees at the facility about travel options, including sustainable and public transport and car-sharing. The travel plan is a requirement of the planning application and Cawingredients would need to implement it.

MS advised that the community put forward a number of representations to the Local Plan consultation relating to public and sustainable transport options to the site. It was noted that current bus services do not align with shift patterns.

5. Drainage update

PB provided an update on drainage. He noted that there are several drainage systems that need to be managed on the site; the first relates to the new highways operation. There will be very little water coming off the highways, but the proposal is to build some swales, covered in grass, so that any liquid from the highway will run into the swales and will then be discharged into the watercourse.

The second is the current green field where the factory will be built. Consultations have been undertaken already with Hambleton Council and the local drainage authority, who are responsible for the current drainage operations. Pending the final approval process, they have signalled approval of the proposed system. A relatively involved system is proposed to mitigate any increased risk of flooding. An oil interceptor will be put in place to prevent any oil spillages or similar entering the watercourse. The system will also contain all drainage within the site, without flooding the pond on the neighbouring land; the designs have been prepared under a once-in-100 year storm scenario, with a 40% allowance for climate change.

PB also outlined the plans for managing trade effluent. This will be pumped up to a trade effluent plant at the top of the site which will effectively act as a private water treatment facility. The treated effluent will be potable to a higher standard than the tap water provided by Yorkshire Water. This will be stored in a series of retention ponds on-site and will eventually be discharged into the water course, but over a longer period of time to mitigate flooding. There will be some seepage into the ground, however as the soil where the factory is to be built is clay, the designs will minimise this.

PB confirmed that the overall drainage strategy for the scheme have been approved by the Council's drainage experts for phases 1 and 2 of the factory proposals.

MS asked whether any excess water could be made use of from a sustainability perspective.

JB confirmed that Cawingredients is looking at proposals for recycling trade effluent for cleaning purposes to help manage the volume of water discharge. JC will also be considering use of rainwater for grey water (e.g. toilet flushing) as part of the proposals. JB confirmed that raw water storage provision will be made as part of the proposals for the new factory.

JB advised that the drainage system responds to a "worst case scenario" but any actions to improve the situation, including more sustainable use of water, will be considered.

JB advised that the third system will meet the operational needs of the site. Discussions have been had with Yorkshire Water regarding the volume of water and waste that is likely to be discharged and they have confirmed that current infrastructure (which to date the consultants have been unable to locate) is unlikely to be able to manage these volumes. JB advised that there is more capacity on the manhole/ pipe at Low Street than Yorkshire Water understood, so the system can connect to this pipe. Yorkshire Water have confirmed that this will be acceptable. The water will be pumped to the manhole located close to number 26 Low St and expect that the system will be gravity based thereafter. The capacity will be sufficient for both phases of work.

Conversations are already taking place with residents on Low Street, who are currently on septic tanks at the bottom of their gardens, about how the work can improve their waste and water connections as

a planning gain. Cawingredients have instructed the drainage consultants to factor the improvements for residents into their plans, effectively giving residents a new system. There are several options to achieving this and a viability survey of residents' gardens and current septic tank systems will need to be carried out. Yorkshire Water has been asked to confirm that they will accept the additional volumes from the residential properties into the network and a response is pending. Approval from Yorkshire Water is required before detailed survey work is undertaken, but this is expected to be positive given the small number of properties affected. There will also be further discussions with residents to ensure that they are content with the proposals and any maintenance cost implications.

Once technical feasibility and scope have been ascertained, JC will discuss cost implications with Cawingredients. If acceptable, Cawingredients will fund the initial infrastructure work, with residents responsible for the annual maintenance of their individual pump systems.

PB was unable to confirm timescales, as these are contingent on the response from Yorkshire Water, but the aspiration is to demonstrate intent to assist Low Street residents' as part of the planning application. In addition to the planning process, Yorkshire Water have their own technical approval process (section 104 agreement), so that Yorkshire Water will take ownership of the new pipework once complete.

MS asked whether information could be provided to residents about the scale of maintenance costs for which they could be liable, so that they can make informed decisions. JC and PB confirmed that they will provide this.

6. Revised site masterplan

JC noted that there have been a number of discussions about how to address some of the points that have been raised consistently throughout the consultation.

In addition to the updates on the building colour and drainage, JC advised that the access road at the southern and western parts of the site will be effectively closed at night-time, due to the very limited number of vehicles that will be accessing the site during the night shift. JB confirmed that there would be no operational vehicle movements at that part of the site during this time. There would need to be access for emergency vehicles and occasional maintenance vehicles, but the access route would be closed to HGVs in response to residents' concerns.

GJ queried the impact of light pollution. SD advised that the detail will be set out in the full lighting report, but the outline methodology sets out a plan that will minimise light spill.

JC has commissioned the landscape architects to produce visuals of summer and winter light impacts. These will be shared once available.

In response to previous discussions about the land bunds, JC advised that further investigations will be made to address concerns about residential properties being higher than ground level on the site.

MS shared further issues raised by residents:

- Fencing – appearance and gap between the security fence and acoustic fence to allow residents access for maintenance and hedge trimming etc. JC confirmed that there will be two fences, with different functions. JC to consider whether fencing drawings can be produced and brought to the next meeting.
- Safety of residents and aircraft – SD confirmed that the MoD will be consulted as part of the planning application process to ensure that heights are acceptable.
- Concerns about adequacy of notice of the highways consultation – SD noted that this is a Hambleton Council responsibility. MS requested that this be fed back to the Council and that more modern ways of informing the community about a consultation be adopted by the Council in future.

7. Outstanding matters for discussion

These were picked up as part of the meeting

8&10. Feedback from members and AOB

No matters were raised.

9. Date of next meeting

SD surmised that the planning application could be submitted in around 4-6 weeks, subject to determination of the highways application.

It was agreed that the group would meet again on Thursday 6 October at 5.30pm, with the intention to wrap up by 7.30pm.

They key topics will be:

- Landscaping
- Lighting
- Drainage
- Update on highways application