

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SILSDEN TOWN COUNCIL FOR PLANNING HELD ON THURSDAY THE 20th April 2023

Commenced 7.33pm

Concluded 8.32pm

Present: Cllrs C Whitaker, Jessup, O'Dwyer, Croft, R Whitaker, Smith, Russell, Ford and Walton. Public [19].

Cllr Walton in the chair

1. Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Naylor, Rushworth and Edwards
2. Resolved to accept the reasons for apologies
3. No declaration of interest for items on this agenda
4. That the minutes of the finance and planning meeting on the 15th December 2022 were ratified
5. Public adjournment – 3 taken
6. Confirmed that Cllr O'Dwyer and Russell along side Ward Cllr C Whitaker will attend the panel meeting for The Willows.
7. To comment on the following planning applications
 - 23/O1261/HOU | Construction of 2 storey side extension and single storey rear extension | 27 Lower Park Green Silsden Keighley West Yorkshire BD20 9QE – No objection.
 - 23/OO013/FUL | Detached two bedroom dwelling with associated off street parking | Land At Grid Ref 404108 446502 Back Briggate Silsden Keighley West Yorkshire – No objection in principal but would request that the original information on their being 8 bird boxes and bat boxes is adhered to as further on in the documentation it refers to only 2. STC would also like to request that materials be change to natural Yorkshire stone, not cladding as this is adjacent to a conservations area. STC also support the comment made within the drainage report.
 - 23/OO829/MCF | Re-opening of Horn Crag Quarry for the purposes of releasing a proven locally distinctive building stone resource | Horn Crag Quarry Off Fishbeck Lane Silsden Keighley West Yorkshire – **Strong objection** :
Application forms states, 29,120 tonnes extracted per annum, this will be devastating to the area.
Transport Statement 1.3 says no Associated HGV movements through Silsden. So will the Quarry stop working if A6034 north is closed for any reason? And who will enforce this?
2.2 No choices are available only HGVs.
2.8 None of the positive contributions listed, will in fact contribute anything to Silsden, if the plan is allowed.
3.2 States Fishbeck lane is an un-adopted road, therefore it is not built to the required standard to withstand the constant use by HGVs, it will quickly become unusable by any vehicle, there is no mention of this road being brought up to highway standards before the operation starts or how it will be maintained after work starts.

3.8 States. At its eastern end, Fishbeck Lane emerges onto Brown Bank Lane, which is a rural, single carriageway road that runs in a general north-east to south-west direction and is maintained by the local Highway Authority.

Does B.M.D.C. believe the road has described above; is capable of surviving without significant upgrading; the passage of 582,400 tons of stone, and the eight wheeled HGVs which will be carrying it over the 20 years of this proposed site operation? We do not. So the cost of the work will have to be paid for by the rate payers of Bradford.

3.9 No mention of the drainage ditches which run down the sides of Brown Banks Lane. Brown Banks Lane could collapse into these ditches if any of these H.G.V.s had to move to the side to make way for another vehicle, or because this site is planned to be in operation for 20years the accumulative effect of this constant wear and tear inflicted by the 29,120 tonnes extracted per annum could cause the road to subside into the ditches, which would cause great expense to Bradford Council similar to that which has been required to upkeep the A6034 over Cringles.

3.18 No mention that the angle of the junction from Brown Bank Lane onto the A6034 is 130 degrees, therefore HGVs entering Brown Banks Lane will have to drive onto the right hand side of the road to get round the corner, in doing so they will cross the top of North St, causing potential conflict with vehicles trying to emerge, whose drivers are only looking right, and not expecting to meet traffic on their side of the road, also the traffic coming up the A6034 will come round the blind bend to be faced with an HGV facing them on their side of the road.

5.5 No allowance for meeting other vehicles (see also 6.7 which is a fabrication of the true impact) Appendix BGH1 the A6034 note conveniently hides the 130 degrees right turn out of and into the Junction with Brown banks lane.

Dust management Scheme

There has been no dust risk assessment undertaken. There are major concerns in particular with cilca particles which are dangerous to health – no mitigation can be found. The policing of the site is said to be the responsibility of the site manger , it is in a windy zone so would the site manager undertake to cease production every time the wind gets up.

6.2.1 Site manager's opinion! Profit will dictate what will happen more than what should be done.

6.3.2 Water bowser, and vehicle required to service portable toilets; not mentioned in the Transport plan, so extra vehicle, probably with many trips to refill bowser and the toilets with water.

Ecological Appraisal

Page 16 2.6 noise and vibration will significantly displace wildlife for the duration of the site which is estimated at 22 years – this if far longer than any of the wildlife known to use that habitat and thus essentially killing any chance for return after displacement. Page 19 and page 22 information is redacted and this council has ascertain from BMDC that this is because the protected species found there was so high risk that it could not go into the public domain.

The report is dismissive of the importance of habitats and species and down plays the number of important/protected species there for example its home to the Song Thrushes which are on the red list and to willow warblers, bullfinches and Dunnocks which are on the amber list.

Bat Survey has demonstrated a likely absence of roosts, during both the summer active season and across the hibernation period. Seasonal Activity Surveys have demonstrated that the Site is used by up to six species of bat, although this is heavily dominated by **common and soprano pipistrelle, and noctule.**

Activity was moderate during the spring period, with marked decreases seen in summer and again in autumn. Patterns of activity suggest that proposals to re-open the quarry face will have minimal impact on local bat populations, provided the habitats across the Site's western sector are largely avoided, as is proposed

Spring: Common pipistrelle and soprano pipistrelle make up most activity, Then Noctules, Brandt's bat, Daubenton's bat, and the Brown long-eared bat much less.

Summer: Common pipistrelle still very evident, but the Noctule is much more in evidence than the soprano pipistrelle, with much lower figures again for the Brandt's bat and Daubenton's bat. No Brown long-eared bats observed.

Autumn: Common pipistrelles and Noctules again the most in evidence. Much less but more than in spring or summer the Brandt's bat and soprano pipistrelle, and one single sighting of the Brown long-eared bat.

Brandt's Bat According to the Woodland Trust, Little is known about the population status of this species, but they **are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as well as being a European protected species.**

Daubenton's bat According to Wildlife Trust again, Conservation status, **Protected in the UK under the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981. European Protected Species under Annex IV of the European Habitats Directive.**

General

There are not consultee responses from either Yorkshire Water, or Footpaths, both these commented on the last application on this site.

Given the amount of water needed to excavate this site there are major concerns about the affect this would have on the water table and there appears to be not investigation into this matter

The application states that residents have been consulted with and offered an alternative water supply. Residents before the Town Council meeting have stated that no such consultation has taken place

Application states reopening but when it reopened in the 80s it was promptly closed by BMDC citing environmental impact and highways impact. Therefore this site has not actually been quarried for over 100 years .The 84 mile round trip from the site to Leyburn for processing is not sustainable travel.

The site itself is home to endangered birds, bats and other wildlife, it's our understanding there is even registered badger sets there.

Transport plan runs to close to new school, plan written 2021, and amendments do not give enough consideration to the new rules regarding safeguarding of vulnerable road users.

Local knowledge identifies several water springs that were affected during the brief reopening in the 80s and there are concerns for the affect within the natural water course and indeed the closeness of the site to the large main water pipe the runs though the adjacent field

There is no mention of any mitigation for light pollution, year round working will mean the site will be flood lit after the sun has set.

The amendments to the plans do not totally mitigate the possibility of contamination of ground water, both for nearby residents or the run off which will find its way into Silsden reservoir.

Saturday morning working from 8am till 1pm with associated noise and pollution is not acceptable

STC strongly believe this site cannot be monitored and cannot adhere to the conditions laid out in the application and that approval should absolutely not be given.

8. Confirmed the date of the next planning meeting as 18th My 2023

.....
Chair
18/05/2023