

NFPC 20/03555 Objection - Construction and Operational Plans

North Ferriby Parish Council (NFPC) strongly objects to the Construction and Operational Plans as they do not meet reasonable requirements for local residents.

Construction Plan

It allegedly “addresses the practical considerations of construction, including the proposed construction methodology and anticipated timescales, and more importantly assesses the impact of construction on the local community” but in fact does little practical to address the impact

NFPC disputes the proposals in the context of a large plot, 150 metres from residents’ houses.

- There are no longer valid reasons for extended working hours due to COVID on a site like this.
- Weekday working hours must finish at 18.00, not 21.00 particularly when concrete finishing will continue thereafter. In Winter this will be under arc lights, already advised as troubling neighbours from Plot D. In summer it will spoil residents’ enjoyment of their gardens and in all seasons it will disturb any child’s reasonable bedtime. Deliveries e.g. dropping steel etc. cannot be tolerated after 17.00
- A clear commitment to NO DRIVEN PILING must be included and only Auger/screw piling used

The statement that there are no Public Rights of Way across the site is misleading as the open space land to the West of the Long Plantation has free access to any public and must be maintained unless acceptable agreement is made with the community.

The statement “a 5m acoustic bund is to be constructed along the eastern boundary of the site” is incorrect as it is a series of bunds of up-to 5 metres high, meaning there are parts only 0.5 metre high and there are clearly two distinct valleys north-eastwards and south-eastwards that will carry construction noise to residents. A serious reassessment must be made.

The wheel wash facility must be used, unlike on Plot D 20/02150, and conditioned as such.

A site access plan for all construction deliveries must be imposed, preventing any HGV’s entering the village of North Ferriby. The applicant should provide the means for controllable restrictions to be put in place, but without impact on normal highway parking for residents.

Operational Management Plan

It is frankly reprehensible that Wykeland think this can be left to reserved matters and only present a “Heads of Terms” Framework Plan – it is the detail which will indicate vehicle movement, shift patterns and likely loss of amenity to residents, and is critical in understanding the noise generation from this site.

This site proposes to operate 24/7 365 days a year meaning that local residents, some of whom only live 150m from the site, will have their residential amenity permanently damaged by this proposal. The ERYC Planning Committee has twice acknowledged that the noise from Transwaste site operating 24/7, would detrimentally impact residential amenity and refused permission to allow this and this decision was also upheld by the Planning Inspector. Please acknowledge that this site will have the same effect and refuse this application.

The only benefit of this application appears to be alleged 'quality jobs' (which is still not substantiated) and the details on these including shift and office based numbers must be advised to ensure that travel plans etc. are acceptable to Elected Members, not just Planning or Economic Development officers after the Planning Committee.

With Amazon's reputation for pushing employment and remuneration conditions to the extreme (See [Challenging Amazon Report | TUC](#)) the final user should be submitting Job Descriptions and typical Employment Contracts from, say, the fulfilment centre in Bowburn, Co. Durham to challenge the widely held belief that Amazon prefer to operate without contracts and union presence, turning over staff inside 2 years or using Agency workers.

If ERYC Economic Development are convinced of Amazon's integrity – they must insist on these submissions for Elected members to assess after independent HR review.

The level of disruption just from the HGV arrivals and departure is seriously concerning (information which is provided by Vectos in the Delivery and Servicing Management Plan). It shows that no consideration has been really given to the proximity of the site to the residential community and opportunities to reduce the impact have not been considered. A specific example to illustrate this shows that the maximum number of HGV's leaving the site at any single hour is between 22:00 and 23:00hrs, and all of these vehicles will exit via a road that will be 150m from peoples houses, when there is an unused 'seasonal gatehouse', exiting the site directly onto Brickyard Lane. Neither of these constraints are imposed, it is purely the choice of Amazon to organise itself in this way.

In the same vein, Amazon appear to have a clear policy of using 3rd party hauliers that enables them to deny all responsibility when these drivers cause devastation in the surrounding area from overnight and rest period parking. The subsequent clean up is then left to ERYC, paid for via the council tax payers whose very lives have been blighted by this behaviour, or action having to be taken by Humberside Police.

This is all too convenient for Amazon and again NFPC is extremely disappointed that ERYC officers cannot understand the business and ethical model of the end user and expect Elected Members to approve this without any supporting information.

Further as the detail of the business is not disclosed, it could be for Amazon's announced venture into Food Supply and the possibility of refrigerated vehicles queuing alongside Long Plantation would be totally unacceptable as the proposed noise mitigation is already assessed as inadequate by ERYC and certainly will not mitigate noise from additional stop/start refrigeration engines. In the absence of an appropriate Operational Management Plan no refrigerated trucks must be allowed on site and if this is a possibility in the future, sufficient electrical hook up points must be provided.

NFPC therefore strongly objects and urges Elected Members to refuse this application as plans submitted for this facility are not transparent and do not contain enough detail.