

## **Outstanding Questions for Planning Officer following Wykeland presentation on 2<sup>nd</sup> Dec 2020**

Sent by email to Thomas Booth-Robinson from North Ferriby Parish Council

### **VISUAL**

Using an average tree height is not acceptable.

Require the applicant to submit a detailed study of the heights of the existing trees, shown with the AOD height consistent with the buildings.

Require the applicant to provide photo montages of the 'winter view' of the site from locations within North Ferriby.

Note the views of the site from the North Ferriby are not 'of an industrial landscape', as claimed by the applicant's consultant. They are of fields and trees (with the trees around the field screening the industrial buildings). This should be acknowledged by the applicant and their submission amended accordingly.

Light and Privacy concerns were raised through the questions, but we do not feel that these questions were adequately answered.

There is no fence around the site and new lights will be installed which will give potential for increased crime in the area and overlooking potential from the windows on all four floors of the eastern face of the building.

Will the building itself be lit which will then be seen from the village?

The eastern elevation of the building should be designed to minimise its visual impact. (measures could include

- non/reduced illumination of the sign (18x6m),
- omission of windows on the 4 floors,
- omission of the blue stripe at the top of the building
- minimal (safe) external light levels, with zero spillage
- cladding finish (colour/tone/light reflectivity) specified to minimise

Can the building be rotated by 90 degrees and put the car park against the Long Plantation to prevent HGVs queuing close to residents housing?

### **TRAFFIC**

Communities in other parts of the country near Amazon distribution centres are suffering as a result of HGV activity associated with the sites.

At Bowburn, documents within the Planning Application dismissed the concerns of residents claiming that HGV's would not use local roads. This has not been the case. In Hoo, Kent, as highlighted recently in the national media, HGVs arriving early park in local streets away from the site have caused many problems including anti-social behaviour that impacts adversely on residents.

There is no reason to believe that this will not occur here. We see no plan within the application for preventing it.

We have already raised these concerns which have yet to be addressed.

- Allocate an appropriate place where HGVs that arrive early wait and drivers who have exceeded their permitted hours can rest
- Assess how many suitable truck stop places are there in the wider area
- Consider how to prevent parking by HGV drivers for their rest periods on local roads being used
- Where are the appropriate welfare facilities located? Will this include showers, beds, food or just toilet facilities? Where will the lorries be left when these are used?

Can the LPA request that there is an HGV overnight ban in Ferriby?

The HGV entrance is via the NE corner of the site and they will queue down the back of the building to gain entrance to the site, however the welfare facilities for the drivers are on the SW corner of the site.

- How to prevent drivers from using the woods as a toilet facility?
- If this does happen who pays for the clearance of this mess?
- Can the traffic flow around the site be reconfigured to prevent HGVs at the rear of the building?

Traffic flow rates projected for the GSJ.

- Do these include the increase that will come when Transwaste increases their intake by 250,000mt to reach the limit of their current permit?
- These should include projected extra vehicle movements from Plot D

We were 'reassured' during the presentation that trucks would not be idling whilst in the queues waiting for entry to the site. Request the Air Quality modelling is carried out to model the situation of idling trucks. (Trucks waiting to cross the railway line on Gibson Lane idle and severely impact the local air quality – will this be a similar situation?)

The expert for air quality also said that there 'was a lot of head room' in the current air quality of the area compared to the limits set. We challenge this statement as the only receptors in the county of East Riding which are close to or exceed the limits are located close to this site.

The traffic consultants said that they would carry out an assessment of the increased traffic flows through Ferriby- has this been done?

Can the Operational Emergency Road be positioned inside the confines of the site? Will the applicant confirm that if there is not an 'Emergency' that this road will be unused? Will this road be lit in darkness all of the time or just in an 'emergency'?

Can the building be rotated by 90 degrees and put the car park against the Long Plantation to prevent HGVs queuing close to residents housing?

Request an assessment be calculated as to what proportion of traffic is arriving from the West and returning to the roads in the West.

Data provided by Highways England following a FOI request dated December 2020, shows that there were over 1100 hours of planned full closures of the A63 within 5km of the Melton junction during the calendar year of 2019 and over 3400 hours of part closures. How will HGV's reach the site when the A63 is closed? Is this issue correctly highlighted within the documents submitted?

## **NOISE**

Following on from a question raised on the evening, please confirm:

- Whether the background noise levels used for the noise report were taken during a period of abnormal background noise ?
- How the noise from the facility w compared to a 'quiet night'
- What conditions will cover noise levels applied to any planning permission?
- During the question time any issues raised about specific noise levels were answered by saying that the LPA would set a noise management plan which would set restrictions on noise that can be created – is that really going to be the case?
- What are the noise levels that are deemed acceptable at the edge of the site and in gardens and homes of residents?
- Will this be specifically conditioned?
- What is the Lmax impact on the ability of residents to sleep? Will conditions be applied that limit Lmax during the night time?

During the presentation it was quoted that only between 1 and 5% of vehicles will have audible reversing beepers, and therefore this would not be a noise issue. How will this be controlled and who is responsible to monitor and ensure that this noise will not be audible?

## **ECOLOGY**

- Who made the decision for bunding? Why do the bunds take up the vast majority of the open space area?
- During the presentation it was mentioned that 'more land for bio-diversity was being explored with the end user'. Where is this land and what is currently on it?
- Concern that the direct impact on the ancient woodland and removal of the veteran trees has not been correctly assessed by the applicant. What are the views of ERYC Trees and Landscape Officers in respect to the proposal? See comments from Woodland Trust in their review of the Planning Application
- Who is assessing the proximity of the bunding to the Long Plantation and the impact that this will have on the woodland?
- There are concerns that the light pollution from the site will also have a detrimental impact on the bats and other wildlife in the woodland. Has the harm to the bat life been fully assess and by whom? Does it include the light that will be reflected from the building into the woodland?

## **GENERAL**

Construction will take place over an 18-month period, however there were no details available for how this will be controlled or limited to maintain amenity.

We request a formal consultation of the Construction Management Plan with residents. Specific issues to be considered are around hours of operation, weekends and bank holidays, site lighting, method of piling, dust suppression/ elimination during excavation work and movement of existing bunds, security and welfare facilities.

We seek assurances that the ERYC can manage the impact of this site and protect the current amenities of residents – where is the funding for this to come from, the developer, the taxpayer, the

end user? Are there sufficient resources and an undertaking from Public Protection that this will be correctly overseen?

Will conditions applied to any planning permission be enforced with the associated legal costs? Current experience shows that this is a weakness within ERYC.

Some residents still have concerns over land contamination. Can ERYC review all data and give assurance to residents on this point?

The Employment and Training plan was mentioned several times; is that going to form part of the planning submission?

They referred to a traffic management plan and an operational plan. When will these be available?