

Dear NYCC,

I would like you to answer a serious matter of concern regarding traffic movement related to the test frack at KM8. I present as my framework for consideration NYCCs' Key Objective 10: Protecting local communities, businesses and visitors from the impacts of development including transport. '

Though the evidence I offer may seem trivial for 'just one test frack', it's just the opposite, it's the only objective data we have. All responsible agents and authorities are presently contemplating how to extrapolate these traffic impact considerations across the county's road network. NYCC must take on these facts if planning consent and related traffic management is to be fit for purpose. A specific point of note is the unconventional nature of the contents, and the extra considerations necessary to ensure due precautions are taken, and preparations are made.

At present multiple lorry movements and convoys pass through my hometown of Kirkbymoorside. With no control, consideration for school runs, town centre congestion, and alarmingly no honesty from Third Energy.

Kirkbymoorside Town Council raised a point about traffic movements to Third Energy and were assured that 'there were no plans to move lorries along the A170 through Kirkbymoorside'. This point was raised due to recorded sightings along this road, sighted in Nawton just after the morning school run. Only three days after receipt of this letter, there were more recorded convoy sightings. Then, yesterday I spoke to a lorry driver from KM8 parked up in the Kirdale Road lay by, 1 mile West of Kirkbymoorside. We chatted briefly, I explained why I was taking photographs of his lorry. He freely stated that they are free to choose any of three routes to Teesside, and have no limitations. I guess, it's the A169 to Whitby, Blakey Ridge and the A170 through my fair town and down Sutton Bank, which are all fair game in the present system!

I definitively state here that Third Energy should not be our first point of contact for information, the conflict of interest is apparent and flawed by design, as is the need for clear independent accountable definitions of traffic management for all future planning permissions and the JWAMP.

HGVs related to fracking activity at KM8 also progress up and down Sutton Bank, which is a discussion point in itself; on one occasion in October I met two huge ten wheelers Lubbers lorries in convoy in Sutton under Whitestone cliff, in the dark, it was challenging, for both passing traffic and the long tail of traffic stuck behind them!

The present TMP covers only the immediate stretch of road from KM8, North along Great Habton road, then East along Kirby Misperton road, until the junction with the A169. And no further. At this point, we go from strict controls and consideration to none. This is remiss, and the impact of HGV movements beyond this point must be assessed.

It is of note that this issue is of relevance to the town centres and 'school runs' of Malton, Pickering, Helmsley too. The specific roads I offer for consideration and due protection A170, A169 Malton to Pickering and Pickering to Whitby, and the A64.

An anecdote to consider, as we reach the half way point... .

At present the largest lorries from KM8 that need to head South down the A169, are instructed to go North to Pickering and round the roundabout if Northerly traffic is too busy. Driving these huge vehicles across the carriageway on a 60mph road, is considered too hazardous. Is that really the best worst option or just underconsidered?

As you all well know, our road network often runs at capacity, town centre congestion and air pollution is a live issue ; the Malton AQMA throws up the clear conclusion that traffic management is the most effective control of problematic air pollution.

This issue is most evident during the tourist season; the A64 is desperate for more capacity just to alleviate the problems with our present demands. Our roads are the veins of our tourism industry, which also presently accommodate lots of farming and industrial traffic too. Increase demands upon them without full consideration, would be to neglect the present fact and risk harm to our tourism industry and unique rural brand.. To reinforce this point I have available a picture of two lorries and a police escort stuck in traffic on the A64 merely a few hundred yards from the York ring road, it clearly shows the conflict of road usage demands we must fully consider. This very point is identified by the JWAMP, and is a point I made myself to the planning committee at the JWAMP in Northallerton ; I ask again, what are the acceptable losses to tourism that the rise of industrial HGV traffic will inevitably bring, and what markers do you have in place to monitor and mitigate this?

Here I would like to bring your attention to section M16 of the proposed JWAMP, where it is clearly stated that some effects are significantly negative ' uncertainty remains that traffic assessment would be sufficiently broad in scope to capture cumulative traffic impacts'.

Now is the time to make that full assessment. Before the JWAMP progresses any further.

Before another frack pad planning application is considered. On a separate point, which I would like to put on record here, the use of Police Discretionary Decisions has on this 'test', rendered traffic impact assessments unfit for purpose, along with facilitating the systemic neglect of NYCCs duty to liaise and consult affected communities. I will give credit to Tom Knox, Vicki Perkins, John Putsey and Inspector Martin Dennison, who have worked hard to liaise in challenging circumstances. In my personal opinion, political and industrial influence has suppressed the transparency and accountability of NYCC, and made myself and many other local citizens question the very mechanism of local democracy. Dramatic claims indeed, yet I stand by them, the failure to fully consult and consider the community, as the Communities Act 2004 dictates, is a matter of grave concern. It is even exacerbates cries of conspiracy and subterfuge, regardless of whether or not they contain merit. Please consider this point when reflections on the successes and failures of the malleable Operation Kingfisher mechanism are debated.

To conclude, there are three key points which need addressing:

- 1) An independent first point of contact must be assigned. My personal consideration is that Ryedale District Council Environment Health need a dedicated member of staff, in contact with all agencies, proactively informing the public and working to negate concern and conspiracy.
- 2)The JWAMP needs a full traffic impact assessment, which considers traffic flow through town centres and, along sensitive routes. It must also integrate present air pollution limits, as defined by PHE.
- 3) The traffic management plans utilised by the NYCC planning department, must extend beyond the immediate communities, to consider all its communities. Specific regard must be given to school runs and town centre congestion.

The secondary point is usage of the Local Resilience Forum as a facilitative mechanism. Protest obviously affects this point, though is an area of debate secondary to our duty to protect communities, businesses and visitors.

I have presented you will lots of interlinking, and overlapping information, as this is the reality of traffic movements related to KM8. This shows how considerations do not simply fall into one area of decision-making.

A 'joined up' proactive and fully informed approach led by NYCC, and functionally supported by RDC, is the only way we can protect our communities, and enforce Key Objective 10.

Regards

Derek  
Cllr DWChapman  
Kirkbymoorside