

Cawingredients – Community Liaison Group – Minutes

6 October 2022 5.30pm – Leeming Bar, Community Hub

Attendees:

Gerald Jennings - Chairman	John Board - Cawingredients
Laurence Beardmore – York and North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce	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	Matt Sawyer – Resident
Rab Hastie – Resident	Laura Pinder – Secretariat – Social Communications

1. Welcome and apologies

Gerald Jennings (GJ) welcomed attendees. Apologies were received from Cllr Carl Les.

2. Minutes of last meeting

Matters arising – Matt Sawyer (MS) asked if we could we upload plans online that the community can see. John Coultas (JC) stressed there are still some changes to be made and out of context might be confusing. It was agreed to watermark the plans as draft.

ACTION Laura Pinder (LP) to upload plans online

MS asked about Cawingredients and a possible community benefit of a cycle route from the roundabout at Spring House to Leeming Bar village centre and then a further route from the bypass to Bedale. It was mentioned that Bedale residents have been promised cycle routes for years that remain undelivered.

JC stated that he doesn't feel Cawingredients will fund this as he suggests the benefits as a result of the proposed scheme are generous.

Discussion was held around community benefits/s.106 agreements.

MS asked about the proposed cycle access at Low Street, is this lit? He suggested light spill from here may contribute to light pollution. He also stressed that irresponsible parking is still a concern.

John Board (JB) emphasised that the parking provision is generous enough to ensure plenty of space for all staff, visitors and contractors, including at shift change. He also stated that staff entry via Low Street will be via fob access, only for staff. Visitors, contractors and maintenance people will be required to enter site via the gatehouse and sign in at reception.

JC stated that the lighting at this pedestrian/cycle entrance will be low level and motion controlled.

ACTION – Peter Jones (PJ) to liaise with NYCC re: appetite to improve the cycle links in the area

MS stated that residents with septic tanks have not been contacted yet. JC replied that no one has been contacted regarding this yet.

JC confirmed that Dudleys (Drainage Engineers) had received confirmation that the Yorkshire Water network could accommodate the estimated additional 6 properties being connected to the sewer.

JC also updated the group on the process of connection and how it works, and the likely costs:

- approx. £2.5k installation fee
- annual service approx. £250
- replacement pump approx. £350-400 (needs replacing approx. every year)
- float switches approx. £68
- running costs 0.75 kw – similar to average Hoover. Usage approx. same as running Hoover for 15 mins a day

PJ asked if a solution exists whereby the properties connect to one larger tank as opposed to individuals?

JC suggested YW would not want to adopt a pumping structure. He further outlined that an alternative solution would be a rising main on one person's land; but that 5 piping systems was the more straightforward solution.

GJ stressed that we need to be clear how many properties this applies to. PJ asked what if one or more do not wish to connect. JC stated that would be fine, the others could proceed.

To summarise, Cawingredients is offering this as a one time offer, subject to planning permission and it was agreed to take the specific conversation away from the meeting.

GJ asked about the landscaping visuals and stressed how disappointing it is to still not have had these back.

SDeegan explained that as the scheme design changes, it has an impact on the consultant's work.

MS said he thought that winter trees would be added to the existing visuals. JC stated that for a smaller scheme, that could be an option, but not for a large complex scheme of this size.

3. Update on Planning Application

SDeegan stated that at the last pre-app meeting with Hambleton District Council's planning officer, it was stated that NYCC highways and National Highways were happy and the only outstanding matter with the highway access application is a construction management plan which will be finalised next week.

GJ asked if this means planning permission will be granted for the highways access application in the next couple of weeks? SDeegan stated hopefully yes, and at which point, the full factory planning application will be submitted.

SDeegan updated the group that ongoing conversations with HDC planning team has brought about the southern part of the Local Plan allocation (which Cawingredients is not developing) becoming 'sterilised' as it wouldn't be accessed from the A684.

The project team have introduced a stretch of safeguarding land down the eastern edge of the site to enable an access road to the southern part of the site, should this come forward for development in the future.

SDeegan tabled a plan which showed how the southern section could be developed, which helped to demonstrate what land would be required as an access spur. The safeguarding of the land would be a s.106 agreement and Cawingredients legal advisors are drafting this.

SDarbyshire asked if this moves the factory and associated structures to the west? JC stated yes, it moves everything so an 8m module is lost, reducing the footprint of the factory but the factory footprint does not come closer to the west.

MS asked whether the permitter access road could move with the development? I.e., as phase one is developed, the access road 'hugs' the development, and only moves out closer to the west as the second phase is developed.

JB stated that would mean building the road twice and highlighted the sustainability issues with this approach.

JC stated that the site bund would be created first, before any other development takes place.

The group discussed the various elements of the scheme that have been improved upon:

- cladding colour to muted green – the group felt much more acceptable
- no vehicles around the perimeter between 9pm and 7am, enforced by bollards etc.
- reduction in site footprint by 40,000 sqm.

SDarbyshire asked about topography and the 4m bunding. JC stated that it will be 4m in height consistently along the topography.

PJ asked if those details are available at a discrete level? JC advised yes.

4. Feedback from members (All)

GJ brought the meeting to a close and stated that this will be the last meeting before the planning application is submitted.

GJ thanked everyone for their time and commitment, for staying late and he hoped members had found the process helpful. He felt discussions had informed the scheme design significantly.

GJ hoped everyone felt they had had the chance to speak and that he had chaired independently.

He outlined that the next meeting would be held once the application had been submitted and validated so that the group had a chance to view and digest the documents and then we would reconvene.

PJ stated that he had worked in planning since 1990 and that this level of community engagement isn't the norm. He said he felt the process has been as far away from a tick box exercise as possible and that it has been exemplary.

MS stated that whilst they still don't want the development, it is now better than it was and we all understand each other better.

JC thanked everyone for their input and felt the scheme had evolved for the better.

JK said she felt the CLG might have been a tick box exercise but the group really has been listened to and she felt it had been worthwhile.

5. Date of next meeting (All)

TBC once planning application submitted and validated.

6. AOB (All) None.