



[www.tockwith.gov.uk](http://www.tockwith.gov.uk)

---

## Tockwith with Wilstrop Parish Council North Yorkshire

Chairman - Cllr C Saunders JP  
17 Westfield Road  
Tockwith  
North Yorkshire  
YO26 7PY

*e-mail: [chairman@tockwith.gov.uk](mailto:chairman@tockwith.gov.uk)*

Clerk to the Council - Mrs G M Firth  
Green Ridge  
Tockwith Lane  
Cowthorpe  
North Yorkshire LS22 5EZ

*e-mail: [parish.clerk@tockwith.gov.uk](mailto:parish.clerk@tockwith.gov.uk)*

---

Ms Victoria Perkin,  
Planning Services,  
Trading Standards and Planning Services,  
North Yorkshire County Council,  
County Hall,  
Northallerton,  
DL7 8AH

29<sup>th</sup> May 2009

Dear Victoria,

[NY/2009/0176/FUL](#)

Demolition of existing warehouse and erection of energy from waste facility with associated air cooled condensers and chimney stack, provision of new weighbridge, drum store, electricity sub-station, new means of enclosure and access gates, car parking and landscaping at 86, Marston Business Park, Tockwith

Following last night's extra-ordinary meeting of the Parish Council I write to **OBJECT STRONGLY** to the above planning application on the following grounds:-

- The proposal does **NOT** accord with **North Yorkshire County Council's Minerals and Waste Development Framework Core Strategy** as it involves the burning of municipal and hazardous waste. At a Public Examination by an Inspector in 2008 it was found that there was no evidence to support incineration as a viable means of disposing of waste. It is stated that there is no specific reason for new technologies and new facilities are not required. It lists at 13.2 the things the Waste Planning Authority needs to be satisfied about when determining a planning application. This proposal is against each of the points a) to h). "The County Council will need to be satisfied that:-  
a) siting and scale is appropriate to its location; b) proposed method and scheme of working would minimize the impact of the proposal; c) there would not be an unacceptable environmental impact; d) there would not be an unacceptable cumulative impact on the local area; e) the landscaping and screening have been designed to adequately screen the proposal in a way that is sympathetic to local landscape character; f) where appropriate, adequate provision is made for the restoration, aftercare and management of the site to an agreed afteruse; g) the proposed transport links are adequate to serve the development and h) other environmental and amenity safeguards would effectively mitigate the impact of the proposal."

- The site is **unallocated** in the **Waste Site Allocations Development Plan Document**, “which helps to implement the spatial vision, strategic objectives and core policies set out in the Core Strategy DPD”, **as a Preferred Option** and, indeed, a site on the west side of Rudgate, further away from Tockwith village and sensitive receptors was **discounted as unsuitable by the County Council** on grounds of “high adverse landscape or visual effects likely and poor accessibility”. “The Waste Site Allocations DPD will therefore establish the suitability in principle of sites for a range of waste related developments.”
- The site was NOT put forward for allocation for waste treatment use, so it should not be allocated for this use in the Waste Plan. No application has been made for the site to be allocated for waste treatment use.
- Waste management principles state that burning waste is not “the best practicable environmental option”. The proposals will be of no significant help in the ‘waste hierarchy’ and will not encourage more recycling of waste.
- Land use planning policies on waste treatment and disposal state that “the principle of sustainable development is to protect the environment and human health.”
- Important in the consideration of waste management is the issue of NEED based on: Existing waste flows and volumes; identification of waste catchment area affected and source of waste; existing provision of facilities dealing with specific waste streams; assumptions on waste management and patterns; assumptions on waste growth over appropriate time periods and predictions on identified shortfall in capacity over appropriate time periods.
- The main planning considerations associated with thermal treatment plants, according to Government Planning Policy Statements, especially PPS 10, are; Scale of proposals; Air quality; Noise; Dust/Odour; Affect on Water resources; Litter; Residential Amenity issues; Traffic and Visual impacts. “A range of urban or urban fringe sites may be suitable” PPS 10 states that “the primary aim is to guard against new or increased hazards caused by development. The most important types of development in this respect include facilities intended for the handling, compaction, treatment or disposal of household or commercial wastes.”

The Parish Council’s objection with reference to the above criteria is:

1. LOSS OF AMENITY to adjacent businesses on the Business Park, some of which are involved in food and pharmaceutical operations and are therefore sensitive receptors, with potential loss of economic viability and ensuing loss of jobs in the rural economy.

2. LOSS OF AMENITY TO TOCKWITH VILLAGE:-

a) SCALE of the proposal is inappropriate in this location, in a rural area adjacent to a residential area and Primary School. There would be an unacceptable environmental impact

b) VISUAL – the 31m high chimney stack, with its’ plume of waste gases, would be highly visible from the village and Conservation Area, the neighbouring residential estate and the Primary School. The local area in the Vale of York is a flat landscape and such an obtrusive element in the landscape would not be acceptable. At present there is no screening to prevent open sight of the Business Park and landscaping measures would take many years to mature.

b) EMISSIONS – would have a severe impact on the lives/health of local residents and businesses because the prevailing winds are from the west/southwest. The village has a lot of ‘inversions’, local chimneys are fluted to prevent downdraughts. The effect of pollution on surrounding agricultural land is un-measurable, the cumulative effects over time can only be guessed at.

c) NOISE – 24/7 operations would be clearly audible to local residents. The new technology used for the condenser fans is unproven and noise of reversing vehicles, opening and shutting of doors, noise from the ‘burning’ operation would all impact on the village, especially at night-time when ambient noise levels are reduced.

d) SMELLS – stockpiling of waste to allow the plant to operate would produce unacceptable smells in the locality

e) **TRAFFIC IMPACT** – the County Council has already stated that the locality has “poor accessibility”. Rudgate, off a B road and not easily accessible from the major road network, is an unclassified road, already eroded and degraded by the current volume of traffic. It is unacceptable to suggest that the traffic generated by the proposals will not have a detrimental effect on road safety.

f) **WATER COURSES** – all run off from the site will eventually find its way into Fleet Beck. No matter how ‘diluted’ this may be it is not acceptable.

g) **EMERGENCY SERVICES** – there is concern that a remote rural locality is unsuitable for such an operation due to the site being far away from cover by Emergency Services in case of accident or emergency arising.

With regard to the claimed benefits of District Heating and use of energy produced by the plant when in operation, there are no details in the plans about how this will be accomplished or even if it would be financially viable.

Until plans have been agreed with the Electricity Company and other major Utility Services there is no guarantee that these ‘benefits’ will ever happen.

It is understood that North Yorkshire County Council has already planned for where the majority of municipal waste from the County will be dealt with. To suggest, therefore, that this ‘windfall’ site, comparatively close to Allerton, the County’s preferred option, would assist the County Council in meeting targets to dispose of municipal waste is inaccurate/misleading.

If only industrial/commercial waste and hazardous waste is likely to be disposed of at Tockwith this gives even greater cause for concern.

The proximity principle cannot apply in this case as there is no definite answer to where the municipal waste will come from. The hazardous waste will be, as now, transported over long distances, viz. the press release from BCB announcing that they had won a contract to dispose of such waste from a paint factory in Liverpool.

Also onward disposal of residues is not addressed in the proposals.

**Sustainable Waste Management** – The overall objective of Government Policy on waste, as set out in the strategy for sustainable development, PPS 10 Annex A, is to protect human health and the environment by producing less waste and by using it as a resource wherever possible. Through more sustainable waste management, moving the management of waste up the ‘waste hierarchy’ of reduction, re-use, recycling and composting, using waste as a source of energy, **and only disposing as a last resort** the Government aims to break the link between economic growth and the environmental impact of waste.

**Positive planning** – by providing opportunities for new waste management facilities **of the right type, in the right place and at the right time.**

The Parish Council earnestly requests that these objections are made known to the councillors who will ultimately determine the application.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs G M Firth  
Clerk to the Council

cc. Miss Anne McIntosh MP, Cllr Savage, the Environment Agency, Harrogate Borough Council, Marston Moor Internal Drainage Board, local Parish Councils, Tockwith Residents’ Association.