



Redbourne Parish Council

Andy Hopkins – Parish Clerk
2 School Lane, Snitterby, DN21 4TS
clerk@redbourneparishcouncil.gov.uk
www.redbourneparishcouncil.gov.uk

**Minutes of the Extraordinary Council Meeting of Redbourne Parish Council held on:
Thursday 4 August 2022 18:30 at St Andrews Church, Redbourne.**

Present: Chair Cllr Lynn Wainwright, Cllr Judy Brown, Cllr Geoff Hawley, Cllr Pauline Hawley, Cllr Phil Hotham & Cllr Penny Stevenson

Andy Hopkins – Parish Clerk

Public Participation

There were 17 members of the public present, who were allowed to speak during the course of the planning item

22/23 – 028

Apologies

To note apologies for absence

Ward Councillors Cllrs England, Foster & Poole

22/23 – 029

Declaration of Interest

To record declarations of interest by any member of the council in respect of the agenda items listed below. Members declaring interests should identify the agenda item and type of interest being declared

There were none

To note any dispensations granted to any member of the council in respect of the agenda items listed below

There were none

22/23 – 030

Planning

The Council **resolved** to drop out of Standing Orders to let members of the public speak on the following item.

Cllr Wainwright introduced the following planning applications and raised concerns of the over industrialisation of the airfield.

PA/2022/1282

Proposed Development Planning permission for a temporary change of use for the storage of prefabricated units

Site Location Hibaldstow Airfield, Redbourne Road,
Hibaldstow, DN20 9NN

And

PA/2022/1294

Proposed Development Planning permission for a temporary change of use for the storage of prefabricated units

Site Location Storage Land, Slate House Farm, Redbourne Road,
Hibaldstow, DN20 9NN

Cllr Wainwright read out a statement from Mr Ralph Day, who was unable to attend the meeting. The key points were:

1. It is a **temporary** planning permission sought for 3 years
2. There is **already a precedent** for the storage of modular buildings on the site as per the granting of planning permission PA/2021/1110
3. There are **no permanent structures** involved
4. There is **no noticeable noise** produced from this storage activity
5. The modular **low-energy homes** being temporarily stored are:
 - Helping the government achieve its target of building 300,000 homes /year to solve the UK's acute housing shortage by the mid 2020's
 - Highly insulated compared to the majority of UK housing stock and have been designed to help the government achieve being a low carbon economy by 2050

In addition, to this there were comments stating how the applicant had made positive impacts on the village.

Mr Robert Borrill addressed the meeting. He pointed out that the use of the airfield was not a new concept, it had been used for storing pipes for the North Sea, by Highways for stone and lampposts, and the Police as a skid pad.

There was a high demand for the use of hardstanding and to not use agricultural land. Mr Borrill said that he always considered the impacts on the village and that he had turned down requests before for the site because of the possible negative effects.

He stated the storage of the units was being done, following Government policy, as support for farmers was due to end. There were already more units on site than approved, hence the new application and was part of the Governments drive to provide sustainable housing.

Cllr Wainwright highlighted concerns that Top Hat (the company storing the units) had filed a £21.3m loss last year, several other modular construction companies had also filed losses. What would happen to the units on the airfield if the company was to go into liquidation. Who would clear the site? This had happened in a previous venture by the applicants leaving the taxpayer and council to pay to clear the site which had become a fire risk. Nick Burton (Top hat representative) said this would not happen as they were expensive units and would always find a buyer.

Cllr Wainwright cited an article in the Times concerning the inability of the national grid to provide electricity for new homes, some boroughs in London have ceased building new homes until 2035 - the National Home Builders Federation have suggested this may spread to further areas of the country - would this not affect sales of these units and leave them indefinitely stored at Hibaldstow? Nick Burton (Top Hat representative) said he was unaware of this and couldn't comment.

Mr Nick Burton who was representing the site said that a number of units should have gone directly to site but had ended up at the airfield and that 140 were due off site soon. When asked why they had selected this site and not another closer to the Factory in Hull or to the South of England where the units would mostly be going, closer to the national road network, Nick Burton stated it was the only suitable site. When asked why that was the case and what others had been looked at, he said it was the only one flat enough but did not say if other sites had been considered.

There was confusion as to why units would be produced if there was no demand. Nick Burton stated there was a demand but because of Covid, delays prevented the permanent siting of the units. They couldn't stop production at the factory line hence the reason why there were so many units being stored more than the 60 on the planning application. Mr Burton was asked how many units would be stored on the airfield at any one time. He reiterated 140 units would be going in the next few days but when asked again how many in total would be on the airfield at any one time, he didn't give an answer. It was stated that 18 months was the longest anything had been stored there. Residents asked why the East side of the runway had been used for storage when it clearly posed a hazard to the Airfield operation and was in close proximity of a gas production site, The Biomass, concerns were raised about the fire hazard and the possibility of noxious fumes from the plastic in which the units were covered. The Parish Council had requested a meeting with NLC Head of Planning raising concerns at the blatant disregard of imposed conditions, as a result the Enforcement Officer was called to site. Yet the units are still being stored there without any supporting planning application. Nick Burton reiterated 140 units would be moved in the next few days but did not say if this would be from the East side of the runway.

Residents had contacted Humberside Fire and Rescue who still thought only 60 units were on site. They would not have known the correct number of appliances to send. They have now updated their records to reflect the larger volume of Units and submitted their requirements for Safety of the site to NLC planning office. Mr Burton claimed they had done a risk assessment and there were fire hydrants at every 5 metres on site. He was asked why safety assessments had not been submitted with the applications. Mr Burton did not comment but Mr Borrill said anyone could come view on site to see the safety measures and he took on board the point they should have kept Humberside Fire updated on the number of units.

Residents made a number of points:

Deliveries were being made onsite outside of the conditions placed on the application - 08:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday. There was noise and activity reported after 23:00 on several nights with use of Flood lighting and movement of the units and of the digestate. This had previously been stored on the airfield and needed to move to make room for the units. Wide loads were blocking traffic on Redbourne Mere and the B1206 through Redbourne. Nick Burton advised wide loads could only travel at escorted times and these were often out of working hours. Cllr Stevenson made the point that they would be unable to comply with the Planning permissions if that was the case. Nick Burton did not comment.

There were 250 units on site and only 60 were approved, and the planning applications only came in after Enforcement got involved.

The airfield has Biomass that makes a smell, and the units cause a visible issue for the Community, and no one in the Village was benefitting from developments at the airfield.

Concerns over safe movement of tractors in the Biomass which is a gas plant. Concerns over the moving of digestate and storing it on a Nitrate sensitive flood plain. Impact to the water supply, environment and farming. No comment made

Why were Mr Day and Mr Borrill not adhering to the correct planning application processes.

The owner of Skydive stated that he had serious concerns over safe operation due to the storage of units on the east side of the airfield. No comments were made by the applicant

It was asked if some sort of camouflage be used if planning permission was given and it was said that this could be investigated.

It was asked why it was being classed as a Brownfield site in the application when it wasn't, it was said that they were led to believe it was by their consultant.

Residents stated regardless of the size of the units they were an eyesore and a visual intrusion on the open countryside and should not be stored there.

Control was needed over what was going on at the area and sticking to approvals.

The Hibaldstow side had been given screening, but not the Redbourne side.

After asking Cllr Wainwright if there was anything else they could assist with, Mr Borrill and Burton left the meeting. Cllr Wainwright thanked them for attending.

Residents were asked to raise their objections to the applications on the NLC Planning portal and consider writing to their MP.

Cllr Wainwright summarised that many of the questions remained to be answered and then went onto outline the Parish Councils objection. It was **resolved** that the Council **objects** to both applications and that the draft objection letter be forwarded to planning.

22/23 – 031

Date and time of the next meeting

- 06 September 2022

Signed _____ Position _____ Date _____