

From: Mark Hill
To:
Bcc: [Chris France](#); [Andrew Muir](#); [Hilary Saunders](#)
Subject: Former Sea View scrapyard raw - planning application for industrial use. ref nym2018_0770
Date: 23 January 2019 10:29:24

Gemma, good morning.

Having revisited the site and appraised the application information there are a number of queries I have before I can prepare a planning report and recommendation and would like your comments/additional information. These are :

1. The application forms seek 3 no buildings however it is apparent from my site visit there are 4 new buildings as shown on your plans ,please confirm the application relates to retention of the four recently constructed buildings and the retention of an existing building at the site. Please confirm what the long standing building is to be used for ?
2. The application plan indicate the siting of seven container structures to be used for Use Class B8 storage however at my site visit I saw dozens of containers at the site which indicates a scale of use way beyond that discussed in pre-application discussions and what is envisaged by you client , please clarify.
3. The site appears to be being laid out for considerable additional outside storage of : cars, HGV vehicles, commercial vehicles, caravans, boats, building materials, fishing equipment, none of which is shown or described in the application information or discussed at pre-application stage, please clarify.
4. There are no landscaping proposals to reinforce the various gaps in the landscaping around the site, this was agreed as a reasonable benefit within any planning application at the pre-application stage and look forward to receiving details showing how the appearance of the site is to be improved in recognition of the nationally protect landscape setting of the site.
5. The application forms state there is no suspected land contamination at the site. Given the former scarp yard use , I consider it is untenable to suggest there is no risk of land contamination and would be grateful if you could take steps to have this risk and mitigation assessed and submitted.
6. The submitted plans indicate food preparation, presence of 10 employees with four buildings and the foul drainage arrangements are advised as 'unknown'. Avoiding the pollution of water courses especially where there are no public sewers is an important planning consideration(especially close to an ecology protected site) and I would be grateful to receive details of how the foul drainage from the site is to be dealt with properly.
7. The site is located outside any settlement where the Authority is keen to prevent 'light pollution' , please can you clarify there is no intention to provide any external lighting at the site.
8. I am waiting to hear whether there are any air/odour concerns from the SBC Environmental Health officer which could require improved air scrubbing equipment or from the Local highway authority (NYCC) in case they feel additional passing places between the site and A171 are needed

I look forward to hearing from you.

By way of an update on the consultation responses I have received:
Hackness & Harwoodale Parish Council – no comments.

Natural England – draw attention to the proximity of the site to European protected site and refer to their standing guidance to mitigate against any ecological impacts and does tie in with the foul drainage concerns mentioned above.

NYM Area Ranger is keen to ensure there is no impact on the PROW which passes across the access to the site.

Fylingdales Parish Council are supportive but note disturbance to locals should be avoided and there are some concerns about land contamination.

Regards.

Mark Hill