



Minerals and Waste Joint Plan

Minerals and Waste Joint Plan Issues and Options Supplementary Sites Consultation

Summary of Responses May 2015

Minerals and Waste Joint Plan Supplementary Sites Consultation

16th January – 13th March 2015

Summary of consultation responses

As part of the Issues and Options consultation in Spring 2014 additional new sites and revised site boundaries for existing site submissions were put forward, these were packaged into a Supplementary Sites document. This report provides details of the comments provided in relation to this consultation.

Consultation

The Supplementary Sites consultation ran for eight weeks from 16th January to 13th March 2015.

The Issues and Options consultation was publicised through a range of means consisting of:

- Press release issued jointly by the three authorities,
- Article in the NYCC electronic newsletter NY NOW (4,014 subscribers);
- Twitter and Facebook announcements by all three authorities;
- Information on the Joint Plan webpage.

A wide range of consultees were contacted either by letter or by email. All consultees were sent details of the consultation. Details of how to access other documents on the Joint Plan website and how to make comments were provided in the letter or email.

The consultation document and was also made available in libraries throughout the Plan area and in the offices of each of the three authorities.

A total of 608 comments were received from 315 respondents. The breakdown of respondents is:

- 1 Adjoining authorities
- 1 Consultants / Agents
- 6 Environmental Amenity Groups
- 6 General
- 279 Individuals
- 4 minerals and waste industry
- 1 Other businesses
- 11 Parish councils
- 4 Statutory bodies
- 2 Utilities

Additional information was provided to consultees on request, following this 1 consultee provided comments which are provided as an additional report in this document.

Sites Report

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3515	0419	Are there any plans to widen and make Lumley Lane and Low Street more safe and suitable for heavy lorries? Are there any plans to keep the air free from pollution, especially dust?	Are there any plans to widen and make Lumley Lane and Low Street more safe and suitable for heavy lorries? Are there any plans to keep the air free from pollution, especially dust?
3577	0409	Concerned about the number of proposed sites around Kirkby Fleetham and cumulative impact in terms of air, noise, dust and visual pollution. There is a risk of more heavy traffic trying to use the Great Langton Bridge which is not suitable for a large amount of heavy traffic.	Concerned about the number of proposed sites around Kirkby Fleetham and cumulative impact in terms of air, noise, dust and visual pollution. There is a risk of more heavy traffic trying to use the Great Langton Bridge which is not suitable for a large amount of heavy traffic.
3368	0013	Object to the proposed fracking at Kirby Misperton. Concerned about the impact of fracking on the environment and increase in lorry movements which will cause safety concerns. There is already a large amount of traffic in the summer with people visiting Flamingo land and the lorries will add to this.	Object to the proposed fracking at Kirby Misperton. Concerned about the impact of fracking on the environment and increase in lorry movements which will cause safety concerns.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3405 ****Consulted under 2922**** 0136

The Council should look create zero waste to landfill. Support provision of an incinerator and recycling site with good road links, such as next to the A1. The existing landfill site at Brompton-on-Swale could be a good location as could make use of the methane which is being generated already. There is no need for additional sand and gravel quarries, they are just created to provide landfill for waste.

The Council should look create zero waste to landfill. Support provision of an incinerator and recycling site with good road links, such as next to the A1, such as existing landfill site at Brompton-on-Swale. Do not think additional sand and gravel quarries are required as they will be used for landfill for waste.

3406 ****Consulted under 2922**** 0137

Concerned landowners have not been contacted to discuss proposals that affect them. Do not support the use of landfill.

Concerned landowners have not been contacted to discuss proposals that affect them. Do not support the use of landfill.

3501 ****Consulted under 3502**** 0331

No particular comments on the supplementary sites consultation but want to record objections to possible use of hydraulic fracturing (fracking). Concerned the activity will contaminate ground water and the water table and cause subsidence and make it hard to get property insurance. Water is used in the process and this will impact on other water supplies. Need to dispose of used contaminated water safely. Concerned about leaking of methane and its impact. The infrastructure will be detrimental to the visual landscape and historical character of the area. A major concern is the scale of the development needed to extract large volumes of gas. There will be an impact on the wildlife and biodiversity and noise pollution in the area

Object to fracking. Concerned about contamination of ground water and the water table, leaking methane, noise pollution impact on the landscape, historical character, wildlife, biodiversity and subsidence. Water used in the process will need to be disposed of safely. Concerned about the scale of development required.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

1111 The Coal Authority

0122 No specific comments to make on proposed supplementary sites. Please note that The Coal Authority has provided all three LPAs with GIS data illustrating the spatial extent of coal mining hazards that pose a potential risk to new development, we would expect this information to be used to identify appropriate sites

Ensure the data provided by The Coal Authority showing the spatial extent of coal mining hazards which pose a potential threat to new development is used in the identification of future sites.

3527

0473 The tourist centre of the City of York and market town of Northallerton do not seem to want any pollution industries near them.

The tourist centre of the City of York and market town of Northallerton do not seem to want any pollution industries near them.

Respondent No. Name

1174

CommentNo Comment

0396

The area around Thornborough Henges has unique and international significance. The landscape setting of the monument complex on the Thornborough Moor promontory has been severely compromised by quarrying. An integrated landscape vision has been produced by NYCC Countryside service, English Heritage, Yorkshire and the Humber Advice and Grants Team and Natural England Yorkshire and Humber Team to inform future discussions on the management of the Thornborough Landscape. The Managing Landscape Change (MLC) Stage 4: Recommendations for planning, which NYCC relies on heavily is flawed. Workings in the area now cover 182 hectares and has contributed to the destruction of tracts of the Henge environs and the archaeological resource. The MLC project states that because of archaeological significance around Thornborough Henges it is difficult to determine whether any part of the landscape would be suitable for further mineral extraction, therefore the applicant was encouraged to develop a model to assist with the understanding of the detailed character of the archaeological landscape. Predictive landscape modelling was used, this assumed that land below a certain contour was too wet for human occupation in prehistoric times, this assumption is not correct as two features were found in this area which prove the land was dry at this time. The restoration will be to lakes, based on the assumption that creating more lakes helps interpret the landscapes evolution and appreciation of the Thornborough Henges, this assumption should be discounted not it is proven the land was not previously a lake but dry. The North Yorkshire and York Landscape Characterisation Project was not consulted upon in the prescribed manner. Between the first and final draft the bullet point 'Promote the design of any new mineral development in sympathy with existing landscape character or earlier stages of

Summary

The landscape setting of the monument complex on the Thornborough Moor promontory has been severely compromised by quarrying. An integrated landscape vision has been produced to inform future discussions on the management of the Thornborough Landscape. The Managing Landscape Change project is considered flawed. MLC recommends that Predictive Landscape Modelling be used to help with understanding the character of the archaeological landscape to determine whether it would be possible for further mineral extraction in the area. The modelling was based on the assumption that some of the area was a lake in prehistoric times, and so restoration to lakes would reflect this. This has been proven not to be the case as feature have been found which would only be present in dry areas. Because the modelling is based on wrong information, restoration should not be to lakes. The North Yorkshire and York Landscape Characterisation Project was not consulted upon in the prescribed manner and a controversial bullet point relating to restoration was added between the first and final draft. There should be no further extraction in the landscape setting of Thornborough Henges and should consider rectifying the damage that extraction has already done.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

landscape evolution' was inserted without appropriate consultation. This is dangerous catch all guidance as it covers a range of scenarios which may or may not be acceptable on many grounds.
Saying the area was a 'former lake' for an extended period of time is inaccurate, therefore the Predictive Landscape Model based on that assumption must be wrong.
There should be no further extraction in the landscape setting of Thornborough Henges and should consider rectifying the damage that extraction has already done.

2823

0039

Waste recycling and combined heat and power developments are supported.

Waste recycling and combined heat and power developments are supported.

3424

0173

Studies show there are 39 mt of gravel available which is more than sufficient to meet predicted demands and there are other sites in Yorkshire available. Villages such as Kirkby Fleetham, Fencote, Langton and Scruton will be ringed by industrial blight. No to industrialisation of rural areas.

39 mt of gravel available which is sufficient to meet predicted demands and other sites in Yorkshire available. Rural villages such as Kirkby Fleetham, Fencote, Langton and Scruton will be ringed by industrial blight.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3502

0332

No particular comments on the supplementary sites consultation but want to record objections to possible use of hydraulic fracturing (fracking).
 Concerned the activity will contaminate ground water and the water table and cause subsidence and make it hard to get property insurance.
 Water is used in the process and this will impact on other water supplies.
 Need to dispose of used contaminated water safely.
 Concerned about leaking of methane and its impact.
 The infrastructure will be detrimental to the visual landscape and historical character of the area.
 A major concern is the scale of the development needed to extract large volumes of gas.
 There will be an impact on the wildlife and biodiversity and noise pollution in the area

Object to fracking.
 Concerned about contamination of ground water and the water table, leaking methane, noise pollution impact on the landscape, historical character, wildlife, biodiversity and subsidence.
 Water used in the process will need to be disposed of safely.
 Concerned about the scale of development required.

3366

0016

Concerned about the impact of minerals extraction and waste disposal plans on the environment. Object to fracking. Details required about what is planned for Pocklington Airfield.

Concerned about the impact of minerals extraction and waste disposal plans on the environment. Object to fracking.

3459

0246

Not everyone possesses the internet or have access to broadband to look at the documents.
 Lack of public transport makes it difficult to access printed copies in libraries or Council offices.
 This consultation does not fit into the published timetable and seems to have been slipped in at the last minute.

Not everyone possesses the internet or have access to broadband to look at the documents.
 Lack of public transport makes it difficult to access printed copies in libraries or Council offices.
 Consultation is outside the published timetable.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary	
1352	0104	A useful and necessary initiative to populate the NYCC 'Landbank' for minerals and waste development over the next 15 years. A user friendly Response Form. It is unclear whether the four sites would be operated by one contractor who theoretically could optimise truck movements, if the sites were operated concurrently there would potentially be 18.63 truck trips per hour.	A useful and necessary initiative to provide 'Landbanks' for minerals and waste. A user friendly Response Form. It is unclear whether the four sites would be operated by one contractor who theoretically could optimise truck movements, if the sites were operated concurrently there would potentially be 18.63 truck trips per hour.	
3365	0005	A medium to long term review into the future of Harewood Whin needs to be undertaken to decide whether it is time to close the site down over a period of time while looking for other options. If the site is closed there must be a plan to render the site safe and minimise its impact on the surrounding residential areas by landscaping.	The future of Harewood Whin needs to be considered and decided if it is time for a phased closure with appropriate restoration.	
2836	***consulted under 2385****	0244	County Council, District and Local Councillors are elected to look after the interest and welfare of those they represent, it is obvious that a quarry is highly detrimental to all those in the area and an application should be refused.	County Council, District and Local Councillors are elected to look after the interest and welfare of those they represent, it is obvious that a quarry is highly detrimental to all those in the area and an application should be refused.
3485		0291	Feel that there has been very little information provided to local inhabitants regarding the proposals. Suspect that this is deliberate and I shall encourage others to vote accordingly.	Feel that there has been very little information provided to local inhabitants regarding the proposals. Suspect that this is deliberate.

Respondent No.	Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
128	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	0265	BAP habitat creation and appropriate habitats for restoration can be developed from the report attached to this response. The Living Landscapes GIS layer which NYCC have, can be used to assess appropriate restoration. Suitable habitats are included within the Living Landscapes showing potential for linking up sites. The restoration of mineral sites has great potential for following government policy in the Natural Environment White Paper and the Lawton Review 'Making Space for Nature' by making wildlife sites 'bigger, better and more joined up'.	BAP habitat creation and appropriate habitats for restoration can be developed from the report attached to this response. The Living Landscapes GIS layer can be used to assess appropriate restoration and the potential for linking up sites. The restoration of mineral sites has great potential for following government policy.
3542		0491	Do not allow fracking due to risk of water contamination and damage to the environment being too great.	Do not allow fracking due to risk of water contamination and damage to the environment being too great.
3541		0489	According to Section 16 of NPPF and NPPG 'perusing sustainable development will involve seeking positive in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment, as well as peoples quality of life which can include replacing poor design with better design' (para 9). Putting industrial activities on the land will not provide a positive improvement to the natural or historic environment. Planning policy and decisions should aim to ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area over the lifetime of the development. This proposal will not do that and additional lorry traffic is not going to be beneficial to nearby villages.	The proposal will not achieve sustainable development as will not add to the quality of the area and the increase in traffic will be detrimental to the villages.
3383		0046	Disappointed that a large scale map illustrating sites in close proximity to one another is not available.	Disappointed that a large scale map illustrating sites in close proximity to one another is not available.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary	
3375	0127	<p>Whatever is planned needs to be both environmentally sensitive and beneficial to the local community, National Parks and AONBs have in the past been deemed so after much consultation, and while nationally there is a move towards economic development in such area, this has to enhance them and not be detrimental. Economic development in the National Parks and AONBs should be related to providing sustainable local employment and housing for the children of the current residents to stop them leaving, while finding new ways of providing a sustainable income flow in both agriculture and the tourist industry.</p> <p>If the this potash application is rejected it will set the tone for future planning applications in the National Park especially in relation to fracking, and building of wind farms.</p>	<p>Planned development should be environmentally sensitive and beneficial to the local community.</p> <p>There is a move to economic development in the National Parks and AONBs, this development should be related to providing sustainable local employment and housing for local people, while funding new ways of providing a sustainable income flow in both agriculture and the tourist industry. Application approvals for large scale development in the National Park should not be allowed.</p>	
3374	0019	<p>With the new incinerator being built at Allerthorpe Hall there does not appear to be a need for any new waste sites.</p>	<p>New waste sites may not be needed when the new incinerator at Allerthorpe Hall is completed.</p>	
836	Scruton Parish Council	0089	<p>The views submitted deserve a sympathetic hearing and should be fully considered.</p>	<p>Respondents views should by fully taken into account in this process.</p>
3597	0501	<p>Object to the site as will intrude into the Green Belt which acts as a buffer zone between the landfill site and Rufforth. The proposal is industrial and so not considered 'special circumstances.'</p> <p>The proposal will increase the level of traffic on the narrow road and through the village increasing the safety risk to pedestrians.</p> <p>The original time limit should be adhered to.</p>	<p>The site will intrude onto the Green Belt, and the proposal does not constitute 'special circumstances'.</p> <p>The level of traffic will increase posing a greater safety risk to pedestrians.</p> <p>The original time limit should be adhered to.</p>	

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
1174	0376	The consultation process is ineffective and there has been a lack of community engagement at parish level. The Parish Council refused to bring the consultation to the attention of residents so it was left to individual residents to circulate the information.	The consultation process at this stage is ineffective and there has been a lack of community engagement at parish level.
2810	0399	Fracking should not be considered as too dangerous. Concerned that minerals extraction will have an adverse Impact on the environment. Main problem is impact on infrastructure over a large area and pollution from noise and fumes from the lorries. Wildlife will be impacted. Look to use new technology to deal with waste, price for recycled products lower than have been in the past. Look at local solutions to reduce transport.	Fracking should not be considered as too dangerous. Concerned that minerals extraction will have an adverse Impact on the environment. Main problem is impact on infrastructure over a large area and pollution form noise and fumes from the lorries. Wildlife will be impacted. Look to use new technology to deal with waste, price for recycled products lower than have been in the past. Look at local solutions to reduce transport.
3373	0018	Wary of gas extraction, especially fracking.	Do not support gas extraction, especially fracking
3546	0496	Communication about consultation could be better as only found out from local flyer. Will check with Parish Council is they were aware.	Communication about consultation could be better.
3371	***Consulted Under 3370*** 0012	Do not support quarrying and extraction. There is a problem with the fumes and odour from Rawcliffe sewage works and its impact on the surrounding area which needs to be sorted.	Do not support quarrying and extraction. There is a problem with the fumes and odour from Rawcliffe sewage works and its impact on the surrounding area which needs to be sorted.

Respondent No.	Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3441	****Consulted under 2904****	0210	There are only two farms between MJP43 and MJP60 so will be cumulative impact.	There are only two farms between MJP43 and MJP60 so will be cumulative impact.
3370		0009	Rawcliffe sewage plant produces a strong smell which carries to the park and ride and can be detected when driving past the site. York should make this and Rufforth a top priority.	Action needs to be taken regarding the smell generated by the Rawcliffe sewage plant and the impact on the surrounding area.
3596		0500	If fracking is to be considered then concerned that the pressurised water used with chemicals to extract the gas cannot be cleaned in order to return it to the environment, so needs to be removed from the drilling site and stored indefinitely.	If fracking being considered concerned that the water used to extract the gas cannot be treated and so needs to be stored indefinitely.
2215	CPRE (Hambleton Branch)	0108	Supply and Demand for Sand and Gravel: The original paper estimated shortfall was about 23 mt, in the period covered, against about 65 mt of estimated reserves in the various sites submitted: Most or all of that requirement could be met by extensions to existing [brownfield] workings: In the context of the NYCC commitment to developing 'policies to protect, conserve and where possible enhance' the environment [see Objective 9, p41 of the M&WJP 2014] new 'greenfield' sites should not go forward to second stage consideration.	Most of the estimated shortfall of sand and gravel could be met by extensions to existing [brownfield] workings. New 'greenfield' sites should not go forward to second stage consideration.

Respondent No.	Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
120	Historic England	0128	Many of the sites have potential to impact upon designated heritage assets. Before allocating these sites an assessment would need to be taken to evaluate what impact the proposed allocations would like have upon the elements which contribute to the significance of designated assets. Where relevant the sites should be evaluated against the framework set out in 'Managing Landscape Change: A multi-disciplinary approach to future mineral extraction in North Yorkshire'.	Many of the sites have potential to impact upon designated heritage assets. Before allocating these sites an assessment would need to be taken to evaluate what impact the proposed allocations would like have upon the elements which contribute to the significance of designated assets. Where relevant the sites should be evaluated against the framework set out in 'Managing Landscape Change: A multi-disciplinary approach to future mineral extraction in North Yorkshire'.
2310	Commercial Boat Operators Association	0282	Concerned about the extent of sand and gravel proposed from sites in Tanfield, Northallerton district and at Escrick. More consideration should be given to sustainable sources available from marine extraction. This avoids the digging the landscape with its detrimental environmental issues. There are large reserves in the North Sea which can be exploited, and carried inland on navigable waterways into Yorkshire, at little or no environmental impact. Use of water transport requires unloading wharves to be safeguarded from development.	Concerned about the extent of sand and gravel proposed from sites in Tanfield, Northallerton district and at Escrick. More consideration should be given to sustainable sources available from marine extraction. There are large reserves in the North Sea which can be exploited, and carried inland on navigable waterways into Yorkshire, at little or no environmental impact. Use of water transport requires unloading wharves to be safeguarded from development.
2011		0431	Should look to locate sites near the City of York.	Should look to locate sites near the City of York.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo Comment	Summary
121 Environment Agency	<p>0528 Developers and decision makers have a responsibility under the Water Framework Directive (WFD) to ensure proposed developments do not cause deterioration in water quality. As part of any planning application the applicant must ensure they have assessed whether the development poses an unacceptable risk of pollution to the water environment. Appropriate mitigation measures must be proposed as necessary to protect the water environment from any identified risks. Information on the water quality status of water bodies following WFD assessment can be found under the following link.</p> <p>Applicants can find further information on water resources under the following link: consult.environment-agency.gov.uk/portal/ho/wfd/draft_plans/consult?pointId=3034101</p> <p>Dependant upon the detail of the proposed activities the developments may require permits under the Environmental Permitting Regulations (2010) (as amended), unless an exemption applies. Some of the proposed allocation sites are for retention of facilities or for changes to activities at existing facilities. The applicants should contact us for further advice on the requirement for permits or applying for variations to existing permits.</p>	<p>As part of the application phase developers must ensure they have assessed whether the development poses an unacceptable risk to pollution of the water environment.</p> <p>Some applications may need an Environmental Permit</p>
92 Durham County Council	<p>0059 The cross boundary impacts on the environment and upon amenity of County Durham's local communities have been considered and no objections to any of the sites proposed are raised.</p>	<p>Do not object to any of the sites proposed.</p>

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary	
1174	0377	Further extraction in the West Tanfield area would lead to unacceptable cumulative losses to agriculture, landscape and cultural heritage as well as heritage assets of international significance. The RSPB now disagrees with the loss of farm land.	Further extraction in the West Tanfield area would lead to unacceptable cumulative losses to agriculture, landscape and cultural heritage as well as heritage assets of international significance.	
2192	Local Access Forum	0191	Felt could not provide a response until received further information regarding access arrangements for the sites. Recommends that the forms which are made public in the future should include details of access arrangements so the public has a clear understanding of the issues involved and can give informed feedback. Mitigation for the disruption of landscape and amenity during working out can be offset by improving local rights of way wither at the time or afterwards through S106s or CIL.	A full response cannot be made without further information regarding access arrangements for the sites.

3436

Jefferson Consulting Limited

0196

Restoration of old quarries could inadvertently destroy potential building stone resources, required for the conservation and repair of buildings. English Heritages' Technical Advice note 'Identifying and Sourcing Stone for Historic Repair' provides guidance on the approach to be used when replacing stone.

In the Plan area significant stone resource includes the Carboniferous sandstones and limestones in the west and, in the east, the Permian Magnesian limestone, the Jurassic Aislaby sandstone, the Calcareous Grit and Hildenley limestone, as well as Cretaceous Chalk . Magnesian limestone has been used locally on a range of buildings, including York Minster, City Walls and many other buildings in York.

A study is underway to locate long term source of magnesian limestone for a major refurbishment project at the Palace of Westminster.

It is therefore recommended that, before permission is given to close an back fill a working quarry, an opportunity is provided for the conservation stone specialist to be notified and visit and sample the site, and if stone for important work is identified that the proposal for backfilling be modified, together with retention of suitable access.

Restoration of old quarries could inadvertently destroy potential building stone resources, required for the conservation and repair of buildings. English Heritages' Technical Advice note 'Identifying and Sourcing Stone for Historic Repair' provides guidance on the approach to be used when replacing stone.

It is therefore recommended that, before permission is given to close an back fill a working quarry, an opportunity is provided for the conservation stone specialist to be notified and visit and sample the site, and if stone for important work is identified that the proposal for backfilling be modified, together with retention of suitable access.

3457

0248

Concerned about lateness of this submission, local people have not had 8 weeks to look into it as most people knew nothing until receiving information from the Parish Council in the middle of February.

Concerned about lack of publicity regarding site, did not know for full period of consultation.

2863

0107

Whilst there is a need to provide building materials/minerals for the continued development of housing and industry in this area, these proposals are fundamentally flawed. The amount of deposits projected in these schemes is small scale when put against the disruption extraction would cause the communities. There are sufficient deposits in the existing extraction sites.

The air pollution from the A1 upgrade is just beginning to abate, just as I look forward to this pollution ending I face the prospect of continual exposure to dust and its associated health problems.

The local roads (e.g. Roughley Bank) are almost in a continual state of disrepair due to the HGV traffic to the local farms and from the haulage company at Kirbkby Fleetham. This situation will only get worse, residents will not be able to enjoy walking, cycling, horse riding, jogging etc. due to the high volume of HGVs, the quality of life and tranquillity of the local community will be ruined for ever.

It is now almost impossible to sell a property in Scruton, prices have plummeted, many of the residents have planned on the financial value of their house providing for their final years, which will now have to be covered by the state.

I will once again remind you of the NYCC planning policy supposedly to protect the green belt. Local government is supposed to protect the local people and to provide a safe environment for them to live.

Whilst there is a need for building materials/minerals these proposals are fundamentally flawed. The benefits of extracting the minerals does not outweigh the disruption it would cause communities in Scruton and Kirkby Fleetham . There are sufficient deposits in the existing extraction sites.

Air pollution and exposure to dust could lead health problems. The local roads are unsuitable and the quality of life and tranquillity of the local community will be ruined. Proposals are contrary to the NYCC planning policy to protect the green belt.

Respondent No.	Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
61	National Grid Gas and Electric	0030	Data provided on the location of electricity and gas transmission networks within the North Yorkshire administrative area (See response for submitted data).	Data provided on the location of electricity and gas transmission networks within the North Yorkshire administrative area (See response for submitted data).
3604		0609	Suggest that in future any properties which are close to proposed sites should receive information directly in the post.	Suggest that in future any properties which are close to proposed sites should receive information directly in the post.
2995		0017	Oppose fracking on any site. Should end reliance on fossil fuels and move to green sustainable energy sources such as solar, wind, tidal, wave ground and air source heat pumps etc. Also need to move away from nuclear power.	Oppose fracking on any site. Move away from fossil fuels and nuclear power to renewable energy sources.
2960		0484	There must be existing quarries that can be expanded and areas of land which are more suitable for quarrying than farmland very close to villages.	Look to expand existing quarries which will not impact on agricultural land and villages.
3360		0014	Would not object as long as extraction or disposal is carried out under strict environmental controls with severe punishment in the case of failure to comply.	Would not object to extraction or disposal subject to the enforcement of strict environmental controls.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary	
3362	0015	<p>There are many negative points raised, but few positive reasons for many of the projects. Will there be any Combined Heat and Power projects for use by industry or the public at lower heating / electricity costs?</p> <p>If fracking is deemed safe and acceptable, will there be long term cheap energy to the public within 20miles of well?</p> <p>Will the road infrastructure be upgraded for the construction phase, and adequate screening of sites for sound reduction, dust and smells, so that local residents and the tourist industry is protected?</p>	<p>There are many negative points raised, but few positive reasons for many of the projects. Will there be any Combined Heat and Power projects for use by industry or the public at lower heating / electricity costs?</p> <p>If fracking is deemed safe and acceptable, will there be long term cheap energy to the public within 20miles of well?</p> <p>Will the road infrastructure be upgraded for the construction phase, and adequate screening of sites for sound reduction, dust and smells, so that local residents and the tourist industry is protected?</p>	
3364	0193	<p>Concerned about the possibility of shale gas being permitted in the area. Request that the Council holds a public meeting.</p>	<p>Concerned about the possibility of shale gas being permitted in the area. Request that the Council holds a public meeting.</p>	
2215	CPRE (Hambleton Branch)	0110	<p>Subjects, such as difficulties with longer term demand forecasts; the potential for easily accessible marine aggregates and potential for supply out-with the NYCC Joint Plan area, should be thoroughly researched before any 'greenfield' sites are progressed to the second stage.</p>	<p>A range of subjects, such as the potential for supply outside of the Joint Plan area (including marine aggregates) should be researched before any 'greenfield' sites are progressed to the second stage.</p>
3428	0182	<p>Does not support fracking as this causes damage to rock formations and the potential risk to underground water sources.</p>	<p>Fracking is not supported as this causes damage to rock formations and the potential risk to underground water sources.</p>	

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

2215

CPRE (Hambleton Branch)

0109

The Supplementary Sites Consultation includes two new Sand & Gravel extraction sites on Land to the West of Kirkby Fleetham [MJP 60] and Toft Hill, Ellerton [MJP 62]. The total of the estimated reserves in the proposed sites is increased to just over 70 mt. MJP 60 is a 'greenfield' site while MJP 62 could be considered an extension to existing/planned operations.

MJP 60 is a 'greenfield' site while MJP 62 could be considered an extension to existing/planned operations.

MJP03

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0529

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

MJP04

3589

0349

Strongly object to the site due to: noise and dust pollution; alteration to landscapes and views; the devaluation of property; traffic problems on unsuitable local roads would lead to dangerous conditions and congestion; security issue due to the proximity of the site.

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Strongly object to the site due to: noise and dust pollution; alteration to landscapes and views; traffic problems on unsuitable local roads; security issue due to the proximity of the site.

3604

0607

Objections are

- the site boundaries are too close to dwellings, especially Leckby Lodge, a bungalow on Waites Lane.
- Increased traffic on Fleethams Lane which has only one passing place, restricted visibility in parts, and already has farm traffic.
- Increased traffic on Waites Lane, especially significant since there are already large numbers of vehicles on the road, twice a day, for Cundall Manor School.
- Destruction of prime agricultural land and public footpaths.

Objections are

- The site boundaries are too close to properties.
- Increased traffic on local roads which have restricted visibility in parts and narrow in places making vehicle passing difficult.
- There will be destruction of prime agricultural land and public footpaths.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo Comment	Summary
121 Environment Agency	<p>0565 The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>The site contains an area within flood zone 2, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:</p> <p>detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site details of mitigation measures surface water runoff the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.</p> <p>The results of a clear and transparent sequential and test</p> <p>If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.</p> <p>Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it</p>	<p>The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>The site contains an area within flood zone 2, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:</p> <p>detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site details of mitigation measures surface water runoff the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site. the results of a clear and transparent sequential and test</p> <p>If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example</p>

must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

MJP05

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0566

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site is dissected by Percy Beck, an ordinary watercourse. If the site is covered by an Internal Drainage Board (IDB), the applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide

main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded. In the absence of an IBD the role is performed by the Lead Local Flood Authority – North Yorkshire County Council.

sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site is dissected by Percy Beck, an ordinary watercourse. If the site is covered by an Internal Drainage Board (IDB), the applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded. In the absence of an IBD the role is performed by the Lead Local Flood Authority – North Yorkshire County Council.

MJP06

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0567 The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site
detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development
examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site
details of mitigation measures surface water runoff the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.

The results of a clear and transparent sequential and test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal

The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site
detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours
details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development
examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site
details of mitigation measures surface water runoff
the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.

The results of a clear and transparent sequential and test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example

should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding

structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the

surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

1174

0378

Support English Heritage's comments against this site provided during the Issues and Options Consultation. Concerned about the sites impact on archaeological features in the area.

Support English Heritage's comments against this site provided during the Issues and Options Consultation. Concerned about the sites impact on archaeological features in the area.

MJP07

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0568

The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site
detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development
examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site
details of mitigation measures surface water runoff the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.

The results of a clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal

The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site
detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours
details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development
examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site
details of mitigation measures surface water runoff
the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.

The results of a clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example

should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding

structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the

surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

1174

0379

Support English Heritage's comments against this site provided during the Issues and Options Consultation. Concerned about the sites impact on archaeological features in the area.

Support English Heritage's comments against this site provided during the Issues and Options Consultation. Concerned about the sites impact on archaeological features in the area.

MJP08

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0530

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates
Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

MJP10

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0531

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

MJP11

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0532

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

MJP12

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0533

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

MJP13

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0561

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

MJP14

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0569

We have been consulted on a planning application at this site under reference NY/2011/0429/ENV. Please see our response that consultation.

The following flood risk comments disregard the previous planning application consultation we have received and the details therein. They provide general information should a further application be made.

The application is split over 2 areas, and will be referred to as north and south sites.

The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site (North & South) lies within the high risk flood zone 3, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

- detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site
- detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours
- details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development
- examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site
- details of mitigation measures
- surface water runoff
- the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.
- The results of a clear and transparent sequential and exception tests

We have been consulted on a planning application at this site under reference NY/2011/0429/ENV. Please see our response that consultation.

The following flood risk comments disregard the previous planning application consultation we have received and the details therein. They provide general information should a further application be made.

The application is split over 2 areas, and will be referred to as north and south sites.

The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site (North & South) lies within the high risk flood zone 3, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

- detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site
- detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours
- details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development

(North) If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

(North) Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route.

The River Ure is classified as a main river. Our formal consent will be required, under the Water Resources Act 1991, for any works in, over, under, or within 8m of a main river and / or a flood defence.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1

examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site
 details of mitigation measures
 surface water runoff
 the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.

the results of a clear and transparent sequential and exception tests

(North) If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

(North) Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route.

The River Ure is classified as a main river. Our formal consent will be required, under the Water Resources Act 1991, for any works in, over, under, or within 8m of a main river and / or a flood defence.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the

year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

MJP16

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0570 The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site
detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours
details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development
examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site
details of mitigation measures
surface water runoff
the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.
The results of a clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route.

Swinney Beck is classified as a main river. Our formal consent will be required, under the Water Resources Act

The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site
detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours
details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development
examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site
details of mitigation measures
surface water runoff
the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.
The results of a clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example

1991, for any works in, over, under, or within 8m of a main river and / or a flood defence.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

We would support flood storage areas being

structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route.

Swinney Beck is classified as a main river. Our formal consent will be required, under the Water Resources Act 1991, for any works in, over, under, or within 8m of a main river and / or a flood defence.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

MJP17

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0571 The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site
 detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours
 details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development
 examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site
 details of mitigation measures
 surface water runoff
 the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site. The results of a clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal,

The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site
 detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours
 details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development
 examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site
 details of mitigation measures
 surface water runoff
 the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.
 The results of a clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example

which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as

structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the

non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

MJP21

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo Comment	Summary
121 Environment Agency	<p>0572 We have been consulted on a planning application at this site under reference NY/2010/0356/ENV. Please see our response that consultation.</p> <p>The following flood risk comments disregard the previous planning application consultation we have received and the details therein. They provide general information should a further application be made.</p> <p>The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>This site lies within land outlined as a possible extension to functional floodplain FZ3b. Therefore the LPA should consider this when assessing site suitability in the sequential test.</p> <p>The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3, and within an area outlined in the Richmondshire SFRA as a possible extension to functional floodplain 3b, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site details of mitigation measures surface water runoff the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and 	<p>We have been consulted on a planning application at this site under reference NY/2010/0356/ENV. Please see our response that consultation.</p> <p>The following flood risk comments disregard the previous planning application consultation we have received and the details therein. They provide general information should a further application be made.</p> <p>The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>This site lies within land outlined as a possible extension to functional floodplain FZ3b. Therefore the LPA should consider this when assessing site suitability in the sequential test.</p> <p>The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3, and within an area outlined in the Richmondshire SFRA as a possible extension to functional floodplain 3b, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground

egress to and from the site.

The results of a clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted.

For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route. Spoil to be stored outside of the floodplain.

The River Swale is classified as a main river. Our formal consent will be required, under the Water Resources Act 1991, for any works in, over, under, or within 8m of a main river and / or a flood defence.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the

contours details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site details of mitigation measures surface water runoff the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site. The results of a clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route. Spoil to be stored outside of the floodplain.

The River Swale is classified as a main river. Our formal consent will be required, under the Water Resources Act 1991, for any works in, over, under, or within 8m of a main river and / or a flood defence.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a

site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in

30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3437

0219

Object to proposal.
 There is already adequate existing capacity for minerals so new sites not required.
 There will be adverse landscape and visual impact in the short, medium and long term.
 The proposal would destroy local wildlife.
 The noise and vibration would affect the village of Kirkby Fleetham.
 Will be dust and air quality issues for residents.
 There will be a detrimental impact on the local highway network, and highway and pedestrian safety. The road will be less accessible to non motorised road users leading to a loss in local amenities.
 There will be a loss of prime agricultural land.

There is a lack of need for the site.
 Concerned about impact on the landscape, agricultural land, wildlife and visual impact on the nearby village,
 The residential amenity will be affected by noise, vibration and dust and air quality will be affected.
 There will be a detrimental impact on the local highway network making it less accessible to non motorised users.

3495

0437

Concerned about significant increase in HGV traffic, pollution of environment and the unknown impact on wildlife.

Concerned about significant increase in HGV traffic, pollution of environment and the unknown impact on wildlife.

3509

0422

Roads around the site are very narrow and already hazardous and could not cope with the increase in heavy traffic.
 There would be a loss of amenities for walkers, cyclists and horse riders using footpaths and bridleways.
 Concerned about noise light and dust pollution in close proximity to residential properties.
 Would be a loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats.
 The site is in close proximity to a conservation village and surrounding access roads are not suitable for any increase in traffic.

Concerned roads around the site are narrow and not suitable for heavy vehicles.
 There would be a loss of amenities for footpath and bridleway users.
 Concerned about noise light and dust pollution in close proximity to residential properties.
 Would be a loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats.
 The site is in close proximity to a conservation village

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3494	0323	If there are problems on the A1 diversions lead traffic in and around Kirkby Fleetham Village. HGVs should not use country roads they are a danger to other road users (walker, cyclists etc.) . Concerned about dust pollution, loss of views, agricultural land and wildlife habitats.	Concerned about increased HGV movements on country road, dust pollution, loss of view, loss of agricultural land and loss of habitats.
3508	0424	Concerned about increase in heavy vehicles and impact on safety of other road users. Concerned about noise increase and dust pollution close to rural areas and a conservation village. Concerns about impact on wildlife habitats and agricultural land. Concerned about impact on social wellbeing, accommodating non motorised road users and wildlife. Concerned about the size of the site in relation to the village.	Concerned about increase in heavy vehicles and impact on safety of other road users. Concerned about noise increase and dust pollution close to rural areas and a conservation village. Concerns about impact on wildlife habitats and agricultural land. Concerned about impact on social wellbeing, accommodating non motorised road users and wildlife. Concerned about the size of the site in relation to the village.
2011	0427	There would be a dramatic increase of large vehicle movement along country lanes creating hazards for other road users. There will be noise, dust and fumes polluting the environment. Kirkby Fleetham could end up surrounded by quarry sites.	Concerned that there will be an increase of large vehicle movements along the country lanes posing a hazard to other road users. Concerned about pollution from noise, dust and fumes. Concerned about cumulative impact if all quarries go ahead.
3403	0117	The cumulative impact of the proposed sites (MJP60, MJP33 and MJP43) would change the rural nature of the area to one of industrialisation impacting upon the quality of life, public amenity (including tranquillity) and tourism of the area.	The cumulative impact of the proposed sites (MJP60, MJP33 and MJP43) should be considered.

MJP22

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0573 The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site
 detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development
 examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site
 details of mitigation measures surface water runoff the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site. The results of a clear and transparent sequential and exception tests

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route. Spoil to be stored outside of the floodplain.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved

The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site
 detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours
 details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development
 examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site
 details of mitigation measures surface water runoff
 the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.
 the results of a clear and transparent sequential and exception tests

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example

Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Danvm DC Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also

structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route. Spoil to be stored outside of the floodplain.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any

contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded.

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Danvm DC Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded.

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

MJP23

3386

0061

Objects due to the potential impact on the course of the roman road and Crag wood.

Objects due to the potential impact on the course of the roman road and Crag wood.

128

Yorkshire Wildlife Trust

0254

This will create a SINC site isolated from neighbouring habitat and be very vulnerable to species loss. Are alternatives available? A restoration of the quarry entirely to nature conservation might mitigate this if a long term plan for management was included.

This site will lead to the isolation of a SINC from neighbouring habitat and very vulnerable to species loss. Restoration to nature conservation might mitigate this if a long term plan for management was included.

3578

0390

The water table is high, some residences rely on a bore hole and the water is used in the brewing industry, so concerned about potential contamination.
The traffic on the narrow lanes would increase considerably, when an active site there were some accidents so extra traffic poses a safety issue for other road users. Also the 2 junctions leading to Jackdaw Crag would be a concern with increased number of lorries.

The water table is high and some properties and businesses rely on the water so concerned about potential contamination.
The traffic on the narrow lanes and junctions would increase considerably and poses a safety risk for other road users.

The site is close to an area of significant history, the site could change the natural beauty and peaceful nature of the landscape.

The site is close to a site of significant history and the landscape and natural beauty could be affected.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo Comment	Summary
3590	<p>0354 The site will impact on Old London Road. There is a nearby site of an ancient Saxon court, the ancient woodland of Crag Wood and site of the Battle of Towton.</p> <p>Our residence is an old Catholic School and there is a cross near the top of the hill which is a pilgrimage site.</p> <p>Concerned about the impact on the amenity of non motorised road users who use the roads. The area is Green Belt and heavily used for leisure.</p> <p>The lanes are too narrow for the site traffic and is not able to be widened, some of the trees have tree preservation orders on them.</p> <p>Already suffer from noise and vibration from the existing quarry and concerned about potential damage to the property. Concerned about cumulative impact if more sites allowed in the area.</p> <p>The local environment would be affected and amenity of residents and visitors.</p>	<p>Concerned the site will impact on local archaeological sites.</p> <p>Concerned about the impact on the amenity of non motorised road users who use the roads. The area is Green Belt and heavily used for leisure.</p> <p>The lanes are too narrow for the site traffic and is not able to be widened, some of the trees have tree preservation orders on them.</p> <p>Already impacted by noise and vibration from existing quarry and worried about cumulative impact if more sites allowed, especially to structure of buildings.</p> <p>The local environment and amenity of residents and visitors would be affected.</p>
1352	<p>0099 Western extension - there is a gas valve compound and high tension electricity transmission line in close proximity to extension area.</p> <p>Southern extension - no objections but residents close by will be impacted.</p> <p>Eastern extension - concerned that blasting will cause structural damage to nearby properties. There will be an increased impact on local and residential amenity in terms of noise, dust, visibility, landscaping and screening. Crag Wood occupies part of the Jackdaw Crag site and is a Local Wildlife site, if the eastern extension is worked the wood would become isolated and inaccessible to all wildlife except birds. Concerned that if the extension is worked it may impact on the aquifer.</p> <p>Provided photos of views.</p>	<p>Western extension - utility apparatus close to the site.</p> <p>Southern extension - no objections but may impact residents close to the extension area.</p> <p>Eastern extension - concerned about impact of blasting on nearby properties. Concerned about increased impact on local and residential amenity due to dust, noise, visibility, landscaping and screening. Concerned about impact on Crag Wood which is a Local Wildlife Site.</p>

1350

0125

Object to extension to the site. Nearby residents are adversely impacted by noise, dust and damage when the current quarry is blasting. The Magnesian limestone from the quarry is soft and of very low quality. The existing quarry is a blot on the landscape. Concerned the existing or proposed site will impact on the quality of the water in the area as a geological fault runs through the quarry. To the west of the site are big electric power cables and a high pressure gas pipeline. To the south the quarry is already close to Warren House Farm and a southern extension would have a greater impact. To the east a greater number of houses would be affected, as well as Crag Wood, which the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust call a 'Local Wildlife Site', if this extension goes ahead the woodland would become isolated. It would be more feasible to extend the site to the north if Moor Lane is rerouted and the quarry extends to a few hundred yards off the A64. The current quarry has certain conditions imposed on it, one of which is having a wheel wash, which has not been installed, instead the road is washed by a bowser which in winter washes salt away and can make the road icy. The quarry does not support the local economy as no locals work there, and it poses a risk to the local brewing industry.

Object to extension to the site. Nearby residents are adversely impacted by noise, dust and damage when the current quarry is blasting. The Magnesian limestone from the quarry is soft and of very low quality. The existing quarry is a blot on the landscape. Concerned the existing or proposed site will impact on the quality of the water in the area as a geological fault runs through the quarry. There are constraints associated with each proposed extension. The existing quarry does not adhere to certain conditions imposed upon it and it does not support the local economy.

3376

0028

Contrary to what Darrington Quarry say, the blasting process used to extract stone, is undoubtedly a problem in my house. It cannot be good for the fabric of the building.

Objects to blasting at the site.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3608

Oxton Farms

0283

The site is located within the Green Belt and locally important Landscape Area, and has the potential to have effects on economically critical underlying water resources.

The potential extension to an existing site will cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt and its purpose. The proposal would likely harm the character and visual amenity of the area, and the amenity of neighbouring residents.

The quality of water within the aquifer underlying the site will also be put at substantial risk by development of the site. The continued quality of this resource is critical in ensuring the short term and long term health of the key brewing industry in the area.

The additional areas proposed appear to include the route of a high power electricity line, and are in close proximity to the main A64 Trunk road. The feasibility, implications and the cost of these constraints need to be fully explored before any allocation of this land can be made.

Notwithstanding the western parcel of land is owned and farmed by our Client and will not be made available for development or mineral extraction.

The site is located within the Green Belt and locally important Landscape Area, and has the potential to have effects on economically critical underlying water resources.

The potential extension to an existing site will cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt and its purpose. The proposal would likely harm the character and visual amenity of the area, and the amenity of neighbouring residents.

The quality of water within the aquifer underlying the site will also be put at substantial risk by development of the site. The continued quality of this resource is critical in ensuring the short term and long term health of the key brewing industry in the area.

The additional areas proposed appear to include the route of a high power electricity line, and are in close proximity to the main A64 Trunk road. The feasibility, implications and the cost of these constraints need to be fully explored before any allocation of this land can be made.

Notwithstanding the western parcel of land is owned and farmed by our Client and will not be made available for development or mineral extraction.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

1503

0350

The southern part of the site is in very close proximity to Warren House Farm and Warren Cottages and would cause extreme disturbance and danger to the inhabitants.

The eastern extension will bring the site in close proximity to residential dwellings which would be affected by blasting operations, causing damage. There would be an increase in dust and noise pollution, not just for neighbouring properties but also for the village of Stutton. It will destroy the wildlife environment of Crag Wood, a local nature reserve. The stone in the area is likely to be poor quality.

Objects to the site (southern extension area) due to proximity to residential properties.
Objects to the site (eastern extension) due to proximity to residential properties, increase noise and dust, and loss of natural habitats of Crag Wood.

120

Historic England

0129

This site lies 1.6 km from the northern edge of the Registered Battlefield of Towton.
· There are several Listed Buildings around Hazelwood Castle (1.6 km to the south-west of this area) including the Grade I Listed Hazelwood Castle and the Roman Catholic Chapel of St Leonard
· The section of Roman Road 2.3 km to the west is a Scheduled Monument.

This site lies 1.6 km from the northern edge of the Registered Battlefield of Towton.
· There are several Listed Buildings around Hazelwood Castle (1.6 km to the south-west of this area) including the Grade I Listed Hazelwood Castle and the Roman Catholic Chapel of St Leonard
· The section of Roman Road 2.3 km to the west is a Scheduled Monument.

3603

0474

This would extend the quarry significantly closer to houses along the old London Road increasing noise, dust and vibrations. It would be closer to Stutton so noise and dust would be carried by the prevailing winds and affect more of the properties there.
There would be increased lorry traffic along country roads used by cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders.
The habitat around Crag Wood would be destroyed.

Concerned about the impact of noise, dust and vibrations will have on local properties.
Concerned about increased HGV traffic on country roads and the impact on other road users.
Concerned about the impact on the wildlife habitat.

114

Ministry of Defence

0048

This site does not fall within any statutory safeguarding zones.

This site does not fall within any statutory safeguarding zones.

Respondent No.	Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3453	***Consulted under 1352***	0225	<p>Not in favour of extension to existing quarry as blasting currently causes nearby houses to shake, and the extension is nearer to houses so could affect the structure of the buildings.</p> <p>Would be a greater impact from the noise and dust at nearby houses as will lose the protection of a rise in the ground. The prevailing wind carries dust to the houses, so if site allowed this would continue for longer.</p> <p>An increase in HGV traffic will exacerbate existing issues for horse riders, cyclists and walkers as is sometimes hazardous.</p>	<p>Object to extension to the quarry as blasting will cause nearby houses to shake and may affect structure.</p> <p>There would be an impact on amenity due to noise and dust pollution and prevailing wind.</p> <p>An increase in HGVs on the roads will make current issues for non motorised users worse and more hazardous.</p>
61	National Grid Gas and Electric	0031	<p>This site is crossed by an overhead electricity line (XC 275 kV) and a high pressure gas pipeline (FM07). Health and Safety Executive guidance applies to this site in the form of the HSE Planning Advice for Development near to Hazardous Installations (PADHI) process when assessing proposals for planning developments. See full response for further details.</p>	<p>This site is crossed by an overhead electricity line and a high pressure gas pipeline, therefore HSE PADHI guidance applies.</p>
3455		0232	<p>Share the views of respondent 1352. Particularly concerned about the increase in traffic using Old London Road, it is narrow, uneven and has several blind bends and is the access to farms and 25 local residences. The lane is also used by a large number of walkers, horse riders and children on bicycles and is unsuitable for a high volume of heavy lorries which would pose a danger to other road users.</p> <p>The noise dust and pollution could result in long term health problems and disruption to wildlife in the area.</p>	<p>Concerned about increase in heavy lorries which will use Old London Road which is an access to farms and residences. It is narrow with blind bends and used by non motorised users so extra lorries would pose a hazard.</p> <p>There will be noise and dust pollution which could have an impact on health and wildlife.</p>

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0574

As stated in our Groundwater Protection Guide (GP3), within Source Protection Zone 1 (SPZ1), we will normally object in principle to any planning application for a development that may physically disturb an aquifer. In many cases quarries go below the water table and therefore can cause physical disturbance to an aquifer. Consequently, we would object to any new quarry developments that proposed to extract sub water table in SPZ1.

One of the main concerns the EA have when it comes to quarry restoration is the risk that infilling quarry voids poses to the water environment. We would look for only inert materials to be used as quarry infill, but the ideal is if quarries are left unfilled. Specifically, we would ask that quarry restoration schemes avoid the infilling of the void in order to return it to agricultural land. Open holes are more protective of groundwater as the infill materials have the potential to introduce contaminants into the water environment.

GP3 states that we will object to all planning applications for landfill sites within SPZ1.

As stated in our Groundwater Protection Guide (GP3), within Source Protection Zone 1 (SPZ1), we will normally object in principle to any planning application for a development that may physically disturb an aquifer. In many cases quarries go below the water table and therefore can cause physical disturbance to an aquifer. Consequently, we would object to any new quarry developments that proposed to extract sub water table in SPZ1.

One of the main concerns the EA have when it comes to quarry restoration is the risk that infilling quarry voids poses to the water environment. We would look for only inert materials to be used as quarry infill, but the ideal is if quarries are left unfilled.

Specifically, we would ask that quarry restoration schemes avoid the infilling of the void in order to return it to agricultural land. Open holes are more protective of groundwater as the infill materials have the potential to introduce contaminants into the water environment.

GP3 states that we will object to all planning applications for landfill sites within SPZ1.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0535

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

MJP24

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0560

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

MJP26

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0562

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

MJP27

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0575

As stated within GP3, inside SPZ1 we will object to proposals for new development of non-landfill waste operations where we believe the operation poses an intrinsic hazard to groundwater.

For any other non-landfill waste operations that are proposed in SPZ1, when considering any environmental permit application we will usually require detailed risk assessment and additional mitigation measures to be put in place to manage any risks to groundwater. Accordingly, we will raise this as a serious concern when responding to any planning application consultation. In sensitive groundwater locations, we will therefore strongly encourage parallel tracked environmental permit applications with planning applications.

Outside SPZ1 we will agree to proposals for new developments of non-landfill waste operations where risks can be appropriately controlled by an environmental permit or a relevant waste exemption.

As stated within GP3, inside SPZ1 we will object to proposals for new development of non-landfill waste operations where we believe the operation poses an intrinsic hazard to groundwater.

For any other non-landfill waste operations that are proposed in SPZ1, when considering any environmental permit application we will usually require detailed risk assessment and additional mitigation measures to be put in place to manage any risks to groundwater. Accordingly, we will raise this as a serious concern when responding to any planning application consultation. In sensitive groundwater locations, we will therefore strongly encourage parallel tracked environmental permit applications with planning applications.

Outside SPZ1 we will agree to proposals for new developments of non-landfill waste operations where risks can be appropriately controlled by an environmental permit or a relevant waste exemption.

121

Environment Agency

0563

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates
Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

MJP28

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0536

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Respondent No.	Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
128	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	0255	There is potential for BAP habitat to be created which might be possible to link to Yorkshire Wildlife Trust Living Landscapes. Magnesian limestone grassland at our nearby Brockadale Nature Reserve might supply green hay for restoration.	Potential for BAP habitat creation linked to Yorkshire Wildlife Trust Living Landscapes. Magnesian limestone grassland at our nearby Brockadale Nature Reserve might supply green hay for restoration.
3386		0057	Object to the site due to loss of woodland.	Object to the site due to loss of woodland.
114	Ministry of Defence	0049	This site does not fall within any statutory safeguarding zones.	This site does not fall within any statutory safeguarding zones.
121	Environment Agency	0576	We have been consulted on a planning application at this site under reference NY/2014/0393/ENV. As of the date of this letter we have not responded to that consultation. Please consult our response in due course.	We have been consulted on a planning application at this site under reference NY/2014/0393/ENV. As of the date of this letter we have not responded to that consultation. Please consult our response in due course.

Respondent No.	Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
120	Historic England	0130	There is a Scheduled Monument (a multivallate enclosure) 2.1 km to the north-east of this area · There is a group of Grade II LBS at Campsmount Farm 2.3 km to the south-east of this area	There is a Scheduled Monument (a multivallate enclosure) 2.1 km to the north-east of this area · There is a group of Grade II LBS at Campsmount Farm 2.3 km to the south-east of this area
3372		0020	Would like to see the site progressed as would have minimal impact on the general public, and the quarry site could be given protection from anyone who wants to see work being done here.	Support progressing this site, provide screening if required.

MJP29

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0537

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

121

Environment Agency

0577

We have been consulted on a planning application at this site under reference NY/2014/0113/ENV. Please see our response that consultation.

We have been consulted on a planning application at this site under reference NY/2014/0113/ENV. Please see our response that consultation.

MJP30

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0538

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

MJP31

Respondent No.	Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3436	Jefferson Consulting Limited	0200	If this site were considered acceptable it would reduce the possibility of stone being lost.	If this site were considered acceptable it would reduce the possibility of stone being lost.
3569		0405	<p>The site is unsuitable for quarrying due to the environmental issues associated with quarrying in a residential area. The road access is unsuitable as is a single track road and heavy traffic will cause disruption and a safety hazard for other road users. An alternative access is not feasible and the road is unadopted. Operating noise, vibrations and dust would cause environmental and social problems for residencies in the area. Quarrying should be carried out way from residences and the Green Belt.</p> <p>The site has archaeological and historical significance and will be impacted by the development.</p> <p>The development will not bring significant employment to the area.</p>	<p>Concerned about impact on the environment.</p> <p>The road access is single track, unadopted and unsuitable for heavy traffic, concerned about disruption and safety hazard to other road users and residents.</p> <p>Noise, vibrations and dust would cause environmental and social problems for residents. The Green Belt will be impacted.</p> <p>Archaeological and historical features will be impacted.</p> <p>The site will not provide employment for many local people.</p>

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3603

0476

HGV traffic on Old London Road would be a hazard to other road users especially non motorised ones. The recreational amenity of residents would be affected.
The HGV traffic would increase noise and dust pollution.

HGV traffic on Old London Road would be a hazard to other road users especially non motorised ones. The recreational amenity of residents would be affected.
The HGV traffic would increase noise and dust pollution.

3455

0233

Share the views of respondent 1352. Particularly concerned about the increase in traffic using Old London Road, it is narrow, uneven and has several blind bends and is the access to farms and 25 local residences. The lane is also used by a large number of walkers, horse riders and children on bicycles and is unsuitable for a high volume of heavy lorries which would pose a danger to other road users.
The noise dust and pollution could result in long term health problems and disruption to wildlife in the area.

Concerned about increase in heavy lorries which will use Old London Road which is an access to farms and residences. It is narrow with blind bends and used by non motorised users so extra lorries would pose a hazard. There will be noise and dust pollution which could have an impact on health and wildlife.

3584

0458

Strongly opposed to any increase in quarrying in the area due to: concern over damage to the water table and water supply to local dwellings via borehole; increase in dust and noise pollution; proximity to residential dwellings; disturbance to residents, cattle and wildlife; increase in HGV traffic on inadequate roads creating danger to other road users, the nearby school and leaving excess mud on roads.

Strongly opposed to the site due to: damage to the water table and local water supply; increase in dust and noise pollution; proximity to residential dwellings; disturbance to residents, cattle and wildlife; increase in HGV traffic.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3453

Consulted under 1352

0226

The access to the site has changed over time, there are several blind bends which has increased the hazard of using the road which is not helped by the growth of trees, hedging and weeds/grass which affect visibility. The verges are not cut and so make the roads narrower, which is mainly single track, plus there are fewer verges available due to water erosion causing ditches and fallen trees and boulders making it more difficult for none motorised users. The junction at Beech Tree Crossroads has poor visibility do poses a hazard when HGVs and other road users meet.

Beech Tree Crossroad and the access road to the site are narrow, largely single track, with blind bends, overgrown trees, hedges and vegetation which affect visibility, there are fewer verges due to water erosion and HGVs using this road has an impact on non motorised users.

3572

0400

Concerned about safety of pedestrians, the number of people who use the proposed access is high, includes walkers, cyclists, dog walkers and horse-riders. The road is single track with restricted visibility. An increase in HGVs will pose a serious risk to other non motorised road users. Concerned about potential contamination of the local water supply which is from a borehole.

The access road is single track with restricted visibility. An increase in HGVs will pose a serious risk to other non motorised road users who use the lane. Concerned about potential contamination of the local water supply which is from a borehole.

1352

0100

Present principle access to Old London Road Quarries is via Moor Lane to Beech Tree Crossroads, then south up over Wingate Hill towards Cocksford hamlet. A safer more direct access could be gained from the south east and should be investigated. Only part of the access road has been adopted and it is unclear who is responsible for the maintenance of the rest. The road is surface and sub base is potholing and breaking up badly and requires constant maintenance. The roads being used by site traffic are narrow, road verges have encroached onto the highway and trees have overgrown over the roads forcing high sided vehicles into the middle of the road.

There are concerns about road safety due to speed of traffic and a traffic calming system should be considered on the Old London Road at its intersection with Moor Lane, Stutton Road and Wheeling Gate.

Operational matters will have an impact on local residents, these include noise, dust, vibrations, smell, vermin, wind blown rubbish, birds and visual impact.

Photos of views of the site were provided

Provided additional information on a spread sheet which attempts to analyse the frequency of truck movements (empty inbound and loaded outbound) using statistics supplied on the data sheet provided by the Council.

Estimates that there will be one truck trip every 13 minutes of each working day for 20 years, this cannot be supported using existing access tracks, equates to 4.63 trucks per hour

A safer more direct access to the site should be investigated. The road infrastructure is inadequate to support an increase in heavy site traffic and maintenance is an issue. The roads are narrow and there are concerns about road safety, traffic calming should be looked into.

Operational matters will have an impact on local residents, these include noise, dust, vibrations, smell, vermin, wind blown rubbish, birds and visual impact. Provided additional information which estimates that there will be 4.63 truck trips and hour.

Respondent No. Name

1503

CommentNo Comment

0342

Old London Road is unsuitable for lorries and is used for leisure and recreational purposes. To the south the road is narrow in places and to the north the road is wider but still unsuitable for more than one vehicle can is extremely dangerous in places (blind bends, and choke points). The Stutton Beech crossroads are dangerous in its current form. The area is historically significant due to the Battle of Towton, the opening of quarries would destroy the historic significance of the area.

Consideration should be given to accessing the site from an alternative direction, such as the old railway line .

Summary

Concerned about traffic impacts of the site on the narrow roads and the existing junctions (Stutton beech crossroads). Consideration should be given to accessing the site from an alternative direction, such as the old railway line. Concerned about the damage to the historic significance of the area.

121

Environment Agency

0539

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

121 Environment Agency

0578

The site is next to an active landfill site - Old London Road Quarries. The applicant should satisfy themselves of any risks.

The site is next to an active landfill site - Old London Road Quarries. The applicant should satisfy themselves of any risks.

3590

0355

The site will impact on Old London Road. There is a nearby site of an ancient Saxon court, the ancient woodland of Crag Wood and site of the Battle of Towton. Our residence is an old Catholic School and there is a cross near the top of the hill which is a pilgrimage site. Concerned about the impact on the amenity of non motorised road users who use the roads. The area is Green Belt and heavily used for leisure. The lanes are too narrow for the site traffic and is not able to be widened, some of the trees have tree preservation orders on them. Already suffer from noise and vibration from the existing quarry and concerned about potential damage to the property. Concerned about cumulative impact if more sites allowed in the area. The local environment would be affected and amenity of residents and visitors.

Concerned the site will impact on local archaeological sites. Concerned about the impact on the amenity of non motorised road users who use the roads. The area is Green Belt and heavily used for leisure. The lanes are too narrow for the site traffic and is not able to be widened, some of the trees have tree preservation orders on them. Already impacted by noise and vibration from existing quarry and worried about cumulative impact if more sites allowed, especially to structure of buildings. The local environment and amenity of residents and visitors would be affected.

Respondent No. Name

1350

CommentNo Comment

0151

Object to the site. In combination with MJP53 , MJP58 and WJP04 and MJP23 the area would be surrounded by quarries. The area is used by walkers, cyclists, runners and horse riders.

Access to the site should be considered, access up Wingate Hill is not acceptable. Consideration should be given to using the disused railway from Towton Bar, Old London Road runs from the Rockingham Arms at Towton straight into the quarry, and possible access from A64/A659 past white Quarry Farm to Old London Road.

Summary

Object to the site. In combination with MJP53 , MJP58 and WJP04 and MJP23 the area would be surrounded by quarries. The area is used by walkers, cyclists, runners and horse riders.

Access to the site should be considered, access up Wingate Hill is not acceptable. Consideration should be given to using the disused railway from Towton Bar, Old London Road runs from the Rockingham Arms at Towton straight into the quarry, and possible access from A64/A659 past white Quarry Farm to Old London Road.

3578

0391

The water table is high, some residences rely on a bore hole and the water is used in the brewing industry, so concerned about potential contamination.

The traffic on the narrow lanes would increase considerably, when an active site there were some accidents so extra traffic poses a safety issue for other road users. Also the 2 junctions leading to Jackdaw Crag would be a concern with increased number of lorries.

The site is close to an area of significant history, the site could change the natural beauty and peaceful nature of the landscape.

The water table is high and some properties and businesses rely on the water so concerned about potential contamination.

The traffic on the narrow lanes and junctions would increase considerably and poses a safety risk for other road users.

The site is close to a site of significant history and the landscape and natural beauty could be affected.

Respondent No. Name

3581

CommentNo Comment

0367

The site is located within an Environment Agency designated Source Protection Zone, Yorkshire Water have previously stated that 'extraction and waste management should be restricted in these areas.'

The hamlet of Cocksford relies solely upon drinking water drawn from a private borehole within the Source Protection Zone so residents would require further details regarding development in the area.

Any impact on the groundwater will affect local breweries as they use the water in their process.

There will be a large increase in lorry traffic and Old London Road is not suitable to deal with the increase, and would cause problems for residents accessing their properties. The lane would have to be maintained as it is unadopted. This site sits to one side of Old London Road, so a new route to Cocksford may be required.

The site would have an impact on historic assets in the area such as Towton Battlefield and Old London Road itself which is recognised by English Heritage.

The east bank of Cock Beck is a Significant Site of Nature Conservation and the area contains ancient woodland and these would be impacted by the development of the site.

A previous application to relocate a small part of Old London Road was refused.

The residents of Cocksford experience flooding, proposals would be expected to assist in mitigation of any enhanced flood risk resulting from reduced flood storage associated with the loss of land mass, topsoil and vegetation, MJP31 in particular would result in the loss of agricultural land.

Dust and noise from extraction will have a significant impact on surrounding residential properties and communities.

Summary

The site is within a designated Source Protection Zone and extraction should be restricted in these areas. One hamlet relies solely on water from within this protection zone so residents would require further details regarding the site. If the groundwater is affected then it will affect the quality of the product local breweries produce.

Old London Road is not suitable to deal with the proposed increase in heavy traffic and residents would have problems accessing their properties. The lane would have to be maintained as it is unadopted. This site sits to one side of Old London Road, so a new route to Cocksford may be required.

There would be an impact on historic assets in the area.

There is a SINC and ancient woodland in the area which would be affected, and there would be a loss of agricultural land. Mitigation would be expected to help minimise flooding.

MJP32

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0540

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

MJP33

3513

0434

This site is inappropriate as it disrupts the living conditions and health of local residents, animals and their ecosystems. Other sites away from villages need to be considered. Evidence from Asarco Smelter in Tacoma, Wasingtin, USA suggests that quarry sites lead to harm and contamination to people, animals and the environment web link: <http://yosemite.epa.gov/RIO/CLEANUP.NSF/sites/Asarco>

Inappropriate site which disrupts the living conditions and health of local residents, animals and their ecosystems.

3495

0438

Concerned about significant increase in HGV traffic, pollution of environment and the unknown impact on wildlife.

Concerned about significant increase in HGV traffic, pollution of environment and the unknown impact on wildlife.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3437

0220

Object to proposal.
 There is already adequate existing capacity for minerals so new sites not required.
 There will be adverse landscape and visual impact in the short, medium and long term.
 The proposal would destroy local wildlife.
 The noise and vibration would affect the village of Kirkby Fleetham.
 Will be dust and air quality issues for residents.
 There will be a detrimental impact on the local highway network, and highway and pedestrian safety. The road will be less accessible to non motorised road users leading to a loss in local amenities.
 There will be a loss of prime agricultural land.

There is a lack of need for the site.
 Concerned about impact on the landscape, agricultural land, wildlife and visual impact on the nearby village,
 The residential amenity will be affected by noise, vibration and dust and air quality will be affected.
 There will be a detrimental impact on the local highway network making it less accessible to non motorised users.

3509

0420

Concerned about increase in transport along single lane country roads which will be hazardous to drivers and other road users, especially walkers and cyclists.
 Concerned about noise, light and dust pollution in close proximity to houses.
 There will be a loss of agricultural land and destruction of wildlife habitats.

Concerned about increase in transport along narrow roads and increased hazard to other road users.
 Concerned about noise, light and dust pollution in close proximity to houses.
 There will be a loss of agricultural land and destruction of wildlife habitats.

3516

0463

Object to site.
 The lanes are used by walkers, cyclists, horse riders and Bedale Hunt, they are unsuitable for heavy lorries and will present a danger to other road users.
 Concerned about noise and dust pollution and impact on the rural setting.
 It is in close proximity to an archaeological site of national importance.
 There would be a loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats.

Unsuitable local roads for HGVs.
 Noise and dust pollution.
 Impacts on the rural setting.
 Proximity to an archaeological site of national importance.
 Loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3403	0118	The cumulative impact of the proposed sites (MJP60, MJP21 and MJP43) would change the rural nature of the area to one of industrialisation impacting upon the quality of life, public amenity (including tranquillity) and tourism of the area.	The cumulative impact of the proposed sites (MJP60, MJP21 and MJP43) should be considered.
3508	0423	Concerned about increase in heavy vehicles and impact on safety of other road users. Concerned about noise increase and dust pollution close to rural areas and a conservation village. Concerns about impact on wildlife habitats and agricultural land. Concerned about impact on social wellbeing, accommodating non motorised road users and wildlife. Concerned about the size of the site in relation to the village.	Concerned about increase in heavy vehicles and impact on safety of other road users. Concerned about noise increase and dust pollution close to rural areas and a conservation village. Concerns about impact on wildlife habitats and agricultural land. Concerned about impact on social wellbeing, accommodating non motorised road users and wildlife. Concerned about the size of the site in relation to the village.
3506	0414	Object to site. The lanes are used by walkers, cyclists, horse riders and Bedale Hunt, they are unsuitable for heavy lorries and will present a danger to other road users. Concerned about noise and dust pollution and impact on the rural setting. It is in close proximity to an archaeological site of national importance. There would be a loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats.	Unsuitable local roads for HGVs. Noise and dust pollution. Impacts on the rural setting. Proximity to an archaeological site of national importance. Loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

1298

0373

There is a lack of need for the mineral from the site. The jobs will not be filled locally. The lanes are too narrow for site traffic and would pose a danger to the local community. The bridge from Kirkby Fleetham to Great Langton is too narrow for lorries and exit onto the B6271 is not suitable, accidents regularly occur on the road and the lorries will have to go through villages both ways. The condition of the road is also poor. Concerned about alteration to the water table and increased risk of flooding and increased insurance costs. There will be noise pollution affecting local and residential amenity. Screening is beneficial but also poses a traffic hazard due to reduced visibility. Access to the proposed footpaths would be restricted by the landowner. Concerned about dust pollution.

There is a lack of need for the mineral. Jobs will not be filled locally. The lanes and bridge are too narrow for site traffic and would pose a danger to the local community. The B road is unsuitable and poorly maintained. Concerned about change in water table and increased risk of flooding. Concerned about noise and dust pollution. The screening poses a traffic hazard due to visibility. Concerned access to footpaths would be restricted.

2931

0194

Property will be surrounded on 3 sides by this quarry, will devalue property and impact on peace and quality of life. Request guidance on how the site can be prevented from going ahead.

Property will be surrounded on 3 sides by this quarry, will devalue property and impact on peace and quality of life. Request guidance on how the site can be prevented from going ahead.

3494

0320

Refer to the comments submitted by Kirkby Fleetham Environmental Protection Group (Dated: August 2007).

Refer to the comments submitted by Kirkby Fleetham Environmental Protection Group (Dated: August 2007).

1446

0325

The site is close to residential properties, there will be noise and dust. There will be inappropriate use of country lanes and roads. The view will be destroyed.

The site is close to residential properties which will be affected by the noise and dust from the site. The site will impact on the visual amenity of residents and the roads are not suitable for site traffic.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3568

0387

Objects to the site on the following grounds: Increased HGV's, dust pollution potentially causing health risks, impact upon local wildlife and their habitat, loss of prime agricultural land, impact upon local amenity and landscape impact.

The county already provide sufficient aggregate and this site would provide excess.

Objects to the site on the following grounds: Increased HGV's, dust pollution potentially causing health risks, impact upon local wildlife and their habitat, loss of prime agricultural land, impact upon local amenity and landscape impact.

The county already provide sufficient aggregate.

2011

0428

There would be a dramatic increase of large vehicle movement along country lanes creating hazards for other road users.

There will be noise, dust and fumes polluting the environment.

Kirkby Fleetham could end up surrounded by quarry sites.

Concerned that there will be an increase of large vehicle movements along the country lanes posing a hazard to other road users.

Concerned about pollution from noise, dust and fumes.

Concerned about cumulative impact if all quarries go ahead.

3580

Newland Jem Ltd

0366

Newland Jem is a property letting business situated between Kirkby Fleetham Hall and Home Farm.

Quarrying at this site will affect the residents in terms of noise, light and dust pollution, businesses will be impacted.

Quarrying at this site will affect residents in terms of noise, light and dust pollution, businesses will be impacted.

3467

0278

Concerned about this site due to the following: increase in HGV traffic volumes; noise and dust pollution in close proximity to the village and conservation area which pose a serious health risk; impact upon wildlife and their habitats; loss of prime agricultural land; impact upon outdoor leisure activities in the area.

Concerned about this site due to the following: increase in HGV traffic volumes; health risks from noise and dust pollution; impact upon wildlife and their habitats; loss of prime agricultural land; impact upon outdoor leisure activities in the area.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo Comment	Summary
121 Environment Agency	<p>0579 The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3 and we have records of the site having previously flooded, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site details of mitigation measures surface water runoff the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site. <p>The results of a clear and transparent sequential and exception tests</p> <p>If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.</p> <p>Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route. Spoil to be stored outside of the floodplain.</p>	<p>The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3 and we have records of the site having previously flooded, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site details of mitigation measures surface water runoff the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site. <p>The results of a clear and transparent sequential and exception tests</p> <p>If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site</p>

The River Swale is classified as a main river. The formal consent of the Agency will be required, under the Water Resources Act 1991, for any works in, over, under, or within 8m of a main river and / or a flood defence.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing

should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route. Spoil to be stored outside of the floodplain.

The River Swale is classified as a main river. The formal consent of the Agency will be required, under the Water Resources Act 1991, for any works in, over, under, or within 8m of a main river and / or a flood defence.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to

into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the

responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

MJP34

3596

0499

The proposal covers a very large area and is expected to last at least 50 years. The proposal includes a 30 mile long underground conveyor to move the potash to Teesside for processing and loading. While this would reduce the impact of transporting the potash on the surrounding areas infrastructure and environment it seems excessive. Another approach would be to have a shorter tunnel to Ruswarp railway loading facility to distribute to the whole of the UK, this could be more cost effective and provide funding to improve the current line and possibly reinstate old lines to the main line.

If permission is given for the mining of potash then fracking should not be allowed in the potash permission area or within a 20 mile radius as too risky.

An alternative to having a 30 mile long conveyor would be to have a shorter conveyor to Ruswarp railway loading facility to transport the potash, this could be more cost effective and provide funding for improving the current line and possibly reinstating connected ones.

3371

Consulted Under 3370* 0011

Nothing should be done to adversely impact on this picturesque area.

Concerned the site will adversely impact on the landscape of the area.

Respondent No. Name

120 Historic England

CommentNo Comment

0132 There are a vast number of designated heritage assets in this part of the National Park.

Summary

There are a vast number of designated heritage assets in this part of the National Park.

252

York Potash

0036

The information presented contains some errors/outdated information.

The application is now submitted and predicted annual output is 13 million tonnes.

The amended area is the vicinity of RAF Fylingdales rather than the village of Fylingdales.

The total application area (including cross-boundary element of the (Mineral Transport System) is 25,500 ha with the area of 'excavation' being 25,200 ha.

The proposed life is 100 years.

Planning Practice Guidance states that in terms of site allocation the highest priority for Authorities is "designating specific sites- where viable resources are known to exist, landowners are supportive of minerals development and the proposal is likely to be acceptable in planning terms". This approach is the only one of three that is required in National Parks and the plan-making (site selection) process should be able, without granting permission, to determine whether a sites is likely to be acceptable. If the 'Site Identification and Assessment Methodology' does not allow for potash site identification then is it fit for purpose?

The York Potash project has a certified (JORC) mineral resource, wide ranging commercial arrangements with mineral landowners, and it is only the last point which needs to be considered.

It may be that the conclusion with respect to acceptability has been reached within the projected Joint Plan adoption period but that is not the case and the process should continue on the assumption that this assessment needs to be undertaken.

In doing so, it is important to remember that the plan period extends to 2030, the consented mine only has planning permission until 2023 and there is a duty on the

The information presented contains some errors/outdated information.

The application is now submitted and predicted annual output is 13 million tonnes.

The amended area is the vicinity of RAF Fylingdales rather than the village of Fylingdales.

The total application area (including cross-boundary element of the (Mineral Transport System) is 25,500 ha with the area of 'excavation' being 25,200 ha.

The proposed life is 100 years.

NPPG requires Authorities to give highest priority to designating specific sites where viable resources are know to exist, land owners are supportive.... And the proposal is likely to be acceptable in planning terms. The site section process should be able to determine the proposal is likely to be acceptable, if it can't is the Site identification Methodology fit for purpose?

Potash extraction is only consented until 2023 the Joint Plan period extends up to 2030 the Authority is required to secure a steady supply up to the end of the plan period.

If permission is granted prior to adoption will the new mine be afforded with the same level of protection as currently afforded to the existing mine?

Authority to provide secure and steady supply of what is a nationally important mineral. There is no current provision for this seven year period and not at York Potash intended extraction levels prior to this date.

In the event that a planning permission is granted prior to adoption of the Joint Plan would the same level of protection that is currently afforded to the existing mine be enshrined in a policy which includes new the new mine?

3375

0126

National policy is to keep National Parks special and only allow essential development in them. The existing potash mine has huge reserves of high quality potash and can continue production for many years. The new potash mine will produce low grade potash for export to Asia, so will have no economic benefit for the local area or the UK. It is proposed to bus workers from Teesside, but many will want to live nearby where there is already a shortage of housing for local people. Large vehicles servicing the site will also negatively impact on local roads.

Existing potash mine has large reserves of high quality potash so can continue for many years. The new potash mine will produce low quality potash which will be exported and so will have no benefit to the local economy or the UK. Workers will not be local, so may be extra pressure on local housing which is already scarce. Large vehicles will negatively impact on local roads.

3386

0062

Objects due to potential impact on NYMNPA and traffic volumes.

Objects due to potential impact on NYMNPA and traffic volumes.

128

Yorkshire Wildlife Trust

0257

Inappropriate development in a national park.

Previous letter of objection attached.

Inappropriate development in a national park.

2823

0037

Supports the development going ahead. The companies proposal appears to be taking precautions to neutralise damage to the environment, such as the underground pipeline system. The proposal will create local jobs.

Supports the development of the potash mine.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121

Environment Agency

0580

We have been consulted on a planning application for this development. Please refer to our response to the planning application.

We have been consulted on a planning application for this development. Please refer to our response to the planning application.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0534

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

3382

0042

The A64 is not suitable for additional traffic related to this site, especially at busy times requiring restrictions on traffic movements.

Negative traffic impacts on the A64. Restrict traffic movements.

3370

0008

The coast road between Scarborough, Whitby and Sandsend and over the North York Moors is in an area of outstanding natural beauty and should be left as it is.

Concerned that the site will adversely impact on special designations in the area.

MJP35

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0581 The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3 and we have information which suggests the site has experience flooding historically, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site
 detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development
 examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site
 details of mitigation measures
 surface water runoff
 the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.
 The results of a clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route.
 Spoil to be stored outside of the floodplain.

The River Nidd is classified as a main river. The formal

The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3 and we have information which suggests the site has experience flooding historically, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site
 detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours
 details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development
 examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site
 details of mitigation measures
 surface water runoff
 the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.
 the results of a clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based

consent of the Agency will be required, under the Water Resources Act 1991, for any works in, over, under, or within 8m of a main river and / or a flood defence.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route. Spoil to be stored outside of the floodplain.

The River Nidd is classified as a main river. The formal consent of the Agency will be required, under the Water Resources Act 1991, for any works in, over, under, or within 8m of a main river and / or a flood defence.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high

The site lies within the Marston Moor Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Marston Moor Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

MJP37

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0541

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

3503

0412

Object to site.

There will be an increase in heavy traffic and this would be inappropriate as access road is narrow with visibility problems and will cause the road to be more hazardous. The site would impact on the visual amenity of the area. There will be a loss of residential amenity as walks, woodland and wildlife habitat would be lost. The woodland acts as a screen so removal will add to the visual impact. The development is of a disproportionate scale to surrounding developments and settlements in the area. There is no indication of the lifespan or restoration proposals for the site. There will be a cumulative impact due to Allerton Park being close by. There has been little publicity about the site.

Access road not suitable for increase in heavy traffic as is narrow and has visibility issues.

There will be a loss of residential amenity as walks, woodland and wildlife habitat would be lost. The woodland acts as a screen so removal will add to the visual impact.

The scale of the site is too large. More information required about lifespan and restoration.

Concerned about cumulative impact.

MJP38

Respondent No. Name

3454

CommentNo Comment

0230

The site lies in a zone 2 flood plain.
 Road access in the area is difficult with weight limits of 7.5 tonnes being in place.
 The quarry will impact on tourism and residents.
 The site is on agricultural land and the quarry will destroy this as restoration likely to be to a lake.
 West Tanfield has recently seen the closure of the refuse facility on Thornborough Road, so seems unfair to have a quarry in the area so soon after its closure.
 The site is close to the village of West Tanfield and its associated conservation area. There are other sites in the consultation with larger reserves and less constraints.
 English Heritage have objected to the site due to its impact on Thornborough Henges in terms of probable local damage from excavation and also loss of amenity.
 There will be noise and dust pollution which could impact on health.

Summary

The site is in flood zone 2.
 Road access in the area is difficult due to weight restrictions.
 There will be an impact on residents and tourists due to noise and dust pollution and loss of amenity.
 There will be a loss of agricultural land.
 West Tanfield is a conservation area and the site is close to Thornborough Henges.

3492

0318

Traffic passing along Nosterfield Road will create noise, dust, pollution, danger to pedestrians, devalue properties and spoil views. The road access to this site is totally unsuitable. It would effect the tourism industry. There is already too many areas of water with the loss of valuable agricultural land.
 The views of the Parish Council are supported.

Traffic passing along Nosterfield Road will create noise, dust, pollution, danger to pedestrians, devalue properties and spoil views. The road access to this site is totally unsuitable. It would effect the tourism industry. There is already too many areas of water with the loss of valuable agricultural land.
 The views of the Parish Council are supported.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3394

0082

Object to the site as the increase in traffic would be unacceptable. There has already been a large amount of quarrying in the area over the years and if allowed it will reduce the amount of agricultural land and impact on local businesses.

Object to the site as the increase in traffic would be unacceptable. There has already been a large amount of quarrying in the area over the years and if allowed it will reduce the amount of agricultural land and impact on local businesses.

3398

0092

Object to the site as it is close to the river, consideration should be given to the potential environmental impacts in terms of flood plains, the local water table and local land and properties.

Road access is poor and the road already has weight restrictions. Noise and dust will impact on local residents who have already suffered from the present of a landfill in the area.

Several houses border the site and they will suffer disruption for the life of the operation and a reduction in the value of there property.

There are lodges near the site so there may be an impact on tourism in the area.

Object as site is close to the river and could have environmental impact in terms of flood plains, the local water table and local land and properties.

The road has weight restrictions and access to the site is poor.

Concerned about residential amenity in terms of noise and dust.

There may be an impact on tourism as holiday accommodation is located nearby.

3483

0314

There is no benefit to West Tanfield to open this site. The roads in the area are not suitable for heavy traffic, there will be disruption for residents in terms of noise and dust with lorries using the local roads. The site will adversely impact on local businesses and affect property prices.

There will be a loss of agricultural land.

There will be an impact on local archaeology and Thornborough Henges is very close.

There is no benefit to West Tanfield to open this site. The roads in the area are not suitable for heavy traffic, there will be disruption for residents in terms of noise and dust with lorries using the local roads. The site will adversely impact on local businesses and affect property prices.

There will be a loss of agricultural land.

There will be an impact on local archaeology and Thornborough Henges is very close.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo Comment	Summary
3442	<p>0192 The site should not be considered for minerals extraction as the site is high quality agricultural land and part of it is close to the River Ure and could potentially flood. The roads in the area are narrow with weight restrictions so unsuitable for heavy lorries. The site is close to West Tanfield and across from a site of holiday lodges. The adjacent area has already been quarried and restored by using landfill which causes smell, dust and traffic. The area is adjacent to Thornborough Henges.</p>	<p>Concerned about loss of high quality agricultural land and possible flooding from the river. The roads are unsuitable for heavy lorries. The site would have an adverse impact on the nearby village and holiday facilities. An adjoining area has already been quarried and restored by using landfill which had an adverse impact on the local amenity. The area is adjacent to Thornborough Henges.</p>
3448	<p>0273 Concerned about the proximity of the proposed site to my property and impact upon the established nearby wildlife area. Potential impact upon the water table. Access to the site and processing of aggregate would cause major problems to local residents.</p> <p>The site lies in a zone 2 flood plain. Road access in the area is difficult with weight limits of 7.5 tonnes being in place. The quarry will impact on tourism and residents. The site is on agricultural land and the quarry will destroy this as restoration likely to be to a lake. West Tanfield has recently seen the closure of the refuse facility on Thornborough Road, so seems unfair to have a quarry in the area so soon after its closure. The site is close to the village of West Tanfield and its associated conservation area. There are other sites in the consultation with larger reserves and less constraints. English Heritage have objected to the site due to its impact on Thornborough Henges in terms of probable local damage from excavation and also loss of amenity. There will be noise and dust pollution which could impact on health.</p>	<p>Proximity to residential properties. Impact upon local wildlife habitats, the water table and local roads. The site is in a flood zone. Road access in the area is difficult due to weight restrictions. There will be an impact on residents and tourists due to noise and dust pollution and loss of amenity. There will be a loss of agricultural land. West Tanfield is a conservation area and the site is close to Thornborough Henges.</p>

Respondent No.	Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
128	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	0256	Within Yorkshire Wildlife Trust Living landscapes therefore possible to link up habitat. There may be a problem with cumulative impacts with so much proposed and actual development in the area.	Within Yorkshire Wildlife Trust Living landscapes therefore possible to link up habitat. May be a problem with cumulative impacts.
3404		0113	The site is to close to the village of West Tanfield and residential properties Including back yards. The site lies in a Flood zone 2, road access is difficult with weight restrictions applying around the site, tourism would be adversely affected- potentially destroyed, the site is prime agricultural farmland. There are other much more suitable sites in the consultation. English Heritage have objected to these sites due to proximity to Thornbrough Henges and East Tanfield, probable local damage and loss of amenity value. Noise and dust can lead to health issues, especially of elderly residents.	The site is to close to the village of West Tanfield and residential properties Including back yards. The site lies in a Flood zone 2, there are traffic related issues, tourism would be adversely affected, the site is prime agricultural farmland. There are other much more suitable sites in the consultation. English Heritage have objected to these sites due to proximity to Thornbrough Henges and East Tanfield. Concern about noise and dust and effect on health.
3560		0522	There are already too many heavy vehicles coming through the village posing a risk to pedestrians and cyclists.	There are already too many heavy vehicles coming through the village posing a risk to pedestrians and cyclists.
3605	****Consulted under 3604****	0242	Object to the site - Prime agricultural land will be destroyed - The site is close to dwellings, especially the luxury lodges which is an up market tourist facility. - The narrow roads are unsuitable for quarry traffic and they will cause disturbance in the local villages.	Object to the site - Prime agricultural land will be destroyed - The site is close to dwellings, especially the luxury lodges which is an up market tourist facility. - The narrow roads are unsuitable for quarry traffic and they will cause disruption in the local villages.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3523

0449

Extraction from this area would cause a disturbance and danger to local residents, causing filth, pollution, noise, road damage and reduction in property values. There is already large amounts of quarrying in the area and this site should be refused.

The site should not be taken forward as it would cause a disturbance and danger to local residents, generating noise, dust an pollution and transport hazards. There is already large amounts of quarrying in the area.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo Comment	Summary
121 Environment Agency	<p>0582 The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>The site contains flood zone 3 at risk from fluvial and coastal flooding, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:</p> <p>detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site details of mitigation measures surface water runoff the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site. The results of a clear and transparent sequential test</p> <p>If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.</p> <p>Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route. Spoil to be stored outside of the floodplain.</p> <p>Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations</p>	<p>The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>The site contains flood zone 3 at risk from fluvial and coastal flooding, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:</p> <p>detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site details of mitigation measures surface water runoff the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site. The results of a clear and transparent sequential test</p> <p>If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example</p>

2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

At the application area's most southern extent, the site lies within the Muston and Yedingham Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land

structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route. Spoil to be stored outside of the floodplain.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any

Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded.

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

The site is next to active landfills – West Tanfield Quarries and West Tanfield Landfill. The applicant should satisfy themselves of any risks.

surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

At the application area's most southern extent, the site lies within the Muston and Yedingham Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any

local records of the site having flooded.

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

The site is next to active landfills – West Tanfield Quarries and West Tanfield Landfill. The applicant should satisfy themselves of any risks.

3410

0156

Object to the site due to:

1. Proximity to Mill Cottages and surrounding properties that would be affected by noise, dust and HGVs.
2. Location in a flood zone leading to instability and greater flood risk.
3. Inadequacy of local roads for HGV access.
4. Impact upon local businesses i.e. tourist based Cedar Retreats, leading to job losses.
5. Loss of agricultural land.
6. Proximity to the nearby archaeological site and East Tanfield Village.
7. Impact upon the value of local properties.
8. Cumulative impact on nearby villages from landfill and quarrying activities including heavy traffic, dust and vermin causing increased harm to health.

Object to the site due to: proximity to surrounding properties; noise and dust impacts; location in a flood zone; inadequacy of local roads for HGV access; impact upon local businesses; loss of agricultural land; proximity to the archaeological site and East Tanfield; impact upon the value of local properties; Cumulative impact on nearby villages from landfill and quarrying activities.

1174

0380

Support English Heritage's comments against this site provided during the Issues and Options Consultation. Concerned about the sites impact on archaeological features in the area.

Support English Heritage's comments against this site provided during the Issues and Options Consultation. Concerned about the sites impact on archaeological features in the area.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary	
948	West Tanfield Parish Council	0058	<p>There are concerns about the potential negative impact on the amenity currently enjoyed by residents living in close proximity to the site, particularly Mill Cottages which adjoins the site but also properties on Nosterfield Road in West Tanfield. There is potential for noise, dust and traffic disturbance. Concerns about the impact on the recently established cedar retreat holiday homes with helps bring economic benefit to the local area, and is likely to be adversely affected by the quarry.</p> <p>The site is prime agricultural land and should remain as such. The proposes restoration to include 'mainly water' would add to the cumulative impacts already experienced by previously restored quarries, resulting in a detrimental impact on the landscape of the area.</p> <p>The site is in close proximity to the Thornbrough Henges giving rise to concerns of an archaeological nature.</p> <p>If the site were to progress there are a number of factors which would need to be considered by the local community, including;</p> <p>Processing- would this be done on site (resulting in unsightly infrastructure) or would it be taken away (resulting in additional traffic movements).</p> <p>Flood risk assessment of the river Ure.</p> <p>Restoration- an alternative proposal, returning the site to productive farmland would be required.</p> <p>Timescales for extraction and proposed hours of operation.</p>	<p>Concerns about the impact on residential amenity, the risk of noise, dust and traffic impacts. Concerned about the impact upon local economy. The site is located on agricultural land and should be returned to it previous state rather than adding to the cumulative impacts on the landscape associated with restoration to water. Concern about the impact on Thornborough Henges. Further information would be required if the site were to progress.</p>

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3473

0285

The site lies in a zone 2 flood plain.
Road access in the area is difficult with weight limits of 7.5 tonnes being in place.
The quarry will impact on tourism and residents.
The site is on agricultural land and the quarry will destroy this as restoration likely to be to a lake.
West Tanfield has recently seen the closure of the refuse facility on Thornborough Road, so seems unfair to have a quarry in the area so soon after its closure.
The site is close to the village of West Tanfield and its associated conservation area. There are other sites in the consultation with larger reserves and less constraints.
English Heritage have objected to the site due to its impact on Thornborough Henges in terms of probable local damage from excavation and also loss of amenity.
There will be noise and dust pollution which could impact on health.

The site is in flood zone 2.
Road access in the area is difficult due to weight restrictions.
There will be an impact on residents and tourists due to noise and dust pollution and loss of amenity.
There will be a loss of agricultural land.
West Tanfield is a conservation area and the site is close to Thornborough Henges.

3548

0511

Object to the site.
It is in a flood plain.
There will be a loss of agricultural land and associated biodiversity benefits.
There will be increased levels of noise, dust, dirt and traffic which will impact on residential amenity.
Will adversely affect tourism and local businesses which are currently improving the area.
Should consider alternative sites for sand and gravel.

The site is on a flood plain.
There will be a loss of agricultural land and associated biodiversity benefits.
There will be increased levels of noise, dust, dirt and traffic which will impact on residential amenity.
Will adversely affect tourism and local businesses which are currently improving the area.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3547

0508

Objects to the site on the following grounds: The site is within a flood plain (zone 2), road access is inadequate with weight restrictions, concern about the local tourism industry, loss of prime agricultural land, it is too close to residential properties and the conservation area of West Tanfield. There are other sites proposed in the consultation which have larger reserves and less constraints. English Heritage object due to its intrusion on Thornborough Henges and East Tanfield. The site would generate noise and dust which is a potential health risk. The quality of life of neighbouring properties would be severely affected.

A cost benefit assessment should be completed taking into account not just economic considerations but the ecological and environmental costs. The site is 'pareto' inefficient and consideration should be given to appropriate compensation.

Objects on the following grounds: Location within a flood zone, poor transport infrastructure. Impact upon local economy, neighbouring properties and conservation area including Thornborough Henges. Loss of Agricultural land and impact upon quality of life.

An assessment should be taken on the site taking account of the economic, social, ecological and environmental costs of the site.

3546

0495

Concerned about traffic and its impact on North Stainley in terms of volume, noise and road damage. Concerned the footpath linking North Stainley to West Tanfield will be affected and this will have an impact on the local economy as site will cause less people to use the camp site.

Concerned about traffic and its impact on North Stainley in terms of volume, noise and road damage. Concerned the footpath linking North Stainley to West Tanfield will be affected.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo Comment	Summary
120 Historic England	<p>0131 This site lies in an area of known archaeological importance containing remains from the Mesolithic, Bronze Age, Roman and Medieval periods.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · This eastern edge of this site lies only 575 metres from the southernmost of the Scheduled Henges at Thornborough · The Scheduled East Tanfield deserted mediaeval village lies just under 1km from the eastern edge of this site · The boundary of the West Tanfield Conservation Area (which includes the Grade I Listed Church of St Nicholas and the Marmion Tower) lies 300 metres from the western corner of this area. · There is a Grade II Listed Building at Sleningford Mill on the opposite bank of the River Ure 300 metres from the southern boundary of this area. <p>We have concerns about the impact which mineral extraction from this site might have upon elements which contribute to the significance of the Scheduled Monuments and other heritage assets in the area. The NPPF makes it clear that Scheduled Monuments are regarded as being designated heritage assets of the highest significance where substantial harm or loss should be exceptional.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The Scheduled East Tanfield deserted mediaeval village lies just under 1km from the eastern edge of this site · The boundary of the West Tanfield Conservation Area (which includes the Grade I Listed Church of St Nicholas and the Marmion Tower) lies 300 metres from the western corner of this area. · There is a Grade II Listed Building at Sleningford Mill on the opposite bank of the River Ure 300 metres from the southern boundary of this area. <p>We have concerns about the impact which mineral extraction from this site might have upon elements which contribute to the significance of the Scheduled Monuments and other heritage assets in the area. The NPPF makes it clear that Scheduled Monuments are regarded as being designated heritage assets of the highest significance where substantial harm or loss should be exceptional.</p>
3553	<p>0515 The site is too close to the village. The noise and dust would be an unacceptable intrusion impacting negatively on the quality of life for residents and the viability of existing tourist related business.</p>	<p>The site is too close to the village. The noise and dust would impact negatively on the quality of life of residents and will impact on tourism.</p>

3443

****Consulted under 3410**** 0208

Object to the site due to:

1. Location in a flood zone leading to instability and greater flood risk.
3. Inadequacy of local roads for HGV access.
4. Impact upon local businesses i.e. tourist based Cedar Retreats, leading to job losses.
5. Loss of agricultural land.
6. Proximity to the nearby archaeological site.
7. Impact upon the value of local properties.
8. Cumulative impact on nearby villages from landfill and quarrying activities including heavy traffic, dust and vermin causing increased harm to health.

Object to the site due to: proximity to surrounding properties; noise and dust impacts; location in a flood zone; inadequacy of local roads for HGV access; impact upon local businesses; loss of agricultural land; proximity to the archaeological site; impact upon the value of local properties; Cumulative impact on nearby villages from landfill and quarrying activities.

3430

0184

Objects to the site due: to loss of prime agricultural land; proximity to Thornborough Henges; proximity to Mill Cottages and the impact the site would have on the residents of these properties as a result of noise, dust and HGV movements; impact upon tourism to the area; the site lies within a flood plain causing instability, including when combined with MJP39 on the opposite site of the river; and traffic impacts, such as weigh restricted roads and impact upon the 'mini-roundabout'.

Objects to the site due: to loss of prime agricultural land; proximity to Thornborough Henges; proximity to Mill Cottages and the impact the site would have on the residents of these properties as a result of noise, dust and HGV movements; impact upon tourism to the area; and the site lies within a flood plain causing instability, including when combined with MJP39 on the opposite site of the river, and traffic impacts.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3591	0339	<p>The site is close to residential properties and concerned about loss of amenity and disruption to resident of West Tanfield.</p> <p>The details provided about the site are sparse, but it will cause long term disruption. Further details are required before further comments can be made.</p> <p>Concerned about impact of noise on residents.</p> <p>There will be an increase in HGV traffic in West Tanfield and the surrounding areas, Mill Cottage is on a country lane and the HGV could pose a hazard and nuisance.</p> <p>Concerned about impact on local business and tourism.</p> <p>There is a risk of localised flooding.</p>	<p>Concerned about loss of amenity, impact of noise and disruption to residents in West Tanfield.</p> <p>The details provided are sparse, more details are required before further comments can be made. There will be an increase of HGVs using the country lanes posing a hazard and nuisance.</p> <p>Concerned about impact on local business and tourism.</p> <p>There is a risk of localised flooding.</p>
3491	0308	<p>There are already too many fields standing in water in the locality, which impacts on the agricultural land and landscape.</p> <p>Heavy traffic would increase to the detriment of the nature of the village of West Tanfield and the relevant narrow lanes which could be dangerous.</p> <p>The noise pollution would be invasive to the residents of Nosterfield Road and nearby Main Street Houses which is a residential area of the village lowering the prices of the houses.</p> <p>The roundabout at the east end of Main Street/Nosterfield Road would not accommodate more heavy vehicles.</p> <p>Main Street East/Nosterfield Road narrows considerably towards the east end, noisy and dangerous now, let alone coping with proposed new gravel extraction traffic.</p> <p>The most dangerous aspects of this proposal are that the site is surrounded by narrow roads and exits, the River Ure flows close to the field and narrow roads and this would inhibit the widening of the roads.</p>	<p>Concerned about flooding and the impact on agricultural land and the landscape and the River Ure is located nearby.</p> <p>There would be an increase in noise pollution.</p> <p>The road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the increase in heavy traffic and it would adversely impact residents.</p>

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary	
3386	0063	Objects due to environmental impact and increased traffic volumes.	Objects due to environmental impact and increased traffic volumes.	
3593	West Tanfield Luxury Lodges Ltd (t/a Cedar Retreats)	0337	<p>Cedar Retreats is a leisure development adjacent to the proposed site, the quarry would adversely affect our business and local businesses helping to build the retreats. Once the retreats development is complete it will employ a number of local people, the retreats will bring money into the local area and support local businesses.</p> <p>Concerned about safety of non motorised road users on the road when site traffic using it as some of it has no footpath. There will be an impact due to noise, dust and dirt from the site and site traffic.</p> <p>A local waste site has recently closed so to have another heavy industry is not fair.</p>	<p>The site would adversely affect the local leisure development and other local businesses, which will impact on the economy of the area.</p> <p>Concerned about non motorised users sharing the road with site traffic when not all of it has a footpath.</p> <p>There will be an impact due to noise, dust and dirt from the site and site traffic.</p>
3559	0521	<p>There has already been extensive quarrying in the area restored to lakes, further lakes would not be beneficial. The local roads are not capable of coping with the current level of traffic so could not deal with an increase in HGVs. Some roads have weight restrictions which are ignored.</p> <p>Concerned the value of property will be affected. Local business and tourism would suffer. No written information has been provided to local residents and so the planning process is not inclusive.</p>	<p>The area has already been heavily impacted by quarrying. The local roads cannot cope with increase in HGV traffic and some roads have weight restrictions on. Local business and tourism will be affected. Local residents should have received more information.</p>	

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3551 ***if sending out in the post consulted under 3547***

0513 The site lies in a flood plain.
Road access is difficult as roads are narrow.
The site will have an adverse impact on tourism.
There will be a loss of high grade agricultural land.
West Tanfield refuse facility recently closed, unfair to impose more industrial activity on the area.
The site is close to West Tanfield Village, there are other more suitable sites proposed.
English Heritage have objected to these sites due to their intrusion on Thornborough Henges and East Tanfield village as a result of probable local damage from excavation and loss of amenity value.
There will be an increase in noise and dust which may impact on residents health.
The benefit gained from the quarry will be much less than the benefit gained from the increased tourism proposed for the area.

The site lies in a flood plain.
Road access is difficult as roads are narrow.
There will be a loss of high grade agricultural land.
The site is close to West Tanfield Village, there are other more suitable sites proposed.
There will be an increase in noise and dust which may impact on residents health.
The benefit gained from the quarry will be much less than the benefit gained from the increased tourism proposed for the area.
English Heritage have objected to the site.

MJP39

3605 ****Consulted under 3604**** 0505

0505 Objections are
- Spoiling of the iconic view of West Tanfield from the Ripon Road. The village with its English Heritage Marmion Tower, Historic Church, 18th Century Bridge and clusters of charming cottages is an important tourist destination.
- Quarry traffic travelling through the village will be dangerous and detrimental.
- Destruction of footpaths, especially the damaging of the frequently used riverside path which is not only part of the 'Ripon Rowel' walk, but an important link between the site at Slenningford Water Mill and the services in the village of West Tanfield, the alternative route would be along the busy main road, made worse by traffic.
- Issues of dust and noise pollution for nearby dwellings
- Damage to the now well developed tourist trade for local business.

Objections are
- Visual amenity of West Tanfield will be impacted, affecting tourism.
- The quarry traffic coming through the village will pose a hazard and have a detrimental impact.
- Footpaths will be damaged diverting users onto the main road where traffic would pose a hazard.
- Concerned about noise and dust pollution.
- The tourist trade will be adversely affected.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3430	0185	Objects to the site due to the negative impact upon West Tanfield. The site would create dust resulting in health issues. The site would ruin part of the Ripon Rowel Walk and the setting of marmion tower. The are is within a flood zone. The working of this site in combination with MJP38 would result in stability issues of the river banks.	Objects to the site due to the negative impact upon West Tanfield. The site would create dust resulting in health issues. The site would ruin part of the Ripon Rowel Walk and the setting of marmion tower. The are is within a flood zone. The working of this site in combination with MJP38 would result in stability issues of the river banks.
3483	0319	There is no benefit to West Tanfield to open this site. The roads in the area are not suitable for heavy traffic, there will be disruption for residents in terms of noise and dust with lorries using the local roads. The site will adversely impact on local businesses and affect property prices. There will be a loss of agricultural land. There will be an impact on local archaeology and Thornborough Henges is very close.	There is no benefit to West Tanfield to open this site. The roads in the area are not suitable for heavy traffic, there will be disruption for residents in terms of noise and dust with lorries using the local roads. The site will adversely impact on local businesses and affect property prices. There will be a loss of agricultural land. There will be an impact on local archaeology and Thornborough Henges is very close.
1174	0381	Support English Heritage's comments against this site provided during the Issues and Options Consultation and this consultation. Concerned about the sites impact on archaeological features in the area.	Support English Heritage's comments against this site provided during the Issues and Options Consultation and this consultation. Concerned about the sites impact on archaeological features in the area.

Respondent No. Name

3473

CommentNo Comment

0284

The entrance to West Tanfield will be marred by the site. The site lies in a zone 2 flood plain. Road access in the area is difficult with weight limits of 7.5 tonnes being in place. The quarry will impact on tourism and residents. The site is on agricultural land and the quarry will destroy this as restoration likely to be to a lake. West Tanfield has recently seen the closure of the refuse facility on Thornborough Road, so seems unfair to have a quarry in the area so soon after its closure. The site is close to the village of West Tanfield and its associated conservation area. There are other sites in the consultation with larger reserves and less constraints. English Heritage have objected to the site due to its impact on Thornborough Henges in terms of probable local damage from excavation and also loss of amenity. There will be noise and dust pollution which could impact on health.

Summary

The site is in flood zone 2. Road access in the area is difficult due to weight restrictions. There will be an impact on residents and tourists due to noise and dust pollution and loss of amenity. There will be a loss of agricultural land. West Tanfield is a conservation area and the site is close to Thornborough Henges.

3591

0340

The site is close to residential properties and concerned about loss of amenity and disruption to resident of West Tanfield. The details provided about the site are sparse, but it will cause long term disruption. Further details are required before further comments can be made. Concerned about impact of noise on residents. There will be an increase in HGV traffic in West Tanfield and the surrounding areas, Quarry House is close to West Tanfield Bridge which is a historical bridge, concerned that the amount of traffic using the bridge will cause long term damage. Concerned about impact on local business and tourism. There is a risk of localised flooding.

Concerned about loss of amenity, impact of noise and disruption to residents in West Tanfield. The details provided are sparse, more details are required before further comments can be made. Quarry House is close to West Tanfield Bridge which is a historical bridge, concerned that the amount of traffic using the bridge will cause long term damage. Concerned about impact on local business and tourism. There is a risk of localised flooding.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3454

0231

The site lies in a zone 2 flood plain.
 Road access in the area is difficult with weight limits of 7.5 tonnes being in place.
 The quarry will impact on tourism and residents.
 The site is on agricultural land and the quarry will destroy this as restoration likely to be to a lake.
 West Tanfield has recently seen the closure of the refuse facility on Thornborough Road, so seems unfair to have a quarry in the area so soon after its closure.
 The site is close to the village of West Tanfield and its associated conservation area. There are other sites in the consultation with larger reserves and less constraints.
 English Heritage have objected to the site due to its impact on Thornborough Henges in terms of probable local damage from excavation and also loss of amenity.
 There will be noise and dust pollution which could impact on health.

The site is in flood zone 2.
 Road access in the area is difficult due to weight restrictions.
 There will be an impact on residents and tourists due to noise and dust pollution and loss of amenity.
 There will be a loss of agricultural land.
 West Tanfield is a conservation area and the site is close to Thornborough Henges.

3410

0157

Object to this site due to: The approach to the conservation village would be ruined; negative impact of dust, noise and HGV movements on local residents; located in a flood zone and may cause instability to the river and increased flood risk; negatively impact the setting of the 15th Century Marmion Tower; local businesses and tourism would be detrimentally effected; loss of agricultural land.

Object to this site due to: landscape and historic setting of the village would be damaged; negative impact of dust, noise and HGV movements; located in a flood zone and may cause instability to the river and increased flood risk; local businesses and tourism would be detrimentally effected; loss of agricultural land.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3404

0114

The site is too close to the village of West Tanfield and residential properties including back yards. The site lies in a Flood zone 2, road access is difficult with weight restrictions applying around the site, tourism would be adversely affected- potentially destroyed, the site is prime agricultural farmland. There are other much more suitable sites in the consultation. English Heritage have objected to these sites due to proximity to Thornbrough Henges and East Tanfield, probable local damage and loss of amenity value. Noise and dust can lead to health issues, especially of elderly residents.

The site is too close to the village of West Tanfield and residential properties including back yards. The site lies in a Flood zone 2, there are traffic related issues, tourism would be adversely affected, the site is prime agricultural farmland. There are other much more suitable sites in the consultation. English Heritage have objected to these sites due to proximity to Thornbrough Henges and East Tanfield. Concern about noise and dust and effect on health.

3448

0274

The site lies in a zone 2 flood plain.
Road access in the area is difficult with weight limits of 7.5 tonnes being in place.
The quarry will impact on tourism and residents.
The site is on agricultural land and the quarry will destroy this as restoration likely to be to a lake.
West Tanfield has recently seen the closure of the refuse facility on Thornborough Road, so seems unfair to have a quarry in the area so soon after its closure.
The site is close to the village of West Tanfield and its associated conservation area. There are other sites in the consultation with larger reserves and less constraints.
English Heritage have objected to the site due to its impact on Thornborough Henges in terms of probable local damage from excavation and also loss of amenity.
There will be noise and dust pollution which could impact on health.

The site is in flood zone 2.
Road access in the area is difficult due to weight restrictions.
There will be an impact on residents and tourists due to noise and dust pollution and loss of amenity.
There will be a loss of agricultural land.
West Tanfield is a conservation area and the site is close to Thornborough Henges.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo Comment	Summary
121 Environment Agency	<p>0583 The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3 and we have records of historical flooding at this location, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site details of mitigation measures surface water runoff the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site. the results of a clear and transparent sequential test <p>The River Ure is classified as a main river. The formal consent of the Agency will be required, under the Water Resources Act 1991, for any works in, over, under, or within 8m of a main river and / or a flood defence.</p> <p>Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be</p>	<p>The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3 and we have records of historical flooding at this location, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site details of mitigation measures surface water runoff the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site. The results of a clear and transparent sequential test <p>The River Ure is classified as a main river. The formal consent of the Agency will be required, under the Water Resources Act 1991, for any works in, over, under, or</p>

adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

within 8m of a main river and / or a flood defence.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a

consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

3398

0093

Object to the site as located close to the river which could have environmental impacts in terms of the effect on the flood plain, water table and local land and property. Concerned about residential amenity in terms of dust and noise.

Object to the site as located close to the river which could have environmental impacts in terms of the effect on the flood plain, water table and local land and property. Concerned about residential amenity in terms of dust and noise.

3394

0083

Object to the site as the increase in traffic would be unacceptable. There has already been a large amount of quarrying in the area over the years and if allowed it will reduce the amount of agricultural land and impact on local businesses.

Object to the site as the increase in traffic would be unacceptable. There has already been a large amount of quarrying in the area over the years and if allowed it will reduce the amount of agricultural land and impact on local businesses.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3443

****Consulted under 3410**** 0209

Object due to
1. There is a camping and caravan park nearby which will be affected by the dust from the quarry, and tourism for all businesses in the area will be adversely impacted.
2. The site is set in a flood zone.
3. The Marmion Tower setting and view would be spoilt, the quarry would have a detrimental effect on the setting of the historical buildings.
4. It will impact on the Ripon Rowels walk and spoil the beauty of the whole area.
5. It is in close proximity to the village and so would have a detrimental effect on health with dust and noise.

Object as would have an adverse impact on leisure and tourism facilities and businesses in the area. The site is in a flood zone. It would have a detrimental effect on the setting of historical buildings and structures.
Would have an impact on public footpaths in the area and spoil the local amenity of the area and the village due to dust and noise.

3491

0309

Concerned about the impact of the quarry in terms of noise and dirt on the structures and beauty of the village, views are a key feature and would be destroyed. The road access in and out of the farm is very poor.

Concerned about the impact the quarry will have on the amenity of the village in terms of noise, dust and views.
The access to the farm is very poor.

MJP41

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo Comment	Summary
121 Environment Agency	<p>0584 The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3 and we have records of the site having previously flooded, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site details of mitigation measures surface water runoff the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site. <p>The results of a clear and transparent sequential test</p> <p>If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.</p> <p>Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route. Spoil to be stored outside of the floodplain.</p>	<p>The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3 and we have records of the site having previously flooded, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site details of mitigation measures surface water runoff the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site. <p>The results of a clear and transparent sequential test</p> <p>If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site</p>

The River Nidd is classified as a main river. The formal consent of the Agency will be required, under the Water Resources Act 1991, for any works in, over, under, or within 8m of a main river and / or a flood defence.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route. Spoil to be stored outside of the floodplain.

The River Nidd is classified as a main river. The formal consent of the Agency will be required, under the Water Resources Act 1991, for any works in, over, under, or within 8m of a main river and / or a flood defence.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

MJP42

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3604

0608

Objections are
 - the site boundaries are too close to dwellings.
 - Increased traffic on Fleethams Lane which has only one passing place, restricted visibility in parts, and already has farm traffic.
 - Increased traffic on Waites Lane, especially significant since there are already large numbers of vehicles on the road, twice a day, for Cundall Manor School.
 - Destruction of prime agricultural land and public footpaths.

Objections are
 - The site boundaries are too close to properties.
 - Increased traffic on local roads which have restricted visibility in parts and narrow in places making vehicle passing difficult.
 - There will be destruction of prime agricultural land and public footpaths.

MJP43

3457

0341

The road infrastructure is unsuitable for quarrying traffic. There is a lack of need for the site. Concerned about impact on environment and health. Concerned about impact on rights of way and the countryside which should be protected.

The road infrastructure is unsuitable for quarrying traffic. There is a lack of need for the site. Concerned about impact on environment and health. Concerned about impact on rights of way and the countryside which should be protected.

3458

0247

Object to the site. The proposed site is not needed, there are other operational sites in the area. The road infrastructure is unsuitable for any increase in HGV traffic. There would be un acceptable noise, dust and light pollution. The site is in close proximity to many residential and business properties as well as a conservation area. There would be a loss of amenities to residents and visitors, a loss of footpaths and bridleways and loss of prime agricultural land and wildlife habitats.

Object to the site. The proposed site is not needed, there are other operational sites in the area. The road infrastructure is unsuitable for any increase in HGV traffic. There would be un acceptable noise, dust and light pollution. The site is in close proximity to many residential and business properties as well as a conservation area. There would be a loss of amenities to residents and visitors, a loss of footpaths and bridleways and loss of prime agricultural land and wildlife habitats..

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3465

0288

Detrimental effects on house prices, increased noise and dust. Increased traffic movements on poor quality, inadequate, roads.

Objects to the site due to increased noise and dust. Increased traffic movements on poor quality, inadequate, roads.

3466

0289

Objects to the site for the following reasons: Prevailing winds would bring dust (health problems), noise and extra traffic, and possible devaluation of property prices.

Objects to the site for the following reasons: Prevailing winds would bring dust (health problems), noise and extra traffic, and possible devaluation of property prices.

2860

0253

It is an extensive area and too large for the local environment and community. The woods must be preserved.

It is an extensive area and too large for the local environment and community. The woods must be preserved.

3449

0211

All the land up for consideration is to the West and South West of Scruton i.e. in the direction of the prevailing winds. The village already suffers to a limited extent from A1 noise when the wind is from this direction so having quarrying in this area would greatly exacerbate the situation in terms of noise and dust for Scruton, Kirkby Fleetham, Great Fencote, Little Fencote and Leeming Bar. The area is currently used for farming and is an area of high value agricultural land which would be spoiled by quarrying. The transport infrastructure is totally inadequate to cope with the vast number of heavy vehicles that this development would entail.

Concerned about increased noise and dust due to prevailing winds on local villages.
Concerned about loss of high value agricultural land.
Transport infrastructure inadequate to cope with heavy site traffic.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3472

0251

Concerned about the impact on the local, narrow, roads which are already unsuitable for the existing heavy vehicles using them. An increase in traffic would pose a threat to people, property and the state of the roads and verges.

Concerned about the impact on the local, narrow, roads which are already unsuitable for the existing heavy vehicles using them. An increase in traffic would pose a threat to people, property and the state of the roads and verges.

3447

0152

This site is too close to Scruton. There will be dust, noise and light pollution detrimental to health and well being particularly affecting the village sports and playground. With the Bedale bypass resulting in the closure of Low Street access to the proposed site will be through Scruton, which is unsuitable for HGVs creating a danger of accidents. The site will remove further arable land in addition to that lost to A1M development and Leeming Bar industrial estate. This impacts on wildlife and air quality.

This site is too close to Scruton and there will be dust, noise and light pollution detrimental to health and wellbeing. Access to the proposed site is unsuitable for HGVs creating a danger of accidents. The site will remove further arable land and will impact on wildlife and air quality.

3470

0275

The attached annotated map shows the location of Field House Equestrian. To the NE and SW of the property is the Wensleydale Railway, to the east is Ham Hall Lane, to the south is the A684 and Northallerton Road is to the west, we have noise pollution from the planes at RAF Leeming. Very shortly the Bedale By-pass and a roundabout will be constructed close to the property. The addition of a noisy quarry in close proximity to the horses will cause them upset.

Cumulative noise pollution impact from numerous sources causing distress to horses linked to the equestrian business.

Additional annotated map provided.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
2828	0167	Opposes the proposed site because it would lead to the destruction of the rural environment, wildlife habitat and loss of prime agricultural land. Preservation of the environment in the Scruton area should be prioritised. Dust and noise pollution from the proposed site could lead to severe health and safety issues. Local roads cannot support increase in HGV traffic and this may lead to congestion and health and safety issues. Quality of life for local residents would be ruined. This proposal would lead to devaluation of property prices in Scruton, which the Council should compensate.	Opposes the proposed site due to: destruction of the rural environment, wild life habitat and loss of prime agricultural land; dust and noise pollution; inadequate local road network; negative impact on quality of life for local residents.
2858	0384	<p>Objects to the site as it would detrimentally effect the quality of life of local residents. Furthermore there would be issues of heavy traffic causing air and noise pollution, but there would be a loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>Would question the need for sand and gravel from this site, as there must be less-disruptive sites available.</p>	<p>Objects to the site due to detrimental effect on the quality of life of local residents, Traffic impacts, air and noise pollution, and loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>Would question the need for sand and gravel from this site, as there must be less-disruptive sites available.</p>
2853	0094	<p>Our previous objection stands.</p> <p>There is a reduction in site area but the alleged mineral reserve remains the same at 6.5 to 8 million tonnes. The borrow pit at Roughley Bank has recently been permitted, an extension to this site for general quarrying purposes should not be allowed, which is what the revision to MJP43 seems to suggest.</p> <p>The site is unlikely to be economically viable and the mineral resource is of inadequate quality and quantity. There is no need for the mineral from this site and the environmental impacts of working and restoration are unacceptable.</p>	<p>The site area has reduced but the level of resource has remained the same. Concerned that the borrow pit at Roughley Bank will be extended to incorporate MJP43 for general quarrying. The site is unlikely to be economically viable and the mineral resource is of inadequate quality and quantity. The need for the mineral from this site needs to be assessed and the environmental impacts of working and restoration are unacceptable.</p>

Respondent No. Name

2848

CommentNo Comment

0315

Objects to the site. There is less emphasis on the Scruton area but the main thrust is towards Leeming Bar. Was led to believe that Roughley Bank would not be included as this would be returned to agricultural use after BALB is built. The whole site would be visible from high ground and would create an eyesore in an area of beauty. An increase in traffic would put pressure on local roads.

Summary

Objects to the site on visual intrusion, impact on local landscape and traffic impacts.

2846

0115

Objects to the site due to proximity to Scruton village, the negative impact on property value. Concerned about noise, dust and associated health issues. The site would result in loss of farmland. There are other sources of material available, the development will not bring any benefit to local residents.

Objects to the site due to proximity to Scruton village. Concerned about noise, dust and associated health issues. The site would result in loss of farmland. Other sources of material are available.

Whilst the reduction in the overall size of the site and the inclusion of possible site restoration is noted, there still remain profound concerns over the selection of this site.

As detailed in the previous response, and not significantly diminished as a result of the revised proposal: 1.The proposed site involves an unacceptable level of disruption, disproportionate with other applications:

a.It remains encircling two properties completely, b.a number of properties would have extraction carried out bordering their boundaries. 2.Given the scale proposed, concerns (individual and cumulative) in relation to impact remain at an unacceptable level – namely (i) quality of life for local residents, (ii) high water table, (iii) increased risk for RAF Leeming (iv) environmental impact, impact on the fishery, and increased noise/particulate pollution impacting remaining crop/livestock production. 3.Residual concerns over impact on property values and physical/mental health still remain.

Additionally: 1.It is noted that despite the reduction in scale, there has been no adjustment to the estimated reserve, unstated annual output or proposed life of the site, affirming the view that this is a speculative proposal, without have undergone appropriate analysis or consideration. 2.The inclusion of the reference to the borrow-pit approval under Other Information has no relevance to this proposal, since it is understood that specific permission was granted for a particular use with a specific end date, and was in no way a precedent to support future expansion/change of use. 3.The proposed site rests close to businesses engaged in food production in Leeming Bar, which are likely to experience adverse effects from dust and other contaminants.

Having reviewed the responses to the previous collection of proposals, MJP43 attracted overwhelming opposition –

Objects to the site for a number of reasons: Proximity and disruption to local residents; cumulative impacts; impact upon water table; increased risk to RAF Leeming; environmental impact; impact upon local agriculture; increase noise/particulate production; concerns over impact upon property values and physical and mental health; the site has not undergone appropriate analysis; the former borrow pit approval on the site is in no way a precedent to support future expansion; overwhelming local opposition.

significantly more than any other proposed sites. Even in revised form, this level of opposition based on valid concerns will remain; there is no desire for such a site in this location, and it should not proceed.

2839

0216

Wish to raise continued objections to the quarry site. The site will impact on the landscape, be detrimental to wildlife, environment and economic standing of local residents.

The industrial sites of Leeming due to the A1 expansion appear to have taken place at an alarming rate and the light and air pollution from these sites has increased significantly. Traffic flow of HGVs is apparent. The quarry site will lead to further light and air pollution, disturbance of wildlife and economic impact on local residents who are already suffering from the current austerity measures in place.

With the building of the A1 bypass NYCC appear to be allowing an expansion of industrial units in the area without justification.

The benefit to the Council and a few land owners is not proportionate to the detriment of residents.

The quarry will discourage tourists from coming to the area.

Object to the site.

The site will impact on the landscape, be detrimental to wildlife, environment and economic standing of local residents.

There will be light and air pollution and increase in HGVs.

The quarry will discourage tourists from visiting the area.

2838

0091

The revised proposal has moved the eastern boundary approximately a quarter of a mile away from the village. We still object to the site as the prevailing wind would carry dust and noise pollution over the village. The roads within and around this site are inadequate for the large lorries which will use them.

Object to revised site as prevailing wind would carry dust and noise over the village and roads will not accommodate the increase in heavy traffic.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

2863

0105

The proposed site for mineral extraction is currently farmland used to raise crops, whose contribution may be viewed as small scale, it is nevertheless integral to the economy. The amount of mineral deposits contained in this area is small scale however the disruption to the local community/environment will be massive. The air pollution from the extraction will cause health problems to the residents of Scruton; the noise from the heavy plant machinery will have a negative effect on quality of life; the damage to local roads will cost far more to repair than the revenue gained by the extraction; the extraction will destroy local ancient woodland and natural habitat, which can never be replaced.

Approximately 10% of the housing in Scruton is up for sale mainly due to the continued proposals to industrialise the surrounding farmland, house prices are plummeting, all because a few seek to gain financial profit to the detriment of the many.

This proposal goes against the NYCC planning process for protecting the green belt.

The proposed site for mineral extraction would lead to the loss of farmland used to raise crops. Disruption to the local community/environment outweighs the benefit of extraction. The site will lead to air/noise pollution and damage local roads which will have a negative effect on quality of life; the extraction will destroy local ancient woodland and natural habitat.

This proposal goes against NYCC planning policy protecting the green belt.

2834

0044

Object to this site due to; dust pollution to local residents homes and property; loss of agricultural land; loss of local wildlife; availability of alternatives; lack of local need; proximity to Scruton village.

Object to this site due to; dust pollution; loss of agricultural land and local wildlife; availability of alternatives; lack of local need; proximity to Scruton village.

2909

0269

Objections to the Plan remain as stated in my response to the Issues & Options consultation. The reduced size of the revised submission has no material effect on my objection.

The reduced size of the revised submission has no material effect on my objection to the site expressed in my previous response.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo Comment	Summary
2822	<p>0509 Although the area has been reduced there are still concerns regarding extraction from this area. The site would generate air pollution, the RAF base would be put at risk as would the food businesses at Leeming Bar. The Bypass would be put at risk of poor visibility from the dust. Removal of sand and gravel would increase the risk of local flooding, creation of ponds would put air craft at risk from birds. The only bridal path would be lost resulting in horse riders, cyclists and walkers using hazardous narrow roads.</p>	<p>Concerned about the risk of air pollution, potential increase risk from flooding and loss or recreational amenity.</p>
2821	<p>0279 The proposal is too close to residential properties in Scruton, Fencote and Leeming. Concerned about the effect upon health of residents as the wind direction is not a constant. Past experience of smells emanating from a bio-digester slurry tank leads to strong concerns for the health of people who live here if the westerly wind carries dust from the quarry.</p> <p>Highways guess that the current background noise of 50 decibels beggars belief, when the maximum allowable is 55 - how convenient. For 2 months every year the noise levels will be 70 decibels. A full noise assessment needs to be undertaken before plans are submitted.</p> <p>The disregard for wildlife is frustrating as the habitats of birds, hedgehogs and other animals will be severely affected. This is in addition to the ever-increasing eyesore of Leeming Bar. The Council should look at alternatives, away from villages which can provide 'secondary materials'. The quality of life of local residents should be the primary concern not the benefit of a few landowners.</p>	<p>Too close to residential properties. Concerned about the effect upon health of residents. Strong concerns for the health of local people due to dust. A full noise assessment needs to be undertaken before plans are submitted. The habitats of wildlife will be severely affected. Cumulative impact from Leeming Bar. The Council should look at alternatives, away from villages. The quality of life of local residents should be the primary concern.</p>

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary	
2784	0240	<p>Object to the site. There are a large number of properties either surrounded or next to the site. This is a breach of peoples human rights, the National Planning Policy Framework and your own planning policy.</p> <p>The site is in the flight line of RAF Leeming which may be affected by dust from the site.</p> <p>Extensions to existing quarries can cover the councils requirements for the next 30 years.</p> <p>There would be a loss of prime agricultural land.</p> <p>The minerals on this site are not very thick, the percentage of minerals extracted to the amount of area destroyed makes this site not viable.</p>	<p>There is a lack of need for the mineral from this site, extensions to existing sites will provide adequate supply. The mineral on the site is of poor depth and so not viable.</p> <p>The site will adversely impact on nearby properties.</p> <p>The site is on the flight path for RAF Leeming airfield, so poses a small risk to the aeroplanes.</p> <p>There would be a loss of prime agricultural land.</p>	
128	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	0258	<p>Patchy site which is very large. Potential for valuable restoration for wildlife. Field margins and hedgerows probably quite ancient and could need protecting. Potential cumulative impacts with other sites further north.</p>	<p>Large, Patchy site with Field margins which could need protecting. Potential for valuable restoration for wildlife. Potential cumulative impacts further north.</p>

121

Environment Agency

0542

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Respondent No.	Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
120	Historic England	0133	<p>A Grade II Listed Ice House lies less than 25 metres from the westernmost edge of this site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Leases Hall, a Grade II Listed Building, lies under 250 metres from the western edge of this area. · There is an unscheduled upstanding round barrow between Leases Hall and the Ice House some 200 metres from the western edge of this area. · The boundary of Scruton Conservation Area (which contains a number of Listed Buildings including the Grade II* Listed Church of St Radegund) lies 1.3km from the eastern corner of this site · A Scheduled Motte and bailey castle and medieval settlement earthworks within Hall Garth lie 2 km from the northern edge of this site <p>The boundary of Kirkby Fleetham Conservation Area lies 2.1 km to the north of this site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Scruton Grange, a Grade II Listed Building, is situated 830 metres from the northern corner of this site · There is a group of three Listed Buildings at Scruton House 1km from the eastern corner of this site. 	<p>A Grade II Listed Ice House lies less than 25 metres from the westernmost edge of this site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Leases Hall, a Grade II Listed Building, lies under 250 metres from the western edge of this area. · There is an unscheduled upstanding round barrow between Leases Hall and the Ice House some 200 metres from the western edge of this area. · The boundary of Scruton Conservation Area (which contains a number of Listed Buildings including the Grade II* Listed Church of St Radegund) lies 1.3km from the eastern corner of this site · A Scheduled Motte and bailey castle and medieval settlement earthworks within Hall Garth lie 2 km from the northern edge of this site <p>The boundary of Kirkby Fleetham Conservation Area lies 2.1 km to the north of this site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Scruton Grange, a Grade II Listed Building, is situated 830 metres from the northern corner of this site · There is a group of three Listed Buildings at Scruton House 1km from the eastern corner of this site.
114	Ministry of Defence	0051	<p>This site lies within the all development consultation zone surrounding RAF Leeming, therefore this development should be referred to the MOD for review.</p>	<p>This site lies within the all development consultation zone surrounding RAF Leeming, therefore this development should be referred to the MOD for review.</p>

Respondent No.	Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
2836	***consulted under 2385***	0243	<p>Oppose any application for this area. As the prevailing wind is from the South West all dust and dirt would be blown towards the village and would be a major health hazard to everyone living in the area.</p> <p>There would be considerable noise created by machinery and extra traffic which will affect the peace and tranquillity of the village.</p> <p>There would also be considerable financial impact as a quarry in the immediate vicinity would reduce the value of all housing and make it much more difficult to sell and also killing the village.</p>	<p>Oppose this site. The prevailing wind will blow dust and dirt towards the village and pose a health hazard.</p> <p>There will be an impact form noise and increased traffic on amenity.</p> <p>The site could have an adverse impact on the economy of the village.</p>
3386		0065	Objects due to environmental impact and increased traffic volumes.	Objects due to environmental impact and increased traffic volumes.
3440		0205	<p>Oppose the site on the grounds of the detrimental effect it will have on the locality. There will be increase heavy traffic in the area and infrastructure will have to be put in place, causing more disruption. There are already many quarries in the area so this one is not required. There will be considerable impact on the local community and property values. The site is in the flight path of RAF Leeming so risk of birdstrike will increase.</p>	<p>There will be an adverse impact on local amenity due to an increase in heavy traffic and building of infrastructure.</p> <p>There is no need for this quarry as already others in the area. The site is in the flight line of RAF Leeming so could be an increase in the risk of birdstrike.</p>

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3437	0204	Object as there is already adequate provision for minerals and so new quarries are not required. There would be adverse landscape and visual impact in the short medium and long term, Kirkby Fleetham is a conservation village. The proposal would affect local wildlife by destroying it. The noise and vibration from the site would affect the village and surrounding locality. There will be dust and air quality issues to the residents as the village is downwind from the site. There will be a detrimental impact on the local highway network and highway and pedestrian safety. There will a loss of amenity for other road users. There will be a loss of prime agricultural land.	There is not a need for the site. There would be an adverse impact on landscape, visual amenity, local wildlife, residential amenity and local amenity in terms of noise, vibration, dust and air quality. There will be an impact on the local highway network and other road users, and a loss of agricultural land.
3425	0170	Object to the site for the following reasons: air and noise pollution; adverse impact on the scenery; local roads are not adequate for increased heavy traffic and will be dangerous for other users.	Object to the site due to: air and noise pollution; adverse impact on the scenery; local roads are not adequate for increased heavy traffic.
3424	0172	Strongly object to the site because the location of the site cannot support it visually (total destruction of local area), environmentally (potentially toxic microparticles) nor practically (road conditions and 120 forty tonne HGVs a day). Furthermore, high quality agricultural land will be lost and there will be an adverse effect on the watertable. The village will be impacted because it is downwind of the site.	Strongly object to the site because the location of the site cannot support it visually, environmentally nor practically (i.e. dust pollution, road conditions and traffic). High quality agricultural land will be lost and there will be an adverse effect on the watertable.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3419 ***Do Not Consult - Consulted Under 2837*** 0177

Object to the site because: The village is a wonderful example of country life and it would be a tragedy if quarrying were permitted in the area; harmful particles from dust pollution leading to health conditions will be a particular issue due to the prevailing wind and the location of a primary school in the village; noise pollution impacting upon the peace and tranquillity of the countryside; impact on local businesses such as the local pub (noise, dust and lost view may discourage customers and visitors); loss of agricultural land which is in great demand; existing quarries should be able to meet demand through extensions; development of the site would ruin a small, peaceful and historic village.

Object to the site because: dust pollution leading to health conditions; noise pollution impacting upon peace and tranquillity; impact on local businesses and visitors to the area; loss of agricultural land; existing quarries should be able to meet demand through extensions; impacts upon an historic village.

3418 ***Do Not Consult - Consulted Under 2837*** 0176

Object to the site because: harmful particles from dust pollution leading to health conditions will be a particular issue due to the prevailing wind and the location of a primary school in the village; noise pollution impacting upon the peace and tranquillity of the countryside; impact on local businesses such as the local pub (noise, dust and lost view may discourage customers and visitors); loss of agricultural land which is in great demand; existing quarries should be able to meet demand through extensions; development of the site would ruin a small, peaceful and historic village.

Object to the site because: dust pollution leading to health conditions; noise pollution impacting upon peace and tranquillity; impact on local businesses and visitors to the area; loss of agricultural land; existing quarries should be able to meet demand through extensions; impacts upon an historic village.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3416

0164

The Proposed site is flawed as it fails to take account of the Bedale, Aiskew and Leeming by-pass (BLAB). The By-pass closes of many of the roads surrounding the site leaving only a few unsuitable narrow roads for the quarry vehicles to use. It appears the new road has not been considered. The proposed closure of Low Street is going to result in an increase of traffic in Scruton Village (vehicles travelling from Kirkby Fleetham and Fencotes) which will be made worse by vehicle movements from the quarry. The site would destroy an area of outstanding beauty, which is enjoyed by walkers, runners and cyclists.

Considers the proposal ill conceived as it hasn't taken account of the proposed BALB and the traffic implications of the sites. Concern about the impact upon leisure activities and destruction of a beautiful area.

2861

0443

Concerns still the same as previous comment at Issues and Option stage. Impact on bridleway, walking and cycle paths, further noise and dust pollution. Concerned about the increase of heavy vehicles using the local roads. The site will be a blight on the landscape for the Wensleydale railway. Woodlands, waterways and wildlife habitat will be lost and the quality of life for residents will be affected. It will have an impact on property prices and sales.

Site will impact on residential amenity and will increase noise and dust pollution. Concerned about the increase of heavy vehicles using the local roads. There will be an impact on visual amenity. Woodlands, waterways and wildlife habitat will be lost and the quality of life for residents will be affected.

3393

0081

This site will have a negative impact on the residents in Little Fencote, Scruton and Leeming Bar. There will be noise and dust pollution, an increase in traffic which will increase the hazard for non motor vehicle road users. Concerned about reduction in property values. The Beadle by-pass, RAF Leeming and A1 upgrade already impact on the residential amenity of the area. The site will cause a loss of agricultural land.

Concerned about impact on residential amenity in terms of dust and noise. Concerned that increase in site traffic will pose a greater hazard for other road users. The site will cause a loss of agricultural land.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3476	0307	<p>There are other sites submitted in the area, there is a lack of need for all of them to be progressed. The site will have a high impact on nearby villages in terms of noise, dust and visual impact.</p> <p>The surrounding roads are unsuitable for heavy traffic and they have no pavements so increased risk to other road users.</p> <p>The suitability of transport links for this site have to be questioned with the number of lorries joining the bypass a significant risk to road safety.</p> <p>The site would have a high impact on the environment and lead to a loss of natural habitat and wildlife.</p> <p>It would have a detrimental effect on the quality of life of residents.</p>	<p>There is a lack of need for all of the proposed sites to be progressed.</p> <p>There will be a high impact on nearby villages and residents in terms of noise, dust and visual impact.</p> <p>The surrounding roads are unsuitable for heavy traffic and have no footpaths so greater risk to other road users.</p> <p>The site would have an impact on the environment and wildlife.</p>
2977	0371	<p>There are a considerable number of dwellings and businesses within close proximity of the proposed site which would be affected by the extraction of minerals. The prevailing westerly winds would carry particles of dust which could cause health issues.</p> <p>Local roads are not suitable for heavy vehicles.</p> <p>There would be a loss of agricultural land in addition to the land lost for the Bedale bypass and A1 upgrade.</p>	<p>Local properties and businesses would be affected by the site.</p> <p>Dust would be carried by the prevailing wind and could cause health problems.</p> <p>The local roads are not suitable for heavy vehicles.</p> <p>There would be a loss of agricultural land.</p>

Respondent No.	Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
2963	***if sending by post consulted under 2784)	0241	<p>Can obtain the Councils requirement for sand and gravel from extensions to existing sites, so no need for this site. If this site went ahead it would be in breach of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Councils planning policies.</p> <p>The density of minerals in relation to the area damaged makes this not a viable project.</p> <p>There are 6 houses that will either be completely surrounded or sat on the edge the quarry, this is unacceptable and in breach of the householders human rights.</p> <p>The dust will be a major issue to aircraft using RAF Leeming as only a few hundred feet above the ground.</p>	<p>No need for this site as requirements can be met from extensions to existing quarries, plus the density of the mineral on site is poor.</p> <p>Houses located near the site will be severely impacted, and some may be surrounded.</p> <p>Concerned that dust will pose a risk to aircraft using RAF Leeming.</p>
2960		0481	<p>The site is too near a village. There would be a loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>Impact on residential amenity, environmental health issues and increase in traffic.</p>	<p>The site is too near a village. There would be a loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>Impact on residential amenity, environmental health issues and increase in traffic.</p>
2948	***Do Not Consult***Consulted Under 2947***	0239	<p>The mineral requirement for the next 50 years can be sourced from extensions to existing sites. this site has a very low mineral content compared to other submissions but affects more people than most.</p> <p>The site would surround some properties, the dust and vibration from the workings would pose a risk.</p> <p>There is a risk to the planes using RAF Leeming airfield.</p> <p>This is a breach of peoples human rights.</p>	<p>There is a lack of need for the site, new resources should be resourced from extensions to existing sites. This site has a very low mineral content.</p> <p>The site would surround some properties and be impacted by the dust and vibration from the site,</p> <p>There is a risk to the planes using RAF Leeming airfield.</p>

Respondent No. Name

2947

CommentNo Comment

0238

There is sufficient mineral content in existing brownfield sites to cover developments for the next 30 to 50 years without destroying greenfield areas.
If new sites are to be found then the density of minerals per acre should be an overriding factor. This site has very little depth of mineral but affects a significant number of people.
The site will surround some properties.
The site is in the flight path of RAF Leeming so small risk to aircraft.
This is a breach of peoples human rights

Summary

No need for this site.
Use density of minerals per acre as an overriding factor, this site has very little depth of mineral.
The site will affect a number of residents and surround some properties.
The site is in the flight path of RAF Leeming so small risk to aircraft.

2933

0359

There is a lack of need for the site as requirements can be met from existing sites.

Should expand exiting sites rather than create new ones on green field sites which would result in the loss of agricultural land.

There are a lot of sites focused in a small area, this would have a detrimental effect on the locality which has already had the environment and landscape impacted by the A1 upgrade, Bedale bypass and service areas.

Concerned about the impact on health through noise, dust and pollutants, especially due to the prevailing wind.

There would be a large increase in heavy traffic the lanes are not suitable and are used as a diversion route if problems on the A1.

Concerned about impact on local habitat for wildlife, hedgerows, trees and watercourses.

Concerned about reduction in opportunities for recreational use of the land and lanes and the landscape would be affected deterring visitors.

The villages are linked and communities would be affected.

The site will not benefit local residents.

There is a lack of detail about the proposals and lack of contact from the minerals industry.

There will be a detrimental impact on business, and house prices in the area.

Lack of need for site, expand existing ones instead.

If all sites in area go ahead will have a detrimental effect on locality in terms of landscape, environment and loss of agricultural land. Wildlife habitats, hedgerows, trees and watercourses will be affected.

Concerned about the impact on health through noise, dust and pollutants, especially due to the prevailing wind.

Local roads not suitable for heavy traffic.

Leisure opportunities will be reduced on land and lanes.

Local communities will be affected and there will be no benefit to local residents.

Need more detail about proposals.

2912

0179

Do not want this site to go ahead. In close proximity to the village a digester, pig farm and this site have been proposed. This site will lead to increased HGV traffic and noise and dust carried by the prevailing westerly winds. The site will impact upon wildlife and may reduce house prices.

Object to the site due to; cumulative impact of a number of different proposals in close proximity to the village; increased HGV traffic and noise and dust impacts; impact upon wildlife; reduction in house prices.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3441	****Consulted under 2904**** 0207	Killerby Hall quarry is only half a mile to north and is about to be submitted to planning, Home Farm Kirkby Fleetham also moving a step closer to being excavated, there are other operational sites in the area so no need for this site. The roads will need upgrading to take the extra lorries. The prevailing wind will carry dust and impact on the air quality over Kirkby Fleetham and Little Fencote. The land is grade two arable land and needed for agriculture.	There are other quarries in the area which are either active or have submitted planning applications, so this site is not needed. The roads will need upgrading to take extra lorries. The prevailing wind will carry dust and impact on the air quality over the local area. There will be a loss of grade two agricultural land.
3403	0119	The cumulative impact of the proposed sites (MJP60, MJP33 and MJP43) would change the rural nature of the area to one of industrialisation impacting upon the quality of life, public amenity (including tranquillity) and tourism of the area.	The cumulative impact of the proposed sites (MJP60, MJP33 and MJP43) should be considered.
2011	0429	There would be a dramatic increase of large vehicle movement along country lanes creating hazards for other road users. There will be noise, dust and fumes polluting the environment. Kirkby Fleetham could end up surrounded by quarry sites.	Concerned that there will be an increase of large vehicle movements along the country lanes posing a hazard to other road users. Concerned about pollution from noise, dust and fumes. Concerned about cumulative impact if all quarries go ahead.
3566	0456	Concerned about the loss of agricultural land changing the nature of the rural area and leading to increased amounts of traffic. What will the site be restored to after extraction has taken place?	Concerned about loss of agricultural land/rural setting and increased amounts of traffic. Concerned about restoration.

Respondent No.	Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3489	Leeming Bar Residents Association	0311	<p>The revision shows removal of some land near Scruton, and the bulk of the site situated nearer to Leeming Bar, it includes the area known as Roughley Bank which is supposed only to be used for extraction of gravel for the bypass.</p> <p>The quarry would have an adverse visual impact on the area. Footpaths would be affected.</p> <p>The narrow roads would become easily congested by site traffic.</p> <p>Much of the natural ridge would be removed causing greater wind and erosion.</p> <p>Noise levels would increase.</p> <p>There has been a lot of industry introduced over the years without upgraded road infrastructure.</p>	<p>The revision has had some of the land removed.</p> <p>The quarry would have an adverse visual impact on the area and cause an increase in noise.</p> <p>The narrow roads would become congested by site traffic and footpaths would be affected.</p> <p>The natural ridge would be reduced resulting in an increase in wind and dust and further erosion.</p>
3499	**** Consulted under 3500***	0330	<p>Our property would be surrounded by the site. This would be detrimental to the value of the property and quality of life of residents and impact on human right to have a healthy standard of living. The proposal goes against national and local planning policy.</p>	<p>Properties would be surrounded by the site which would impact on quality of life of residents. The proposal appears to go against national and local policy.</p>
3550		0512	<p>The existing roads are too narrow and not capable of dealing with the proposed level of heavy traffic.</p> <p>There is a lack of detailed information about which areas will be quarried and individual sites.</p> <p>There is a lack of need for the site.</p> <p>The water table will be affected and will need to find a way to dispose of the excess water from the quarrying process.</p> <p>There will be a loss of agricultural land, wildlife habitats and an adverse impact on the environment in general.</p> <p>There will be an increase in noise and dust pollution, which will be carried to the village by the prevailing wind so air quality will be affected and may cause health problems.</p>	<p>The narrow roads not suitable for increase in heavy traffic.</p> <p>There is a lack of need for the site.</p> <p>The water table will be affected and excess water from the quarrying process will need to be disposed of.</p> <p>There will be a loss of agricultural land, wildlife habitats and an adverse impact on the environment in general.</p> <p>There will be an increase in noise and dust pollution which will impact on air quality and may impact on residents health.</p>

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3494

0321

If there are problems on the A1 diversions lead traffic in and around Kirkby Fleetham Village. HGVs should not use country roads they are a danger to other road users (walker, cyclists etc.) . Concerned about dust pollution, loss of views, agricultural land and wildlife habitats.

Concerned about increased HGV movements on country road, dust pollution, loss of view, loss of agricultural land and loss of habitats.

1505

0465

This submission has been amended, still object in terms of lack of need, access and loss of agricultural land.

This submission has been amended, still object in terms of lack of need, access and loss of agricultural land.

2215

CPRE (Hambleton Branch)

0111

Welcomes the significant reduction to the area covered by the original proposal, which goes some way to preserve the environment of Scruton.

Welcomes the reduction to the area covered by the original proposal, which goes some way to preserve the environment of Scruton.

However, the number of affected properties still exceeds those of the other Sand & Gravel sites identified in the 2014 Consultation. It is also observed that the substantial reduction to the area covered in MJP 43 is not accompanied by any reduction in the estimated reserves. This may indicate that the Scruton site is more speculative than the more developed assessments for extensions to existing quarries. Extra caution needs to be exercised before MJP 43 is moved to a second stage.

However, properties are still affected by the proposal and the reduction to the area covered in MJP 43 is not accompanied by any reduction in the estimated reserves indicating that the site is speculative. Extra caution needs to be exercised before MJP 43 is moved to a second stage.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3524	0450	<p>Objects to the site on the following grounds: Inadequate road network leading to increased disruption and hazards. Noise, dust and light pollution creating unpleasant and unhealthy environment. The rural landscape will be spoilt, agricultural land will be lost. The quarry would be contrary to the limits put upon development rights of the conservation area. There would be a loss of wildlife habitats and residential amenity. There is an overcapacity of resources of 39 million tonnes, the need for this site is questioned.</p>	<p>Objects to the site on the following grounds: Inadequate road network leading to increased disruption and hazards. Noise, dust and light pollution. The landscape will be spoilt, agricultural land wildlife habitats and residential amenity will be lost. The quarry would be contrary to the limits put upon development rights of the conservation area. There is an overcapacity of resources of 39 million tonnes, the need for this site is questioned.</p>
1266	0305	<p>The site is close to Scruton, Little Fencote and Leeming Bar and will have an adverse impact in terms of noise, dust and visual impact. The surrounding roads are unsuitable for the movement of heavy traffic and there are no pavements. The suitability of the transport links for this site have to be questioned with the number of lorries which will use the new by pass there would be an increased risk to road safety. There are other sites proposed in the area so no need for this one as they have better access and less environmental impact and less disruption to residents.</p>	<p>The site is close to several villages and there will be an adverse impact in term of noise, dust and visual impact. The surrounding roads are not suitable for heavy traffic and there are no pavements, and there would be an increased risk to road safety. There is a lack of need for this site and there are more suitable sites in the area.</p>
3495	0439	<p>Concerned about significant increase in HGV traffic, pollution of environment and the unknown impact on wildlife.</p>	<p>Concerned about significant increase in HGV traffic, pollution of environment and the unknown impact on wildlife.</p>

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3496

0327

The site is not the best solution for the future demand for minerals. There are other brownfield sites which could be expanded and source a higher level of demand than is actually required.

In view of preliminary tests there would be a disproportionately large amount of disruption and public nuisance relative to the benefit derived. There are other sites with a far higher mineral density per acre, where less individuals would be inconvenienced.

There is a risk of dust and vibrations bringing down an aircraft from RAF Leeming.

Should expand brownfield sites to deal with further demand as this site is not the best solution.

The site would have an adverse impact on residents.

There is a risk of aeroplanes from RAF Leeming being affected.

3516

0464

Object to site.

The lanes are used by walkers, cyclists, horse riders and Bedale Hunt, they are unsuitable for heavy lorries and will present a danger to other road users.

Concerned about noise and dust pollution and impact on the rural setting.

It is in close proximity to an archaeological site of national importance.

There would be a loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats.

Unsuitable local roads for HGVs.

Noise and dust pollution.

Impacts on the rural setting.

Proximity to an archaeological site of national importance.

Loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats.

3513

0433

This site is inappropriate as it disrupts the living conditions and health of local residents, animals and their ecosystems. Other sites away from villages need to be considered.

Evidence from Asarco Smelter in Tacoma, Wasingtin, USA suggests that quarry sites lead to harm and contamination to people, animals and the environment web link: <http://yosemite.epa.gov/RIO/CLEANUP.NSF/sites/Asarco>

Inappropriate site which disrupts the living conditions and health of local residents, animals and their ecosystems.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3506	0415	<p>Object to site.</p> <p>The lanes are used by walkers, cyclists, horse riders and Bedale Hunt, they are unsuitable for heavy lorries and will present a danger to other road users.</p> <p>Concerned about noise and dust pollution and impact on the rural setting.</p> <p>It is in close proximity to an archaeological site of national importance.</p> <p>There would be a loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats.</p>	<p>Unsuitable local roads for HGVs.</p> <p>Noise and dust pollution.</p> <p>Impacts on the rural setting.</p> <p>Proximity to an archaeological site of national importance.</p> <p>Loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats.</p>
3500	0328	<p>Our property would be surrounded by the site. This would be detrimental to the value of the property and quality of life of residents and impact on human right to have a healthy standard of living. The proposal goes against national and local planning policy.</p>	<p>Properties would be surrounded by the site which would impact on quality of life of residents. The proposal appears to go against national and local policy.</p>
3525	0452	<p>Objects to the site on the following grounds:</p> <p>Inadequate road network leading to increased disruption and hazards.</p> <p>Noise, dust and light pollution creating unpleasant and unhealthy environment. The rural landscape will be spoilt, agricultural land will be lost. The quarry would be contrary to the limits put upon development rights of the conservation area. There would be a loss of wildlife habitats and residential amenity.</p> <p>There is an overcapacity of resources of 39 million tonnes, the need for this site is questioned.</p>	<p>Inadequate road network leading to increased disruption and hazards. Noise, dust and light pollution. The landscape will be spoilt, agricultural land wildlife habitats and residential amenity will be lost. The quarry is contrary to the designation of the conservation area. There is an overcapacity of resources of 39 million tonnes, the need for this site is questioned.</p>

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3485

0290

The effects of gravel extraction are well known, so I am assuming that all factors have been carefully considered for the site. Should the scheme be given the go ahead the operators must be subject to national and the Councils controls, including frequent assessments of the impact of the extraction and processing. All reasonable precautions will need to be taken to mitigate harmful side effects. Management plans should consider effects upon the local community. Funds should be set aside to ensure the site is restored.

Additional information has been provided.

If the scheme goes ahead the operators must be subject to controls, including frequent assessments of the impact of the extraction and processing. All reasonable precautions will need to be taken to mitigate impacts. Management plans should consider effects upon the local community. Funds should be set aside to ensure the site is restored.

836

Scruton Parish Council

0123

Previous objections still apply such as impact on prime agricultural land, noise and air pollution affecting village residents and surrounding areas. Some properties will be completely surrounded by quarry works. There are a number of high profile food industries nearby. The site is in the flight path of RAF Leeming. The roads are unsuitable for heavy vehicles associated with mineral extraction. Prevailing winds would directly affect the settlement with air, noise and carbon pollution.

The site will have an impact on the agricultural land. Residential amenity will be impacted by noise and dust in the prevailing winds and the closeness of the site to houses. Nearby food businesses may be impacted. The roads are unsuitable for site traffic and the site is in the flight path of RAF Leeming.

Respondent No.	Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
377	Aiskew and Leeming Bar Parish Council	0606	<p>The Parish Council supports surrounding villages in its objection to this site.</p> <p>Object due to:</p> <p>Noise and pollution affecting all residents in surrounding areas.</p> <p>A number of properties will be completely surrounded by quarry works.</p> <p>There are a number of food industries in the area of the proposed quarry.</p> <p>The site is on the flight path of RAF Leeming.</p> <p>The country roads in the area are unsuitable for heavy vehicles required for mineral extraction.</p> <p>The site is on prime agricultural land.</p>	<p>Object due to:</p> <p>Noise and pollution affecting all residents in surrounding areas.</p> <p>A number of properties will be completely surrounded by quarry works.</p> <p>There are a number of food industries in the area of the proposed quarrying.</p> <p>The site is on the flight path of RAF Leeming.</p> <p>The country roads in the area are unsuitable for heavy vehicles required for mineral extraction.</p> <p>The site is on prime agricultural land.</p>
836	Scruton Parish Council	0087	<p>Although there has been a reduction in the quantity of land submitted the area is still considerable and will severely impact on private homes, businesses and farms.</p> <p>The prevailing winds will bring dust, silicas and noise into the direction of the village, which is already under threat from creeping industrialisation and commercialism (pig farming, vehicle yards, road works, industrial estates, bio-digesters and quarries). The increase in traffic around the narrow village lane is also of considerable concern to walkers, horse riders etc.</p> <p>Concern regarding health issues for elderly residents from the increased air pollution for the site workings.</p> <p>There are other less populated sites already producing sand and gravel which can be extended with far less disruption.</p>	<p>Although it has been reduced the site is still a large area which would severely impact on residential and recreational amenity. Concerned about the health impact on elderly residents and increased noise and dust carried in to the village on prevailing winds.</p> <p>The area is threatened by industrialisation from a number of other developments.</p> <p>There are other more suitable, less populated, areas which already extract sand and gravel which can be extended with less disruption.</p>

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3486

Consulted Under 2909

0271

The revised area would change the nature of Scruton Village.
 The prevailing wind will increase air and noise pollution over the nearby villages.
 Some properties will be surrounded and there seems to be no consideration for quality of life for the residents.
 There will be a loss of agricultural land.
 There is lack of need for the site and if was operational the mineral would be transported over long distances.
 The area is close to nearby villages and would have a detrimental effect on these.

The revised area would change the nature of Scruton Village.
 The prevailing wind will increase air and noise pollution over the nearby villages.
 The quality of life of nearby residents and villagers will be impacted on, some properties will be surrounded by the site.
 There will be a loss of agricultural land.
 There is a lack of need for the site, and long travel distances for any mineral excavated.

3595

0353

Object to the site, it will materially alter the character of this small rural village. It is close to a national cycle route and the site traffic will deter cyclists from coming to the village.
 There will be an increase in noise and dust in this rural part of North Yorkshire adversely affecting the lives and health of people living in and visiting the area.

Object to the site.
 It will materially alter the character of the village and deter cyclists from visiting as the National Cycle route is nearby.
 Concerned about increase in noise and dust and the impact on health and amenity of residents and visitors.

3575

0365

Objects to the site for the following reasons:
 there is already enough gravel available for the next 50 years; the roads leading to the site are inadequate; concerned about the impact on the water table; and the prevailing winds will carry dust and noise into village adversely affecting the environment.

Objects to the site for the following reasons:
 there is already enough gravel available for the next 50 years; the roads leading to the site are inadequate; concerned about the impact on the water table; and the prevailing winds will carry dust and noise into village adversely affecting the environment.

MJP44

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0543

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

MJP45

121

Environment Agency

0585

We have been consulted on a planning application at this site under reference NY/2015/0058/ENV. As of the date of this letter we have not responded to that consultation. Please consult our response in due course.

We have been consulted on a planning application at this site under reference NY/2015/0058/ENV. As of the date of this letter we have not responded to that consultation. Please consult our response in due course.

121

Environment Agency

0545

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

MJP46

3495

0440

Concerned about significant increase in HGV traffic, pollution of environment and the unknown impact on wildlife.

Concerned about significant increase in HGV traffic, pollution of environment and the unknown impact on wildlife.

2011

0430

There would be a dramatic increase of large vehicle movement along country lanes creating hazards for other road users.
There will be noise, dust and fumes polluting the environment.
Kirkby Fleetham could end up surrounded by quarry sites.

Concerned that there will be an increase of large vehicle movements along the country lanes posing a hazard to other road users.
Concerned about pollution from noise, dust and fumes.
Concerned about cumulative impact if all quarries go ahead.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo Comment	Summary
121 Environment Agency	<p>0586 The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>This site lies within land outlined as a possible extension to functional floodplain FZ3b. Therefore the LPA should consider this when assessing site suitability in sequential test.</p> <p>The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3 and we have records of the site having previously flooded, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site details of mitigation measures surface water runoff <p>the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site. The results of a clear and transparent sequential test</p> <p>Bolton Beck is classified as a main river. The formal consent of the Agency will be required, under the Water Resources Act 1991, for any works in, over, under, or within 8m of a main river and / or a flood defence.</p> <p>Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal,</p>	<p>The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>This site lies within land outlined as a possible extension to functional floodplain FZ3b. Therefore the LPA should consider this when assessing site suitability in sequential test.</p> <p>The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3 and we have records of the site having previously flooded, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site details of mitigation measures surface water runoff <p>the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.</p> <p>The results of a clear and transparent</p>

which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as

sequential test

Bolton Beck is classified as a main river. The formal consent of the Agency will be required, under the Water Resources Act 1991, for any works in, over, under, or within 8m of a main river and / or a flood defence.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not

non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

We would support flood storage areas

MJP49

3435

Ramblers' Association

0195

The public bridelway that passes through this site is one of only two north-south rights of way from Scarborough. This bridelway is essential link in the current network and in the planned enhancement of public footpaths in the Eastfield area.

It is essential that this right of way be maintained, preferably in its current route. Any proposal to develop the site should detail the means by which passage can be preserved (if necessary implementing a series of temporary diversions) during working of the site.

being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

The public bridelway that passes through this site is one of only two north-south rights of way from Scarborough. This bridelway is essential link in the current network and in the planned enhancement of public footpaths in the Eastfield area.

It is essential that this right of way be maintained, preferably in its current route. Any proposal to develop the site should detail the means by which passage can be preserved (if necessary implementing a series of temporary diversions) during working of the site.

121 Environment Agency

0587

As stated in our Groundwater Protection Guide (GP3), within SPZ1, we will normally object in principle to any planning application for a development that may physically disturb an aquifer. In many cases quarries go below the water table and therefore can cause physical disturbance to an aquifer. Consequently, we would object to any new quarry developments that proposed to extract sub water table in SPZ1.

One of the main concerns the EA have when it comes to quarry restoration is the risk that infilling quarry voids poses to the water environment. We would look for only inert materials to be used as quarry infill, but the ideal is if quarries are left unfilled.

Specifically, we would ask that quarry restoration schemes avoid the infilling of the void in order to return it to agricultural land. Open holes are more protective of groundwater as the infill materials have the potential to introduce contaminants into the water environment.

GP3 states that the EA will object to all planning applications for landfill sites within Source Protection Zone 1 (SPZ1).

The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

This site may be considered as containing functional floodplain FZ3b. Paragraph 6.2.2 of The North East Yorkshire SFRA (PPS25 Update) February 2010 states:

“all areas within Flood Zone 3 which are located outside of currently developed sites and are not defended to a proven standard of protection of at least 5% have been defined as Flood Zone 3b Functional Floodplain. This includes all floodplain areas behind agricultural flood banks.”

As stated in our Groundwater Protection Guide (GP3), within SPZ1, we will normally object in principle to any planning application for a development that may physically disturb an aquifer. In many cases quarries go below the water table and therefore can cause physical disturbance to an aquifer. Consequently, we would object to any new quarry developments that proposed to extract sub water table in SPZ1.

One of the main concerns the EA have when it comes to quarry restoration is the risk that infilling quarry voids poses to the water environment. We would look for only inert materials to be used as quarry infill, but the ideal is if quarries are left unfilled.

Specifically, we would ask that quarry restoration schemes avoid the infilling of the void in order to return it to agricultural land. Open holes are more protective of groundwater as the infill materials have the potential to introduce contaminants into the water environment.

GP3 states that the EA will object to all planning applications for landfill sites within Source Protection Zone 1 (SPZ1).

The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

Therefore the LPA should consider this when assessing site suitability sequential test

The site contains high risk flood zone 3 along the eastern boundary, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site

detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours

details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels

proposed for the development

examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site

details of mitigation measures

surface water runoff

the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.

the results of a clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route. Spoil to be stored outside of the floodplain.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved

This site may be considered as containing functional floodplain FZ3b. Paragraph 6.2.2 of The North East Yorkshire SFRA (PPS25 Update) February 2010 states:

“all areas within Flood Zone 3 which are located outside of currently developed sites and are not defended to a proven standard of protection of at least 5% have been defined as Flood Zone 3b Functional Floodplain. This includes all floodplain areas behind agricultural flood banks.”

Therefore the LPA should consider this when assessing site suitability sequential test

The site contains high risk flood zone 3 along the eastern boundary, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site
detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours

details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development

examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site
details of mitigation measures

Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Muston & Yedingham Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site.

surface water runoff
the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.
The results of a clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route. Spoil to be stored outside of the floodplain.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other

The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Muston & Yedingham Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

MJP50

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0546

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

MJP51

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo Comment	Summary
121 Environment Agency	<p>0588 The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3 and we have records of the site having historically flooded, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site details of mitigation measures surface water runoff the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site. <p>The results of a clear and transparent sequential test</p> <p>The River Ure is classified as a main river. The formal consent of the Agency will be required, under the Water Resources Act 1991, for any works in, over, under, or within 8m of a main river and / or a flood defence.</p> <p>Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be</p>	<p>The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3 and we have records of the site having historically flooded, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site details of mitigation measures surface water runoff the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site. <p>The results of a clear and transparent sequential test</p> <p>The River Ure is classified as a main river. The formal consent of the Agency will be required, under the Water Resources Act 1991, for any works in, over, under, or</p>

adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

within 8m of a main river and / or a flood defence.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a

MJP52

3363

0002

It is not appropriate to locate a mineral site near a primary school and playing fields, the heavy traffic will disrupt commuters and school traffic and pose a threat to residents. The site would adversely impact on the village and conservation areas and would be located too close to York.

consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

Concerned the site will be too near a primary school and playing fields, the impact of increased traffic at busy times may adversely impact the amenity of the village as well as being located too close to York.

121

Environment Agency

0589

The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site
 detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours
 details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development
 examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site
 details of mitigation measures
 surface water runoff
 the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.
 The results of a clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route. Spoil to be stored outside of the floodplain.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations

The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site
 detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours
 details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development
 examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site
 details of mitigation measures
 surface water runoff
 the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.
 The results of a clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example

2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Marston Moor Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for

structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route. Spoil to be stored outside of the floodplain.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any

any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Marston Moor Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

1096

Nether Poppleton Parish
Council

0296

Major objection is on traffic management. The A59 Boroughbridge Road is already at saturation point at certain times of the day without the addition of additional heavy lorries from the site.

There will need to be wheel washing restrictions on the site as a condition.

Concerned about the high level of ground water as if excavations take place major pumping is likely to be required resulting in more noise and pollution.

Concerned the site could be used for fracking and so object to this due to very sandy deep deposited layers within the ground and the effect water pumping at high pressure would have.

Object to site due to roads not being able to cope with increase in traffic. There will have to be wheel washing facilities for the lorries.

There is a high level of ground water so if excavations take place pumping will be required which would result in an adverse impact from noise and pollution.

Object to fracking on the site.

MJP53

Respondent No. Name

3581

CommentNo Comment

0368

The site is located within an Environment Agency designated Source Protection Zone, Yorkshire Water have previously stated that 'extraction and waste management should be restricted in these areas.'

The hamlet of Cocksford relies solely upon drinking water drawn from a private borehole within the Source Protection Zone so residents would require further details regarding development in the area.

Any impact on the groundwater will affect local breweries as they use the water in their process.

There will be a large increase in lorry traffic and Old London Road is not suitable to deal with the increase, and would cause problems for residents accessing their properties. The lane would have to be maintained as it is unadopted. This site sits to one side of Old London Road, so a new route to Cocksford may be required.

The site would have an impact on historic assets in the area such as Towton Battlefield and Old London Road itself which is recognised by English Heritage.

The east bank of Cock Beck is a Significant Site of Nature Conservation and the area contains ancient woodland and these would be impacted by the development of the site.

A previous application to relocate a small part of Old London Road was refused.

The residents of Cocksford experience flooding, proposals would be expected to assist in mitigation of any enhanced flood risk resulting from reduced flood storage associated with the loss of land mass, topsoil and vegetation, and would result in the loss of agricultural land.

Dust and noise from extraction will have a significant impact on surrounding residential properties and communities.

Summary

The site is within a designated Source Protection Zone and extraction should be restricted in these areas. One hamlet relies solely on water from within this protection zone so residents would require further details regarding the site. If the groundwater is affected then it will affect the quality of the product local breweries produce.

Old London Road is not suitable to deal with the proposed increase in heavy traffic and residents would have problems accessing their properties. The lane would have to be maintained as it is unadopted. This site sits to one side of Old London Road, so a new route to Cocksford may be required.

There would be an impact on historic assets in the area.

There is a SINC and ancient woodland in the area which would be affected, and there would be a loss of agricultural land. Mitigation would be expected to help minimise flooding.

121

Environment Agency

0547

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Respondent No. Name

1352

CommentNo Comment

0101

Present principle access to Old London Road Quarries is via Moor Lane to Beech Tree Crossroads, then south up over Wingate Hill towards Cocksford hamlet. A safer more direct access could be gained from the south east and should be investigated. Only part of the access road has been adopted and it is unclear who is responsible for the maintenance of the rest. The road is surface and sub base is potholing and breaking up badly and requires constant maintenance. The roads being used by site traffic are narrow, road verges have encroached onto the highway and trees have overgrown over the roads forcing high sided vehicles into the middle of the road. There are concerns about road safety due to speed of traffic and a traffic calming system should be considered on the Old London Road at its intersection with Moor Lane, Stutton Road and Wheedling Gate. Operational matters will have an impact on local residents, these include noise, dust, vibrations, smell, vermin, wind blown rubbish, birds and visual impact.

Photos of views of the site were provided

Provided additional information on a spread sheet which attempts to analyse the frequency of truck movements (empty inbound and loaded outbound) using statistics supplied on the data sheet provided by the Council. Estimates that there will be one truck trip every 6 minutes of each working day for 20 years, this cannot be supported using existing access tracks, equates to 10.29 truck trips per hour

Summary

A safer more direct access to the site should be investigated. The road infrastructure is inadequate to support an increase in heavy site traffic and maintenance is an issue. The roads are narrow and there are concerns about road safety, traffic calming should be looked into. Operational matters will have an impact on local residents, these include noise, dust, vibrations, smell, vermin, wind blown rubbish, birds and visual impact. Additional information provided, estimates 10.29 truck trips per hour.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
1503	0351	<p>Old London Road is unsuitable for lorries and is used for leisure and recreational purposes. To the south the road is narrow in places and to the north the road is wider but still unsuitable for more than one vehicle and is extremely dangerous in places (blind bends, and choke points). The Stutton Beech crossroads are dangerous in its current form. The area is historically significant due to the Battle of Towton, the opening of quarries would destroy the historic significance of the area.</p> <p>The proposal will adjoin the boundary of the Old School House, causing extreme disturbance to the inhabitants.</p>	<p>Concerned about traffic impacts of the site on the narrow roads and the existing junctions (Stutton beech crossroads). Concerned about the damage to the historic significance of the area. Concerned about proximity to properties.</p>
1352	0159	<p>Additional Comments:</p> <p>Concerned about the number and frequency of HGV movements required to achieve the proposed production output rates on unsuitable roads. Calculations indicate that there would be one HGV movement on average every 5.83 minutes each working day for 20 years. This is a minimum as HGV movements related to MJP58 and WJP04 have not been considered. The existing road infrastructure cannot accommodate this volume and weight of traffic.</p> <p>Annotated maps and calculations of HGV movements were provided.</p>	<p>Calculations indicate that there would be one HGV movement on average every 5.83 minutes each working day for 20 years. The existing road infrastructure cannot accommodate this volume and weight of traffic.</p>

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121

Environment Agency

0590

As stated in our Groundwater Protection Guide (GP3), within SPZ1, we will normally object in principle to any planning application for a development that may physically disturb an aquifer. In many cases quarries go below the water table and therefore can cause physical disturbance to an aquifer. Consequently, we would object to any new quarry developments that proposed to extract sub water table in SPZ1.

One of the main concerns the EA have when it comes to quarry restoration is the risk that infilling quarry voids poses to the water environment. We would look for only inert materials to be used as quarry infill, but the ideal is if quarries are left unfilled.

Specifically, we would ask that quarry restoration schemes avoid the infilling of the void in order to return it to agricultural land. Open holes are more protective of groundwater as the infill materials have the potential to introduce contaminants into the water environment.

GP3 states that the EA will object to all planning applications for landfill sites within Source Protection Zone 1 (SPZ1).

As stated in our Groundwater Protection Guide (GP3), within SPZ1, we will normally object in principle to any planning application for a development that may physically disturb an aquifer. In many cases quarries go below the water table and therefore can cause physical disturbance to an aquifer. Consequently, we would object to any new quarry developments that proposed to extract sub water table in SPZ1.

One of the main concerns the EA have when it comes to quarry restoration is the risk that infilling quarry voids poses to the water environment. We would look for only inert materials to be used as quarry infill, but the ideal is if quarries are left unfilled.

Specifically, we would ask that quarry restoration schemes avoid the infilling of the void in order to return it to agricultural land. Open holes are more protective of groundwater as the infill materials have the potential to introduce contaminants into the water environment.

GP3 states that the EA will object to all planning applications for landfill sites within Source Protection Zone 1 (SPZ1).

Respondent No. Name

3569

CommentNo Comment

0406

The site is unsuitable for quarrying due to the environmental issues associated with quarrying in a residential area. The road access is unsuitable as is a single track road and heavy traffic will cause disruption and a safety hazard for other road users. An alternative access is not feasible and the road is unadopted. Operating noise, vibrations and dust would cause environmental and social problems for residencies in the area. Quarrying should be carried out way from residences and the Green Belt. The site has archaeological and historical significance and will be impacted by the development. The development will not bring significant employment to the area.

Summary

Concerned about impact on the environment. The road access is single track, unadopted and unsuitable for heavy traffic, concerned about disruption and safety hazard to other road users and residents. Noise, vibrations and dust would cause environmental and social problems for residents. The Green Belt will be impacted. Archaeological and historical features will be impacted. The site will not provide employment for many local people.

3603

0475

HGV traffic on Old London Road would be a hazard to other road users especially non motorised ones. The recreational amenity of residents would be affected. The HGV traffic would increase noise and dust pollution.

HGV traffic on Old London Road would be a hazard to other road users especially non motorised ones. The recreational amenity of residents would be affected. The HGV traffic would increase noise and dust pollution.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3578

0392

The water table is high, some residences rely on a bore hole and the water is used in the brewing industry, so concerned about potential contamination.
The traffic on the narrow lanes would increase considerably, when an active site there were some accidents so extra traffic poses a safety issue for other road users. Also the 2 junctions leading to Jackdaw Crag would be a concern with increased number of lorries.
The site is close to an area of significant history, the site could change the natural beauty and peaceful nature of the landscape.

The water table is high and some properties and businesses rely on the water so concerned about potential contamination.
The traffic on the narrow lanes and junctions would increase considerably and poses a safety risk for other road users.
The site is close to a site of significant history and the landscape and natural beauty could be affected.

1350

0153

Object to the site. In combination with MJP31 , MJP58 and WJP04 and MJP23 the area would be surrounded by quarries. The area is used by walkers, cyclists, runners and horse riders.
Access to the site should be considered, access up Wingate Hill is not acceptable. Consideration should be given to using the disused railway from Towton Bar, Old London Road runs from the Rockingham Arms at Towton straight into the quarry, and possible access from A64/A659 past white Quarry Farm to Old London Road.

Object to the site. In combination with MJP31 , MJP58 and WJP04 and MJP23 the area would be surrounded by quarries. The area is used by walkers, cyclists, runners and horse riders.
Access to the site should be considered, access up Wingate Hill is not acceptable. Consideration should be given to using the disused railway from Towton Bar, Old London Road runs from the Rockingham Arms at Towton straight into the quarry, and possible access from A64/A659 past white Quarry Farm to Old London Road.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3590

0356

The site will impact on Old London Road. There is a nearby site of an ancient Saxon court, the ancient woodland of Crag Wood and site of the Battle of Towton. Our residence is an old Catholic School and there is a cross near the top of the hill which is a pilgrimage site. Concerned about the impact on the amenity of non motorised road users who use the roads. The area is Green Belt and heavily used for leisure. The lanes are too narrow for the site traffic and is not able to be widened, some of the trees have tree preservation orders on them. Already suffer from noise and vibration from the existing quarry and concerned about potential damage to the property. Concerned about cumulative impact if more sites allowed in the area. The local environment would be affected and amenity of residents and visitors.

Concerned the site will impact on local archaeological sites. Concerned about the impact on the amenity of non motorised road users who use the roads. The area is Green Belt and heavily used for leisure. The lanes are too narrow for the site traffic and is not able to be widened, some of the trees have tree preservation orders on them. Already impacted by noise and vibration from existing quarry and worried about cumulative impact if more sites allowed, especially to structure of buildings. The local environment and amenity of residents and visitors would be affected.

3572

0401

Concerned about safety of pedestrians, the number of people who use the proposed access is high, includes walkers, cyclists, dog walkers and horse-riders. The road is single track with restricted visibility. An increase in HGVs will pose a serious risk to other non motorised road users. Concerned about potential contamination of the local water supply which is from a borehole.

The access road is single track with restricted visibility. An increase in HGVs will pose a serious risk to other non motorised road users who use the lane. Concerned about potential contamination of the local water supply which is from a borehole.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3455

0234

Share the views of respondent 1352. Particularly concerned about the increase in traffic using Old London Road, it is narrow, uneven and has several blind bends and is the access to farms and 25 local residences. The lane is also used by a large number of walkers, horse riders and children on bicycles and is unsuitable for a high volume of heavy lorries which would pose a danger to other road users.
The noise dust and pollution could result in long term health problems and disruption to wildlife in the area.

Concerned about increase in heavy lorries which will use Old London Road which is an access to farms and residences. It is narrow with blind bends and used by non motorised users so extra lorries would pose a hazard. There will be noise and dust pollution which could have an impact on health and wildlife.

3453

Consulted under 1352

0227

The access to the site has changed over time, there are several blind bends which has increased the hazard of using the road which is not helped by the growth of trees, hedging and weeds/grass which affect visibility. The verges are not cut and so make the roads narrower, which is mainly single track, plus there are fewer verges available due to water erosion causing ditches and fallen trees and boulders making it more difficult for none motorised users. The junction at Beech Tree Crossroads has poor visibility poses a hazard when HGVs and other road users meet.

Beech Tree Crossroad and the access road to the site are narrow, largely single track, with blind bends, overgrown trees, hedges and vegetation which affect visibility, there are fewer verges due to water erosion and HGVs using this road has an impact on non motorised users.

MJP54

57

Plasmor Ltd

0217

Request that information provided for LAA regarding consented and unconsented reserves for the quarry are fed into the site profile for Mill Balk Quarry in the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan.

Request that information provided for LAA regarding consented and unconsented reserves for the quarry are fed into the site profile for Mill Balk Quarry in the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan.

121

Environment Agency

0548

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0591 As stated in our Groundwater Protection Guide (GP3), within SPZ1, we will normally object in principle to any planning application for a development that may physically disturb an aquifer. In many cases quarries go below the water table and therefore can cause physical disturbance to an aquifer. Consequently, we would object to any new quarry developments that proposed to extract sub water table in SPZ1.

One of the main concerns the EA have when it comes to quarry restoration is the risk that infilling quarry voids poses to the water environment. We would look for only inert materials to be used as quarry infill, but the ideal is if quarries are left unfilled.

Specifically, we would ask that quarry restoration schemes avoid the infilling of the void in order to return it to agricultural land. Open holes are more protective of groundwater as the infill materials have the potential to introduce contaminants into the water environment.

GP3 states that the EA will object to all planning applications for landfill sites within Source Protection Zone 1 (SPZ1).

The site is close to an active landfill – Green Lane Landfill Site and the applicant should satisfy themselves of any risks.

As stated in our Groundwater Protection Guide (GP3), within SPZ1, we will normally object in principle to any planning application for a development that may physically disturb an aquifer. In many cases quarries go below the water table and therefore can cause physical disturbance to an aquifer. Consequently, we would object to any new quarry developments that proposed to extract sub water table in SPZ1.

One of the main concerns the EA have when it comes to quarry restoration is the risk that infilling quarry voids poses to the water environment. We would look for only inert materials to be used as quarry infill, but the ideal is if quarries are left unfilled.

Specifically, we would ask that quarry restoration schemes avoid the infilling of the void in order to return it to agricultural land. Open holes are more protective of groundwater as the infill materials have the potential to introduce contaminants into the water environment.

GP3 states that the EA will object to all planning applications for landfill sites within Source Protection Zone 1 (SPZ1).

The site is close to an active landfill – Green Lane Landfill Site and the applicant should satisfy themselves of any risks.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3386

0064

Objects due to loss of wildlife habitat at Mount Pond.

Objects due to loss of wildlife habitat at Mount Pond.

2200

0249

The proposal for possible site restoration as 'agriculture at original levels' is far too woolly. The restoration requirement must be unequivocal and binding if this site is not to end up so compromised by subsequent planning applications that it evolves into the many metres high earth covered structure surrounding Alne Brickworks that resembles a latter day tumulus and blights the countryside.

The proposal for possible site restoration as 'agriculture at original levels' is far does not provide enough detail, it should not be affected by subsequent planning applications.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo Comment	Summary
1114 Woodland Trust	<p>0292 Concerned about the impact of this proposed site upon Heron Wood (grid ref: SE616411).</p> <p>The NPPF para 118 and Minerals Policy Statement section 14 supports the protection of ancient woodland and recognises that it is sensitive to adjacent development. Para 6.4 of Natural England standing advice for Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees (April 2014) states that 'the SoS supports the argument for a 15m buffer around affected ancient woodland, but larger buffers may be required'</p> <p>Through the creation of new wooded areas or buffer zones around ancient woodland, the impacts of damaging edge effects can be reduced significantly. A buffer zone of at least 50m of semi-natural vegetation would be required to protect woodland from the proposed change in land use for the purpose of clay extraction.</p> <p>Impacts from the proposed site include: light pollution affecting the visibility of the moon and stars and certain species, it is recommended that lighting is kept to a minimum and directed away from woodland edges, with limited lighting during hours of darkness; noise pollution is likely to limit the distributions of animal species, particularly bird diversity; surface run-off leading to a potential change in species composition in the long term, measures should be taken to prevent the possibility of this occurring and hard-standing should be kept away from woodland edges.</p> <p>An objection to this site will be held until a suitably large buffer is implemented in conjunction with an area proposed for clay extraction.</p>	<p>Concerned about the impact of this proposed site upon Heron Wood. An objection to this site will be held until a suitably large buffer is implemented in conjunction with an area proposed for clay extraction.</p> <p>Specific consideration should be given to the proximity of the site to ancient woodland, light and noise pollution and surface runoff.</p>

Respondent No.	Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3372		0021	Would like to see the site progressed as would have minimal impact on the general public, and the quarry site could be given protection from anyone who wants to see work being done here.	Support progressing this site, use screening if required.
120	Historic England	0134	<p>The boundary of Escrick Conservation Area (which contains a number of Listed Buildings including the Grade II* Listed Escrick Park and Coach House) lies 550 metres to the north-east of this site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The boundary of the Stillingfleet Conservation Area (which includes the Grade I Listed Church of St Helens) lies 1.7 km to the east of this area. · This site lies some 2.2 km from the Grade II Registered Historic Park and Garden at Moreby Hall. <p>This landscape includes the Grade II* Listed Moreby Hall</p>	<p>The boundary of Escrick Conservation Area (which contains a number of Listed Buildings including the Grade II* Listed Escrick Park and Coach House) lies 550 metres to the north-east of this site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The boundary of the Stillingfleet Conservation Area (which includes the Grade I Listed Church of St Helens) lies 1.7 km to the east of this area. · This site lies some 2.2 km from the Grade II Registered Historic Park and Garden at Moreby Hall. <p>This landscape includes the Grade II* Listed Moreby Hall</p>
114	Ministry of Defence	0050	This site does not fall within any statutory safeguarding zones.	This site does not fall within any statutory safeguarding zones.
128	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	0259	Seems a very large site to be used for landfill, particularly with increases in recycling and reductions on landfill. Would it be restored to poor quality agricultural land, what evidence is there for good quality agricultural land on landfill? The Trust would expect some restoration for nature conservation. Brickponds can be extremely valuable for wildlife, particularly invertebrates and amphibians if well designed.	A large site for landfill, particularly with increases in recycling and reductions on landfill. Would it be restored to poor quality agricultural land? The Trust would expect some restoration for nature conservation including brickponds.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

537

Escrick Parish Council

0335

The site can only be accessed from the A19, which is heavily trafficked, especially at peak times, so site traffic will compound the traffic delays.

Other development sites in the area will also cause an increase in traffic on the A19 and surrounding network. There is inadequate capacity on the A19 for an increase in heavy traffic.

The site bisects the Trans Pennine Trail which is part of the National Cycle Network as well as part of a European walking route and so needs protection as if the site went ahead there would be a conflict between site traffic and cyclists and walker and an impact on the amenity of the users of the trail with wider environmental implications for the surrounding countryside.

There would be an impact on the amenity of local residents and businesses including a Children's Day Nursery. There would be environmental health issues.

The long term nature of the site and increase of traffic is a concern and do not believe this is a suitable or sustainable site. Other sites which are better strategically located.

Concerned about the impact of site traffic on the already busy A19, especially at peak times. There are other development sites in there area which also impact on the network and the A19 does not have the capacity to cope. The site will impact on the Trans Pennine Trail which is used by cyclists and walkers so needs to be protected. The amenity of walkers and cyclists would be impacted and there would be environmental implications on the surrounding area.

There would be an impact on the amenity of local residents and businesses and environmental issues. Concentred about the long term nature of the site and associated increase in traffic. This site is not suitable or sustainable, should look at other sites which are better strategically located.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo Comment	Summary
121 Environment Agency	<p>0592 The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>The site contains flood zone 2, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:</p> <p>detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site details of mitigation measures surface water runoff the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.</p> <p>The results of a clear and transparent sequential test</p> <p>If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.</p> <p>Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be</p>	<p>The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>The site contains flood zone 2, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:</p> <p>detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site details of mitigation measures surface water runoff the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.</p> <p>The results of a clear and transparent sequential test</p> <p>If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be</p>

adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Ouse & Derwent Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

The site is close to an active landfill – Escrick Brickworks and the applicant should satisfy themselves of any risks.

consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Ouse & Derwent Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

The site is close to an active landfill – Escrick Brickworks and the applicant

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

should satisfy themselves of any risks.

816

Riccall Parish Council

0461

Concerned regarding the proposed development adjacent to the former Escrick Brickworks due to: impact of additional HGV traffic; impact of pollution to air or groundwater. Support is given to the comments made by Escrick Parish Council.

Concerned due to: impact of additional HGV traffic; pollution to air or groundwater.

MJP57

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo Comment	Summary
121 Environment Agency	<p>0593 The proposed development site sits just outside SPZ1 and within SPZ 2.</p> <p>As stated within GP3, inside SPZ1 we will object to proposals for new development of non-landfill waste operations where we believe the operation poses an intrinsic hazard to groundwater.</p> <p>For any other non-landfill waste operations that are proposed in SPZ1, when considering any environmental permit application we will usually require detailed risk assessment and additional mitigation measures to be put in place to manage any risks to groundwater. Accordingly, we will raise this as a serious concern when responding to any planning application consultation. In sensitive groundwater locations, we will therefore strongly encourage parallel tracked environmental permit applications with planning applications.</p> <p>Outside SPZ1 we will agree to proposals for new developments of non-landfill waste operations where risks can be appropriately controlled by an environmental permit or a relevant waste exemption.</p>	<p>The proposed development site sits just outside SPZ1 and within SPZ 2.</p> <p>As stated within GP3, inside SPZ1 we will object to proposals for new development of non-landfill waste operations where we believe the operation poses an intrinsic hazard to groundwater.</p> <p>For any other non-landfill waste operations that are proposed in SPZ1, when considering any environmental permit application we will usually require detailed risk assessment and additional mitigation measures to be put in place to manage any risks to groundwater. Accordingly, we will raise this as a serious concern when responding to any planning application consultation. In sensitive groundwater locations, we will therefore strongly encourage parallel tracked environmental permit applications with planning applications.</p> <p>Outside SPZ1 we will agree to proposals for new developments of non-landfill waste operations where risks can be appropriately controlled by an environmental permit or a relevant waste exemption.</p>

121

Environment Agency

0564

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

MJP58

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0594 The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site contains an area of flood zone 2 and we have records that the site has suffered historic flooding, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site
 detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours
 details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development
 examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site
 details of mitigation measures
 surface water runoff
 the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.
 The results of a clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Cock Beck which runs adjacent to the southern boundary is classified as a main river. The formal consent of the Agency will be required, under the Water Resources Act 1991, for any works in, over, under, or within 8m of a main river and / or a flood defence.

The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site contains an area of flood zone 2 and we have records that the site has suffered historic flooding, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site
 detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours
 details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development
 examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site
 details of mitigation measures
 surface water runoff
 the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.
 The results of a clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Cock Beck which runs adjacent to the southern boundary is classified as a main river. The formal consent of the Agency will be required, under the Water Resources Act 1991, for any works in, over, under, or within 8m of a main river and / or a flood defence.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface

water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3569	0407	<p>The site is unsuitable for quarrying due to the environmental issues associated with quarrying in a residential area. The road access is unsuitable as is a single track road and heavy traffic will cause disruption and a safety hazard for other road users. An alternative access is not feasible and the road is unadopted.</p> <p>Operating noise, vibrations and dust would cause environmental and social problems for residencies in the area. Quarrying should be carried out way from residences and the Green Belt.</p> <p>The site has archaeological and historical significance and will be impacted by the development.</p> <p>The development will not bring significant employment to the area.</p>	<p>Concerned about impact on the environment.</p> <p>The road access is single track, unadopted and unsuitable for heavy traffic, concerned about disruption and safety hazard to other road users and residents.</p> <p>Noise, vibrations and dust would cause environmental and social problems for residents. The Green Belt will be impacted.</p> <p>Archaeological and historical features will be impacted.</p> <p>The site will not provide employment for many local people.</p>
3572	0402	<p>Concerned about safety of pedestrians, the number of people who use the proposed access is high, includes walkers, cyclists, dog walkers and horse-riders. The road is single track with restricted visibility. An increase in HGVs will pose a serious risk to other non motorised road users.</p> <p>Concerned about potential contamination of the local water supply which is from a borehole.</p>	<p>The access road is single track with restricted visibility. An increase in HGVs will pose a serious risk to other non motorised road users who use the lane.</p> <p>Concerned about potential contamination of the local water supply which is from a borehole.</p>

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

1350

0154

Object to the site. In combination with MJP31 , MJP53 and WJP04 and MJP23 the area would be surrounded by quarries. The area is used by walkers, cyclists, runners and Horse riders.
Access to the site should be considered, access up Wingate Hill is not acceptable. Consideration should be given to using the disused railway from Towton Bar, Old London Road runs from the Rockingham Arms at Towton straight into the quarry, and possible access from A64/A659 past white Quarry Farm to Old London Road.

Object to the site. In combination with MJP31 , MJP53 and WJP04 and MJP23 the area would be surrounded by quarries. The area is used by walkers, cyclists, runners and Horse riders.
Access to the site should be considered, access up Wingate Hill is not acceptable. Consideration should be given to using the disused railway from Towton Bar, Old London Road runs from the Rockingham Arms at Towton straight into the quarry, and possible access from A64/A659 past white Quarry Farm to Old London Road.

Respondent No. Name

3581

CommentNo Comment

0369

The site is located within an Environment Agency designated Source Protection Zone, Yorkshire Water have previously stated that 'extraction and waste management should be restricted in these areas.'

The hamlet of Cocksford relies solely upon drinking water drawn from a private borehole within the Source Protection Zone so residents would require further details regarding development in the area.

Any impact on the groundwater will affect local breweries as they use the water in their process.

There will be a large increase in lorry traffic and Old London Road is not suitable to deal with the increase, and would cause problems for residents accessing their properties. The lane would have to be maintained as it is unadopted. This site sits to one side of Old London Road, so a new route to Cocksford may be required.

The site would have an impact on historic assets in the area such as Towton Battlefield and Old London Road itself which is recognised by English Heritage.

The east bank of Cock Beck is a Significant Site of Nature Conservation and the area contains ancient woodland and these would be impacted by the development of the site.

A previous application to relocate a small part of Old London Road was refused.

The residents of Cocksford experience flooding, proposals would be expected to assist in mitigation of any enhanced flood risk resulting from reduced flood storage associated with the loss of land mass, topsoil and vegetation, and would result in the loss of agricultural land.

Dust and noise from extraction will have a significant impact on surrounding residential properties and communities.

Summary

The site is within a designated Source Protection Zone and extraction should be restricted in these areas. One hamlet relies solely on water from within this protection zone so residents would require further details regarding the site. If the groundwater is affected then it will affect the quality of the product local breweries produce.

Old London Road is not suitable to deal with the proposed increase in heavy traffic and residents would have problems accessing their properties. The lane would have to be maintained as it is unadopted. This site sits to one side of Old London Road, so a new route to Cocksford may be required.

There would be an impact on historic assets in the area.

There is a SINC and ancient woodland in the area which would be affected, and there would be a loss of agricultural land. Mitigation would be expected to help minimise flooding.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary	
3578	0393	<p>The water table is high, some residences rely on a bore hole and the water is used in the brewing industry, so concerned about potential contamination.</p> <p>The traffic on the narrow lanes would increase considerably, when an active site there were some accidents so extra traffic poses a safety issue for other road users. Also the 2 junctions leading to Jackdaw Crag would be a concern with increased number of lorries.</p> <p>The site is close to an area of significant history, the site could change the natural beauty and peaceful nature of the landscape.</p>	<p>The water table is high and some properties and businesses rely on the water so concerned about potential contamination.</p> <p>The traffic on the narrow lanes and junctions would increase considerably and poses a safety risk for other road users.</p> <p>The site is close to a site of significant history and the landscape and natural beauty could be affected.</p>	
3453	***Consulted under 1352***	0228	<p>The access to the site has changed over time, there are several blind bends which has increased the hazard of using the road which is not helped by the growth of trees, hedging and weeds/grass which affect visibility. The verges are not cut and so make the roads narrower, which is mainly single track, plus there are fewer verges available due to water erosion causing ditches and fallen trees and boulders making it more difficult for none motorised users. The junction at Beech Tree Crossroads has poor visibility poses poses a hazard when HGVs and other road users meet.</p>	<p>Beech Tree Crossroad and the access road to the site are narrow, largely single track, with blind bends, overgrown trees, hedges and vegetation which affect visibility, there are fewer verges due to water erosion and HGVs using this road has an impact on non motorised users.</p>
3584	0459	<p>Object to the proposed site because the access road is unsuitable for HGV traffic and would not be safe for pedestrians and other road users to use.</p>	<p>Object because the access road is unsuitable for HGV traffic and would not be safe for pedestrians and other road users to use.</p>	

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3455

0235

Share the views of respondent 1352. Particularly concerned about the increase in traffic using Old London Road, it is narrow, uneven and has several blind bends and is the access to farms and 25 local residences. The lane is also used by a large number of walkers, horse riders and children on bicycles and is unsuitable for a high volume of heavy lorries which would pose a danger to other road users.

The noise dust and pollution could result in long term health problems and disruption to wildlife in the area.

Concerned about increase in heavy lorries which will use Old London Road which is an access to farms and residences. It is narrow with blind bends and used by non motorised users so extra lorries would pose a hazard. There will be noise and dust pollution which could have an impact on health and wildlife.

1503

0343

Old London Road is unsuitable for lorries and is used for leisure and recreational purposes. To the south the road is narrow in places and to the north the road is wider but still unsuitable for more than one vehicle and is extremely dangerous in places (blind bends, and choke points). The Stutton Beech crossroads are dangerous in its current form. The area is historically significant due to the Battle of Towton, the opening of quarries would destroy the historic significance of the area.

Concern about the use of the site for recycling to risk of pollution risk to groundwater.

Consideration should be given to accessing the site from an alternative direction, such as the old railway line .

Concerned about traffic impacts of the site on the narrow roads and the existing junctions (Stutton beech crossroads). Consideration should be given to accessing the site from an alternative direction, such as the old railway line. Concerned about the damage to the historic significance of the area. Concerned about the potential pollution risks associated with recycling activities.

Respondent No. Name

3590

CommentNo Comment

0357

The site will impact on Old London Road. There is a nearby site of an ancient Saxon court, the ancient woodland of Crag Wood and site of the Battle of Towton. Our residence is an old Catholic School and there is a cross near the top of the hill which is a pilgrimage site. Concerned about the impact on the amenity of non motorised road users who use the roads. The area is Green Belt and heavily used for leisure. The lanes are too narrow for the site traffic and is not able to be widened, some of the trees have tree preservation orders on them. Already suffer from noise and vibration from the existing quarry and concerned about potential damage to the property. Concerned about cumulative impact if more sites allowed in the area. The local environment would be affected and amenity of residents and visitors.

Summary

Concerned the site will impact on local archaeological sites. Concerned about the impact on the amenity of non motorised road users who use the roads. The area is Green Belt and heavily used for leisure. The lanes are too narrow for the site traffic and is not able to be widened, some of the trees have tree preservation orders on them. Already impacted by noise and vibration from existing quarry and worried about cumulative impact if more sites allowed, especially to structure of buildings. The local environment and amenity of residents and visitors would be affected.

1352

0102

Present principle access to Old London Road Quarries is via Moor Lane to Beech Tree Crossroads, then south up over Wingate Hill towards Cocksford hamlet. A safer more direct access could be gained from the south east and should be investigated. Only part of the access road has been adopted and it is unclear who is responsible for the maintenance of the rest. The road is surface and sub base is potholing and breaking up badly and requires constant maintenance. The roads being used by site traffic are narrow, road verges have encroached onto the highway and trees have overgrown over the roads forcing high sided vehicles into the middle of the road.

There are concerns about road safety due to speed of traffic and a traffic calming system should be considered on the Old London Road at its intersection with Moor Lane, Stutton Road and Wheeling Gate.

Operational matters will have an impact on local residents, these include noise, dust, vibrations, smell, vermin, wind blown rubbish, birds and visual impact.

Photos of views of the site were provided
Additional comment - no annual waste tonnage statistics available on the information supplied, any truck movements in addition to limestone extraction truck frequencies would further exacerbate the transport problems.

A safer more direct access to the site should be investigated. The road infrastructure is inadequate to support an increase in heavy site traffic and maintenance is an issue. The roads are narrow and there are concerns about road safety, traffic calming should be looked into.

Operational matters will have an impact on local residents, these include noise, dust, vibrations, smell, vermin, wind blown rubbish, birds and visual impact. No transport figures made available, but any additional transport would increase the problems.

MJP59

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0595 The site falls within SPZ 1. As stated in our Groundwater Protection Guide (GP3), within SPZ1, we will normally object in principle to any planning application for a development that may physically disturb an aquifer. In many cases quarries go below the water table and therefore can cause physical disturbance to an aquifer. Consequently, we would object to any new quarry developments that proposed to extract sub water table in SPZ1.
One of the main concerns the EA have when it comes to quarry restoration is the risk that infilling quarry voids poses to the water environment. We would look for only inert materials to be used as quarry infill, but the ideal is if quarries are left unfilled.
Specifically, we would ask that quarry restoration schemes avoid the infilling of the void in order to return it to agricultural land. Open holes are more protective of groundwater as the infill materials have the potential to introduce contaminants into the water environment.
GP3 states that the EA will object to all planning applications for landfill sites within Source Protection Zone 1 (SPZ1)

The site falls within SPZ 1. As stated in our Groundwater Protection Guide (GP3), within SPZ1, we will normally object in principle to any planning application for a development that may physically disturb an aquifer. In many cases quarries go below the water table and therefore can cause physical disturbance to an aquifer. Consequently, we would object to any new quarry developments that proposed to extract sub water table in SPZ1.
One of the main concerns the EA have when it comes to quarry restoration is the risk that infilling quarry voids poses to the water environment. We would look for only inert materials to be used as quarry infill, but the ideal is if quarries are left unfilled.
Specifically, we would ask that quarry restoration schemes avoid the infilling of the void in order to return it to agricultural land. Open holes are more protective of groundwater as the infill materials have the potential to introduce contaminants into the water environment.
GP3 states that the EA will object to all planning applications for landfill sites within Source Protection Zone 1 (SPZ1)

121

Environment Agency

0549

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

3427

0181

The roads surrounding the site are used for recreational purposes, dog walking, ramblers, runners and cyclists, there are high sided overgrown verges which make it difficult for pedestrian to move out of the road when vehicle are coming. HGV's on this road would be a hazard to non motorized users (NMU).

Therefore the following two conditions should be applied to the planning permission:

-a footpath/cycle path be constructed next to the road, paid for by the developers as this will make the road safe for NMU

- restrictions on HGVs outside normal working hours (none after 6pm or weekends).

Concerned about the impact the site may have on Forge Valley and the impact upon peace and tranquillity of this nature reserve. Screening should be used to minimise the effects. Concerned about the effect blasting may have on wildlife habitats.

To ensure safety of the non-motorized users of the road conditions should be applied which, seek to construct a path/cycle way along Cockrah Road and apply restrictions to vehicle movements (none after 6 or during weekends). Screening should be planted and consideration. Should be given to protection of the local wildlife which will be affected by blasting.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3381

0041

Considers the site to be a good thing for the village, as it would provide local jobs

Supports the site as it would provide local employment.

3449

0212

This is a rural and farming area of high value agricultural land which would be spoiled by quarrying.
Transport infrastructure is inadequate to cope with the vast number of heavy vehicles that this development would entail and with longer journey times than MJP43 in order to access the main road and motorway system.
The close proximity to areas of population in Kirkby Fleetham, Great Fencote. Little Fencote, Scruton and Leeming Bar make this site far from ideal for the reasons listed above.

Concerned about the loss of high value agricultural land.
Transport infrastructure not suitable for the large number of heavy site vehicles and this development would have longer journey times than MJP43 in order to access the main road and motorway system.
Concerned about the impact the site would have on local villages.

3459

0222

Object to the site.
The road structure cannot accommodate existing traffic and flooding is a common occurrence on the roads.
Site traffic would cause major disruption and an hazard to other road users, both motorised and non motorised, and would be worse in icy weather.
The bridge onto the B6271 is unsuitable for HGVs.
The land is grade 2 agricultural land and so should be maintained as it also provides habitat for the local wildlife and bird populations.
The site is too close to the village which is a conservation area.
Winds would carry noise and dust into the village. Light pollution would also be an issue.
Support the site at Killerby over this one. There is a lack of needed for this site.

Road structure and local bridge cannot accommodate the existing traffic and they often flood.
Site traffic would adversely impact on other road users.
Concerned about loss of prime agricultural land and its impact on wildlife.
The site is too close to the local village, winds will carry noise and dust into the village and there would be light pollution.
There is a lack of need for the site.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

1266

0304

Of all the sites in the area this one is likely to have the greatest impact on the local residents, the boundary comes to the edge of the village and will have a high and unacceptable impact on the quality of life of the local community.

The site is flat making noise abatement, dust suppression and visual screening impossible to achieve.

The local roads are unsuitable for heavy traffic and would pose a risk to other road users.

There would be a loss of agricultural land for the duration of operations, and restoration may involve importation of topsoil.

The natural habitat and resident wildlife will be adversely affected.

There is an application being considered for extraction elsewhere in the area so there is a lack of need for the mineral; from this site.

This site will have the greatest impact on local residents compared to others in the area.

There will be an adverse impact from noise, dust and visual impact.

Local roads unsuitable for heavy traffic and poses a risk to other road users.

Concerned about loss of agricultural land and importation for restoration.

There is a lack of need for the mineral.

3385

0056

Object to this proposal as the extra traffic will impact on pedestrians and horse riders using the narrow roads and increase the level of pollution.

Object to this proposal as the extra traffic will impact on pedestrians and horse riders using the narrow roads and increase the level of pollution.

3460

0221

The site is very close to the conservation village of Kirkby Fleetham and its main access roads.

The prevailing wind will blow dust and noise pollution from the site across the village which could pose a health hazard. The land is grade 2 farmland which should be maintained. Loss of the farmland, hedges and possibly woodland and bog area will cause a loss of wildlife habitat, reducing bird and animal populations. There are endangered bird species in the area including sky-larks, yellow hammers, and lapwings which could be lost.

The roads are unsuitable for large numbers of HGV vehicles as are narrow and heavily used by other motor vehicles and non-motorised users, so safety and quality of life of these users would be affected. Residents living along the roads would also be adversely impacted. There is no adequate route from the quarry site to the A1.

There are other sites proposed in the area which if all approved the quality of aggregate provided will vastly exceed the need.

Residents will suffer a loss of amenity and lifestyle

The site will adversely impact on nearby villages, the prevailing wind will carry dust and noise pollution into the villages. Concerned about loss of prime agricultural land.

Loss of farmland, hedges, woodland and bogs will impact the wildlife habitat.

The roads are unsuitable for HGV traffic and will adversely impact on other road users as well as residents living alongside the roads and there is no adequate route from the site to the A1.

There are other sites proposed in the area, if all approved will exceed the need for the mineral.

3539

0486

The site is large and would have a huge impact on residents of Kirkby Fleetham and the Fencotes as too close to the villages. The site would detract from the conservation status of Kirkby Fleetham.

There would be a significant impact on health and quality of life of residents. The prevailing wind would carry dust pollution to the villages and pose a risk to health of residents, school children, stock and crops.

The residents would be impacted by noise and light pollution.

There would be a loss in wildlife habitat and grade 2 agricultural land.

The water table would be affected and the surrounding land.

The proposed quarry is totally inappropriate for this locality.

The site is too close to villages and would detract from the conservation status of Kirkby Fleetham.

The prevailing wind would carry dust pollution to the villages and pose a risk to health.

There would be a loss in wildlife habitat and grade 2 agricultural land.

The water table would be affected and the surrounding land.

The overall quality of life of residents would be impacted.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo Comment	Summary
3010	<p>Concerned about impact of site traffic on local roads, they will damage the roads further and impact on non motorised users who use the road due to lack of footpaths.</p> <p>Kirkby Fleetham is in a conservation area and there is an area of wet woodland nearby which is important for wildlife. There would be an adverse impact on local and migrating wildlife.</p> <p>The quarrying will occur at unsocial hours so will be issues relating to noise, light, dust and emission pollution.</p> <p>The site is close to a primary school and residents and may adversely affect their health.</p> <p>There is a lack of need for the mineral.</p>	<p>Concerned about traffic impact of the site on the road structure and to other road users.</p> <p>Concerned will impact on wildlife and conservation area.</p> <p>Will be noise, dust and light pollution and from lorry emissions.</p> <p>Will impact on residential amenity of the village.</p> <p>There is a lack of need for the mineral.</p>
3461	<p>Object to the site. The prevailing wind would carry noise, dust and pollution to the surrounding villages thus increasing health issues.</p> <p>Would impact on transport on narrow lanes.</p> <p>The area already has an excessive amount of aggregate at its disposal beyond what is required in the long term, no immediate requirement for more mineral extraction.</p> <p>The site is close to a conservation area and so will have an impact on the wildlife and agricultural land.</p> <p>Should consider expanding all existing mineral sites by a small amount so new sites would not be required.</p>	<p>Object to the site. Concerned about increase in noise, dust and pollution due to the prevailing wind.</p> <p>Concerned about the increase in traffic.</p> <p>Does not feel there is a need for the quarry in the short term.</p> <p>Site is close to a conservation area and so wildlife will be impacted and also agricultural land.</p> <p>Look to expand existing sites before creating new ones.</p>

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo Comment	Summary
3564	<p>0526 There is no need for this quarry as there is sufficient mineral to meet demand until 2030.</p> <p>The road system is not robust enough to cope with the increase in heavy lorries and related traffic. The roads are used as a diversionary route due to roadworks or accidents and the quarry traffic would add to the congestion.</p> <p>There would be a loss of high quality agricultural land.</p> <p>The prevailing wind would carry air pollution to the nearby villages which includes a primary school and a high proportion of older residents.</p> <p>There would be a significant impact on wildlife, habitats and landscape.</p>	<p>There is a lack of need for the quarry. The road system will not be able to cope with the site traffic and will increase congestion.</p> <p>There would be a loss of high quality agricultural land.</p> <p>There would be a significant impact on wildlife, habitats and landscape.</p>
3456	<p>0237 There is no need for the site as there is already excess provision of minerals compared with expected demand up to 2030. If all the sites in the area are allowed Kirkby Fleetham village would be surrounded by mineral sites.</p> <p>The site is on Grade 2 agricultural land which would be lost. Access to the site is along narrow country roads which are unsuitable for a large amount of lorries. Low street will become a much busier route for residents once the A1 upgrade is completed as there will be a route north via the link road to Catterick.</p> <p>There will be noise, from processing and pumping, due to the high water table, as well as dust and light pollution in Kirkby Fleetham. Much of the village is set in a conservation area and will be close the site, which will affect local businesses and the local footpath from Lumley Lane to Great Fencote.</p>	<p>There is a lack of need for the mineral from the site. If all sites in the area are allowed they will surround Kirkby Fleetham.</p> <p>There would be a loss of high value agricultural land.</p> <p>The narrow lanes are unsuitable for a large number of lorries.</p> <p>Local and residential amenity will be affected due to noise, light and dust pollution which will also impact on local businesses.</p> <p>Could loose a public right of way.</p>

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3480

0302

If the site is allowed the depth of the excavations will be so deep they will be lower than the water table, so this will be reduced which will impact on surrounding areas.

If all of the proposed sites go ahead then there will be excess capacity, so there is no need for this site.

There will be a loss of high quality agricultural land.

There will be an increase of traffic on the narrow roads and an increased hazard.

If all quarries in the area allowed would be a cumulative impact.

The site is close to a village and screening will have little effect on the noise from the site, it will have an adverse effect on the residents of the villagers quality of life.

Concerned about impact on maintenance of power supply.

The excavations will go below the level of the current water table, and reduce its level which will impact on surrounding land.

There is lack of need for the mineral if other sites go ahead.

Concerned about the hazard posed by an increase in traffic on the narrow roads.

Could be a cumulative impact of other quarries in the area are allowed.

The site is close to a village and there would be an impact in residential amenity due to the noise form the site.

3490

0310

There would be a loss of agricultural land.

Lanes, footpaths, bridleways could be lost.

Heavy transport would cause disruption an be a hazard to other road users.

The site is too close to a conservation village.

There would be a loss of agricultural land.

Lanes, footpaths, bridleways could be lost.

Heavy transport would cause disruption an be a hazard to other road users.

The site is too close to a conservation village.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3458

0223

Object to the site.
The proposed site is not needed, there are other operational sites in the area.
The road infrastructure is unsuitable for any increase in HGV traffic.
There would be unacceptable noise, dust and light pollution.
The site is in close proximity to many residential and business properties as well as a conservation area.
There would be a loss of amenities to residents and visitors, a loss of footpaths and bridleways and loss of prime agricultural land and wildlife habitats.

Object to the site.
The proposed site is not needed, there are other operational sites in the area.
The road infrastructure is unsuitable for any increase in HGV traffic.
There would be unacceptable noise, dust and light pollution.
The site is in close proximity to many residential and business properties as well as a conservation area.
There would be a loss of amenities to residents and visitors, a loss of footpaths and bridleways and loss of prime agricultural land and wildlife habitats.

Respondent No. Name

3384

CommentNo Comment

0047

Object to the site, it covers a large area and is very close to the villages of Kirkby Fleetham, Great Fencote and Little Fencote and will impact on the residential amenity of residents.

Concerned about amount of noise and dust which will be generated, both by the excavation process and screening of the site.

Concerned about the increase in the level of lorry traffic.

It is not clear where the access point will be, but if minor roads are used then they would not be able to accommodate the increase in heavy traffic, there are no footpaths so will cause problems for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders and damage could occur to the verges. Lorries from the site are also likely to deposit mud on the roads.

If the development goes ahead it will change the landscape from being mainly agricultural.

There does not appear to be any mitigation for the above issues so the site should not go ahead.

The site is proposed to be restored to agriculture, but if no waste or new material is imported the ground level will be a lot lower than the surrounding area.

Summary

Object to the site due to the impact it will have on residential and local amenity in terms of dust, noise, increase in heavy traffic, impact on wildlife, making it more difficult for non vehicle users to use the roads and landscape impact.

The restoration to agriculture would result in the land at the site being at a lower level than the surrounding area.

Respondent No.	Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3493	*** consulted under 3456***	0294	<p>Object to this site.</p> <p>The site is on grade 2 agricultural land which would be lost. There is lack of need for the mineral as there is excess provision elsewhere.</p> <p>Access to the site is along narrow bendy roads which are unsuitable for HGV lorries.</p> <p>Low Street would probably be main access to the site and it will become much busier on completion of the A1 upgrade. There will be noise, from processing and pumping due to the high water table, as well as dust and light pollution in Kirkby Fleetham as site is affected by prevailing wind. Kirkby Fleetham village is in a conservation area.</p> <p>There would be a loss of a footpath from Lumley Lane to Great Fencote and loss of habitat for wildlife. If other nearby sites are allowed it would have a cumulative impact.</p>	<p>Concerned about loss of agricultural land. There is lack of need for the mineral. Access roads are narrow and bendy and unsuitable for HGVs.</p> <p>Concerned about the impact of noise, dust and light pollution on the village which affected by the prevailing wind. Kirkby Fleetham is in a conservation area. Concerned that could loose a footpath between Lumley Lane and Great Fencote. Concerned about cumulative impact if other sites in the area also allowed to go ahead.</p>
3380		0040	<p>Objects to the site on the following grounds: Heavy transport to and from site, dust blowing into the village, dirt on the roads, disruption on roads and the impact on the countryside, the protection of the countryside should be paramount to NYCC.</p>	<p>Objects to the site due to traffic impacts, dust pollution and impact on the countryside.</p>
3379		0035	<p>Considers the site to be unsuitable on the following grounds:- Traffic impacts on narrow country roads unsuitable for HGVs. The impact of noise, dust and light pollution on the whole village. Loss of amenity to walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Loss of greenbelt, agricultural land and wildlife habitats. Proximity to a conservation area. Considers there to be sufficient sites elsewhere.</p>	<p>Objects to the site due to traffic impacts, noise dust and light pollution, loss of residential and recreational amenity, impact on wildlife, greenbelt and agricultural land. Considers there to be sufficient sites already.</p>

Respondent No. Name

3457

CommentNo Comment

0224

There are major infrastructure constraints as local road structure is unsuitable due to their rural nature and being narrow, and only wide enough for one vehicle in places. The transporting of minerals from this site is not encouraging sustainable movements of minerals as markets or sources for it would not be local as all local developments will be complete long before the site is proposed.

The site is not accessible for employees to use public transport so would increase the carbon footprint and unlikely to employ locally.

The road system does not have the capacity to accommodate the level of traffic the site will generate. When surrounding roads are blocked traffic is diverted through Kirkby Fleetham.

The residents would be exposed to extra health issues due to air, noise, light and dust pollution from the proposed site, which will add to the pollution from the A1 upgrade.

The site is too close to the conservation village and historic site as there are castle remains in Kirkby Fleetham.

Surrounding local roads are susceptible to flooding and the quarry would affect the available land to soak up the rain and stop greater flooding issues, so any work affecting the water table would be detrimental to the village.

The site would also lead to the loss of valuable grade 2 listed agricultural land, so is not in keeping with environmental policy of protecting the environment and local wildlife habitat, as native and migrating birds use the fields regularly.

The loss of amenities for walkers, cyclists and horse riders would be considerable if the site went ahead. Could lose public rights of way on the site.

There is no need for the mineral in the site as is stockpiled elsewhere and another site is due to start in the locality.

Summary

The roads are rural and too narrow to cope with an increase in HGV vehicles. The roads are prone to flooding and the quarry would lessen the availability of land to soak up the rain to prevent greater flooding and impact on the water table.

It would not be encouraging sustainable movements of minerals if the site went ahead as the mineral would not be used locally.

There would be an impact on amenity and health in terms of noise, dust, air and light pollution, which will add to the pollution from the A1 upgrade.

The site is too close to the conservation village of Kirkby Fleetham.

Public transport for employees is not available and unlikely to employ locally.

There would be a loss of amenity for non motorised road users and could lose a public right of way which crosses the site.

There is no need for the mineral as stockpiled elsewhere, and other sites are planned in the area.

121

Environment Agency

0550

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

3543

0492

Wildlife habitats and the ecosystem will be affected.
The small rural roads not suitable for increase in HGV traffic which would pose a risk to other road users and wildlife.
The prevailing wind would carry dust pollution posing an increased health risk to residents.
Noise pollution would increase and residential and local amenity would be affected.
The progressing of this site would cause a feeling of ill will towards the Council.

Concerned about impact on wildlife habitats and the ecosystem.
Increase in HGVs on rural roads pose a risk to other road users and roads not suitable.
Concerned about noise and dust pollution and impact of site on local and residential amenity.

2977

0372

A significant number of dwellings and businesses and a primary school would be affected by the extraction of minerals. The prevailing westerly winds would carry particles of dust which could cause health issues.
Local roads are not suitable for heavy vehicles.
There would be a loss of agricultural land in addition to the land lost for the Bedale bypass and A1 upgrade.

Local properties, businesses and a primary school would be affected by the site.
Dust would be carried by the prevailing wind and could cause health problems.
The local roads are not suitable for heavy vehicles.
There would be a loss of agricultural land.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3378

0034

The proposal is in very close proximity to our house. Concerned about the traffic impacts, noise and dust pollution giving rise to health concerns and impact on wildlife. The quality of life of residents will be affected as well as house prices, resulting in financial concern. The site is in close proximity to a conservation area, and will devastate community village life.

Object to the site due to traffic impacts, pollution issues (noise and dust) and impact upon wildlife, concerned about health issues and quality of life, local amenity and impact on house prices.

3377

0033

Objects to the site on the following grounds: negative impact on the rural environment and landscape, noise, dust and pollution, traffic impacts and proximity to the village of Kirkby Fleetham.

Objects to the site on the following grounds: negative impact on the rural environment and landscape, noise, dust and pollution, traffic impacts and proximity to the village of Kirkby Fleetham.

3494

0322

If there are problems on the A1 diversions lead traffic in and around Kirkby Fleetham Village. HGVs should not use country roads they are a danger to other road users (walker, cyclists etc.) . Concerned about dust pollution, loss of views, agricultural land and wildlife habitats.

Concerned about increased HGV movements on country road, dust pollution, loss of view, loss of agricultural land and loss of habitats.

3383

0045

Strongly object to this site due to; negative impact upon recreational activities in the local area; cumulative impact from various local developments (A1 upgrade) and another proposed site (MJP43); traffic impacts upon inadequate local roads; proximity to local village and buildings; noise and dust pollution from blasting.

Strongly object to this site due to; negative impact upon recreational activities in the local area; cumulative impact from various local developments; traffic impacts; proximity to local village; noise and dust pollution.

3594

0334

The quarry will have a negative impact on traffic, quality of life, the peaceful setting of the village, the health of the population and would not be beneficial to the community.

There will be a negative impact on traffic, quality of life including the peaceful setting of the village. Health will be impacted and would not be beneficial to the community.

Respondent No.	Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
114	Ministry of Defence	0053	This site lies within the 15.2m statutory height consultation zone and birdstrike safeguarding zone for RAF Leeming. The MOD would need to be consulted on any development exceeding this height criteria, plus review the restoration details for the proposed site.	This site lies within the 15.2m statutory height consultation zone and birdstrike safeguarding zone for RAF Leeming. The MOD would need to be consulted on any development exceeding this height criteria, plus review the restoration details for the proposed site.
3582		0352	<p>Object to site.</p> <p>It will devalue nearby properties.</p> <p>It will pose a hazard to health in terms of air pollution.</p> <p>The narrow lanes are too narrow for the increase in heavy traffic and other non motorised road users will be impacted.</p> <p>Wildlife habitats will be destroyed and the beauty and tranquillity will be impacted.</p> <p>Local businesses will be affected and it is close to the cemetery.</p> <p>Already had to put up with a new service station and new road from the quarry at Scruton which impedes the journey to Leeming Bar.</p>	<p>Object to site.</p> <p>Concerned about impact upon health in terms of air pollution.</p> <p>Concerned about impact of site traffic on non road users as lanes are too narrow.</p> <p>Concerned about impact on wildlife habitats and beauty and tranquillity in the area.</p> <p>Local businesses will be impacted.</p> <p>Already been adversely impacted from nearby site.</p>
3583		0348	<p>Strongly against the proposal for the following reasons:</p> <p>Proximity to my house; the site would make the access road unsafe for other road users due to increase HGV movements; noise and air pollution would detrimentally impact nearby residents; the site would deter people from moving into the village; alternative sites located away from residents should be chosen.</p>	<p>Strongly against the proposal for the following reasons: Proximity to residential properties; access roads would be unsafe for other road users due to increase HGV movements; noise and air pollution; alternative sites located away from residents should be chosen.</p>

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

2215 CPRE (Hambleton Branch)

0112

The site is of considerable concern as it is very close to Kirkby Fleetham, Great Fencote and Little Fencote.

The population of these communities exceeds 500 and besides the dwellings there is a Primary School and thriving Pub Restaurant. The site is only a few hundred yards from the school, inn and houses on the west side of Kirkby Fleetham and but little more from the properties in Great Fencote. Furthermore the map is out of date. To the immediate north of the proposed site only Melton House and Fleetham Lodge are marked, whereas thirteen dwellings have now been developed there.

So large a development [100 hectares], with a twenty year life is not appropriate so close to significant areas of settlement: A development which would diminish the quality of life for communities and which would not be consistent with the declared NYCC Objective 9. Especially is this the case when alternative sources of supply are available.

The proposal for land West of Kirkby Fleetham [MJP 60] should not go forward to stage 2.

The site is of considerable concern as it is very close to Kirkby Fleetham, Great Fencote and Little Fencote.

The proposed size and life of the site is not appropriate so close to significant areas of settlement due to the impact upon quality of life of local communities. The site would not be consistent with the declared NYCC Objective 9. Alternative sources of supply are available.

3588

0345

Objects to the site on the following grounds: HGVs on narrow roads causing disruption and hazards to other road users; noise, light and dust pollution, loss of amenity for walkers, cyclists and horse riders, proximity to a conservation area, loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats, extraction is already planned close to the village and this would exacerbate the problem, house prices and overall quality of life will be adversely affected and desecration of the countryside with little regard for future generations.

Objects to the site on the following grounds: traffic impacts; noise, light and dust pollution, overall impact of quality of life, loss of amenity for walkers, cyclists and horse riders, proximity to a conservation area, loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats, extraction is already planned close to the village and this would exacerbate the problem, and desecration of the countryside with little regard for future generations.

Respondent No.	Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3486	***Consulted Under 2909***	0272	Objects to the site. This site makes the industrial scale of quarrying in the area worse. It is close to the villages of Kirkby Fleetham, Great Fencote and Little Fencote and have a detrimental effect on these villages. The villages to the east (Great and little Fencote would suffer air pollution and noise pollution. The site is prime agricultural land.	Object to the site due to the excessive quarrying in the area, the detrimental impact upon the villages of Great and Little Fencote and Kirkby Fleetham, including noise and dust. Loss of agricultural land.
3484		0268	There is 39 mt excess at existing sites which would meet demand. Access roads are inadequate for 120 return HGV journeys and associated traffic creating dangers for walkers, cyclists (Sustrans route 71) and horse riders and leading to losses of footpaths and bridleways. A loss of grade 2 agricultural land which would be impossible to restore. Impact on water table, the nearby Moors Hill wet woodland and bog wildlife habitat and Mill Beck. The resulting lakes after restoration of the site would present a flood risk to local roads and bird strike to planes from RAF Leeming. Proximity to a conservation village. Noise, dust, landscape and visual impact on the Village and the local school. There are existing and proposed sites close to the village creating a horseshoe of quarrying around the Village.	There is 39 mt excess at existing sites which would meet demand. Access roads are inadequate for HGV and associated traffic creating dangers for walkers, cyclists and horse riders . A loss of grade 2 agricultural land. Impact on water table and nearby Moors Hill wet woodland. Restoration to water would present a flood risk to local roads and bird strike. Proximity to a conservation village. Noise, dust, landscape and visual impact. Cumulative impact from numerous existing and proposed sites.
2909		0270	The addition of this site to the original proposals shows scant regard for the objections I have made since the same conditions apply regarding negative environmental impact and quality of life of local residents. In addition to my stated objections there are concerns about the extent on reliance of food imports. These proposals appear to sacrifice productive agricultural land for minerals which could be extracted from alternative sites offering no food producing benefit.	This site sill have a negative environmental impact and quality of life of local residents. These proposals sacrifice productive agricultural land for minerals which could be extracted from alternative sites.

3482

Consulted Under 3478

0266

Object to the site.
 If surrounding sites also went ahead the village of Kirkby Fleetham would be surrounded.
 Concerned about visible pollution in the air as well as invisible pollution, the upgrade of the A1 will also cause increased pollution and poses a high risk to health.
 Once the A1 upgrade is completed there will be a new route to areas west of the A1, lorries from the site are likely to use this and increase the danger for other road users.
 There would be a loss of high quality agricultural land as restoration would be to a lake.
 There would be an impact on wildlife in the area.
 The lake would pose a birdstrike hazard to aircraft from RAF Leeming.
 Concerned about the impact from noise pollution.
 Concerned about loss of public amenity in terms of impact on non motorised road users and loss of footpaths and bridleways.
 Landowner has not given permission for any testing on the site.
 There is no need for the sand and gravel from the site.
 It would be difficult to screen the site.

Concerned about cumulative impact if more sites in the area allowed.
 Concerned about pollution in the area from the site and A1.
 Concerned about increased danger from increase in number of lorries, and impact on non motorised road users.
 Concerned about permanent loss of agricultural land, if restored to a lake would also pose a bird strike threat to RAF Leeming.
 There would be an impact on wildlife and loss of footpaths and bridleways and would be difficult to screen the site.
 There is a lack of need for the mineral.

Respondent No. Name

3577

CommentNo Comment

0404

Object to the site.
The operation indicates that they will build a new access link to the A1(M) but no details have been provided. The existing roads in and around the village are unsuitable for large lorries. If a link road is created it may change the character of the local area.
The increase in traffic will increase air pollution which will be carried by prevailing winds and may have an adverse impact on health of residents.
The quarry will generate high levels of noise, dust and air pollution which will impact on the quality of life, health and general amenity of the area.
There will be a loss of high grade agricultural land.
Concerned about impact on the water table and water quality.
More details required regarding the operation and restoration of the site.

Summary

The existing roads in and around the village are unsuitable for large lorries. If a link road is created it may change the character of the local area.
There will be noise, dust and air pollution which will be carried by prevailing wind to local villages and could have an impact on health, quality of life and general amenity of the area.
There will be a loss of high grade agricultural land.
Concerned about the impact on the water table and water quality.

3474

0333

There is a lack of need for the site as existing sites already meet future demand.

The increase in heavy site traffic and workers vehicles will cause disruption along narrow lanes and pose a hazard to other road users. The extra traffic may also damage road services and verges.

The site will generate noise, light and dust pollution due to the prevailing wind and this will affect the whole of the village.

There will be a loss of amenities for horse riders, walkers and cyclists with the Sustrans route, bridleways and footways being affected.

The site is too close to the village which is a conservation village.

There will be a loss of prime grade 2 agricultural land and wildlife habitat.

The water table is high and lakes will form where excavation takes place, there could be flooding in the village after heavy rain. The lakes are a concern for RAF Leeming as increased risk of birdstrike.

Mill Beck nearby could be polluted.

Restoration will not be back to the same quality of agricultural land.

There is a lack of need for the site.

Concerned about increase in traffic on narrow lanes and its risk to and impact on amenity of other road users.

Concerned about noise dust and light pollution from the site and its impact on the village.

The site is too close to the village.

There will be a loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitat.

Concerned about increased risk of flooding in the village and pollution of nearby watercourses.

If lakes form may be an increased risk of birdstrike for planes from RAF Leeming.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary	
3481	***Consulted Under 3478***	0267	<p>Object to the site.</p> <p>If surrounding sites also went ahead the village of Kirkby Fleetham would be surrounded.</p> <p>Concerned about visible pollution in the air as well as invisible pollution, the upgrade of the A1 will also cause increased pollution and poses a high risk to health.</p> <p>Once the A1 upgrade is completed there will be a new route to areas west of the A1, lorries from the site are likely to use this and increase the danger for other road users.</p> <p>There would be a loss of high quality agricultural land as restoration would be to a lake.</p> <p>There would be an impact on wildlife in the area.</p> <p>The lake would pose a birdstrike hazard to aircraft form RAF Leeming.</p> <p>Concerned about the impact from noise pollution.</p> <p>Concerned about loss of public amenity in terms of impact on non motorised road users and loss of footpaths and bridleways.</p> <p>Landowner has not given permission for any testing on the site.</p> <p>There is no need for the sand and gravel from the site.</p> <p>It would be difficult to screen the site.</p>	<p>Concerned about cumulative impact if more sites in the area allowed.</p> <p>Concerned about pollution in the area from the site and A1.</p> <p>Concerned about increased danger from increase in number of lorries, and impact on non motorised road users.</p> <p>Concerned about permanent loss of agricultural land, if restored to a lake would also pose a bird strike threat to RAF Leeming.</p> <p>There would be an impact on wildlife and loss of footpaths and bridleways and would be difficult to screen the site.</p> <p>There is a lack of need for the mineral.</p>
3476	0306	<p>This site is one of five submitted sites within a small area.</p> <p>This site will have a significant impact on the lives of the local community with a high impact on the lives of the local community.</p> <p>The site is flat so visual screening will be difficult and there will be noise and dust pollution.</p> <p>The roads are narrow lanes without footpaths and are unsuitable for heavy traffic. They are used by other road users and extra traffic would present a severe risk to them.</p> <p>There would be a loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>Wildlife will be affected.</p> <p>There is a lack of need for the site.</p>	<p>The site will have a significant impact on the local community in terms of noise and dust pollution and visual amenity.</p> <p>The roads are unsuitable for heavy traffic and other road users will be put at risk.</p> <p>There would be a loss of agricultural land and wildlife would be affected.</p> <p>There is a lack of need for the site.</p>	

Respondent No.	Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
836	Scruton Parish Council	0088	Concerned about the impact of this site on the properties in Scruton including traffic impact on the narrow country roads. This creeping industrialisation again threatens the quality of life in the village.	Concerned about the impact of this site on the properties and residents of Scruton including traffic impact and impact on quality of life.
713	Kirkby Fleetham with Fencote Parish Council	0466	<p>Oppose this site.</p> <p>There is a lack of need for this site, there is an application currently being considered in the area which will meet the shortfall until 2030. Other sites proposed in the area would also cover the need.</p> <p>The site is close to Kirkby Fleetham conservation area and the Fencotes, over 1000 residents would be impacted by environmental pollution in terms of noise and dust, which would also pose a risk to health. The villages will also be impacted by other quarries in the area if they get the go ahead.</p> <p>There would be a loss of grade 2 agricultural land.</p> <p>The site would destroy a valuable amenity area used by walkers and horse riders, the landscape amenity will also be impacted especially with the lowering of the water table. Wildlife will be affected.</p> <p>The local roads are not suitable for HGV traffic, and there will be an increased risk to other road users. Low Street especially will be impacted as this is also an access route to other proposed sites in the area. There will be an impact from noise and dust pollution and risk to health.</p> <p>The water table would be affected and in turn affect local wetland sites and adjacent agricultural land. The site is unlikely to be restored to agricultural land.</p> <p>Hambleton District Council has identified Kirkby Fleetham for future housing, the site could have an adverse impact on this.</p>	<p>Oppose this site. There is a lack of need for the site.</p> <p>It is close to villages and residents would be impacted by noise and dust pollution. There would be a loss of grade 2 agricultural land.</p> <p>There would be a loss of recreational and landscape amenity and wildlife would be affected.</p> <p>The local roads are unsuitable for HGV traffic and there would be an increased risk to other road users.</p> <p>The water table would be affected which would affect local wetland sites and adjacent agricultural land.</p>

Respondent No. Name

3478

CommentNo Comment

0300

Object to site.
If surrounding sites also went ahead the village of Kirkby Fleetham would be surrounded.
Concerned about visible pollution in the air as well as invisible pollution, the upgrade of the A1 will also cause increased pollution and poses a high risk to health.
Once the A1 upgrade is completed there will be a new route to areas west of the A1, lorries from the site are likely to use this and increase the danger for other road users.
There would be a loss of high quality agricultural land as restoration would be to a lake.
There would be an impact on wildlife in the area.
The lake would pose a birdstrike hazard to aircraft from RAF Leeming.
Concerned about the impact from noise pollution.
Concerned about loss of public amenity in terms of impact on non motorised road users and loss of footpaths and bridleways.
Landowner has not given permission for any testing on the site.
There is no need for the sand and gravel from the site.
It would be difficult to screen the site.

Summary

Concerned about cumulative impact if more sites in the area allowed.
Concerned about pollution in the area from the site and A1.
Concerned about increased danger from increase in number of lorries, and impact on non motorised road users.
Concerned about permanent loss of agricultural land, if restored to a lake would also pose a bird strike threat to RAF Leeming.
There would be an impact on wildlife and loss of footpaths and bridleways and would be difficult to screen the site..
There is a lack of need for the mineral.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3479	***consulted under 3478***	0301	<p>Object to site.</p> <p>If surrounding sites also went ahead the village of Kirkby Fleetham would be surrounded.</p> <p>Concerned about visible pollution in the air as well as invisible pollution, the upgrade of the A1 will also cause increased pollution and poses a high risk to health.</p> <p>Once the A1 upgrade is completed there will be a new route to areas west of the A1, lorries from the site are likely to use this and increase the danger for other road users.</p> <p>There would be a loss of high quality agricultural land as restoration would be to a lake.</p> <p>There would be an impact on wildlife in the area.</p> <p>The lake would pose a birdstrike hazard to aircraft form RAF Leeming.</p> <p>Concerned about the impact from noise pollution.</p> <p>Concerned about loss of public amenity in terms of impact on non motorised road users and loss of footpaths and bridleways.</p> <p>Landowner has not given permission for any testing on the site.</p> <p>There is no need for the sand and gravel from the site.</p> <p>It would be difficult to screen the site</p>	<p>Concerned about cumulative impact if more sites in the area allowed.</p> <p>Concerned about pollution in the area from the site and A1.</p> <p>Concerned about increased danger from increase in number of lorries, and impact on non motorised road users.</p> <p>Concerned about permanent loss of agricultural land, if restored to a lake would also pose a bird strike threat to RAF Leeming.</p> <p>There would be an impact on wildlife and loss of footpaths and bridleways and would be difficult to screen the site..</p> <p>There is a lack of need for the mineral.</p>
128	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	0260	<p>Cumulative impacts with other suggested sites in the area will be considerable. Links to the Yorkshire Trust Living Landscapes would be possible to link up habitat. If consented a detailed restoration and management plan will be needed.</p>	<p>Cumulative impacts will be considerable. Links to the Yorkshire Trust Living Landscapes would be possible to link up habitat. If consented a detailed restoration and management plan will be needed.</p>

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
2863	0106	<p>The proposed site for mineral extraction is currently farmland used to raise crops, whose contribution may be viewed as small scale, it is nevertheless integral to the economy. The amount of mineral deposits contained in this area is small scale however the disruption to the local community/environment will be massive. The air pollution from the extraction will cause health problems to the residents of Fencote; the noise from the heavy plant machinery will have a negative effect on quality of life; the damage to local roads will cost far more to repair than the revenue gained by the extraction;</p> <p>This proposal goes against the NYCC planning process for protecting the green belt.</p>	<p>The proposed site for mineral extraction would lead to the loss of farmland used to raise crops. Disruption to the local community/environment outweighs the benefit of extraction. The site will lead to air/noise pollution and damage local roads which will have a negative effect on quality of life;</p> <p>This proposal goes against NYCC planning policy protecting the green belt.</p>
3566	0457	<p>Concerned about the loss of agricultural land changing the nature of the rural area and leading to increased amounts of traffic. What will the site be restored to after extraction has taken place?</p>	<p>Concerned about loss of agricultural land/rural setting and increased amounts of traffic. Concerned about restoration.</p>
3567	0444	<p>Concerned about air pollution and risk to health. Surrounding roads not suitable for heavy traffic and will cause disruption to other road users and deposits on the roads.</p> <p>Concerned about noise pollution.</p> <p>Will be a loss of grade 2 agricultural land.</p> <p>There is lack of need for the site.</p>	<p>Concerned about air pollution and risk to health.</p> <p>Surrounding roads not suitable for heavy traffic and will cause disruption to other road users and deposits on the roads.</p> <p>Concerned about noise pollution.</p> <p>Will be a loss of grade 2 agricultural land.</p> <p>There is lack of need for the site.</p>

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3568

0388

Objects to the site on the following grounds: Increased HGV's, dust pollution potentially causing health risks, impact upon local wildlife and their habitat, loss of prime agricultural land, impact upon local amenity and landscape impact.

The county already provide sufficient aggregate and this site would provide excess.

Objects to the site on the following grounds: Increased HGV's, dust pollution potentially causing health risks, impact upon local wildlife and their habitat, loss of prime agricultural land, impact upon local amenity and landscape impact.

The county already provide sufficient aggregate

2933

0360

There is a lack of need for the site as requirements can be met from existing sites.

Should expand exiting sites rather than create new ones on green field sites which would result in the loss of agricultural land.

There are a lot of sites focused in a small area, this would have a detrimental effect on the locality which has already had the environment and landscape impacted by the A1 upgrade, Bedale bypass and service areas.

Concerned about the impact on health through noise, dust and pollutants, especially due to the prevailing wind.

There would be a large increase in heavy traffic the lanes are not suitable and are used as a diversion route if problems on the A1.

Concerned about impact on local habitat for wildlife, hedgerows, trees and watercourses.

Concerned about reduction in opportunities for recreational use of the land and lanes and the landscape would be affected deterring visitors.

The villages are linked and communities would be affected.

The site will not benefit local residents.

There is a lack of detail about the proposals and lack of contact from the minerals industry.

Lack of need for site, expand existing ones instead.

If all sites in area go ahead will have a detrimental effect on locality in terms of landscape, environment and loss of agricultural land. Wildlife habitats, hedgerows, trees and watercourses will be affected.

Concerned about the impact on health through noise, dust and pollutants, especially due to the prevailing wind.

Local roads not suitable for heavy traffic.

Leisure opportunities will be reduced on land and lanes.

Local communities will be affected and there will be no benefit to local residents.

Need more detail about proposals.

Object to the extraction of sand and gravel at this site west of Kirkby Fleetham. Conservation areas were introduced to protect the character and appearance of areas. Kirkby Fleetham was designated as a Conservation area on 23rd February 1988.

The proposal is close to the village and will not preserve/enhance the area due to noise, vibration and dust. Noise impact arising from the mobile, static, semi-mobile plant and HGVs, which will be transmitted beyond site boundaries, reduces the quality of life of communities and visitors. Large and small particulate dust, produced by moving soil, overburden excavation and mechanical handling of minerals, emitted from HGVs and distributed further afield by other vehicles and wind can damage the environment in two ways: the visible dirtying of building exteriors and interiors requiring frequent cleaning; dust may chemically attack some materials leading to damage. Vibration can damage buildings in several ways: physical separation, cracks in buildings, movement of objects inside buildings.

What formal Transport Assessment has been undertaken in relation to the site? Even with the upgrade to the A1M access routes surrounding the site will be minor roads and there will be a substantial increase of HGV traffic out of scale with local roads. On-site workforce would need to access the site via private vehicles due to lack of public transport leading to increased congestion on unsuitable roads creating a risk to pedestrians, other road users and damage to the environment. Empty and laden HGV movements at unsocial hours will have significant impacts on communities as confirmed by a strategic report (Assess the design of lorries and quarries for aggregates transport - Cranfield University 2009).

Extraction of minerals will be below the water table

Object to the site due to: impact upon the nearby conservation area; Noise impact arising from the site and HGVs reducing the quality of life of communities and visitors; Dust impact damaging the local environment and buildings; Vibration damaging buildings; a substantial increase of HGV and other associated traffic out of scale with local roads damaging to the environment; HGV movements at unsocial hours will have significant impacts on communities; Impact upon the water table and other consequences resulting from pumping water; The site is unsuitable considering other designated but unused sites in close proximity have many years of extractable minerals.

requiring pumping of the water and increased noise pollution. Where and how much water will be removed? Will the water table be lowered and what impact will this have on the local environment?

The site is unsuitable considering the other designated but unused sites in close proximity which have many years of extractable minerals.

3570

0395

Heavy transport along narrow unsuitable roads will cause disruption and a hazard to road users.
Noise dust and light pollution will affect several villages, particularly with the prevailing winds.
There will be a loss of amenities for walkers, cyclists and horse riders who use the bridleways around the area.
The site is too close to a conservation village which is in the middle of a circle of villages.
There is a lack of need for the site and more suitable sites closer to where the gravel is needed.
Will loose high quality agricultural land and wildlife habitat.
The water table will be affected.

Heavy transport along narrow unsuitable roads will cause disruption and a hazard to road users.
Noise dust and light pollution will affect several villages, particularly with the prevailing winds.
There will be a loss of amenities for walkers, cyclists and horse riders who use the bridleways around the area.
The site is too close to a conservation village.
There is a lack of need for the site and more suitable sites closer to where the gravel is needed.
Will loose high quality agricultural land and wildlife habitat.
The water table will be affected.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
2901	0386	<p>Strongly object to the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <p>Destruction of a quiet scenic route for cyclists, horse riders and wildlife.</p> <p>Proximity to a burial ground and church.</p> <p>Destruction of a historic battle site and agricultural land.</p> <p>Traffic impacts</p> <p>Noise, dust and light pollution.</p> <p>Devaluation of properties</p>	<p>Strongly object to the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <p>Loss of residential amenity and wildlife;</p> <p>Proximity to a burial ground and church;</p> <p>Destruction of a historic battle site and agricultural land and, Traffic impacts;</p> <p>Noise, dust and light pollution.</p>
3579	0374	<p>Object to the site.</p> <p>There is a lack of need for the site.</p> <p>The infrastructure is unsuitable, the roads are too narrow for heavy traffic and unmanageable and dangerous and will impact on the amenity of other road users.</p> <p>The village is a conservation area with good views.</p> <p>Concerned about the loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Concerned about noise and dust pollution and risk to health.</p>	<p>Object to the site.</p> <p>There is a lack of need for the site.</p> <p>The infrastructure is unsuitable, the roads are too narrow for heavy traffic and will impact on the amenity of other road users.</p> <p>The village is a conservation area with good views.</p> <p>Concerned about the loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Concerned about noise and dust pollution and risk to health.</p>
3571	***Consulted Under 3570*** 0364	<p>Concerned about the site on the following grounds:</p> <p>Heavy traffic on narrow unsuitable roads; noise, light and dust pollution; loss of amenity; proximity to residential properties; there is already adequate mineral supply available and there are other, more suitable, sites closer to where the material will be used. The site would result in loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats and affect the water table.</p>	<p>Concerned about the site on the following grounds:</p> <p>Heavy traffic on narrow unsuitable roads; noise, light and dust pollution; loss of amenity; proximity to residential properties; loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Considers there to be adequate mineral supply and more appropriate sites available.</p>

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3467

0277

Concerned about this site due to the following: increase in HGV traffic volumes; noise and dust pollution in close proximity to the village and conservation area which pose a serious health risk; impact upon wildlife and their habitats; loss of prime agricultural land; impact upon outdoor leisure activities in the area.

Concerned about this site due to the following: increase in HGV traffic volumes; health risks from noise and dust pollution; impact upon wildlife and their habitats; loss of prime agricultural land; impact upon outdoor leisure activities in the area.

3488

0312

The narrow lanes are not suitable for heavy traffic, the roads are used by non motorised road users and they are at greater risk, and there will be an impact on the quality of life of residents.

Residents and animals health will be affected by dust.

There are several sites proposed in this area and it is too much for the communities of the area.

There would be a loss of grade 2 agricultural land and the water table would be depleted and there would be a large impact on the carbon footprint.

Residents will not be able to move due to property values and their quality of life will be affected.

There is lack of need for the site. Sites near York should be proposed.

The narrow lanes are unsuitable for heavy traffic, non motorised road users would be affected and there would be an impact on the quality of residents lives in terms of health and local amenity.

There would be a cumulative impact if all sites in the area go ahead.

There would be a loss of agricultural land.

Should look in York area for sites.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3573

0363

Objects to the site on the following grounds:
 Heavy transport on narrow roads; Noise, light and dust pollution;
 Loss of amenity; Proximity to a conservation area; Loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitat; and desecration of the countryside with little regard for future generations.

Quarrying is already planned close to the village and this would add to the situation, house prices and overall quality of life would be affected.

Objects to the site on the following grounds:
 Traffic impacts; Noise, light and dust pollution;
 Loss of amenity; Proximity to a conservation area; Loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitat; and desecration of the countryside with little regard for future generations.
 Quarrying is already planned close to the village and this would add to the situation.

2858

0385

Concerned about the site due to its proximity to the villages of Fencote and Kirkby Fleetham and the negative effect on the wellbeing of the residents of the area.
 Any possible advantage gained from minerals development in the area will be counteracted by the dramatic loss of amenity and loss of character of the area.

Concerned about the site due to its proximity to the villages of Fencote and Kirkby Fleetham and the negative effect on the wellbeing of the residents of the area.
 Any possible advantage gained from minerals development in the area will be counteracted by the dramatic loss of amenity and loss of character of the area.

Respondent No. Name

2853

CommentNo Comment

0095

This is a greenfield site on higher land away from existing quarrying and outside the traditional Swale Valley sand and gravel sites.

It is currently agricultural land with open views and a public footpath going across it and two watercourses on the eastern site boundary, it overlooks Kirkby Fleetham and has properties directly adjacent to it. The lanes surrounding it are narrow and used by walkers, joggers, cyclists and horse riders.

There is no publically available borehole information for the site. The evidence provided by the Council documents demonstrate that there is no need for this site as other aggregate resources are available locally.

There is no similar development in the area and the site will have an impact on local amenity. There is no clear access to the site and surrounding roads are narrow. It is likely that plant will also be required on the site. The site is likely to be restored to a water area posing a birdstrike hazard, proposed agricultural restoration would be limited resulting in loss of agricultural land.

The site would be visible over a large area, and screening bunds would be visually intrusive in the open landscape, the visual amenity of local properties would be affected.

Local amenity would be affected as there would be an impact from site noise and dust and site traffic.

The site would impact on the landscape, there would be a loss of agricultural land and 'The Bog' area north of Todd Lane would be affected or lost leading to a loss of habitat and diversity.

The landscape would be changed from agricultural land and lead to a loss in agricultural land. The footpath could be lost affecting local amenity.

The site would impact on residential amenity as it is close to housing in Kirkby Fleetham, the Fencotes and other individual properties.

Restoration is unlikely to benefit the area and if other proposed quarries in the vicinity get permission there will

Summary

This site is located away from existing quarrying and traditional sand and gravel sites.

It will impact on local amenity by possible loss of a footpath across the site, there will also be an increase in noise and dust. There will be an increase in heavy duty traffic on the narrow roads which will impact the pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders and other road users. The access to the site is not clear and could cause problems on the local road network.

The site would be visible over a large area and will impact on visual amenity. It is also close to residential properties and will have an impact on residential amenity in terms of noise, dust, traffic and visual amenity.

The proposed agricultural restoration will be limited and the site is likely to be restored to water posing a birdstrike hazard and loss of agricultural land resulting in a loss of habitat and biodiversity and may impact on surrounding landscape features such as the bog adjacent to the site.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3574	0362	<p>Concerned about the potential risk of air pollution from fine particles carried on the prevailing westerly winds.</p> <p>Concerned about noise from the site and traffic impact.</p>	<p>Concerned about the potential risk of air pollution form fine particles carried on the prevailing westerly winds. Concerned about noise from the site and traffic impact.</p>
3487	0313	<p>There is lack of need for the site.</p> <p>If all sites in the area go ahead it will surround the villages in addition to the disruption from the upgrade of the A1 and Bedale bypass.</p> <p>There will be a loss of grade 2 agricultural land and so have an impact on jobs. The land has a high water table which would drain away when the site is excavated and this will have a knock on effect for wildlife and stock.</p> <p>The heavy traffic from the site will have to use the narrow lanes and will impact on local residents and other road users in terms of volume and noise and amenity.</p> <p>The dust and noise will cause disruption for residents and will be a risk to health from air pollution.</p> <p>There will be an adverse impact on the landscape, visual amenity and conservation status of the village.</p> <p>Quality of life will be impacted upon and there will be no economic gain.</p> <p>It is understood that the gravel will be used in York, should look for sites closer to the City as are good quality deposits down there.</p> <p>Concerned about the impact the site will have on local businesses.</p> <p>Have included photos to show what would be impacted if the site went ahead.</p>	<p>There is a lack of need for the site. Sites near York which have good quality reserves should be considered.</p> <p>There will be a cumulative impact if all sites in the area go ahead and some residencies and villages will be surrounded. Quality of life will be affected without any economic gain.</p> <p>There will be a loss of agricultural and an impact on the water table and this will affect wildlife and stock.</p> <p>Concerned about impact site traffic will have on residents and other road users in terms of noise and amenity as lanes are narrow.</p> <p>Will be pollution from noise and dust and pollution could pose a health risk.</p> <p>There will be an adverse impact on the landscape, visual amenity and conservation status of the village.</p> <p>Concerned about impact quarrying will have on local businesses.</p>

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3576

0389

Objects to the site as it would be severely detrimental to village life and the surrounding area. Concerned about noise and dust pollution which poses a health hazard and the loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats. Increased traffic on the country roads will create hazards to non motorized users. Impact upon the water table and the effect the this may have on properties and land (subsidence). The proposal would result in a de-valuation of properties and impact upon a conservation area.

Objects to the site due to loss of residential amenity and impact upon village life, health concerns, loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats and traffic impacts.

3565

***if senting out by post
consulted under 3564***

0527

Access along Low Street is already limited and there is no room for a lorry and a car to pass each other. The site is close to a burial ground and so the site traffic could cause distress and inconvenience to mourners and visitors. There is no need for the sand and gravel in this site.

Access along Low Street is already limited and there is no room for a lorry and a car to pass each other, the traffic will impact on residents and visitors. There is no need for the sand and gravel in this site.

1450

0168

Object to this site for the following reasons: the site is extensive and in very close proximity to the villages of Kirkby Fleetham and Great Fencote; if all submitted sites were taken forward Kirkby Fleetham would be surrounded on three sides; local roads are incapable of supporting increased HGV traffic movements; noise, dust and airborne pollution would affect the village; the watertable would be affected potentially leading to flooding and inherent dangers such as birdstrike of planes from RAF Leeming; detrimental impacts to woodlands and streams; extensions to existing quarries would supply sufficient sand and gravel for the period; the impact upon local residents for the next 20 years; loss of grade 2 agricultural land.

Object to this site because: proximity to Kirkby Fleetham and Great Fencote; cumulative impact from submitted sites; local roads are incapable of supporting increased HGV traffic movements; noise, dust and airborne pollution; impact on watertable; potentially flooding and inherent dangers e.g. birdstrike of planes from RAF Leeming; detrimental impacts to woodlands and streams; extensions to existing quarries would supply sufficient sand and gravel for the period; impact upon local residents; loss of grade 2 agricultural land.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3414	0161	Concern about noise pollution, dust and light pollution, potential for contamination of local water courses and traffic impacts. The surrounding roads are used by walkers and cyclists for recreational purposes and the enjoyment of the are will be destroyed. Habitats would be destroyed. The village is a conservation area, allowing a quarry so close to the village would undermine this designation.	Concern about noise pollution, dust and light pollution, potential for contamination of local water courses and traffic impacts. The surrounding roads are used by walkers and cyclists for recreational purposes and the enjoyment of the are will be destroyed. Habitats would be destroyed. The village is a conservation area, allowing a quarry so close to the village would undermine this designation.
3514	0411	One site looks to be going ahead in the area so not feasible to have another one in the area. There would be a visual impact on the area and restoration to water would change the landscape. There will be a loss of grade 2 agricultural land. Will need an air quality management plan to prevent air pollution affecting the village as located close by. There are major infrastructure constraints, there is a proposed access link to the A1 but no guarantee narrow local roads will not be used. Concerned about noise, vibration and pollution from the site and its impact on residents. If excavate all the sites at once there will be nothing left for the next generation.	Not feasible to have more than one site operational in the area. The restoration would change the landscape and there would be a visual impact on the area as well as a loss of agricultural land. Concerned about noise, vibration and pollution from the site and its impact on residents of nearby village, an air quality management plan will be required. There are infrastructure constraints in terms of narrow roads.
3425	0169	Object to the site for the following reasons: air and noise pollution; adverse impact on the scenery; local roads are not adequate for increased heavy traffic and will be dangerous for other users.	Object to the site due to: air and noise pollution; adverse impact on the scenery; local roads are not adequate for increased heavy traffic.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3515

0418

Concerned about noise, pollution and heavy traffic impact. The countryside will be adversely impacted and there is a lack of need for the mineral.

Concerned about noise, pollution and heavy traffic impact. The countryside will be adversely impacted and there is a lack of need for the mineral.

3424

0171

Strongly object to the site because the location of the site cannot support it visually, environmentally (potentially toxic microparticles) nor practically (road conditions). Furthermore, high quality agricultural land will be lost and there will be an adverse effect on the watertable.

Strongly object to the site because the location of the site cannot support it visually, environmentally nor practically (i.e. dust pollution and road conditions). High quality agricultural land will be lost and there will be an adverse effect on the watertable.

3516

0462

Object to site.
The lanes are used by walkers, cyclists, horse riders and Bedale Hunt, they are unsuitable for heavy lorries and will present a danger to other road users.
Concerned about noise and dust pollution and impact on the rural setting.
It is in close proximity to an archaeological site of national importance.
There would be a loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats.

Unsuitable local roads for HGVs.
Noise and dust pollution.
Impacts on the rural setting.
Proximity to an archaeological site of national importance.
Loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo Comment	Summary
3423 ***Consulted Under 3401***	0178 Object to the proposed site for the following reasons: Noise, light and air pollution which will affect health of local residents and surrounding plants; damage to biodiversity which is important as all species are interlinked, loss of grade 2 agricultural and damage to local wildlife and their habitats; long lasting disruptions to the village residents for the next 20 years; the gravel is not needed as there is an excess of 39 mt over the plan period suggesting this site is not needed; house prices in the area will undoubtedly decline as will the local economy; increased traffic levels and HGVs on inadequate local roads causing disruption and danger to other users as well as the likely deposit of mud and rocks. The proposed site is 400 metres away from the conservation village which is recognised for its natural ecological and/or cultural value.	Object to the proposed site for the following reasons: Noise, light and air pollution; damage to biodiversity; loss of grade 2 agricultural; damage to local wildlife and their habitats; long lasting disruptions to the village residents; this site is not needed; the local economy will decline; inadequate local roads for HGVs; the proposed site is 400 metres away from the conservation village.
3422	0174 Strongly object to the site because: two sites are already close to Kirkby Fleetham, a third would have excessive impact on the small rural community; creation of significant heavy transport from the site on inadequate local roads; noise and dust pollution carried directly into the village; proximity of the development to properties in the village leading to a negative impact on market value.	Strongly object to the site because: cumulative impact from numerous nearby extraction sites; creation of significant heavy transport on inadequate local roads; noise and dust pollution; negative impact on market value of local houses.
3421	0175 Strongly object to the site because: two sites are already close to Kirkby Fleetham, a third would have excessive impact on the small rural community; creation of significant heavy transport from the site on inadequate local roads; noise and dust pollution carried directly into the village; proximity of the development to properties in the village leading to a negative impact on market value.	Strongly object to the site because: cumulative impact from numerous nearby extraction sites; creation of significant heavy transport on inadequate local roads; noise and dust pollution; negative impact on market value of local houses.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3495

0436

Concerned about significant increase in HGV traffic, pollution of environment and the unknown impact on wildlife.

Concerned about significant increase in HGV traffic, pollution of environment and the unknown impact on wildlife.

3415

0160

Concerned about the site due to proximity to the village, the surrounding roads are narrow and the site would increase the number of large vehicles on the roads which are used by walkers and cyclists and young children for recreation. There is also concern about noise, dust and loss of agricultural land.

Opposes the site due to concerns about traffic impact, loss of recreational amenity, noise and dust pollution and loss of agricultural land.

3513

0432

This site is inappropriate as it disrupts the living conditions and health of local residents, animals and their ecosystems. Other sites away from villages need to be considered. Evidence from Asarco Smelter in Tacoma, Wasingtin, USA suggests that quarry sites lead to harm and contamination to people, animals and the environment web link: <http://yosemite.epa.gov/RIO/CLEANUP.NSF/sites/Asarco>

Inappropriate site which disrupts the living conditions and health of local residents, animals and their ecosystems.

3412

0162

Objects to the site as it is in close proximity to a conservation area, concerned about the noise, dust and traffic impact of the site. The site is adjacent to an area of historic importance and the quarry could destroy important historic artefacts. The area provides habitats for lots of wildlife which would be destroyed.

Objects to the site as it is in close proximity to a conservation area, concerned about the noise, dust and traffic impact of the site. The site is adjacent to an area of historic importance and the quarry could destroy important historic artefacts. The area provides habitats for wildlife which would be destroyed.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3411

0163

Objects to the site due to increased HGV on narrow unsuitable country roads and would need to be widened. Dust from the site would be carried on the winds from the east into the villages of Kirkby Fleetham and Great Fencote. The site is in close proximity to Carr lake which provides important wildlife habitats; the site would drain this lake and affect the foundations of adjacent properties.

Objects to the site due to increased HGV on narrow unsuitable country roads and would need to be widened. Dust from the site would be carried on the winds from the east into the villages of Kirkby Fleetham and Great Fencote. The site is in close proximity to Carr lake which provides important wildlife habitats; the site would drain this lake and affect the foundations of adjacent properties.

3520

0445

Concerned about increased noise and pollution. The road infrastructure is unsuitable for HGVs and poses a risk to other road users and the site would result in a loss of agricultural land.

Concerned about noise, pollution and traffic impact as well as the loss of agricultural land.

3521

0446

North Yorkshire already exceeds its quota for minerals by several million tonnes; therefore this site is unnecessary. The roads around the site are narrow and unsuitable for HGVs. The site is located on productive agricultural land. The water table is high and drainage would be required, resulting in a loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats. Concerned about noise, dust and light pollution. There are three other sites proposed (Killerby, Scruton and Langton Bridge) making this site seem a little excessive.

Concerned about traffic impacts, loss of agricultural land, impact upon the water table and local wildlife and noise, dust and light pollution. The need for this site and additional minerals is questioned.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3409	0124	<p>The site would have a detrimental effect on the surrounding countryside especially the wildlife and there will be a loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>The site traffic would cause congestion on the narrow lanes and impact on other road users both motorised and non motorised, especially since the access from the Richmond road is over a single carriageway bridge.</p> <p>Concerned about flooding, the water table is high in the area and there are natural springs, any diversion of these could cause problems.</p> <p>The properties in the village will loose value and there will be and impact from noise and pollution of the atmosphere. A site should not be located so close to residences.</p>	<p>The site would impact on the wildlife and countryside. There would be a loss of agricultural land. Site traffic would have an adverse impact on other road users as lanes are narrow.</p> <p>Concerned about potential flooding.</p> <p>Would be an impact on residential amenity due to noise and air pollution.</p>
3408	0139	<p>Object to the proposed site because it is too close to local habitations and the impacts from noise and dust will be horrific. Local roads are not suitable for HGVs to transport to and from the site. If the site was to be developed quick growing trees (leylandii) should be planted to shield the site from the nearby village.</p>	<p>Object to the proposed site due to; proximity to local houses; impacts from noise and dust; local roads are not suitable for HGVs. If the site was to be developed trees should be planted to shield the site from the nearby village.</p>
3407	0138	<p>Expressing concern over the proposal for extraction of sand and gravel west of Kirkby Fleetham. We want to protect this lovely area. The proposed site is too close to the conservation village and HGVs would cause disruption to local access roads increasing hazards to other road users.</p> <p>The proposed site would lead to loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitat and negative effects such as noise, dust and light pollution. The proposed site would have an impact upon the village being considered as a sustainable location for family housing.</p>	<p>Expressing concern over the proposed site MJP60. It is too close to the conservation village; HGVs would disrupt local access roads increasing hazards to other road users; loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitat; negative effects such as noise, dust and light pollution; impacts upon the potential siting of new houses in the village.</p>

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3406

****Consulted under 2922**** 0121

Concerned that a spring rises within the plan area, which drains into Bogwood and then a stream runs into the river Swale, and if excavation takes place the area will fill with water. If the restoration is to landfill then the quarry will need to be sealed which will alter the underlying hydrology either by stopping the stream, on which stock rely, or by the pastures becoming marshy and unproductive and useless for grazing.

The Bogwood is a significant rare habitat and contains newts, toads, frogs and sticklebacks in the stream as well as well as species of mosses and other flora, a change in hydrology will put these at risk.

Nearly a third of proposed site includes land which is farmed by the consultee, the loss of this land would make the farm uneconomic and destroy the consultees business. The access to the site is very limited and narrow and unsuitable for the proposed site traffic, plus it is close to homes.

There will be an impact from noise and fumes and general disruption on the area.

Concerned the restoration will be to landfill which will alter the underlying hydrology of the area and cause problems for the surrounding agricultural land and Bogwood habitat. The consultee farms almost a third of the site, los of this land would make the farm uneconomic.

Concerned about the poor access to the site and the impact of the increase in heavy traffic will have on nearby residents.

There will be unacceptable levels of noise, fumes and general disruption to the area.

3405

****Consulted under 2922**** 0120

The site is close to residents properties in Great and Little Fencote and Kirkby Fleetham and will impact on the value and residential amenity in terms of noise, smell, vermin and pollution.

The roads are narrow and unsuitable for the proposed number of lorries to and from the site, and will make roads unsafe particularly at the corner at Salutation where it is difficult for 2 cars to pass.

The area is used recreationally for walking, cycling, horse riding, jogging and dog walking, if the site goes ahead it will impact peoples quality of life of residents and visitors.

Agricultural land will be lost and a wildlife habitat will be destroyed.

The site is on flat land and so there will be a visual impact if it goes ahead

The site will impact on the residential and local amenity of nearby villages in terms of noise, smell, vermin and pollution.

The site traffic will cause problems on the narrow lanes.

The site will impact on peoples quality of life and reduce recreational accessibility to the area.

There will be a loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitat and the site will cause a visual impact on the surrounding area.

3417

0165

Objects to the site as a result of concerns about loss of tranquillity of the area. The increased noise from vehicles and quarry activities would negatively impact on the ability to work at home. The site would also destroy wildlife habitats.

Objects to the site due to loss or tranquillity, increased noise and dust and loss of habitats.

3437

0203

Object as there is already adequate provision for minerals and so new quarries are not required. There would be adverse landscape and visual impact in the short medium and long term, Kirkby Fleetham is a conservation village. The proposal would affect local wildlife by destroying it. The noise and vibration from the site would affect the village and surrounding locality. There will be dust and air quality issues to the residents as the village is downwind from the site. There will be a detrimental impact on the local highway network and highway and pedestrian safety. There will a loss of amenity for other road users. There will be a loss of prime agricultural land.

There is not a need for the site. There would be an adverse impact on landscape, visual amenity, local wildlife, residential amenity and local amenity in terms of noise, vibration, dust and air quality. There will be an impact on the local highway network and other road users, and a loss of agricultural land.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3446

0022

Strongly object to any of the sites proposed by the MWJP but specifically this proposed site as it will desolate the beautiful countryside whilst targets for gravel extraction are already being exceeded from other sites for the next 20 years plus. The extracted gravel will not be used in this area. The site will affect tourism in the area whilst causing air and noise pollution. Impacts upon migrating birds that currently settle on the proposed site. The jobs created by the site will not be local as the majority of local people are retired. Extraction sites should be proposed closer to the houses proposed to be built from the material. There will be an impact upon the long term health of local people including those attending the school. The site will encroach on the recently renovated graveyard. There will be an impact due to increase in traffic on other road users and the surroundings.

Strongly object to any of the sites proposed but specifically this proposed site due to: it will desolate the beautiful countryside; targets for gravel extraction are already being exceeded; the extracted gravel will not be used in this area; it will affect tourism in the area whilst causing air and noise pollution; impacts upon migrating birds; any jobs created will not be local; extraction sites should be closer to the houses proposed to be built from the material; impact upon the long term health of local people; encroachment on the graveyard; impact of the increase in traffic on other road users.

3496

0326

The site is not the best solution for the future demand for minerals. There are other brownfield sites which could be expanded and source a higher level of demand than is actually required.

Should expand brownfield sites to deal with further demand as this site is not the best solution.

3500

0329

Our property would be surrounded by the site. This would be detrimental to the value of the property and quality of life of residents and impact on human right to have a healthy standard of living both now and for future generations. The proposal goes against national and local planning policy.

Properties would be surrounded by the site which would impact on quality of life of residents. The proposal appears to go against national and local policy.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3504	0416	<p>The site would impact on the local and residential amenity of the village. The site is too close to the village and will impact local businesses.</p> <p>The non motorised users of the local roads will be impacted by the increase in heavy traffic and there will be an increased safety hazard.</p> <p>The site would affect the views and if trees are planted this will have the same effect.</p> <p>Residents will be impacted by noise, dust and light pollution from the site which will increase with the prevailing wind.</p> <p>There would be a loss of grade 2 agricultural land and wildlife habitat.</p> <p>There is a lack of need for the mineral</p>	<p>The site is too close to the village and will impact on local and residential amenity and businesses.</p> <p>The increase in heavy traffic will pose a safety hazard for other road users.</p> <p>Views would be affected.</p> <p>Concerned about impact of noise, dust and light pollution especially with prevailing wind.</p> <p>There would be a loss of grade 2 agricultural land and wildlife habitat.</p> <p>There is a lack of need for the mineral.</p>
3505	0382	<p>Concerned about the impact upon the village school. The school has a small number of children attending and anything that could potentially put families off moving to the area may prove detrimental to the future viability of the school. Additional concerns include road safety.</p>	<p>Concerned about the impact upon the village school. The Site could potentially put families off moving to the area and prove detrimental to the future viability of the school. Additional concerns include road safety.</p>
3506	0413	<p>Object to site.</p> <p>The lanes are used by walkers, cyclists, horse riders and Bedale Hunt, they are unsuitable for heavy lorries and will present a danger to other road users.</p> <p>Concerned about noise and dust pollution and impact on the rural setting.</p> <p>It is in close proximity to an archaeological site of national importance.</p> <p>There would be a loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats.</p>	<p>Unsuitable local roads for HGVs.</p> <p>Noise and dust pollution.</p> <p>Impacts on the rural setting.</p> <p>Proximity to an archaeological site of national importance.</p> <p>Loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats.</p>

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3441

****Consulted under 2904**** 0206

Killerby Hall quarry is only half a mile to north and is about to be submitted to planning, Home Farm Kirkby Fleetham also moving a step closer to being excavated, there are other operational sites in the area so no need for this site. The roads will need upgrading to take the extra lorries. The prevailing wind will carry dust and impact on the air quality over Kirkby Fleetham and Little Fencote. The land is grade two arable land and needed for agriculture.

There are other quarries in the area which are either active or have submitted planning applications, so this site is not needed. The roads will need upgrading to take extra lorries. The prevailing wind will carry dust and impact on the air quality over the local area. There will be a loss of grade two agricultural land.

3439

0202

Object to quarry as will impact on local business. There are four other quarries proposed within a 3 mile area. The noise, pollution and traffic will increase. There is a school pick up point near the site so the road will have to be widened and a footpath added to allow school children to walk up the lane. There will be a loss of wildlife and amenities for walkers.

Object to quarry as will impact on local business. There are four other quarries proposed within the area. The noise, pollution and traffic will increase. There is a school pick up point near the site so mitigation measures will have to be included in the proposal. There will be a loss of wildlife and amenities for walkers.

3438

0201

Object to this site as there would a loss of high class agricultural land, loss of wildlife habitat, prevailing wind will carry air pollution. The increased number of heavy lorries will add to the increased traffic due to the A1 upgrade. There will be an increase in noise. There will be a loss of amenity for walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Will impact on conservation structures and the water table.

Would lead to a loss of high quality agricultural land and wildlife habitat. There will be an increase in traffic, pollution and noise and a loss of amenity for other road users. Conservation structures and the water table will be impacted on.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3426	0166	The site will impact on a large number of people in the surrounding villages. The location will make it difficult to ameliorate the noise and environmental consequences arising from the site as well as the visual impact. Local roads are unsuitable for HGVs and the resultant traffic impacts would be detrimental. The proposal would lead to a loss of good quality agricultural land and is not supported by the landowners. Other nearby mineral sites are at a more advanced stage. The required supply of sand and gravel can be met by the extension of existing sites.	The site will impact on a large number of people and the location will make it difficult to mitigate the noise, environmental and visual consequences arising from the site. Traffic impacts would be detrimental and the proposal would lead to a loss of good quality agricultural land. Cumulative impacts from nearby sites. The required supply of sand and gravel can be met by the extension of existing sites.
3508	0425	Concerned about increase in heavy vehicles and impact on safety of other road users. Concerned about noise increase and dust pollution close to rural areas and a conservation village. Concerns about impact on wildlife habitats and agricultural land. Concerned about impact on social wellbeing, accommodating non motorised road users and wildlife. Concerned about the size of the site in relation to the village.	Concerned about increase in heavy vehicles and impact on safety of other road users. Concerned about noise increase and dust pollution close to rural areas and a conservation village. Concerns about impact on wildlife habitats and agricultural land. Concerned about impact on social wellbeing, accommodating non motorised road users and wildlife. Concerned about the size of the site in relation to the village.
3429	0183	Objects to this site for the following reasons: traffic impacts, noise and visual intrusion, loss of residential amenity and recreational use of the area.	Objects to this site for the following reasons: traffic impacts, noise and visual intrusion, loss of residential amenity and recreational use of the area.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3509

0421

Roads around the site are very narrow and already hazardous and could not cope with the increase in heavy traffic.
 There would be a loss of amenities for walkers, cyclists and horse riders using footpaths and bridleways.
 Concerned about noise light and dust pollution in close proximity to residential properties.
 Would be a loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats.
 The site is in close proximity to a conservation village and surrounding access roads are not suitable for any increase in traffic.

Concerned roads around the site are narrow and not suitable for heavy vehicles.
 There would be a loss of amenities for footpath and bridleway users.
 Concerned about noise light and dust pollution in close proximity to residential properties.
 Would be a loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats.
 The site is in close proximity to a conservation village

3510

0435

Concerned about an increase in HGV traffic making roads unsafe for other road users and pedestrians. The site will change the nature of the village with no consideration for the welfare of the community. Proximity to a conservation village and cumulative impact of numerous extraction sites. Noise and dust pollution in the surrounding villages will be significant. Potential impact upon the local water table detrimental to Moorhills Plantation. Issues relating to electricity supply as the village experiences regular power cuts. Loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats.

Concerned about an increase in HGV traffic; no consideration for the welfare of the community; proximity to conservation village; cumulative impact of numerous extraction sites; noise and dust pollution; impact upon the local water table; Issues relating to electricity supply; Loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats.

3511

0417

Concerned about excess noise, volume of traffic and dust which will impact on residents and recreation in the area.
 Object to any mineral extraction in the area.
 There is a lack of need for the mineral.

Concerned the increase in noise, volume of traffic and dust will impact on residential and recreational amenity.
 There is a lack of need for the mineral.
 Object to any extraction in the area.

3434

0189

Prevailing winds are westerly and carry a significant and noticeable levels of noise and dust onto properties in Kirkby Fleetham. The planned level of extraction will mean high levels of vehicle movements in the quarry itself and local roads, even if specified routes are identified.

There is already significant planning blight to properties within the village as a result of this application. There will be a considerable reduction in the enjoyment of the view as will overlook the quarry rather than agricultural land.

Kirkby Fleetham is a conservation village and permitting a quarry in such close proximity would seem contradictory to the concept of conservation.

The land is currently very high grade agricultural land which would be destroyed by the quarry, the water table is high in the area and so it would flood once quarrying ceased.

Concerned prevailing wind will carry noise and dust onto the village.

There will be a large increase in lorry movements on the narrow local roads.

Local amenity, residential amenity and visual amenity will be adversely affected by locating the quarry so close to the village.

Kirkby Fleetham is a conservation village and so a quarry should not be allowed in such close proximity.

There would be a loss of very high grade agricultural land and as the water table in the area is high the quarry would flood once excavation was complete.

Respondent No. Name

3433

CommentNo Comment

0190

There will be a large increase in large and heavy lorries using the lanes leading to and from Kirkby Fleetham. It is well known already that the lanes are dangerous, especially for non motorised users, there are no pavements and lines of sight are very poor due to hedges and bends. The new A1 and Bedale bypass will not resolve these issues, in fact they make it worse.

The westerly prevailing winds will generate noise, debris and dust for the residential and community facilities in the village of Kirkby Fleetham and will have a serious detriment to the well being, health and peace of those living in and visiting the village. Several local businesses rely on passing trade which will be depleted given the diminished tranquillity, fresh air and peace currently enjoyed.

There are several footpaths crossing the area and their closure and amenity loss would be detrimental, especially since the councils inability to ensure other public footpaths leading to the local church have not correctly been marked on the definitive map and have been blocked by the local landowner.

The area is a rich vibrant habitat for owls, bats and many other species of wildlife and fauna, these will all be impacted by the quarry. The impact should be guarded against as the local eco-system has already been disrupted by the A1 widening and Bedale Bypass. The loss of agricultural land will have a negative impact upon the rural economy. The area also supports local employment, not only in agriculture but with the associated shoots, livery's and local hunt kennels.

The Council should be able to identify other areas where the impact of quarrying will have less negative impacts.

Summary

Concerned about potential increase in heavy traffic on the narrow lanes which are already dangerous, especially for non motorised road users.

There will be an adverse impact on residential and local amenity due to prevailing winds carrying noise, dust and debris into the village, local businesses may be impacted as may be less passing trade.

Concerned that that several footpaths may be lost and impact on local amenity of the area.

Concerned about the impact the quarry may have on local wildlife and fauna, as already affected by A1 upgrade and Bedale Bypass.

Concerned about potential loss of agricultural land and loss of local employment.

Council should look at sites which will have less of an impact on the local residents and area.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3432	0187	Object to the site due to; proximity to the village; detrimental impact upon health due to dust and noise from the site; traffic impacts from HGVs accessing the site having hazardous impacts for residents and visitors; cumulative impacts from two permitted sand and gravel extraction sites close to the village; loss of grade 2 agricultural land and other amenities.	Object to the site due to; proximity to the village; detrimental impact upon health due to dust and noise; traffic impacts; cumulative impacts from nearby extraction sites; loss of grade 2 agricultural land and other amenities.
3431	0186	Object to site for the following reasons: Existing sites can be extended -without sourcing new ones. Additional and unacceptable demands on existing C class roads, Increase in traffic and works vehicles and staff and locals using new roads. Health impacts noise, dust causing possible respiratory health problems. Environmental impact upon locals woods, water table and upon a conservation area, and landscape views. Loss or residential amenity (walking, cycling and horse riding). Loss of Grade 2 Agricultural land. Devaluation of properties There is no other industrial development in the area.	Objects to the site on the following grounds: Traffic impact, Health problems including causing respiratory problems. Environmental impacts upon woodland, watertable and conservation are impacting upon landscape views. Loss of agricultural land and Loss of residential amenity.
3512	0410	Site covers an area larger than the villages of Great Fencote and Kirkby Fleetham and is in close proximity to the village. The prevailing wind will carry dust and pollutants towards the village. The roads cannot support the increase in heavy traffic and there will be an impact on other non motorised users. There will be a loss of prime agricultural land. Will have an impact on local villages. Concerned about cumulative impact of there being more than one site proposed in the area,	Site covers a large area and is in close proximity to the village. Prevailing wind will carry dust and pollutants to the village. Roads are unsuitable for site traffic and will have an impact on non motorised users. There will be a loss of agricultural land. May be cumulative impact if more than one site in area developed.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3420

0180

Object to the proposed site on the following grounds: the industrial site of considerable size is in close proximity to Kirkby Fleetham and Fencotes adversely affecting the whole community; large increase in HGV and smaller vehicles causing road damage, increased likelihood of accidents, creating additional noise, air pollution and congestion leading to industrialisation of the area; noise and air pollution from the site itself; cumulative impact from other site submissions i.e. MJP21, MJP33 and MJP43, isolating the community from an environmental perspective; the rural community is already isolated by the development of the A1(M) in the east, the River Swale in the West, the Bedale Bypass in the South and current quarry workings to the North, the proposed site would have a negative effect on local residents; the proposed site is contrary to the draft vision which seeks to enhance the environment; Para 5.43 of the MWJP I&O document suggests that there is not a need for more quarrying and question why this proposal is being entertained.

Object to the proposed site due to: the considerable size of the site in close proximity to local villages; large increase in traffic causing road damage, increased likelihood of accidents, creating additional noise, air pollution and congestion; noise and air pollution from the site itself; cumulative impact from other site submissions nearby; isolation of the community by the A1(M) in the east, the River Swale in the West, the Bedale Bypass in the South and current quarry workings to the North; the proposed site is contrary to the draft vision which seeks to enhance the environment; contrary to Para 5.43 of the MWJP I&O document which suggests that there is not a need for more quarrying.

3507

0441

Concerned about the site due to the following issues-
Heavy traffic on narrow roads, presenting a hazard to other road users. Dust will be carried into the village on prevailing winds causing health problems and coating the whole village in a layer of dust, which over time will block drains leading to flooding.
The site would lead to constant noise and light pollution from machinery and vehicles.
The site would result in loss of agricultural land resulting in an inability to produce crops and meat.
There would be a loss of amenity, loss of natural habitats and wildlife and loss of local views into Yorkshire Dales.
Photographs of view have been submitted along with this representation.

Concerned about traffic impacts, noise dust and light pollution including the potential health risks, Loss of agricultural land, wildlife habitats and scenic views.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3392

0079

The site is inappropriate and damaging to local residents and the local environment. It is extremely close to the villages of Kirkby Fleetham, Great Fencote and Little Fencote and many residences will be affected. Concerned about the affect noise and dust from the site will have on amenity and wildlife. The level of heavy traffic will increase and impact on narrow local roads, they may also distribute mud from the site onto the roads. There are no footpaths on the roads so will be increased risk to pedestrians, cyclist and horse riders. Concerned about reduction in property values. The site will reduce the amount of agricultural land available. Do not believe that there is any mitigation measures to deal with the above issues and so the site should not go ahead. The restoration proposal is back to agriculture, if no new material is imported for restoration the level of the land will be a lot lower than surrounding areas and may not be suitable for agriculture.

Concerned about impact of noise and dust on residential amenity and wildlife, increase in heavy traffic on narrow lanes may cause mud on the road and an increased risk to non motor vehicle users. The site will reduce the amount of agricultural land in the area, and if not restored properly may lead to the land on the site being a lot lower than the surrounding area.

3400

****Consulted under 3401**** 0096

Strongly object to the site on the following grounds: Excessive and heavy transport to and from the site along narrow roads causing hazards to other road users and pedestrians; noise dust and light pollution and health issues; adverse environmental impact including permanent loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats resulting in landscape change affecting the character of the conservation area; loss of residential amenity and impact upon house prices

Strongly object to the site on the following grounds: Transport impacts, noise dust and light pollution, adverse environmental impact including permanent loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats, landscape impact and affect on the character of the conservation area and loss of residential amenity.

Respondent No. Name

3397

CommentNo Comment

0090

The site is considered totally unsuitable. The site is exposed and limited opportunity for adequate screening. The prevailing winds will blow noise, dust and fumes into the village. Extraction has already taken place in the surrounding area and this proposal would result in the village been surrounded on three sides. The road network is too narrow and unsuitable for lorry movements. Footpaths would become impassable for recreational activity.

The village of Kirkby Fleetham is a conservation area, how can the heart of the village be conserved when the surrounding area will be spoilt.

The site would be over exploitation of the area as well as an unacceptable disturbance to the village residents.

Summary

Objects to the site for the following reasons: Proximity to the village, impact from noise, dust and pollution, cumulative impacts of the proposal with other workings and loss of local amenity.

3396

0084

Objects to the site due to the proximity to the house. The site would result in a loss of residential amenity, loss of tranquillity and the increase noise, dust and dirt. The site will impact on property values. The site is in close proximity to the village, which has a vibrant community, pub and school. It would effect tourism to the area.

Objects to the site due to loss of residential amenity, impact on tranquillity and tourism increase in noise and dust .

Respondent No. Name

3395

CommentNo Comment

0085

The proposal would have a huge devastating impact on the popular, thriving community of Kirkby Fleetham and the neighbouring villages Great and Little Fencote. The site would impact on residential amenity, the local school and small businesses. The site is west of the village and the prevailing winds would bring noise, dust and light pollution in to the village. House prices would be negatively affected, the narrow country roads would become hazardous and there would be a loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitat. The local landscape would be destroyed.

There are other quarry sites in close proximity to the area MJP33 Home Farm and MJP21 Land at Killerby (which already has planning Permission) a third site would damage the prosperity of the area, and quality of life. The area has recently seen increased noise and light pollution as a result of the recent A1 upgrade.

Summary

Concerned about the impact on the local villages, residential amenity, loss of agricultural, biodiversity and local economy. Concerned about the traffic impacts, and noise dust and light pollution. Concerned about the cumulative impacts of recent development (A1 upgrade) and other proposed and existing sites.

1505

0442

Objective 9 of the MWJP Issues and Option document 2014 is to 'protect, conserve and where possible enhance the environment' so new greenfield sites should not go forward to the second stage when extensions of existing brownfield working can accommodate the need. The area of Kirkby Fleetham is already potentially accommodating the need for sand and gravel without including this site, so this site should be discounted as there is no need for the mineral. The site lies close to Kirkby Fleetham and the Fencotes, Kirkby Fleetham is a conservation village. Residents would be affected by the impact of environmental pollution such as noise, dust and lighting. The prevailing wind will increase the environmental pollution on the villages. There would be a loss of Grade 2 agricultural land, NYCC own policies state that Grade 2 land should be preserved and brownfield and grade 3 land should be considered first for minerals development. The CPRE has objected to this site being submitted and we endorse this. The approach to this site is a local road and there are accessibility issues along Low Street, the road has been described as inadequate in respect of another local site so will be the same for MJP60.

There is a lack of need for the site. Grade 3 agricultural and brownfield land should be looked at first for minerals sites. There would be a loss of grade 2 agricultural land. The site is close to villages, one of which is a conservation village and there will be a loss of amenity and a loss of the natural environment for residents.

3401

0097

Object to the site on the following grounds: Traffic Impacts; noise, dust and environmental impacts including carbon emissions and effect on water and air quality; landscape and visual intrusion; stability; blasting. Potential for respiratory health issues . Permanent loss of agricultural land and impact upon the character of the landscape.

Object to the site on the following grounds: Traffic Impacts; noise, dust and environmental impacts including carbon emissions, air quality and effect on water; landscape and visual intrusion; stability; blasting.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary	
3524	0451	<p>Objects to the site on the following grounds: Inadequate road network leading to increased disruption and hazards. Noise, dust and light pollution creating unpleasant and unhealthy environment. The rural landscape will be spoilt, agricultural land will be lost. There would be a loss of wildlife habitats and residential amenity. There is an overcapacity of resources of 39 million tonnes, the need for this site is questioned.</p>	<p>Objects to the site on the following grounds: Inadequate road network leading to increased disruption and hazards. Noise, dust and light pollution. The landscape will be spoilt, agricultural land wildlife habitats and residential amenity will be lost. There is an overcapacity of resources of 39 million tonnes, the need for this site is questioned.</p>	
120	Historic England	0135	<p>Given the proximity of this site to these monuments and to the A1, there is a high likelihood of important archaeological remains in this area some of which may, potentially, be of national importance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The boundary of the Kirkby Fleetham Conservation Area lies only 350 metres to the east of this area. · The remains of the motte and bailey castle and medieval settlement earthworks within Hall Garth are a Scheduled Monument. They lie only 325 metres from the eastern boundary of this site · Friar's Garth, a Grade II Listed Building , lies only 150 metres from this sites northern extent. 	<p>Given the proximity of this site to these monuments and to the A1, there is a high likelihood of important archaeological remains in this area some of which may, potentially, be of national importance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The boundary of the Kirkby Fleetham Conservation Area lies only 350 metres to the east of this area. · The remains of the motte and bailey castle and medieval settlement earthworks within Hall Garth are a Scheduled Monument. They lie only 325 metres from the eastern boundary of this site · Friar's Garth, a Grade II Listed Building , lies only 150 metres from this sites northern extent.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3391	0077	<p>Concerned that a part of the submitted Site on land west of Kirkby Fleetham (MJP60) includes land owned by myself (see attached map). It is extremely discourteous of CEMEX not to have consulted me.</p> <p>Object to this site due to; destruction of highly productive arable farmland; extraction of sand & gravel will lower water table in surrounding fields to the detriment of sustainable crop production; negative noise and dust impacts; surrounding road network is not adequate for high daily HGVs.</p>	<p>A part of Site MJP60 includes land owned by myself (see attached map). It is extremely discourteous of CEMEX not to have consulted me.</p> <p>Object to this site due to; loss of arable farmland; negative impact on water table on the crop production of surrounding fields; negative noise and dust impacts; surrounding road network is not adequate.</p>
3390	0076	<p>Considers the site to be at an inappropriate location; remote from the proposed site at Killerby Hall; too close to a conservation area; the site lies on a main approach road to the village; the site is inappropriate due to the potential traffic, light pollution and dust. An alternative site at Killerby Hall and Lawsons land down by Langton Bridge are less obtrusive to the village setting and residents, is barely visible from any roads, is located closer to the bridge service road which would cause significantly less disruption to local residents. The Kirkby Fleetham site will blight the property market for the village for years to come, which can be avoided by the exclusion of this site from the</p>	<p>Objects to the site due to: inappropriate location; remote from the proposed site at Killerby (MJP21); too close to a conservation area; potential traffic, light pollution and dust impacts.</p> <p>Alternative sites at Killerby (MJP21) and Langton Bridge (MJP33) are less obtrusive to the village setting and residents, The Killerby Site (MJP21) is barely visible from any roads and is located closer to the bridge service road causing significantly less disruption to local residents.</p>

Respondent No.	Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3389		0078	Opposed to the proposed extraction of sand & gravel at the site west of Kirkby Fleetham (MJP60) due to; proximity to the conservation village and its access roads; there are already three quarries earmarked in the area (Roughly Bank, Scruton and Killerby) and an additional site would lead to the village being surrounded; devaluation of local properties; noise, light and dust pollution; the extra burden of HGVs on unsuitable local roads; loss of amenity for visitors to the area and residents (e.g. walking, cycling & horse riding); loss of prime agricultural land; eyesore to the landscape.	Opposed to the site MJP60 due to; proximity to the conservation village and its access roads; cumulative impact from other proposed quarries in the area (Roughly Bank, Scruton and Killerby); noise, light and dust pollution; unsuitable local roads; loss of amenity for visitors to the area and residents; loss of prime agricultural land; landscape impacts.
3387		0060	Do not support the site as it would result in loss of amenity and agricultural and grazing land. The road (Lumley Lane, Low Street and Todd Lane) are narrow for and unsuitable for HGVs. Kirkby Fleetham is a quiet conservation village and the proposal would ruin the lives of residents.	Do not support the site as it would result in loss of amenity and agricultural and grazing land. The road (Lumley Lane, Low Street and Todd Lane) are narrow for and unsuitable for HGVs.
3554	***if sending out postal consulted under 3513***	0516	Oppose the site as too close to the village and the school. The traffic will significantly increase and pose a hazard to pedestrians. The quarry will have an adverse impact on the environment including noise and air pollution which will impact upon the community.	The site is too close to the village. The increase in traffic will pose a hazard to pedestrians. There will be noise and dust pollution which will impact on the community.
3386		0066	Objects due to environmental impacts and increased traffic volumes.	Objects due to environmental impacts and increased traffic volumes.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3393	0080	<p>The site is too close to residential properties, it will cause noise disturbance, dust pollution and traffic problems. The site will impact on residents leisure pursuits and business. The increase in traffic will be hazardous to non motor vehicle road users.</p> <p>Concerned about reduction in property values.</p> <p>The Bedale by-pass, RAF Leeming and A1 upgrade already impact on the residential amenity of the area. The site will cause a loss of agricultural land.</p>	<p>Concerned about the impact on residential amenity in terms of noise, dust and increase in traffic.</p> <p>Increase in traffic will cause a hazard for non motor vehicle road users.</p> <p>Concerned about loss of agricultural land if the site goes ahead.</p>
3525	0453	<p>Objects to the site due to inadequate road infrastructure, narrow country roads with HGVs would result in hazards for other road users. The site would cause pollution, dust, noise and light. The area is a conservation area and development in the area must not be intrusive on the locality. The quarry would spoil the rural landscape, not enhance it, there would be a loss of habitats, local amenity and agricultural land.</p> <p>There is already an over capacity of available minerals so there no need for the site.</p>	<p>Objects to the site due to impact upon transport infrastructure and existing road users, the site would detrimentally effect the conservation are and would result in a loss of habitats, local amenity and agricultural land.</p> <p>The need for the site is questioned when there is already an over capacity of extracted minerals.</p>
3403	0116	<p>Adverse effect of increased weight and numbers of vehicles along country lanes, resulting deterioration of roads, disruption and loss of public amenity and safety concerns. Deterioration of property. Prevailing winds resulting in increased, invasive and persistent noise and increased dust, light pollution and impact upon the water table.</p> <p>The cumulative impact of the proposed sites (MJP21, MJP33 and MJP43) would change the rural nature of the area to one of industrialisation impacting upon the quality of life, public amenity (including tranquillity) and tourism of the area.</p>	<p>Traffic Impact, loss of amenity, safety issues, noise dust, light pollution and impact upon the water table. The cumulative impacts of sites should be considered.</p>

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3402

****Consulted under 3401**** 0098

Object to the site as in a conservation area.
 Concerned about noise, dust, increase in HGV traffic, loss of agricultural land, loss of amenities for walkers, cyclists and horse riders.
 There may be an impact on residents health, an increased risk of accidents on the narrow roads and there will be an adverse impact on the landscape.

The site would have an impact on local amenity and residential amenity in terms of noise, dust, HGV traffic, loss of agricultural land.
 There would be an increased risk of accidents on the narrow lanes, impact on residents health and an impact on the landscape.

3526

0477

There is a lack of need for the site as a planning application is being considered for another large site in the area.
 The access to the site from the A1 is along country lanes which is not suitable for a large amount of HGVs.
 The villages of Kirkby Fleetham and the Fencotes are close to the site and affected by the prevailing wind so there will be increased noise and dust pollution.
 There will be a loss of Grade 2 agricultural land.
 The residential amenity of the area would be lost.
 The landscape amenity and wildlife would be impacted.
 The site is unlikely to be restored to agriculture, more likely to a lake.

There is a lack of need for the site.
 Access route on narrow lanes and unsuitable for HGVs.
 Nearby villages will be affected by noise and dust pollution carried on the prevailing wind.
 There will be a loss of Grade 2 agricultural land.
 The residential amenity of the area would be lost.
 The landscape amenity and wildlife would be impacted.

2011

0426

There would be a dramatic increase of large vehicle movement along country lanes creating hazards for other road users.
 There will be noise, dust and fumes polluting the environment.
 Kirkby Fleetham could end up surrounded by quarry sites.

Concerned that there will be an increase of large vehicle movements along the country lanes posing a hazard to other road users.
 Concerned about pollution from noise, dust and fumes.
 Concerned about cumulative impact if all quarries go ahead.

MJP61

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0551

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

120

Historic England

0140

Tollerton Conservation Area lies 1.6km from the south-western corner of this area

- Alne Conservation Area (which includes the Grade I Listed Church of St Mary) lies 2km from the western edge of this area
- Forest hall farmhouse, approximately 1km from the north-western corner of this area, is a Grade II Listed Building

Tollerton Conservation Area lies 1.6km from the south-western corner of this area

- Alne Conservation Area (which includes the Grade I Listed Church of St Mary) lies 2km from the western edge of this area
- Forest hall farmhouse, approximately 1km from the north-western corner of this area, is a Grade II Listed Building

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

128 Yorkshire Wildlife Trust

0261

The Yorkshire Wildlife Trust would support restoration for nature conservation. The Trust was not consulted on the application but would agree with the comments from NYCC Ecology team. Brickponds can be extremely valuable for wildlife, particularly invertebrates and amphibians if well designed. The development is in an area which is dominated by arable farming so restoration to nature conservation could be particularly valuable.

The Yorkshire Wildlife Trust would support restoration for nature conservation including well designed brickponds. The Trust agrees with the comments from NYCC Ecology team. The site area is dominated by arable farming so restoration to nature conservation could be particularly valuable.

3386

0067

The manufacture of hand-made bricks is supported.

The manufacture of hand-made bricks is supported.

121 Environment Agency

0596

We have been consulted on a planning application at this site under reference RA/2014/129048/02. Please see our response that consultation.

We have been consulted on a planning application at this site under reference RA/2014/129048/02. Please see our response that consultation.

114 Ministry of Defence

0052

This site lies within the 15.2m statutory height consultation zone and birdstrike safeguarding zone for RAF Linton on Ouse. The MOD would need to be consulted on any development exceeding this height criteria, plus review the restoration details for the proposed site.

This site lies within the 15.2m statutory height consultation zone and birdstrike safeguarding zone for RAF Linton on Ouse. The MOD would need to be consulted on any development exceeding this height criteria, plus review the restoration details for the proposed site.

MJP62

Respondent No.	Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
114	Ministry of Defence	0054	This site falls within the 91.4m statutory height consultation zone surrounding RAF Leeming, Topcliffe and Linton on Ouse. The MOD would need to be consulted on any criteria exceeding this height criteria, plus review restoration details for the proposed site.	This site falls within the 91.4m statutory height consultation zone surrounding RAF Leeming, Topcliffe and Linton on Ouse. The MOD would need to be consulted on any criteria exceeding this height criteria, plus review restoration details for the proposed site.
3372		0023	Would like to see the site progressed as would have minimal impact on the general public, and the quarry site could be given protection from anyone who wants to see work being done here.	Support progression of this site, use screening if required.
128	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	0262	Potential for value to be added to the Living Landscapes area but there will also be cumulative impact with other sites proposed in the area.	Potential for value to be added to the Living Landscapes area but there will also be cumulative impact.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121

Environment Agency

0605

The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site contains flood zones 2 and 3, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site

detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours

details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development

examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site

details of mitigation measures

surface water runoff

the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.

The results of a clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route. Spoil to be stored outside of the floodplain.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations

The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site contains flood zones 2 and 3, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site

detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours

details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development

examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site

details of mitigation measures

surface water runoff

the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.

The results of a clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example

2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for

structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route. Spoil to be stored outside of the floodplain.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any

any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

We would support flood storage areas being considered/created onsite during the post extraction site remediation phase.

3386

0068

Objects due to environmental impacts and increased traffic volumes.

Objects due to environmental impacts and increased traffic volumes.

120

Historic England

0141

1 km to the south-west of this site is the Scheduled Castle Hills Medieval Motte and Bailey Castle and 20th Century airfield defences
 · Manor Cottage a Grade II Listed Building lies 400 metres from the western edge of this site and Manor House 460 metres from the western edge of this site

1 km to the south-west of this site is the Scheduled Castle Hills Medieval Motte and Bailey Castle and 20th Century airfield defences
 · Manor Cottage a Grade II Listed Building lies 400 metres from the western edge of this site and Manor House 460 metres from the western edge of this site

3494

0324

If there are problems on the A1 diversions lead traffic in and around Kirkby Fleetham Village. HGVs should not use country roads they are a danger to other road users (walker, cyclists etc.) . Concerned about dust pollution, loss of views, agricultural land and wildlife habitats.

Concerned about increased HGV movements on country road, dust pollution, loss of view, loss of agricultural land and loss of habitats.

NEW

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

2183 Fitzwilliam (Malton) Estates

0188

Would like the minerals extraction site at Brows Quarry included as a site within the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan. The site is an old existing quarry which was included in the NYCC Minerals Core Strategy First Consultation in April 2010, having been granted planning permission in November 2009. The planning permission lapsed in November 2012, but there is a continued demand for the traditional building stone found in the Malton area, particularly for the repair and maintenance and repair of historic buildings such as those found in Malton as well as nearby historic buildings including Rievaulx Abbey, Byland Abbey and the bridge at Stamford Bridge. Brows Quarry is a regionally strategic minerals asset. Would like to open the site again and believe that it should be included in the Joint Plan. Prepared to provide more details of the site if required.

Would like the minerals extraction site at Brows Quarry included as a site within the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan. The site has previously been granted planning permission which expired in 2012. There is a demand for the building stone in the Malton area, particularly for maintenance and repair of historic buildings around Malton. Would like to open the site again and it is regionally significant.

WJP01

3386

0069

The proposed development is supported. The land may require remediation.

The proposed development is supported. The land may require remediation.

120 Historic England

0142

The boundary of Spenningthorpe Conservation Area (which contains a number of Listed Buildings including the Grade I Listed Church of St Michael) lies 590 metres to the south-east of this site.
 · This site lies 2.5 km from the boundary of the Grade II Registered Historic Park and Garden at Constable Burton Hall. This landscape includes the Grade I Listed Constable Burton Hall, and the Grade II* Coach House and Stables

The boundary of Spenningthorpe Conservation Area (which contains a number of Listed Buildings including the Grade I Listed Church of St Michael) lies 590 metres to the south-east of this site.
 · This site lies 2.5 km from the boundary of the Grade II Registered Historic Park and Garden at Constable Burton Hall. This landscape includes the Grade I Listed Constable Burton Hall, and the Grade II* Coach House and Stables

WJP03

Respondent No.	Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
2310	Commercial Boat Operators Association	0281	We note and approve of this site, its location makes it ideally suitable for the use of water transport, reducing traffic congestion and carbon emissions, by importing the waste fuel.	We note and approve of this site, its location makes it ideally suitable for the use of water transport, reducing traffic congestion and carbon emissions, by importing the waste fuel.
294	Canal & River Trust	0497	The site has an operational wharf and future operations and uses of the site should consider the use of the wharf for the transportation of materials to and from the site. This approach would be consistent with paragraph 143 of the NPPF, which requires LPAs when preparing local plans to safeguard existing, planned and potential wharves and associated storage, handling and processing facilities for the bulk transport by inland waterways of minerals including recycled, secondary and marine-dredged materials.	The site has an operational wharf which should be considered for the transport of materials to and from the site, which would be supported by the NPPF.
3386		0070	The development of a 'green energy' facility on this site is supported. The land may require remediation.	The development of a 'green energy' facility on this site is supported. The land may require remediation.
3372		0024	Would like to see the site progressed as would have minimal impact on the general public.	Support progression of this site.
120	Historic England	0143	Kellington Windmill, a Grade II Listed Building, lies 2km from the eastern edge of this area.	Kellington Windmill, a Grade II Listed Building, lies 2km from the eastern edge of this area.

121

Environment Agency

0597

The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site contains areas of flood zone 2, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site

detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours

details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development

examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site

details of mitigation measures

surface water runoff

the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site. The results of a clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it

The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site contains areas of flood zone 2, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site
detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours

details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development

examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site
details of mitigation measures

surface water runoff

the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.

The results of a clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be

must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Danvm DC Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a

If discharging surface water drainage to the Knottingley & Goole Canal, we recommend the applicant contacts the Canals and Rivers Trust to obtain consent for the works and to agree a discharge rate with them directly.

consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Danvm DC Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

If discharging surface water drainage to the Knottingley & Goole Canal, we recommend the applicant contacts the Canals and Rivers Trust to obtain consent for the works and to agree a discharge rate with them directly.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

527

Eggborough Parish Council

0086

The Southmoor Energy Centre is not currently a designated waste site. It is therefore detrimental to all residents that this site has been added retrospectively.

The Southmoor Energy Centre is not currently a designated waste site. It is therefore detrimental to all residents that this site has been added retrospectively.

61

National Grid Gas and Electric

0032

This site is crossed by an overhead electricity line (4YR 400kV) which should be taken into account when assessing proposals for planning developments. See full response for further details.

This site is crossed by an overhead electricity line which should be taken into account when assessing proposals for planning developments.

WJP04

3578

0394

The water table is high, some residences rely on a bore hole and the water is used in the brewing industry, so concerned about potential contamination from landfill.
The traffic on the narrow lanes would increase considerably, when an active site there were some accidents so extra traffic poses a safety issue for other road users. Also the 2 junctions leading to Jackdaw Crag would be a concern with increased number of lorries.
The site is close to an area of significant history, the site could change the natural beauty and peaceful nature of the landscape.

The water table is high and some properties and businesses rely on the water so concerned about potential contamination from landfill.
The traffic on the narrow lanes and junctions would increase considerably and poses a safety risk for other road users.
The site is close to a site of significant history and the landscape and natural beauty could be affected.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3455	0236	<p>Share the views of respondent 1352. Particularly concerned about the increase in traffic using Old London Road, it is narrow, uneven and has several blind bends and is the access to farms and 25 local residences. The lane is also used by a large number of walkers, horse riders and children on bicycles and is unsuitable for a high volume of heavy lorries which would pose a danger to other road users.</p> <p>The noise dust and pollution could result in long term health problems and disruption to wildlife in the area.</p>	<p>Concerned about increase in heavy lorries which will use Old London Road which is an access to farms and residences. It is narrow with blind bends and used by non motorised users so extra lorries would pose a hazard. There will be noise and dust pollution which could have an impact on health and wildlife.</p>
1503	0344	<p>Old London Road is unsuitable for lorries and is used for leisure and recreational purposes. To the south the road is narrow in places and to the north the road is wider but still unsuitable for more than one vehicle and is extremely dangerous in places (blind bends, and choke points). The Stutton Beech crossroads are dangerous in its current form. The area is historically significant due to the Battle of Towton, the opening of quarries would destroy the historic significance of the area.</p> <p>Concern about the use of the site for recycling to risk of pollution risk to groundwater.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to accessing the site from an alternative direction, such as the old railway line .</p>	<p>Old London Road is unsuitable for lorries and is used for leisure and recreational purposes. To the south the road is narrow in places and to the North the road is wider but still unsuitable for more than one vehicle and is extremely dangerous in places (blind bends, and choke points). The Stutton Beech crossroads are dangerous in its current form. Consideration should be given to accessing the site form an alternative direction, such as the old railway line. The area is historically significant due to the Battle of Towton, the opening of quarries would destroy the historic significance of the area.</p> <p>Concern about the use of the site for recycling to risk of pollution risk to groundwater.</p>

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3584

0460

Object to the proposed site because the access road is unsuitable for HGV traffic and would not be safe for pedestrians and other road users to use.

Object because the access road is unsuitable for HGV traffic and would not be safe for pedestrians and other road users to use.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo Comment	Summary
121 Environment Agency	<p>0598 The proposed site falls within SPZ 2 and 3. we will object to any proposed landfill site in groundwater source protection zone 1 as directed by GP3. For all other proposed landfill site locations, a risk assessment must be conducted based on the nature and quantity of the wastes and the natural setting and properties of the location.</p> <p>Where this risk assessment demonstrates that active long-term site management is essential to prevent long-term groundwater pollution, we will object to sites:</p> <p>Below the water table in any strata where the groundwater provides an important contribution to river flow or other sensitive surface waters; Within source protection zones 2 or 3; On or in a principal aquifer.</p> <p>There may be cases where substantial, natural low permeability geological barriers overlie a SPZ3 or principal aquifer and where these would be sufficient to prevent long-term pollution and satisfy the requirements of the legislation. We will only take such circumstances into consideration where:</p> <p>The site is located outside any designated SPZ2; and It can be demonstrated that the presence of the natural low permeability geological barriers, where necessary by site specific investigation; and The site is above the water table where groundwater provides an important contribution to river flow or other sensitive surface waters.</p> <p>We would object to an application to landfill if the required risk assessment concluded that long term management was essential for the safe operation of the landfill.</p> <p>The proposed development will only meet the requirement</p>	<p>The proposed site falls within SPZ 2 and 3. we will object to any proposed landfill site in groundwater source protection zone 1 as directed by GP3. For all other proposed landfill site locations, a risk assessment must be conducted based on the nature and quantity of the wastes and the natural setting and properties of the location.</p> <p>Where this risk assessment demonstrates that active long-term site management is essential to prevent long-term groundwater pollution, we will object to sites:</p> <p>Below the water table in any strata where the groundwater provides an important contribution to river flow or other sensitive surface waters; Within source protection zones 2 or 3; On or in a principal aquifer.</p> <p>There may be cases where substantial, natural low permeability geological barriers overlie a SPZ3 or principal aquifer and where these would be sufficient to prevent long-term pollution and satisfy the requirements of the legislation. We will only take such circumstances into consideration where:</p> <p>The site is located outside any designated SPZ2; and It can be demonstrated that the presence of the natural low permeability geological barriers, where necessary by</p>

of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site contains an area of flood zone 2 and we have records that the site has suffered historic flooding, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

Detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site

Detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours

Details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development

Examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site

Details of mitigation measures

Surface water runoff

The applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.

The results of a clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Cock Beck which runs adjacent to the southern boundary is classified as a main river. The formal consent of the Agency will be required, under the Water Resources Act 1991, for any works in, over, under, or within 8m of a main river and / or a flood defence.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations

site specific investigation; and
The site is above the water table where groundwater provides an important contribution to river flow or other sensitive surface waters.

We would object to an application to landfill if the required risk assessment concluded that long term management was essential for the safe operation of the landfill.

The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site contains an area of flood zone 2 and we have records that the site has suffered historic flooding, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

Detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site
Detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours

Details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development

Examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site

2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

Details of mitigation measures
Surface water runoff

The applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.

The results of a clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Cock Beck which runs adjacent to the southern boundary is classified as a main river. The formal consent of the Agency will be required, under the Water Resources Act 1991, for any works in, over, under, or within 8m of a main river and / or a flood defence.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead

to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3453

Consulted under 1352

0229

The access to the site has changed over time, there are several blind bends which has increased the hazard of using the road which is not helped by the growth of trees, hedging and weeds/grass which affect visibility. The verges are not cut and so make the roads narrower, which is mainly single track, plus there are fewer verges available due to water erosion causing ditches and fallen trees and boulders making it more difficult for none motorised users. The junction at Beech Tree Crossroads has poor visibility and poses a hazard when HGVs and other road users meet.

Beech Tree Crossroad and the access road to the site are narrow, largely single track, with blind bends, overgrown trees, hedges and vegetation which affect visibility, there are fewer verges due to water erosion and HGVs using this road has an impact on non motorised users.

1350

0155

Object to the site. In combination with MJP31 , MJP53 and WJP58 and MJP23 the area would be surrounded by quarries. The area is used by walkers, cyclists, runners and Horse riders.
Access to the site should be considered, access up Wingate Hill is not acceptable. Consideration should be given to using the disused railway from Towton Bar, Old London Road runs from the Rockingham Arms at Towton straight into the quarry, and possible access from A64/A659 past white Quarry Farm to Old London Road.

Object to the site. In combination with MJP31 , MJP53 and WJP58 and MJP23 the area would be surrounded by quarries. The area is used by walkers, cyclists, runners and horse riders.
Access to the site should be considered, access up Wingate Hill is not acceptable. Consideration should be given to using the disused railway from Towton Bar, Old London Road runs from the Rockingham Arms at Towton straight into the quarry, and possible access from A64/A659 past white Quarry Farm to Old London Road.

Respondent No. Name

3569

CommentNo Comment

0408

The site is unsuitable for quarrying due to the environmental issues associated with quarrying in a residential area. The road access is unsuitable as is a single track road and heavy traffic will cause disruption and a safety hazard for other road users. An alternative access is not feasible and the road is unadopted. Operating noise, vibrations and dust would cause environmental and social problems for residences in the area. Quarrying should be carried out way from residences and the Green Belt. The site has archaeological and historical significance and will be impacted by the development. The development will not bring significant employment to the area.

Summary

Concerned about impact on the environment. The road access is single track, unadopted and unsuitable for heavy traffic, concerned about disruption and safety hazard to other road users and residents. Noise, vibrations and dust would cause environmental and social problems for residents. The Green Belt will be impacted. Archaeological and historical features will be impacted. The site will not provide employment for many local people.

1352

0103

Present principle access to Old London Road Quarries is via Moor Lane to Beech Tree Crossroads, then south up over Wingate Hill towards Cocksford hamlet. A safer more direct access could be gained from the south east and should be investigated. Only part of the access road has been adopted and it is unclear who is responsible for the maintenance of the rest. The road is surface and sub base is potholing and breaking up badly and requires constant maintenance. The roads being used by site traffic are narrow, road verges have encroached onto the highway and trees have overgrown over the roads forcing high sided vehicles into the middle of the road.

There are concerns about road safety due to speed of traffic and a traffic calming system should be considered on the Old London Road at its intersection with Moor Lane, Stutton Road and Wheedling Gate.

Operational matters will have an impact on local residents, these include noise, dust, vibrations, smell, vermin, wind blown rubbish, birds and visual impact.

Photos of views of the site were provided.

Provided additional information on a spread sheet which attempts to analyse the frequency of truck movements (empty inbound and loaded outbound) using statistics supplied on the data sheet provided by the Council.

Estimates that there will be one truck trip every 16 minutes of each working day for 9 years, this cannot be supported using existing access tracks, equates to 3.71 trucks per hour

A safer more direct access to the site should be investigated. The road infrastructure is inadequate to support an increase in heavy site traffic and maintenance is an issue. The roads are narrow and there are concerns about road safety, traffic calming should be looked into.

Operational matters will have an impact on local residents, these include noise, dust, vibrations, smell, vermin, wind blown rubbish, birds and visual impact. Additional information provided, estimate will be 3.71 trucks per hour.

Respondent No. Name

3572

CommentNo Comment

0403

Concerned about safety of pedestrians, the number of people who use the proposed access is high, includes walkers, cyclists, dog walkers and horse-riders. The road is single track with restricted visibility. An increase in HGVs will pose a serious risk to other non motorised road users. Concerned about potential contamination of the local water supply, which is from a borehole, from waste deposited in the area.

Summary

The access road is single track with restricted visibility. An increase in HGVs will pose a serious risk to other non motorised road users who use the lane. Concerned about potential contamination of the local water supply from waste deposited in the area.

3581

0370

The site is located within an Environment Agency designated Source Protection Zone, Yorkshire Water have previously stated that 'extraction and waste management should be restricted in these areas.'

The hamlet of Cocksford relies solely upon drinking water drawn from a private borehole within the Source Protection Zone so residents would require further details regarding development in the area.

Any impact on the groundwater will affect local breweries as they use the water in their process.

There will be a large increase in lorry traffic and Old London Road is not suitable to deal with the increase, and would cause problems for residents accessing their properties. The lane would have to be maintained as it is unadopted.

The site would have an impact on historic assets in the area such as Towton Battlefield and Old London Road itself which is recognised by English Heritage.

The east bank of Cock Beck is a Significant Site of Nature Conservation and the area contains ancient woodland and these would be impacted by the development of the site. A previous application to relocate a small part of Old London Road was refused.

The residents of Cocksford experience flooding, proposals would be expected to assist in mitigation of any enhanced flood risk resulting from reduced flood storage associated with the loss of land mass, topsoil and vegetation, MJP31 in particular would result in the loss of agricultural land.

Dust and noise from extraction will have a significant impact on surrounding residential properties and communities.

The site is within a designated Source Protection Zone and extraction should be restricted in these areas. One hamlet relies solely on water from within this protection zone so residents would require further details regarding the site. If the groundwater is affected then it will affect the quality of the product local breweries produce.

Old London Road is not suitable to deal with the proposed increase in heavy traffic and residents would have problems accessing their properties. The lane would have to be maintained as it is unadopted.

There would be an impact on historic assets in the area.

There is a SINC and ancient woodland in the area which would be affected.

Mitigation would be expected to help minimise flooding.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3436 Jefferson Consulting Limited

0198

Before approving backfilling of this site it should be assessed to see if the stone is used for important buildings, especially churches in the area, through inspection of older buildings. Sampling and petrographic analysis can help identify whether or not the stone could be used as a replacement for another magnesian limestone which is currently not available for conservation work.

Before approving backfilling of this site it should be assessed to see if the stone is used for important buildings, especially churches in the area, through inspection of older buildings. Sampling and petrographic analysis can help identify whether or not the stone could be used as a replacement for another magnesian limestone which is currently not available for conservation work.

3590

0358

The site will impact on Old London Road. There is a nearby site of an ancient Saxon court, the ancient woodland of Crag Wood and site of the Battle of Towton. Our residence is an old Catholic School and there is a cross near the top of the hill which is a pilgrimage site. Concerned about the impact on the amenity of non motorised road users who use the roads. The area is Green Belt and heavily used for leisure. The lanes are too narrow for the site traffic and is not able to be widened, some of the trees have tree preservation orders on them. Already suffer from noise and vibration from the existing quarry and concerned about potential damage to the property. Concerned about cumulative impact if more sites allowed in the area. The local environment would be affected and amenity of residents and visitors.

Concerned the site will impact on local archaeological sites. Concerned about the impact on the amenity of non motorised road users who use the roads. The area is Green Belt and heavily used for leisure. The lanes are too narrow for the site traffic and is not able to be widened, some of the trees have tree preservation orders on them. Already impacted by noise and vibration from existing quarry and worried about cumulative impact if more sites allowed, especially to structure of buildings. The local environment and amenity of residents and visitors would be affected.

WJP05

3361 Ellisbates Finacial Solutions

0001

The traffic around this area is congested enough without extra traffic created by having a waste site.

A waste site in this location will increase traffic and congestion.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary	
3363	0003	The site could lead to pollution near the river and conservation area. The increase in traffic will cause disruption during busy periods and pose a threat to residents.	Concerned about possible pollution affecting the river and conservation area and also the increase in traffic during busy periods.	
1096	Nether Poppleton Parish Council	0297	<p>Major objection is on traffic management. The A59 Boroughbridge Road is already at saturation point at certain times of the day without the addition of additional heavy lorries from the site.</p> <p>There will need to be wheel washing restrictions on the site as a condition.</p> <p>No detail is provided about the type of waste the site will deal with. Allerton Park and Harewood Whin are nearby so no need for this facility.</p> <p>Concerned the site could be used for fracking and so object to this due to very sandy deep deposited layers within the ground and the effect water pumping at high pressure would have.</p>	<p>Object to the site due to roads not being able to cope with increase in traffic.</p> <p>There will have to be wheel washing facilities for the lorries.</p> <p>There is no need for the site as others nearby.</p> <p>Object to fracking on the site.</p>

121

Environment Agency

0599

The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site

detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours

details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels

proposed for the development examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site

details of mitigation measures

surface water runoff

the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.

the results of a clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route. Spoil to be stored outside of the floodplain.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations

The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site
detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours

details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development

examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site

details of mitigation measures

surface water runoff

the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.

The results of a clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example

2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Marston Moor Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for

structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route. Spoil to be stored outside of the floodplain.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any

any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Marston Moor Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

WJP06

Respondent No.	Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
537	Escrick Parish Council	0336	<p>The site can only be accessed from the A19, which is heavily trafficked, especially at peak times, so site traffic will compound the traffic delays.</p> <p>Other development sites in the area will also cause an increase in traffic on the A19 and surrounding network. There is inadequate capacity on the A19 for an increase in heavy traffic.</p> <p>The site bisects the Trans Pennine Trail which is part of the National Cycle Network as well as part of a European walking route and so needs protection as if the site went ahead there would be a conflict between site traffic and cyclists and walker and an impact on the amenity of the users of the trail with wider environmental implications for the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>There would be an impact on the amenity of local residents and businesses including a Children's Day Nursery. There would be environmental health issues.</p> <p>The long term nature of the site and increase of traffic is a concern and do not believe this is a suitable or sustainable site. Other sites which are better strategically located. The site is only being proposed for waste disposal here to fill the void made by extraction and more suitable sites exist elsewhere. It is not sustainable to import waste long distance to fill a hole and possibly restore the site to agricultural use, potentially leaving a long term scar on the countryside.</p>	<p>Concerned about the impact of site traffic on the already busy A19, especially at peak times. There are other development sites in there area which also impact on the network and the A19 does not have the capacity to cope.</p> <p>The site will impact on the Trans Pennine Trail which is used by cyclists and walkers so needs to be protected. The amenity of walkers and cyclists would be impacted and there would be environmental implications on the surrounding area.</p> <p>There would be an impact on the amenity of local residents and businesses and environmental issues. Concentred about the long term nature of the site and associated increase in traffic. This site is not suitable or sustainable, should look at other sites which are better strategically located.</p> <p>The waste site is only proposed to fill the void left by excavation of clay, more suitable sites exist elsewhere. It is not sustainable to transport waste long distances to fill the void and possibly restore the site to countryside leaving a long term scar.</p>
3386		0071	<p>The remediation/ landscaping of the site (when extraction is complete) is supported.</p>	<p>The remediation/ landscaping of the site (when extraction is complete) is supported.</p>

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

120 Historic England

0144

The southern boundary of Escrick Conservation Area (which contains a number of Listed Buildings including the Grade II* Listed Escrick Park and Coach House) lies 900 metres from the north-eastern corner of this site.

- The southern boundary of Stillingfleet Conservation Area (which contains a number of Listed Buildings including the Grade I Listed Church of St Helen) lies 1.8 km from the western edge of this site.
- The Gate Piers to Escrick Park, a Grade II Listed Building, lies 1.4 km from the southern edge of this site.
- The Garden Temple, a Grade II Listed Building, lies 1.2 km from the eastern edge of this site.
- A Scheduled Monument (York prebendary manor moated site) and the associated Manor House which is a Grade II* Listed Building lies 2.1 km from the southernmost point of this area
- This north-western corner of this site lies 2.2 km from the boundary of the Grade II Registered Historic Park and Garden at Moreby Hall. This landscape includes the Grade II* Listed Moreby Hall

- The southern boundary of Stillingfleet Conservation Area (which contains a number of Listed Buildings including the Grade I Listed Church of St Helen) lies 1.8 km from the western edge of this site.
- The Gate Piers to Escrick Park, a Grade II Listed Building, lies 1.4 km from the southern edge of this site.
- The Garden Temple, a Grade II Listed Building, lies 1.2 km from the eastern edge of this site.
- A Scheduled Monument (York prebendary manor moated site) and the associated Manor House which is a Grade II* Listed Building lies 2.1 km from the southernmost point of this area
- This north-western corner of this site lies 2.2 km from the boundary of the Grade II Registered Historic Park and Garden at Moreby Hall. This landscape includes the Grade II* Listed Moreby Hall

816 Riccall Parish Council

0455

Concerned regarding the proposed development adjacent to the former Escrick Brickworks due to: impact of additional HGV traffic; impact of pollution to air or groundwater. Support is given to the comments made by Escrick Parish Council.

Concerned due to: impact of additional HGV traffic; pollution to air or groundwater.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo Comment	Summary
1114 Woodland Trust	<p>0293 Concerned about the impact of this proposed site upon Heron Wood (grid ref: SE616411).</p> <p>The NPPF para 118 and Minerals Policy Statement section 14 supports the protection of ancient woodland and recognises that it is sensitive to adjacent development. Para 6.4 of Natural England standing advice for Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees (April 2014) states that 'the SoS supports the argument for a 15m buffer around affected ancient woodland, but larger buffers may be required'</p> <p>Through the creation of new wooded areas or buffer zones around ancient woodland, the impacts of damaging edge effects can be reduced significantly. A buffer zone of at least 50m of semi-natural vegetation would be required to protect woodland from the proposed change in land use for the purpose of clay extraction.</p> <p>Impacts from the proposed site include: light pollution affecting the visibility of the moon and stars and certain species, it is recommended that lighting is kept to a minimum and directed away from woodland edges, with limited lighting during hours of darkness; noise pollution is likely to limit the distributions of animal species, particularly bird diversity; surface run-off leading to a potential change in species composition in the long term, measures should be taken to prevent the possibility of this occurring and hard-standing should be kept away from woodland edges.</p> <p>An objection to this site will be held until a suitably large buffer is implemented in conjunction with an area proposed for clay extraction.</p>	<p>Concerned about the impact of this proposed site upon Heron Wood. An objection to this site will be held until a suitably large buffer is implemented in conjunction with an area proposed for clay extraction.</p> <p>Specific consideration should be given to the proximity of the site to ancient woodland, light and noise pollution and surface runoff.</p>

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

128

Yorkshire Wildlife Trust

0263

Object to the entire site being landfill and would expect long term ecological management plan.

Object to the entire site being landfill and would expect long term ecological management plan.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo Comment	Summary
121 Environment Agency	<p>0600 The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>The site contains flood zone 2, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:</p> <p>detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site details of mitigation measures surface water runoff the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.</p> <p>The results of a clear and transparent sequential test</p> <p>If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.</p> <p>Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be</p>	<p>The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>The site contains flood zone 2, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:</p> <p>detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site details of mitigation measures surface water runoff the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.</p> <p>The results of a clear and transparent sequential test</p> <p>If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be</p>

adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Ouse & Derwent Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

The site is close to an active landfill – Escrick Brickworks and the applicant should satisfy themselves of any risks.

Summary

consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Ouse & Derwent Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

The site is close to an active landfill – Escrick Brickworks and the applicant should satisfy themselves of any risks.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3372	0025	Would like to see the site progressed as would have minimal impact on the general public,	Support progression of this site.
3475	0299	Object as Escrick is a small village next to the A19, the path alongside the A19 is well used by school children so there would be an increased risk to them and local businesses if the level of traffic increased, the roads would not be able to cope as there are already congestion issues.. The increase in lorries could cause structural damage to properties. Concerned about the smell the site would generate having an adverse impact on residents.	Object as there would be an increased risk to pedestrians and other road users due to increase in lorries, the roads would not be able to cope and congestion would increase. The increase in traffic will increase risk of structural damage to properties. The smell from the site would have an adverse impact on residential amenity.

WJP08

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0552

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

121 Environment Agency

0601

The proposed development sits above an active landfill – Allerton Park. The applicant should satisfy themselves of any risk.

The proposed development sits above an active landfill – Allerton Park. The applicant should satisfy themselves of any risk.

2823

0038

Supports this site.

This site is supported.

WJP09

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0553

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

WJP10

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0554

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

3436

Jefferson Consulting Limited

0199

Building stone can also be lost when old extractive sites are used for industrial or residential development. Should important stone be left in the faces, these should be left accessible in order that intermittent small scale extraction can occur, as and when necessary.

Building stone can also be lost when old extractive sites are used for industrial or residential development. Should important stone be left in the faces, these should be left accessible in order that intermittent small scale extraction can occur, as and when necessary.

WJP11

120

Historic England

0145

There are three Listed Buildings in Rufforth to the west of this area, the nearest one of which (a pinfold) would be 250 metres from the westernmost extent of this area.
· The boundary of Upper Poppleton Conservation Area lies 1.8 km to the north-east of this site.

There are three Listed Buildings in Rufforth to the west of this area, the nearest one of which (a pinfold) would be 250 metres from the westernmost extent of this area.
· The boundary of Upper Poppleton Conservation Area lies 1.8 km to the north-east of this site.

Respondent No.	Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
1097	Rufforth and Knapton Parish Council	0150	<p>[Responses used ref MJP52 Harewood Whin, however Harewood Whin is WJP11, therefore to help consider the response appropriately it is being recorded against the correct reference no.)</p> <p>Objects to the site as it will intrude into the Green Belt. The site has always had a time limited permission with the promise of full restoration. The Proposal is not suitable in the green belt and would be more suited to an industrial estate, for example the Hessay sites which has good links to the A59.</p> <p>The site will also generate increased HGV movements on an already busy B road.</p>	Objects to the site as it falls within an area of Green belt. Concerns the site will generate increased HGV movements on already busy roads.
114	Ministry of Defence	0055	This site falls within the 91.4m statutory height consultation zone surrounding RAF Leeming, Topcliffe and Linton on Ouse. The MOD would need to be consulted on any criteria exceeding this height criteria, plus review restoration details for the proposed site.	This site falls within the 91.4m statutory height consultation zone surrounding RAF Leeming, Topcliffe and Linton on Ouse. The MOD would need to be consulted on any criteria exceeding this height criteria, plus review restoration details for the proposed site.
1519	York Outer MP	0375	<p>Have attached correspondence to City of York Council and National Planning Casework Unit.</p> <p>Concerned about the increase in traffic throughout the surrounding area.</p> <p>40 to 50 HGVs pass through Rufforth each day which disrupts the lives of local residents and poses a risk to other road users.</p> <p>There was a fire at the facility recently and concerned this can happen again.</p> <p>These concerns should be addressed if the site is to be progressed.</p>	<p>Concerned about the increase in traffic throughout the surrounding area.</p> <p>40 to 50 HGVs pass through Rufforth each day which disrupts the lives of local residents and poses a risk to other road users.</p> <p>There was a fire at the facility recently and concerned this can happen again.</p> <p>These concerns should be addressed if the site is to be progressed.</p>

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3536

0482

Object to site. Should adhere to timescales set out in previous applications.
 Have been safety issues on site in past with 2 fires and incidents of methane release affecting the health of some residents.
 Concerned about safety of residents due to increase in HGV traffic and excessive speed.
 Have to suffer odour pollution and litter.
 Send the waste to AWRP rather than Harewood Whin.
 Disagree with importing waste from other areas.
 Concerned about encroachment into residential areas and onto the Green Belt.

Object to site. Should adhere to timescales set out in previous applications.
 Have been safety issues on site in past with 2 fires and incidents of methane release affecting the health of some residents.
 Concerned about safety of residents due to increase in HGV traffic and excessive speed.
 Have to suffer odour pollution and litter.
 Send the waste to AWRP rather than Harewood Whin.
 Disagree with importing waste from other areas.
 Concerned about encroachment into residential areas and onto the Green Belt.

3544

0493

Object, there should be no further intrusion onto the Green Belt and already suffer from awful smells from the site.

Object due to potential impact on the Green Belt and also object to odour from the site.

3530

0470

Object to any further development on this greenfield site. Application for the proposal has already been called in by Secretary of State.

Object to any further development on this greenfield site

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3531	0471	<p>Waste sites should be located close to industrial and population centres not in the countryside.</p> <p>Concerned about impact on local residents quality of life by expansion of site. The site was originally time limited, but this has been exceeded.</p> <p>Should not expand onto the Green Belt.</p> <p>Concerned about impacts from increase in HGV traffic on the roads, congestion and environment.</p> <p>There will be an increase in noise and odour pollution from the site. If the site does get permission the impact on the village and its residents should be minimised.</p> <p>The site should only deal with York waste not imported waste.</p> <p>It was proposed that each district should have a WTS, but this is not the case, so large WTS take the extra, before being moved to AWRP once built so more impact on the roads.</p>	<p>Waste sites should be located close to industrial and population centres not in the countryside.</p> <p>Concerned about impact on local residents quality of life by expansion of site. The site was originally time limited, but this has been exceeded.</p> <p>Should not expand onto the Green Belt.</p> <p>Concerned about impacts from increase in HGV traffic on the roads, congestion and environment.</p> <p>There will be an increase in noise and odour pollution form the site. If the site does get permission the impact on the village and its residents should be minimised.</p>
3532	0472	<p>Object to this plan which is a betrayal of previous undertakings.</p>	<p>Object to this site.</p>
3533	0478	<p>Object to site as will intrude onto Green Belt land, which is supposed to be a buffer between Rufforth and the landfill site.</p> <p>The current site has a time limit which should be adhered to.</p> <p>The current proposal is for activities which should take place on an industrial estate not on the Green Belt, recycling already occurs at Hessay, so no need for it to be located at Harewood Whin and no 'special circumstances'.</p> <p>There would be a large increase in HGV traffic on the B road and through the village.</p>	<p>Object to site as will intrude onto the Green Belt.</p> <p>The current site has a time limit which should be adhered to.</p> <p>The activities proposed should be ion an industrial estate.</p> <p>There would be a large increase in HGV traffic on the roads and through the village.</p>

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3534

0479

The site will intrude onto the Green Belt which acts as a buffer between Rufforth and the landfill site. The activities proposed should be on an industrial estate not on Green Belt land. Recycling already takes place at Hessay which has good access onto the A59. Waste currently going to landfill will eventually go to AWRP so do not need other waste activity here and no 'special circumstances' for it to be on the Green Belt. There will be a large increase in HGV traffic on the B road and through the village.

Object as site will intrude onto the Green Belt, and no 'special circumstances' as to why it should. The activities proposed should be located on an industrial estate. There will be a large increase in HGV traffic on the B road and through the village.

3528

The Old School Rufforth York

0468

Object to the site, It should not be on Green Belt land. Concerned about increase in traffic and noise. Concerned about environmental health impact from the site.

Object to the site, It should not be on Green Belt land. Concerned about increase in traffic and noise. Concerned about environmental health impact from the site.

3535

0480

Object to site. A planning application for the site has been called in by the Secretary of State, so should wait for the result of this first. The number of HGVs passing through the village will increase. There was a time limit on the workings at Harewood Whin, further development goes against this. The activity proposed should not take place on the Green Belt, it should be on an industrial estate such as Hessay. Waste will be dealt with at Allerton Park once it is built so this one can be then restored.

Should wait for results of the 'call in' before considering this site. HGV numbers through the village will increase. The time limits on previous applications should be adhered to. The activities proposed should take place on an industrial estate. Waste will be dealt with at AWRP rather than Rufforth in the future so no extra development is needed.

3527

0467

Object to the site as on Green Belt land and this should not be used for industrial use. Concerned about pollution and increase in HGVs on the country roads.

Object to the site as on Green Belt land and this should not be used for industrial use. Concerned about pollution and increase in HGVs on the country roads.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3537

0483

Site would encroach onto Green Belt and go against policy as no 'special circumstances' have been put forward for the development.

The activities are industrial and so incompatible with the Green Belt.

If proposal agreed would set a precedence for other development in the Green Belt.

Do not need an energy from biomass facility at Harwood Whin as energy from waste site being built at Allerton Park.

The proposal goes against Green Belt policy, if allowed would set a precedent for other development in the Green Belt. There is no need for a biomass facility at Harewood Whin.

3538

0485

There is currently a planning application being considered for this site. The activities proposed are industrial and not compatible with the Green Belt policy and not considered 'special circumstances.'

There is no requirement for a biomass energy from waste facility here when AWRP is being built.

The activities are industrial and sop not compatible with Green Belt policy as do not constitute 'special circumstances'. No need for biomass energy from waste plant as AWRP is being built.

3370

0007

Concerned about the methane fumes and other smells from the current site and their impact on health.

Concerned about the methane fumes and other smells from the current site and their impact on health.

3540

0487

Object to the site as have concerns about safety issues, health issues due to odour, the amount of litter and rubbish in the area and the increase in vehicles to and from the site. It will further encroach on the rural area around Rufforth. The original site had a time limit when it would then be returned to green land.

Object to the site as have concerns about safety issues, health issues due to odour, the amount of litter and rubbish in the area and the increase in vehicles to and from the site. It will further encroach on the rural area around Rufforth. Should stick to the original time limits.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0602 The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site contains flood zone 3, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site
 detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours
 details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development
 examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site
 details of mitigation measures
 surface water runoff
 the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.
 The results of a clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route.
 Spoil to be stored outside of the floodplain.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal,

The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site contains flood zone 3, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site
 detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours
 details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development
 examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site
 details of mitigation measures
 surface water runoff
 the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.
 The results of a clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be

which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Marston Moor Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as

located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route. Spoil to be stored outside of the floodplain.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the

non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

The proposed development sits above an active landfill – Harewood Whin Landfill. The applicant should satisfy themselves of any risk.

existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Marston Moor Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

The proposed development sits above an active landfill – Harewood Whin Landfill. The applicant should satisfy themselves of any risk.

3542

0490

Object to the site.
 The proposal to extend into Green Belt land goes against national policy as the proposal is not considered exceptional circumstances. The site also infringes on the green corridor which is protected by the York Local Plan. The amount of traffic on the B1224 would significantly increase and so increase pollution, the safety of villagers would also be compromised.
 The site already produced noxious odours and gas, this would get worse.
 Concerned about potential for more fires due to poor site management.
 The amount of litter and rubbish from the site would increase.
 The new buildings would add to the visual impact of the site. There would be an increase in noise from traffic and the site. The proposal will impact on the character of the village and cause a loss of amenity.
 There was a time limit on the original site which should be adhered to.
 There are more suitable locations for the proposed activities.

The proposal to extend into Green Belt land goes against national policy, it also infringes on the green corridor which is protected by the York Local Plan. Concerned about increase in traffic and pollution and risk to residents. Concerned about increase in odour, litter, visual impact, noise, impact on character and amenity of village. Should identify more suitable locations and stick to original time limits.

3386

0072

Neutral. This site is in a existing waste transfer station, the facility should not be extended into the Green Belt.

Neutral. This site is in a existing waste transfer station, the facility should not be extended into the Green Belt.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3450

0213

Object to this site as would be too close to the village of Rufforth and the increase in traffic through the village would be very dangerous, especially for school children. Also going out to the York outer ring road, which is only single carriageway would be extremely dangerous too. If the entire City Ring Road was dual carriageway it might be easier.

Object to the site on the basis that the increase in traffic through the village and to the York outer ring road would be dangerous.

3477

0298

Harewood Whin is not meant to be permanent, is on Green Belt land and dwarfs the village of Rufforth. Concerned about the increase in traffic which will increase the danger in the village. Waste management should be managed on an industrial estate linked to a good road system, not on Green Belt land, the development will have a long term damaging effect on residents lives.

Waste sites should be on an industrial estate linked to a better road system not Green Belt land. Concerned about increase in traffic on the road and increased danger to residents..

3471

0252

[Response was made under MJP52 but appears to relate to the Harewood Whin.]

Objects to the proposal as it would continue the industrialisation of the green belt and is no way 'special circumstances'. The development would impact on the surrounding villages with increased HGV on minor roads.

Objects to the proposal as it would continue the industrialisation of the green belt and is no way 'special circumstances'. The development would impact on the surrounding villages with increased HGV on minor roads.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3469	0276	<p>Object to the proposed site for the following reasons: the site intrudes into the Green Belt that lies adjacent to Rufforth; CYC and Yorwaste had provided assurances that the Green Belt would be preserved; The site of operations appears to be industrial in nature and therefore falls foul of the notion of Green Belt. Such operations should be sited within an area identified or currently used as an industrial site, a number of which close to Rufforth serve this purpose ideally; with the advent of the AWRP this will negate the need for a waste transfer station at Harewood Whin; CYC and Yorwaste have provided assurances that the operations at Harewood Whin are of a temporary nature which this proposal seems directly opposed.</p> <p>The response states MJP52 but this is a mistake and should refer to WJP11 Harewood Whin, Rufforth.</p>	<p>Object to the proposed site for the following reasons: the industrial site intrudes into the Green Belt which CYC and Yorwaste assured would not happen; Such operations should be sited within an area identified or currently used as an industrial site; AWRP negates the need for a waste transfer station at Harewood Whin; This proposal directly opposes the assurance that operations at Harewood Whin are of a temporary nature.</p> <p>The response states MJP52 but this is a mistake and should refer to WJP11 Harewood Whin, Rufforth.</p>
3468	0250	<p>Objects to the site on the grounds that there are no 'Special Circumstances' for it to be approved in the Green Belt, and it would greatly increase HGV traffic on an already busy road and through the village of Rufforth.</p>	<p>Objects to the site on the grounds that there are no 'Special Circumstances' for it to be approved in the Green Belt, and it would greatly increase HGV traffic on an already busy road and through the village of Rufforth.</p>
3464	0287	<p>Objects to the industrialisation of the greenbelt adjacent to the village of Rufforth. Objects to transporting waste long distances via road from source of arisings, waste should be dealt with in the are it is produced. Objects to the increased HGVs which will pass through Rufforth on the narrow winding roads.</p>	<p>Objects to the site due to its location and impact upon the Green Belt. Concerned about traffic impacts.</p>

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3462

Consulted under 3451*

0245

Object to proposal. An approved planning application extends the existing site outside its retaining bund and onto Green Belt land which was specifically set aside to act as a buffer. The site generates a lot of HGV traffic of which a large amount passes through the village along a narrow bendy road, an extension to the site will generate more traffic.

When the site was originally given permission it was for a fixed timescale, this has already been exceeded by several years, so any further development will be contrary to this agreement

Object to proposal. Will take up some of the Green Belt land which is supposed to act as a buffer.

More HGV traffic will be generated along the narrow road and through the village. Original application was time limited, this has been exceeded and will be again if site allowed.

3529

0469

Object to the site, It should not be on Green Belt land.
Concerned about increase in traffic and noise.
Concerned about environmental health impact from the site.

Object to the site, It should not be on Green Belt land.
Concerned about increase in traffic and noise.
Concerned about environmental health impact from the site.

Respondent No. Name

3451

CommentNo Comment

0214

Object to the site. The proposal would extend the site onto adjacent Green Belt land currently designated as a buffer between the existing site and the B1224. The original plan had the whole site remaining within the earth bund which surrounds it and this was all agreed by CYC and Yorwaste as a condition of the operation. The Harewood Whin site always had a time limit on its activities, at the end of which the site would be closed, landscaped and returned to the community. This time limit has already been extended, and your proposal would extend it again contrary to the planning constraint when the site was established. Rufforth village is blighted by HGV traffic much of which is involved with Harewood Whin despite Yorwaste's statements to the contrary. Any increase in activity at the site would only make this traffic problem worse on a busy, narrow and dangerous road. The planning application submitted to CYC under 13/00041/FULM to extend the Harewood Whin site has already been called in by the Secretary of State after vigorous opposition from the local community. Until a decision is made it would be premature to consider this site. There was a fire on the composting platform which clearly started through mis-management of the composting process, and through further mismanagement continued to burn for several weeks generating a great deal of smoke and pollution adversely affecting local communities on the downwind side.

Summary

Object to the site as the extension would impact the adjacent Green Belt. The site has previously been extended and had a time limit which has also been extended, any further extension would be contrary to the original planning constraint. The local village already has problems with HGV traffic on the narrow road and this proposal would make it worse. An application to extend the site has been called in by the Secretary of State and are waiting for a decision, so premature to consider the extension until a decision is made. Concerned about the running of the site as have had a fire there in the past.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3541	0488	<p>There is no proven need to extend the site or use biomass and landfill gas to generate energy.</p> <p>There is already an issue with odour from the site, expansion will make this worse.</p> <p>Concerned about risk of more fires.</p> <p>The industrialisation of the Green Belt will detract from the Councils bid to achieve World Heritage status.</p> <p>So object to expansion of the site</p>	<p>Object to expansion of the site as no proven need for extra facilities.</p> <p>Concerned odour problem will increase and about risk of more fires on site.</p> <p>The industrialisation of the Green Belt will detract from the Councils bid to achieve World Heritage status.</p>
3497	***Consulted under 2813*** 0295	<p>[Refers to reference MJP52 as being Rufforth, but is actually WJP11.]</p> <p>Object to proposal, and CYC planning application 13/00041/FULM.</p> <p>It would be on Green Belt land which acts as a buffer between the village and York and should be preserved for future generations. There has been a site at Harewood Whin for 30 years and problems keep increasing as the site has expanded and more traffic has been generated, especially HGVs.</p> <p>The use of the Green Belt should not be allowed to be used for industry.</p> <p>All alternatives should be taken into account as there are already better sites in other parts of North Yorkshire.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to residents.</p>	<p>The proposal would be on Green Belt land which acts as a buffer between Rufforth and York and should be preserved. The problems at Harewood Whin keep increasing as the site expands, especially in terms of an increase in HGV traffic.</p> <p>Green Belt land should not be used for industry.</p> <p>Other sites in North Yorkshire should be considered and consideration given to local residents.</p>
3498	0317	<p>Object to the site due to its location within the Green Belt.</p> <p>Concerned about traffic impacts including pedestrian safety. Considers there to be better sites.</p>	<p>Object to the site due to its location within the Green Belt. Concerned about traffic impacts including pedestrian safety. Considers there to be better sites.</p>

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3517

0398

Objects to the site due to its encroachment into the Green Belt. Considers there to be no need for the site in the future as waste will go to AWRP. The site will increase the amount of HGV's on an already busy B road. It is premature to include the site in the MWJP when the recent application has been called in by the Secretary of State.

Objects to the site due to its encroachment into the green belt. Considers there to be no need for the site in the future as waste will go to AWRP. The site will increase the amount of HGV's on an already busy B road.

3518

0397

Objects to the site due to its encroachment into the Green Belt. Considers there to be no need for the site in the future as waste will go to AWRP. The site will increase the amount of HGV's on an already busy B road. It is premature to include the site in the MWJP when the recent application has been called in by the Secretary of State.

Objects to the site due to its encroachment into the green belt. Considers there to be no need for the sites in the future as waste will go to AWRP. The site will increase the amount of HGV's on an already busy B road.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3413

0158

Strongly object to the proposal at Harewood Whin. As the proposed expansion of the existing site is now subject to a Public Enquiry presumably this proposal cannot be taken forward until the inquiry is concluded. The proposal is for a huge factory situated in the Green Belt the purpose of which is to preserve the rural character of villages. National Planning guidelines require there to be exceptional circumstances, which this is clearly not the case.

The original permission for Harewood Whin made much of returning the land to agricultural use after 15-20 years, whereas the new proposal would take the life of the site to a total of 50 years. The proposal to operate from 07:00-23:00 would result in unacceptable noise and light pollution and 300 daily HGV movements seven days a week along the inadequate B1224. Current HGV movements and previous assurances from Yorwaste give no confidence in their determination or ability to police the situation.

This site is inappropriate in the Greenbelt with no proof of exceptional circumstances. The assurances made to local residents when the site opened should be kept.

Strongly object to this site due to; location in Green Belt with no proof of exceptional circumstances; unacceptable noise and light pollution; unacceptable traffic impacts on inadequate local roads; inability of Yorwaste to police the traffic impacts; the site cannot be taken forward until the public inquiry is concluded into the current application;

The original permission for Harewood Whin intended restoration to agricultural use after 15-20 years, the new proposal would take the life of the site to a total of 50 years.

3522

0447

The site should not be extended due to the unpleasant smells and debris which affects, not only local residents but further afield in Acomb.

Concerned about odour and debris.

Respondent No. Name

3452

CommentNo Comment

0215

Object to the site.
 The proposal to create a recycling facility and waste transfer station breaches both the Government and City of York guidelines for protecting the Green Belt. The site is located within an area in the City of York Council and Yorwaste have repeatedly stated their intention to preserve a green belt corridor alongside the B1224. The proposal goes against these guidelines as it is located within the green belt corridor.
 When the original site was created the residents were informed of the time limits of the operations set out in the original planning application. Subsequent applications also set out time limits, and so it should be time for operations to start scaling down but the proposal is to expand rather than contract operations.
 The proposal would likely generate an increase of HGV traffic through the village of Rufforth which already has more than its fair share.
 The matter has been referred to the Secretary of State who has 'called in' the application, so it is premature to include the site in the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan.

Summary

Object to the site as goes against Governments and City of York guidelines on the Green Belt.
 Past applications have listed time limits for operations, so should be time for operations to be scaled down not expanded.
 There would be an increase in HGV traffic through the village.
 The application for the site has been 'called in' by the Secretary of State, so premature to include it in the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan.

3587

0346

Objects to the site. Considers it to be already large enough. It is far too close to residential areas. There is in adequate screening of the existing site. Foul smells originate from the site. The site is a fire risk with smoke affecting properties for miles.

Objects to the site. Considers it to be already large enough. It is far too close to residential areas. There is in adequate screening of the existing site. Foul smells originate from the site. The site is a fire risk with smoke affecting properties for miles.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3602

0507

Object to site.
 It will intrude onto Green Belt land which acts as a buffer between Rufforth and the landfill site.
 The current site has a time limit on it which should be adhered to.
 The proposal is for industrial proposals which should be on an industrial estate such as at Hessay.
 In future waste will be disposed of at AWRP so no need for new proposal at Harewood Whin.
 The HGV traffic will increase a lot and will impact further on the village.

Object to site.
 It will intrude onto Green Belt land.
 The current site has a time limit on it which should be adhered to.
 The proposal should be on an industrial estate.
 In future waste will be disposed of at AWRP so no need for new proposal at Harewood Whin.
 The HGV traffic will increase a lot and will impact further on the village.

3601

0506

Object to site.
 It is surrounded by Green Belt land and industrial activity is inappropriate.
 The site should be being restored under the terms of the original application.
 Concerned about increase in already heavy HGV traffic.

Object to site.
 It is surrounded by Green Belt land and industrial activity is inappropriate.
 The site should be being restored under the terms of the original application.
 Concerned about increase in already heavy HGV traffic.

3600

0504

Object to site.
 Under the original application the time limit is now up and the site should be being restored.
 The current application has been called in by the Secretary of State so should wait for this to be resolved before planning further development.
 The site has been mismanaged resulting in a recent fire which caused health and environmental concerns for residents and businesses.
 The proposed encroachment onto the Green Belt is unacceptable.

Under the original application the site should now be being restored. Should wait for the outcome of the SoS 'call in' before planning more development.
 A recent fire cause health and environmental issues.
 The proposed encroachment onto the Green Belt is unacceptable.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3599	0503	<p>Object as site would be on Green Belt land and industrial processes not allowed except in exceptional circumstances, which is not the case.</p> <p>Concerned about safety of the site after a recent fire. Traffic is not supposed to come through Rufforth village, but it does, and the level will increase if this proposal is allowed.</p>	<p>The site would impact on Green Belt land and it is not an exceptional circumstance. Concerned about safety of the site after a recent fire.</p> <p>Concerned about increase in HGVs going through the village.</p>
3598	0502	<p>There is no proven need for the extension to the site as AWRP is being built which will deal with York's waste. The current site produces a lot of odours, which would be made worse if new proposal allowed.</p> <p>Concerned about impact of potential fires on the site to the environment.</p> <p>York City Council wants to improve the air quality in York, are outer villages not included.</p> <p>York City Council are also bidding for World Heritage Status, would development on Green Belt land impact on this.</p> <p>The HGV traffic would greatly increase.</p>	<p>No need for the site with AWRP being built.</p> <p>Concerned about increase in odours and potential for additional fire and their impact on the environment.</p> <p>The extension will not improve air quality which CYC is trying to do, and may affect the bid for World Heritage Status if Green Belt is built on.</p>
3382	0043	<p>The A1237 is not suitable for additional traffic related to this site, restrictions on traffic movement is required.</p>	<p>Negative traffic impacts on the A1237. Restrict traffic movements.</p>
3592	0338	<p>Object to the site. It will intrude onto the Green Belt and reduce the buffer zone between the landfill site and Rufforth. The number of HGVs going through the village to the B1224 will increase significantly.</p> <p>The site had a time limit for restoration. Recycling should be carried out on an industrial estate rather than on Green Belt land. The application has been called in so should wait for this to be resolved first.</p>	<p>Object to site, it will intrude onto the Green Belt and reduce the buffer zone between the landfill site and Rufforth. The number to HGVs going through the village will increase significantly. There is a time limit for the restoration of a site. Recycling should be on industrial land rather than Green Belt. Should wait for the result of the call in of the application before proceeding with this site.</p>

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
3545	0494	<p>Under the original planning application a bund was built, if this site went ahead the bund would be breached and the Green Belt encroached upon.</p> <p>Due consideration has not been given to earlier commitments to minimise the impact of the landfill site on the community, this proposal would increase HGV traffic and industrialisation of the rural community.</p>	<p>Object to the expansion of the site, the bund build round the site would be breached and Green Belt land encroached upon.</p> <p>The proposal will increase HGV traffic and industrialisation of the rural area and further impact the local community.</p>
3586	0347	<p>The site would introduce an industrial process which is inappropriate within a Green Belt. It will result in harmful visual impact on the routes into the City of York and would be detrimental on the residents of Rufforth. There would be an increase in traffic on already congested B road.</p> <p>There application has been called in by the SoS and it is considered premature to include the proposal within the MWJP.</p>	<p>The site would introduce an industrial process which is inappropriate within a Green Belt. It will result in harmful visual impact on the routes into the City of York and would be detrimental on the residents of Rufforth. There would be an increase in traffic on already congested B road.</p> <p>There application has been called in by the SoS and it is considered premature to include the proposal within the MWJP.</p>
3585	0361	<p>Object to the site.</p> <p>The site would be built on Green Belt Land when more suitable areas are available.</p> <p>There would be a large increase of HGV/Large vehicles going through Rufforth Village.</p> <p>The life of the site would be extended which goes against the condition in the previous planning application.</p> <p>A bridleway would be used as access to the site.</p> <p>Should wait for the outcome of the Call in of the application before proceeding with the site.</p>	<p>The Green Belt would be impacted when other areas more suitable.</p> <p>Concerned about increase in HGVs through Rufforth Village.</p> <p>Do not agree with extending the life of the site.</p> <p>The proposed access is unsuitable.</p> <p>Do not process until call in of application has been resolved.</p>

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

2813

0316

Objects to the site on the following grounds:
The site is within Green Belt which should be preserved.
The site already generates significant amounts of traffic (particularly HGVs) on the B1224 between Wetherby and York. There are far better sites in other parts of Yorkshire.

Objects to the site due to location within the Green Belt and traffic impacts.

3563

*** If sending out by post
consulted under 3536****

0525

Object as amended site boundary will intrude into the Green Belt which is used as a buffer between the landfill site and the B1224 into Rufforth. The current application has a time limit on activities.
The processes proposed should be located on an industrial estate not in the Green Belt. There are other more suitable sites in the area such as Hessay. In future waste will go to Allerton Park and the landfill will not be used so there is no need for a waste transfer station at Harewood Whin. The proposal will greatly increase traffic on the B road and through the village and cause problems at tight corners. Should wait for the results of the Secretary of States 'Call in' on an application at Harewood Whin.

The proposal will intrude onto the Green Belt which is currently used as a buffer between the village and landfill site. There is a time limit in current activities on the site.
The process proposed should be located on an industrial estate, there are more suitable sites in the area and so no need for it here.
The level of traffic will increase and pose problems in the village.
Should wait for the results of the 'call in' on a Harewood Whin application before proceeding.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3562

0524

Object as amended site boundary will intrude into the Green Belt which is used as a buffer between the landfill site and the B1224 into Rufforth. The current application has a time limit on activities.

The processes proposed should be located on an industrial estate not in the Green Belt. There are other more suitable sites in the area such as Hessay. In future waste will go to Allerton Park and the landfill will not be used so there is no need for a waste transfer station at Harewood Whin. The proposal will greatly increase traffic on the B road and through the village and cause problems at tight corners. Should wait for the results of the Secretary of States 'Call in' on an application at Harewood Whin.

The proposal will intrude onto the Green Belt which is currently used as a buffer between the village and landfill site. There is a time limit in current activities on the site.

The process proposed should be located on an industrial estate, there are more suitable sites in the area and so no need for it here.

The level of traffic will increase and pose problems in the village.

Should wait for the results of the 'call in' on a Harewood Whin application before proceeding.

3369

0006

Object to the proposals at this site, it would industrialise a rural area, would permanently destroy the green belt when there are brownfield alternatives and the increase in traffic would be increased and dangerous due to the narrow road and pavements and add to the current traffic problem.

Object to proposals as would adversely impact on the rural area, permanently destroy part of the green belt and cause increased traffic which will add to the current traffic problem.

3371

Consulted Under 3370

0010

Major improvement is required at the Harewood Whin site to eliminate the fumes and smell.

Major improvement is required at the Harewood Whin site to eliminate the fumes and smell.

3552

0514

Object to site.

The original permission was time limited which has already been exceeded.

Industrial traffic will be increased on B1224 and through the village.

Object to site.

The original permission was time limited which has already been exceeded.

Industrial traffic will be increased on B1224 and through the village.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

3549

0510

The site is already large enough. Concerned about traffic impacts, the local paths are very narrow, any further development on the site would increase the problems and hazards already experienced.

The site already generates litter and unpleasant smells in warm and wet weather. There was recently a fire at the site which was allowed to burn for days, releasing fumes into the village.

Concerned about traffic increased impacts and the size of the site.

3555

0517

Object to proposal to extend into the Green Belt, the activities would be better placed in a different location and has no 'special need' to use the Green Belt. Other suitable locations include Hessay and North Minster Park. The current permission at Harewood Whin has a limited lifespan, with access from the York ring road, but this has been flouted. The new proposal will increase volumes of HGV traffic on narrow roads through a village.

The proposal will breach the Green Belt, breach current planning permissions and increase traffic on a minor road and ignore use of A59.

3556

0518

Object to the site as will intrude into Green Belt land which is used as a buffer between the landfill site and the B1224 into Rufforth. The site should be on an industrial site and not the Green Belt. There will be a huge increase in HGVs on the B1224 through Rufforth.

The site will intrude onto the Green Belt which is used as a buffer between the landfill site and the village of Rufforth. The proposal should be located on an industrial site. The number of HGVs through the village will increase.

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary	
3365	0004	It is accepted that Harewood Whin is serving a useful purpose but not keen on an extension. It is viewed as a big smelly tip, the Council should try to improve the publics perception by circulating a leaflet detailing the work done there and its benefit to the community. At times the wind blows light refuse onto surrounding agricultural and residential land and onto the A1237, greater mitigation should be in place to deal with this.	More information should be provided to the public regarding the work and benefits of Harewood Whin. More needs to be done to address the problem of wind sometimes blowing light refuse onto surrounding land and highways.	
3557	0519	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt as it is industrial activity which should be located on an industrial estate. Should use waste transfer rather than landfill, there are already operational sites in the area and more suitable locations identified in the York Local Plan such as at Northminster. Waste in future will go to Allerton Park and the landfill will close.	The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt as it is industrial activity which should be located on an industrial estate. There are more suitable sites in the York area. In future waste will go to Allerton Park rather than to landfill.	
3558	0520	Object as current application for a limited timescale. The proposal will be intrusive and make more incursions into the Green Belt land. Further development of the site should not be allowed.	Current application is for a limited timescale and will intrude into the Green Belt.	
3561	*** if Sending out by post consulted under 3530****	0523	Object to the proposals for an industrial development on a greenfield site.	Object to the proposals for an industrial development on a greenfield site.

WJP13

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0555

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

120

Historic England

0146

The western boundary of Halton East Conservation Area lies within 660 metres of this site
The boundary of Droughton Conservation Area lies 1.2 km to the south-east of this site · The boundary of Eastby Conservation Area lies 1 km to the north-west of this site

The western boundary of Halton East Conservation Area lies within 660 metres of this site
The boundary of Droughton Conservation Area lies 1.2 km to the south-east of this site
· The boundary of Eastby Conservation Area lies 1 km to the north-west of this site

WJP16

Respondent No. Name	CommentNo Comment	Summary
121 Environment Agency	<p>0603 The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>The site lies within the medium risk flood zone 2, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:</p> <p>detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site details of mitigation measures surface water runoff the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.</p> <p>The results of a clear and transparent sequential test</p> <p>Finished Floor Levels for the site should be set a minimum of 300mm above whichever is the greater of existing ground levels, the highest recorded flood level (if available) or the 1 in 100 modelled level (if available), plus a further 300mm of flood proofing. If Finished Floor Levels cannot be raised, the applicant should provide adequate justification. We would expect to see additional flood proofing has been integrated in response to the lowering of floor levels.</p> <p>Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal</p>	<p>The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>The site lies within the medium risk flood zone 2, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:</p> <p>detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site details of mitigation measures surface water runoff</p> <p>the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.</p> <p>The results of a clear and transparent sequential test</p> <p>Finished Floor Levels for the site should be set a minimum of 300mm above whichever is the greater of existing ground levels, the highest recorded flood</p>

should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Selby Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water

level (if available) or the 1 in 100 modelled level (if available), plus a further 300mm of flood proofing. If Finished Floor Levels cannot be raised, the applicant should provide adequate justification. We would expect to see additional flood proofing has been integrated in response to the lowering of floor levels.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

Summary

existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The site lies within the Selby Internal Drainage Board (IDB). The applicant should contact the IDB to discuss any works that will affect any watercourses classified as non main river as formal consent from them under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The IDB is the responsible authority for any works that would affect any watercourses (classified as non main river) within the site. The applicant should also contact the IDB regarding their requirements regarding surface water runoff and to ascertain whether or not they have any local records of the site having flooded

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

WJP17

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0556

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

WJP18

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0604 The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site
 detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours
 details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development
 examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site
 details of mitigation measures
 surface water runoff
 the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.
 The results of clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route. Spoil to be stored outside of the floodplain.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations

The proposed development will only meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework if a Flood Risk Assessment is submitted in which it considers risk from all sources of flooding, and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

The site lies within the high risk flood zone 3, therefore the applicant should submit as a minimum the following information:

detailed topographic survey (to ordnance datum) of the existing site
 detailed plans (to ordnance datum) of the proposed site levels and ground contours
 details of the floor and critical infrastructure levels proposed for the development
 examination of proposed site contours in relation to flood flow routes and levels and access to and from the site
 details of mitigation measures
 surface water runoff
 the applicant should ensure that there is safe access and egress to and from the site.
 The results of clear and transparent sequential test

If possible, all development is to be located within Flood Zone 1. If this is not possible, a sequential risk-based approach within the development site should be adopted. For example

2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The proposed development sits above an active landfill – Tancred Landfill. The applicant should satisfy themselves of any risk.

structures such as site offices should be located within the areas of the site identified as at the lowest flood risk.

Level for level compensatory storage must be provided for volumes displaced from flood zone 3, within flood zone 1 areas of the site and within the same flood flow route. Spoil to be stored outside of the floodplain.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SUDS approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SUDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum we would want to see any

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

surface water discharge restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If not calculated, then the greenfield run-off from a 1 in 1 year storm (1.4l/s/ha) should be used. For any brownfield areas within the development, we would want to see as a minimum a 30% reduction in surface water discharge, this is as a consequence of climate change and recommendations in the Pitt Review. The applicant must also provide sufficient attenuation and long term storage at least to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design should also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event, plus 30% to account for climate change, and surcharging the drainage system can be stored on the site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into the watercourse.

The proposed development sits above an active landfill – Tancred Landfill. The applicant should satisfy themselves of any risk.

WJP19

3386

0073

Neutral. The site is used as an existing waste Transfer station.

Neutral. The site is used as an existing waste Transfer station.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

120

Historic England

0147

Lodge Farmhouse, a Grade II Listed Building, lies 320 metres from the western edge of this site.

- Robin Hood and Little John Stones, a Grade II Listed structure, lies 740 metres from the eastern edge of this area.
- There is a Grade II Listed garden wall 720 metres to the north of this site.
- The eastern edge of this area lies 930 metres from a moated site which is a Scheduled Monument.

Lodge Farmhouse, a Grade II Listed Building, lies 320 metres from the western edge of this site.

- Robin Hood and Little John Stones, a Grade II Listed structure, lies 740 metres from the eastern edge of this area.
- There is a Grade II Listed garden wall 720 metres to the north of this site.
- The eastern edge of this area lies 930 metres from a moated site which is a Scheduled Monument.

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

121 Environment Agency

0557

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

WJP21

457

Burton Salmon Parish Council

0383

Concerned about the traffic impact this site may have when combined with existing operations. It is considered that 'infill' was part of the original quarry approval (2004) and not a new site. Would ask that strict working and traffic conditions be imposed.

Concerned about the traffic impact this site may have when combined with existing operations. It is considered that 'infill' was part of the original quarry approval (2004) and not a new site. Would ask that strict working and traffic conditions be imposed.

121

Environment Agency

0558

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

3372

0026

Would like to see the site progressed as would have minimal impact on the general public,

Supports progression of this site.

3436

Jefferson Consulting Limited

0197

Before approving backfilling of this site it should be assessed to see if the stone is used for important buildings, especially churches in the area, through inspection of older buildings. Sampling and petrographic analysis can help identify whether or not the stone could be used as a replacement for another magnesian limestone which is currently not available for conservation work.

Before approving backfilling of this site it should be assessed to see if the stone is used for important buildings, especially churches in the area, through inspection of older buildings. Sampling and petrographic analysis can help identify whether or not the stone could be used as a replacement for another magnesian limestone which is currently not available for conservation work.

128

Yorkshire Wildlife Trust

0264

This site is close to a number of SINC sites, sensitive restoration taking into account valuable habitat locally could be excellent for nature conservation.

This site is close to a number of SINC sites, sensitive restoration taking into account valuable local habitats could be excellent for nature conservation.

Respondent No.	Name	CommentNo	Comment	Summary
120	Historic England	0148	<p>This proposal could sterilise a potential source of stone for the future repair of York Minster. The site should be geologically/petrographically surveyed, in order to assess the quality of remaining stone, before any infilling is permitted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · There is a group of Grade II Listed Buildings at Byram Hall the closest of which would be 320 metres from the eastern edge of this site · There are two Grade II Listed Buildings at Poole Manor Farm 175 metres from the northern boundary of this site 	<p>This proposal could sterilise a potential source of stone for the future repair of York Minster. The site should be geologically/petrographically surveyed, in order to assess the quality of remaining stone, before any infilling is permitted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · There is a group of Grade II Listed Buildings at Byram Hall the closest of which would be 320 metres from the eastern edge of this site · There are two Grade II Listed Buildings at Poole Manor Farm 175 metres from the northern boundary of this site
3386		0074	Support. The remediation/landscaping of the quarry site (when extraction is complete) is supported.	Support. The remediation/landscaping of the quarry site (when extraction is complete) is supported.
WJP22				
294	Canal & River Trust	0498	<p>The site was previously approved for a biomass power plant scheme including a new wharf for the importation of biomass fuel via the Aire and Calder Navigation canal. Need to ensure that a new wharf is built as part of the new biomass scheme to enable sustainable transport of fuel along the waterway, reducing reliance on HGVs and helping to reduce congestion and greenhouse gas emissions in line with paragraph 30 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>If the site goes ahead need to ensure that a new wharf is built to enable sustainable transport of fuel for the biomass plant and so reduce reliance on HGVs.</p>

121

Environment Agency

0559

The site falls entirely within low-risk Flood Zone 1. Paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others. Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries

The Site falls within a low-risk Flood Zone 1. The NPPF pp103 requires all applications within a site area of 1 hectare or greater to be submitted with a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) This FRA should include a surface water drainage scheme which demonstrates there is no increase in surface water runoff from the site. As a minimum the surface water discharge should be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rate. If the applicant has no site specific calculation for this then a greenfield run-off rate from a 1 in 1 year storm of 1.4l/s/ha should be used in any calculations. For any brownfield areas within the development, drainage proposals should provide for a minimum of a 30% reduction in surface water discharge. This is to accommodate climate change and follows a recommendation of the Pitt Review. The applicant must ensure the drainage strategy provides attenuation and long term storage sufficient to accommodate at least a 1 in 30 year storm. The drainage design should ensure that any storm water arising from a 1 in 100 year event, incorporating a 30% allowance for climate change and surcharging of the drainage system, can be stored on the site. The way in which the storm water would be stored on site must be without risk to people or property and without overflowing into any watercourse from where it could go on to increase flood risk to others.

groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365.

For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

Approved document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 establishes a hierarchy for surface water disposal, which encourages a SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) approach. Under Approved Document Part H the first option for surface water disposal should be the use of SuDS, which encourage infiltration such as soakaways or infiltration trenches. In all cases, it must be established that these options are feasible, can be adopted and properly maintained and would not lead to any other environmental problems. For example, using soakaways or other infiltration methods on contaminated land carries groundwater pollution risks and may not work in areas with a high water table. Where the intention is to dispose to soakaway, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under Building Research Establishment (BRE) Digest 365. For sites which lie within close proximity to a watercourse, or have a watercourse within the site boundaries, it should be noted that following the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, the Environment Agency is no longer the responsible authority for ordinary watercourses. In the absence of a local Internal Drainage Board, the applicant should discuss the following items with the Lead Local Flood Authority:

Surface water discharge connection and discharge rates

Respondent No. Name

CommentNo Comment

Summary

Any structures requiring permanent and/or temporary consent adjacent to the watercourse

Any maintenance requirements which may include land retained for access.

Any information relating to historic flooding or specific site information which may affect the flood risk as a result of this development.

3372

0027

Would like to see the site progressed as would have minimal impact on the general public.

Support progression of this site.

2310

Commercial Boat Operators Association

0280

We note and approve of this site, its location makes it ideally suitable for the use of water transport, reducing traffic congestion and carbon emissions, by importing the biomass fuel.

We note and approve of this site, its location makes it ideally suitable for the use of water transport, reducing traffic congestion and carbon emissions, by importing the biomass fuel.

3386

0075

The development of a green energy biomass facility is supported.

The development of a green energy biomass facility is supported.

120

Historic England

0149

There are two Grade II Listed Buildings 1.1km to the south-east of this area (Dovecote Farmhouse and Pollington Hall)

There are two Grade II Listed Buildings 1.1km to the south-east of this area (Dovecote Farmhouse and Pollington Hall)

Comments provided after provision of additional information

Respondent Number	Comment No	Sites	Summary
2192	0001		MJP12 - No access objections or observations MJP06 - No problem MJP11 - No objection or observation MJP16 - No objection or observation MJP22 - No objection or observation MJP23 - No objection or observation MJP15 - No objection or observation MJP35 - No objection or observation MJP38 - No objection or observation MJP28 - No comment MJP29 - No comment MJP45 - No comment MJP54 - No comment MJP09 - No comment MJP24 - No comment MJP46 - No comment MJP27 - No comment MJP57 - No comment WJP01 - No comment WJP05 - No comment WJP08 - No comment WJP09 - No comment WJP11 - No comment WJP13 - No comment WJP15 - No comment WJP16 - No comment WJP17 - No comment WJP18 - No comment WJP19 - No comment WJP21 - No comment WJP22 - No comment
2192	0002	MJP04	Concerned about the likely loss of a number of rights of way within the proposed quarry area i.e. the North/South footpath adjacent to Aram Grange, the 2 east/west footpaths across the south-western area of the site, the important Fleetham Lane and another footpath leading east to Throstle Farm from Fleetham Lane. This is a massive loss of public amenity, together with the loss of several areas of woodland, so it is difficult to see how the LAF could recommend such proposals. In its current form this large site would have a considerably negative effect on the needs of non motorised users locally. The two access sites suggested are not a problem.

2192	0003	MJP05	Concerned that the bridleway dissected by the proposed site would not be protected, and without a resolved access plan it is hard to comment, other than by saying the lanes surrounding Brearton are narrow, the verges not wide and measures should include passing places for lorries. Restoration has not been addressed at this stage, but the main concern is the impact on the right of way on the east of the site and the effect on the use and enjoyment of this public amenity by the quarry operation.
2192	0004	MJP07	The integrity of the footpath west of the site must not be compromised, and there should be mitigation measures to offset the impact on enjoyment of the footpaths in the area. When combined with MJP06 there will be a major reduction in hedges and trees with no commitment to restoration. The resulting landscape will be very different in the years to come and will have an impact on wildlife corridors for owls and other species and a knock on effect on the viability of the countryside as a living environment.
2192	0005	MJP08	Not clear about the access arrangement, but if Langton Lane, an important UCR is used, then sufficient passing places and gritted surface should be provided, i.e. not a slippery type of tarmac which would be unsafe for use by riders. Otherwise no access issues.
2192	0006	MJP10	Concerned that currently Potgate is being accessed along Water Lane, and important bridleway in an area short of routes. Wherever possible, quarry access should not compromise the safety and enjoyment of non motorised users, and the lorries impact on the use of the road by horse riders. The proposed access would exacerbate the current problem, and a better access solution would be from the north, beyond Musterfield on the road to Friars Heath.
2192	0007	MJP14	The proposed access will use a considerable length of the Ripon Rowel Way, which is a bridleway of some importance as this section affords horse riders an important safe alternative to the busy A6108. When bridleways are given a hard surface to withstand lorry traffic it takes away from the pleasure of the original semi-metalled surface, which would be less damaging for horses legs and sustainable if there had not been interference. Non motorised traffic would have to share the confined space with lorry traffic, expect mitigation measures such as extended by-passes for lorries. No amount of mitigation will compensate for the dirt, noise and nuisance of sharing what should be a quiet rural track with quarry traffic and the subsequent absence of wildlife.
2192	0008	MJP17	In the A1 upgrade Leases Lane will become a link to a new bridleway, thus when horse riders have been provided with a mitigating quiet route in view of the lack of A1 crossings and sharing bridges with traffic, they will now find themselves having to share a single track road with lorries. Expect a widening of the lane to accommodate two lorries abreast, passing places and further mitigating measures. The integrity of Ghyll Lane bridleway should not be compromised.
2192	0009	MJP21	The non motorised routes planned are much appreciated in lieu of the considerable loss of landscape character. In addition to the stretch of road from Killerby Cottages to the local access road along Low Street should be widened so two lorries can pass, and have a non motorised route of 2 miles behind the hedge to separate lorries from the vulnerable user along the narrow lane which also has a narrow verge. It was suggested that a bridge across the Swale of non motorised users would enhance the network considerably as the communities are trapped between the A1 and the Swale near Kiplin, thus saving traffic from going through Scorton and Catterick Village. The area downstream from Catterick has been recognised by the Local Nature Partnership in having great potential not just for access, but for its rich wildlife, historic associations and archaeology. A connecting bridge available to the non motorised public post-excavation would enable this to happen.
2192	0010	MJP31	Proposed access would be onto a necessary bridleway, so mitigation measures would be required, such as widening of the track with passing places and the surface making suitable for lorries.
2192	0011	MJP32	Whichever way the access will be will impact on the quiet network used by many riders locally. A slightly better alternative to the access suggested off Redgate Lane, would seem to be via the old quarry west of High Cayton to the south and then west to the road at Ten Acre Plantation. The usual mitigation contributions would be expected particularly in view of the area of lost woodland.

2192	0012	MJP33	Proposals supported because of the access bridge across the Swale, recommended that the permissive 'walkways' be permissive bridleways in accordance with the LAF principles of Best Value and fair opportunity for all those vulnerable in traffic. This scheme in conjunction with NY/2010/0356/ENV will make a massive area of excavation and detailed restoration plans must be provided with the application. There is great scope here for partnership with both schemes providing a community benefit in terms of access and nature reserve. The Forum would like to see this development demonstrate what can be achieved through a proactive approach.
2192	0013	MJP34	Response already submitted to both NYCC and Mr C France of NYMNP planning department. We recommend that mitigation measures included a new bridleway across the minehead to save conflict of quarry traffic and non motorised users on the coast to coast stretch of the busy B1416, amongst other improvements to the local rights of way network in view of the disturbance and landscape changes.
2192	0014	MJP37	Proposed access will impact heavily on this bridleway and the LAF expects the usual measures to mitigate for loss of quiet enjoyment, pleasant lane surface, noise and wildlife habitat impact. This development would adversely affect a bridleway (15.48/2/1) and three footpaths (15.48/4/1 15.48/4/2 and 15.48/9/1). No provision is made to protect the footpaths which could be lost for ever. The stretch of footpath 15.48/9/1 north of Lylands Farm is an important link from Great Ouseburn to the bridleway going west, which avoids the busy B3265. The proposed access is along the bridleway (15.48/2/1) known as Moor Lane, which is an important route. When bridleways are given a hard surface to withstand lorry traffic, this takes away from the pleasure of the original semi-metalled surface, which would have been less damaging for horses legs and perfectly sustainable had there not been interference. Non motorised users would have to travel with the prospect of meeting lorries in a confined space, not originally intended for quarry operation. The LAF would expect mitigation measures such as extended by-passes for lorries and the provision for separate equestrian and pedestrian paths.
2192	0015	MJP39	This application obliterates two attractive footpaths, one with a lovely river view, so the Forum would wish to know how the NMU access would be preserved. There is no problem with the access from the A6108.
2192	0017	MJP49	Metes Lane (30.20/8/1) which runs through the middle of the proposed quarry, is a bridleway and links rights of way between Flixton and Seamer. This is only one of two north-south footpaths east of the A64. Therefore it is important that the route is not closed. The proposed quarry is very near an internationally important archaeological site (Star Carr) therefore the LPA should consult Natural England on likely risks. The site is also adjacent to the refuse landfill site for Scarborough, would quarrying affect the stability of the tip?
2192	0018	MJP50	The proposed access is along U1765 which is a key route from Winteringham to the A64. The proposed quarry is in a SSSI Impact Risk Zone, which applies to planning applications for quarries, including new proposals. Therefore the LPA should consult Natural England on likely risks.
2192	0019	MJP51	The proposed new quarry is in a SSSI High Impact Risk Zone, which applies to planning applications for quarries, including new proposals. Therefore the LPA should consult Natural England on likely risks.
2192	0020	MJP52	The proposed new quarry is in a SSSI Impact Risk Zone, which applies to planning applications for quarries, including new proposals. Therefore the LPA should consult Natural England on likely risks. It is within the Yorkshire Ouse, Nidd and Swale catchment area subject to the Catchment Sensitive Farming Delivery Initiative 2011-2016. It is within the City of York Green Belt.
2192	0021	MJP53	The proposed access will use a considerable length of bridleway known as the Old London Road, which is of some importance as this section affords horse riders the only way to Towton. When bridleways are given a hard surface to withstand lorry traffic it takes away from the pleasure of the original semi-metalled surface, which is less damaging for horses legs and perfectly sustainable had there not been interference. Non motorised traffic would have to travel expecting to meet quarry traffic, the LAF would expect mitigation measures such as extended by-passes for lorries and the provision of separate equestrian and pedestrian paths. The proposed new quarry is in a SSSI Impact Risk Zone, which applies to planning applications for quarries, including new proposals. Therefore the LPA should consult Natural England on likely risks.

2192	0022	MJP55	The Trans Pennine Trail and York and Selby Path run between the two sections of the proposed quarry. Will the Mount Bridge be strong enough to take the quarry traffic over the Trail and Path? This proposed new quarry is in a SSSI Impact Risk Zone, which applies to planning applications for quarries, including new proposals. Therefore the LPA should consult Natural England on likely risks.
2192	0023	MJP59	A footpath (30.22/702) runs along the eastern boundary of the proposed site at the edge of Forge Valley Woods, which is a Natural Nature Reserve. This path is an important part of the network and should be protected. The proposed new quarry is in a SSSI Impact Risk Zone, which applies to planning applications for quarries, including new proposals. Therefore the LPA should consult Natural England on likely risks. The disused quarry is to the west of Coackrah Road has not operated for several years and so should not be referred to as an extension to the disused quarry, The proposed access is onto Cockrah Road which goes uphill from West Ayton to Spikers Hill Farm and is used by dog walkers, other walkers, runners and cyclists as well as the occasional car travelling for recreational purposes to the layby near the existing quarry. It has high sided banks in places, is quite narrow, and for that part of the road from beyond the caravan park to the existing quarry, has no pedestrian path, thus non motorised users have to use the road. Therefore the LAF recommends that the developers are required to construct a footpath/cycle path next to the road.
2192	0024	MJP61	The footpath (10.6/2/2) that runs along the northern side of the proposed site and between the site and the existing quarry/brickworks requires protection. The proposed access to the quarry would cross this footpath.
2192	0025	MJP26	Long Lane runs through the site (UUR?) connecting Kirk Smeaton to Barnsdale Bar. This should not be affected.
2192	0026	MJP58	The proposed access will use a considerable length of bridleway known as the Old London Road, which is of some importance as this section affords horse riders the only way to Towton. When bridleways are given a hard surface to withstand lorry traffic it takes away from the pleasure of the original semi-metalled surface, which is less damaging for horses legs and perfectly sustainable had there not been interference. Non motorised traffic would have to travel expecting to meet quarry traffic, the LAF would expect mitigation measures such as extended by-passes for lorries and the provision of separate equestrian and pedestrian paths. The proposed new quarry is in a SSSI Impact Risk Zone, which applies to planning applications for quarries, including new proposals. Therefore the LPA should consult Natural England on likely risks.
2192	0027	WJP04	This proposed new waste site is in a SSSI Impact Risk Zone, which applies to planning applications for Landfill. Includes inert landfill, non-hazardous landfill, hazardous landfill. Therefore the LPA should consult Natural England on likely risks.
2192	0028	WJP06	This proposed new waste site is in a SSSI Impact Risk Zone, which applies to planning applications for Landfill. Includes inert landfill, non-hazardous landfill, hazardous landfill. Therefore the LPA should consult Natural England on likely risks.
2192	0029	WJP07	This proposed new waste site is in a SSSI Impact Risk Zone, which applies to planning applications for Landfill. Includes inert landfill, non-hazardous landfill, hazardous landfill. Therefore the LPA should consult Natural England on likely risks.
2192	0030	WJP10	This proposed new waste site is in a SSSI Impact Risk Zone, which applies to planning applications; mechanical and biological waste treatment, inert landfill, non-hazardous landfill, hazardous landfill, household civic amenity recycling facilities construction, demolition and excavation waste, other waste management. Therefore the LPA should consult Natural England on likely risks. This site is also within the Selby Green Belt.

2192	0031	MJP43	<p>This application subsumes a useful bridleway, and across the Bedale bypass which isn't indicated on the application. Extraction both sides of Low Street would render the area very busy with quarry traffic.</p> <p>The applicants will not be aware that NYCC had promised to make non motorised users route north of the bypass, almost parallel with it from Hamhall Lane to Low Street, using an existing farm track and the access to the balancing pond just east of Low Street. This was part of an arrangement as non motorised users together with the LAF forewent normal provision on the actual bypass in order to reduce the cost and make the project financially viable. The application subsumes this non motorised users promised route, at eastern end of the proposed working just north west of the railway line. One of their suggested accesses is off the Bedale bypass and unless some recognition and allowance is made for the proposed non motorised users route then the Forum would be most unhappy with this application.</p> <p>The total area of the proposed application will dramatically alter the landscape because it is so very large, and the environmental impact on non motorised users enjoyment of a previously 'green and pleasant countryside' must be questionable.</p>
------	------	-------	---

Contact us

Minerals and Waste Joint Plan Team Planning Services, North Yorkshire County Council, County Hall, Northallerton, North Yorkshire, DL7 8AH

Tel: **01609 780780** Email: **mwjointplan@northyorks.gov.uk**