

# Arkendale, Coneythorpe & Clareton Parish Council

Minutes of the meeting of the Parish Council held on Monday 26<sup>th</sup> July 2010 at 7.30 p.m.  
in Arkendale Memorial Hall

**Present:** Mr P Topham (Chairman), Mrs A Cuthbert, Mr P Houseman and Mrs S Shipman.

**In Attendance:** Mrs Z Hopps (Clerk).

Also present were eighteen members of the public.

2010.40 **Apologies for absence** were accepted from Cllr D Smith. County Councillor John Watson and Harrogate Borough Councillor Anthony Alton also sent their apologies.

2010.41 **Declarations of Interest.** None.

2010.42 **Minutes of the previous meetings** held on Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> May 2010, having been previously circulated were approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

2010.43 **Public Participation.** Members of the public expressed concerns about the proposals to build a Waste Recovery Park at Allerton Quarry, which would include an 'Energy from Waste' plant (an incinerator). Contributions from the floor dealt with issues such as noise and light pollution, the possible effects on levels of kerbside recycling collections and traffic movements, as well as serious concerns expressed about the incinerator itself. After everyone who wished to do so had spoken, the Chairman thanked them for their contributions to the debate.

2010.44 **Planning applications dealt with between meetings.** It was noted that the following application was considered under the provisions of Council Standing Order No 32(c):

2010.44.1 Field House, Arkendale, Knaresborough, HG5 0QU. Erection of two storey side extension and front porch. No objections.

2010.45 **Allerton Waste Recovery Park – request for scoping opinion.**

It was noted that AmeyCespa, the preferred bidder, has started a process of consultations with the local community. The meeting received brief reports from public meetings recently held at Marton cum Grafton, Whixley and Great Ouseburn.

The Chairman explained what issues should be considered when forming a response to the consultation from North Yorkshire County Council. The request from NYCC is for comments on the scope of what issues should be covered in the Environmental Impact Statement required on the proposed Waste Recovery Park.

It was agreed that the Parish Council should respond to the consultation as follows:

*"1. Introductory remarks.*

*The Parish Council would like to express its concerns about the financial impact of the proposed development on the ratepayers of North Yorkshire. While it is appreciated that this scoping request only covers items connected with an Environmental Impact Assessment, it is noted that in the Scoping Report dated June 2010, the developer states (p3) that "if [the present level of landfill use] continues, over the next 25 years, the cost of landfilling will reach an estimated £1.8 billion...[which] could mean a 15% rise in council tax".*

*There are a lot of assumptions in that statement which the Parish Council challenges. Local residents are questioning why, in the current economic climate, such a controversial scheme of £1.4bn be undertaken when cutbacks are being implemented elsewhere. If the County and Borough Councils put more effort into promoting and enabling recycling, and if more emphasis was put on the reduction of packaging and other waste by supermarkets and other suppliers, then the predicted levels of landfill will not be reached. The Parish Council is concerned that the developer will in fact, from day one, take large amounts of commercial and other waste in order to keep its throughput up to required levels, because the assumptions behind predicted levels of household waste are wrong.*

*2. It is understood that the proposal for this site is to only deal with North Yorkshire's waste - but the Parish Council is concerned that the contract terms and conditions may be varied in future to allow waste from further afield to be brought to the site, because North Yorkshire will not in fact produce*

# Arkendale, Coneythorpe & Clareton Parish Council

*the quantities predicted. Shipping waste in from other counties will obviously have a massive environmental impact on the road network and surrounding areas. Any contractual restrictions on shipping in waste from outside North Yorkshire should be made more clear.*

*3. Consideration of alternatives. What alternatives were considered? On p34 the developer states that Chapter 15 will detail how other sites have been investigated, but this is only in the context of this type of "Recovery Park". The Parish Council would like more detail on alternative technologies that avoid incineration, and wishes to see evidence of what those alternative technologies could achieve.*

*4. Planning History. The original planning permission for the quarry was only granted on the clear commitment that the land would be restored and landscaped. Successive planning consents have reinforced this requirement, and yet this new application would remove that obligation. The Parish Council is concerned that if such a planning requirement can be removed then any planning requirements associated with this development could also similarly be removed in future. What restrictions will be put in place to prevent future industrial enlargement and development of the site and ribbon development along the A168? And what faith can be put in any such restrictions?*

*5. Surrounding Land Uses. At the risk of stating the blindingly obvious, Allerton Castle (Grade 1), Allerton Folly (Grade 2) and Allerton Park and Garden (Grade 2) are all listed structures. The Scoping Report talks about recreating a hill and planting woodland, but these landscape mitigation measures proposed are purely "add on or cosmetic" landscape measures to remedy the adverse effects of the building and are not likely to be successful because they do not address the wider landscape harm and address the wider public concerns surrounding this development, they only attempt to hide the development. It will not be hidden and will cause harm to these listed structures and the wider surrounding landscape, and the Parish Council considers that this should be acknowledged.*

*6. Noise. The Parish Council wishes to see more information about predicted noise levels, particularly from the mechanical treatment, and comparisons with current levels, particularly at night.*

*7. Light. Light pollution is an issue locally and the Parish Council would like to see commitments to a lighting system that is designed to avoid any dome effect.*

*8. Power. The electricity generated will be going through to the Coneythorpe substation. If the current cabling is used, or an additional cable follows the line currently used, it will be less than 10 metres from Clareton residences. What implications will there be for the health of the residents because of increased magnetic levels etc.*

*9. Outputs. The Parish Council wishes to see a breakdown of the predicted 120 vehicle movements a day, and also wishes to see an analysis of expected road traffic on the A59 associated with this development. The construction phase should also be included in these traffic predictions as the Parish Council considers that the period of construction will create many more vehicle movements to the site. Has consideration been given to particular times of increased traffic flow locally, such as the Great Yorkshire Show in Harrogate? Has consideration been given to the predicted increases in traffic locally when the new hotel development at Flaxby Golf Course is completed? The Parish Council would like analysis of the carbon footprint of all the construction machines, trucks, employees' vehicles, etc and that is before all the vehicle movements when the incinerator is complete. Seventy employees will all need transport to get to the site as there is no public transport.*

*10. The Parish Council is concerned about the proposed use of the bottom ash and wishes to see further detail given about how much bottom ash will be created at the end of the process, and what will happen to it, and any alternatives uses to which it would be put if the primary use (in road construction) did not go ahead.*

*11. The Parish Council disputes the figure of only 1,200 people living in the impact area (p30 of the Scoping Report) - the parishes of Marton cum Grafton and Great Ouseburn both have populations of over 500, Whixley is over 700 and this Parish Council a population of nearly 400 (all 2001 Census*

# Arkendale, Coneythorpe & Clareton Parish Council

figures) - this is before you include other local parishes and the town of Boroughbridge which is just 10 minutes away from the site. The Parish Council also disputes the implication that because the area is "sparsely populated" then somehow it is OK to go ahead with this project. This development will have an adverse impact on the farming economy and the more general rural economy locally, as people are driven away from local villages by the creation of such a large and visible industrial plant on their doorstep.

12. *The impact on other recycling schemes. The Parish Council is concerned that this scheme is being promoted as recycling most of what it receives, and that this will give residents of North Yorkshire the belief that they do not have to bother to recycle their own household waste for kerbside collection. In fact only a small percentage of waste will be recycled. Although the Scoping Report (p9) states that the development will recycle 11,500 tonnes of plastic, paper and metals, even that figure includes a reject stream (not quantified) for disposal to landfill. The vast majority of the waste entering the site (up to a maximum of 500,000 tonnes per annum) will either be fed through the anaerobic digester and then sent to the incinerator or sent directly to the incinerator. More detail is required on all these figures, and information should be given about what other measures are going to be taken to improve overall recycling rates in North Yorkshire."*

Lastly, it was agreed that it would be a good idea if all North Yorkshire County Councillors were invited to visit the village and the proposed site of the Waste Recovery Park before their vote on the issue in October. This matter to be discussed further at the next Parish Council meeting.

2010.46 **Participatory Budgeting** (minute 2010.32 refers). The Chairman informed members about the Age Concern 'taster sessions' for using computers, and it was agreed that this would be a good idea for the scheme. It was agreed that Cllr Shipman would provide the Chairman with some more background information, and that he would contact Mr Bill Cross (Rural Action Yorkshire) to further develop the project.

2010.47 **Statement of accounts for the period 1<sup>st</sup> April 2010 – 30<sup>th</sup> June 2010.** The statement of accounts for the current year was noted and the following payments approved (copy appended to the minutes):

P2/10	James Mackman (internal audit)	80.00
P4/10	Zurich (insurance)	205.00
P5/10	Arkendale Village Hall (hire charge)	18.00

2010.48 **Correspondence received.**

2010.48.1 HBC Consultation meetings – timetable for 2010/11. Noted.

2010.49 **Matters for inclusion on the next Agenda** include the condition of roads, grasscutting contracts and the date of the talk from the dogwarden.

2010.50 **Date and Time of next meeting.** It was confirmed that the next meeting of the Council would be held on Monday 20<sup>th</sup> September 2010, in the Village Hall, Arkendale.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 9.00 p.m.