

Bagby & Balk Parish Councils Response to the amended application.

The response should not be taken to mean that BBPC accepts that the consultation is meaningful – it is not, for the following very good reasons.

1. Unconditional planning approval cannot be granted for the Hangar B and the fuel facility retrospective applications that HDC wrongly consider amount to mere “amendments”. Inspectors have found against both of these developments in the past and HDC have conceded that this is the case. It is pointless to put the application before the Committee when it can’t approve the application.

2. Conditional approval is equally impossible unless meaningful conditions accompanying the application satisfy six stringent tests. These six tests are not met in relation to the fuel facility anymore now than when they were considered by the Inspector who rejected the conditions. Conditions are not even proposed in relation to Hangar B. Again, such an application is pointless as it can’t be approved.

3. The application has no business plan – yet another cause for rejection by the Committee in the past.

4. The application (and EIA) is silent on the impact of no less than 11 separate breaches of planning that HDC is investigating. BBPC cannot properly comment or be consulted meaningfully on significant development that is omitted from the application

5. It follows that the application and consultation is pointless – no approval can be given to it as it stands and the consultation exercise is meaningless as the proposal is incomplete and does not give a true baseline for comments by interested parties

HDC needs to go back to the drawing board and do the following :-

1. Issue enforcement notices in respect of all 11 breaches .

2. If these enforcements result in more retrospective applications, then the whole package cannot conceivably be treated as an amendment. Instead, it should be the subject of a new application with a new EIA in which the entire cumulative impact of the far reaching move to a full commercial use can be assessed properly.

HDC having let residents down so badly in the past must do this at the very least. Where it does not exercise primary responsibility (e.g safety, and licensing arrangements for the fuel facilities and pollution issues) HDC should be urging those bodies who are responsible to use all powers at their disposal to clarify and regularise the highly unsatisfactory position at the airfield.

Regards

Chris Augur Chairman Bagby and Balk PC