

ISH2 Written summaries of East Riding of Yorkshire Council's oral submission

Highways

- There has been no change in ERYC's position on the use of Park Lane.
- The September 2020 traffic data is all that ERYC have available and that is why it is being relied upon, as there is no alternative. It is acknowledged that this could have changed in this time however we do not have data to support this.
- Unable to explain why the vehicle movements associated with a consented battery storage scheme at Creyke Beck were considered acceptable at that time. There have however been a number of complaints and road safety matters as a result of the construction of this development. The construction of this development is now complete. There have been a number of incidents during the time of the construction phase of this development however it is difficult to understand if it was specifically related to that development.
- The Council consider the use of Park Lane for the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
- The restricted hours for use of Park Lane between 9:30am and 3:00pm would mitigate the impact to some extent however would not fully alleviate our concerns.
- Mitigation suggested by ERYC would be to use an alternative access, such as those pending planning permission from the A1079, should Park Lane be accepted for use for the ExA, additional passing places, temporary traffic Regulation orders and parking restrictions should be considered.
- Confirmation that with the exception of the consented Hornsea Four DCO which is understood to have been shelved, the three planning applications which all involve the same access from the A1079 (being the access included in the Hornsea Four DCO) are all still pending decisions in which it is likely to be another few weeks before these are determined.
- Confirm that there are currently no restriction on HGV's along Park Lane.
- There have been 17 recorded injury collisions along the route of Park Lane, resulting in 18 casualties. 3 serious, 15 slight. Of these, 5 were motorcycle riders, 4 cycle riders and 3 pedestrians. So the majority vulnerable road users.

Noise and Vibration

- Confirmed that ERYC Environmental Health Officer is satisfied with the additional/amended information and the explanation provided by the applicant's team.

Land, Soil and Groundwater

- Lead Local Flood Authority confirmed they were satisfied with the Flood Risk Assessment.

Health and Safety

- No comments.

Landscape and Visual

- Concerns relate to weather temporary lighting will be required during construction. Acknowledge that working hours would not exceed 7pm however in the winter months there is darkness from 4pm. Therefore, any lighting required during this period should be considered, including vehicle movements. Whilst the effect in isolation may be of minor, we must be conscious of all the landscape and visual effects aggregated, including nighttime ones.
- Question if earliest feasible apply to all planting or to specific areas. ERYC were satisfied with the applicants response.
- A review of the SoCG is required to provide clarity/confirmation on the matter of planting as ERYC maintain the view that further planting is required in places.

Heritage

- Church of St Margaret – The level of harm on this asset identified by ERYC is low, which would be further mitigated by appropriate planting and landscaping. There is therefore a minor difference from the conclusions of the applicant which identified no harm. ERYC are however satisfied that no further assessment is necessary to be undertaken.
- On 20th October the matter on the passing place opposite Meaux Abbey Farm within the SoCG was agreed by ERYC.
- Site of the Meaux Cistercian Abbey – It is appreciated that the increased landscape buffer at the northern edge of area F and the existing hedgerows, will considerably minimise the impact. Whilst ERYC do not fully agree with the Applicants conclusion that there would be no change, no effect, and no impact

on the significance, we would place this as being a low level of change, a low level of effect and a low, less than substantial impact on its significance.

- Wawne Grange – The level of harm caused would be less than substantial, falling at the low to mid-point of the spectrum of impact covered by Paragraph 215 of the NPPF. We therefore also generally agree with the conclusions drawn by the applicant's heritage specialist in table 9-8 of the ES on Cultural Heritage, although we would place the level of impact as being marginally higher.

Biodiversity

- With regards to Category B trees, the disagreement between ERYC and the application is mostly based on the fact that it has not been discussed following the submission of the local impact report. ERYC accept that quite a lot of the category B trees are shrub groups, and so that lessens the impact because the mitigation planting will be functioning faster than if it were for mature tree groups. There is commitment to crown lifting and pruning rather than removal where possible which is welcomed. A slight update to the impact assessment at 4.3 of the arboriculture report would be appreciated. Tree cover in the Authority area is low given the vast expanses of arable, so trees do form a very important landscape feature and ecological feature as a whole, where we have them in the East Riding.

Other Matters

- There is slight conflict with the certain parts of policies of the Local Plan however ERYC maintain that when read as a whole, the development is compliant with the local plan.