

**Initial Comments regarding Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation document for Site M29 (Lumby)**

As a resident of Lumby I represent myself and some other residents of Lumby, known collectively as the PLANET group, some of whom have already written to NYCC to object to the Quarry application.

They have received neither notice of this meeting nor a copy of the consultation document. We intend to produce a full rebuttal of the application so would appreciate a timetable of the dates and events through to the final decision to enable us to fully engage in the process.

Other members of the Lumby community may also wish to consider objecting to the proposal.

At this stage, regarding the consultation document, given the short time since receipt, I would like to make the following brief comments.

1. There is a need to demonstrate that any additional capacity for magnesium limestone is required in NYCC as demand for crushed rock is reducing in this region.
2. Specific comments re 'Accessibility and Travel Issues' section:

The use/replication of the existing access to the contractor's compound is not relevant because the whole site exists only under a Private Finance Initiative (PFI) planning approval which was allowed to support the A1(M) project. Such approvals are temporary and exist only to support the PFI.

According to the contractor, as stated in a site meeting on 5 September (which included Leader of Selby DC, Head of Planning at Selby DC, Legal Services, Selby DC, Environmental Health Selby DC), the site will be returned to agricultural use by end December 2006, as the cause of the latest delay has now been resolved.. At this time a completion certificate for the project will be issued (ie before the NYCC Minerals decision is finalised).

The contractor also stated in the meeting that the site exit and clearance was to commence in October 2006. In this meeting I showed the contractor the following text as an indication of what was required:

“ The sites are cleared of all infrastructure, including:

- Fencing, lights, offices, tarmac, concrete hardstanding, access roads, utility supplies, sheds, plant & equipment.
- The A63 access is removed and restored to blend with the line of the footpath, by installation of kerbs and footpath.
- All caravans are removed.
- Topsoil is laid over the site.
- The site is fully restored to the original greenbelt condition. “

The contractor's representative (Mr Snart), agreed with this definition

Consequently,

- a. As no Selby DC planning approval exists for the site beyond its use as part of the A1(M) construction project termination which starts in October 2006 to terminate by end December 2006 according to the contractor, reference to the facility as the basis for comparison in support of a quarry or the assumption that any part of the site infrastructure will exist should not form part of this application process.
- b. Furthermore, mention of vehicle movement from the quarry site of 80 vehicles a day being compared with the current contractor's 250-300 movements a day is again misleading as the site will not exist at the time of the decision. The real comparison is therefore to 80 from zero.

Finally, it is suggested that the statements of inaccurate information and their use in support of this quarry proposal should cause this application to be rejected at this early stage in the process.