

Response from Amotherby Parish Council, Dec 2015 on "Sites Consultation –Local Plan Sites Document and SSM"

Four questions are posed in the Sites Consultation Document (pg 56) and in the Sites Consultation Service Villages summary (pg 6):-

1. What are your views on the Council's preferred sites?
2. Do you have any views on how we have selected these sites?
3. Do you think there are better sites for housing development in these locations, and why?
4. Are there any further sites listed below we should be considering for allocation?

Please find below Amotherby Parish Council's responses to these questions. We have limited our replies to sites in Amotherby and Swinton.

1. What are your views on the Council's preferred sites?

- In our role as representatives of residents of Amotherby the Parish Council OBJECT STRONGLY to the selection of Site 8- (land east of properties on Main Street and north of St Helen's) as a preferred development site for the following reasons.
- Amotherby Parish Council last year undertook a Public Consultation meeting which resulted in a comprehensive "Submission to RDC" in Dec 2014, to which we refer you back, and from which extracts are included below (*in italics*). The views expressed in this are still the views of the Parish Council.
- This was the one site residents overwhelmingly did not want developed.
- Development here will add considerably to traffic problems in the village, which already suffers excessively being a through route to Pickering, Kirbymoorside and other villages, with heavy vehicles associated with BATA and huge problems with school traffic.
- The Highway Authority do not appear to have taken into account the issue of the impact the school has on traffic flows and highway safety in Amotherby and the simple fact that any development accessing off Main Street will add to those problems and will be affected by them. Sometimes the street is gridlocked. There is a detrimental impact resulting which manifests itself in damaged grass verges, vehicles speeding to exit the area as soon as possible, excessive fumes and noise, notwithstanding the ongoing efforts of the Parish Council to achieve mitigation. Adding to this situation is unacceptable especially when other sites are available.
- We have some doubts about access to this site being satisfactorily achievable. We believe that part of the logical potential access between Zetechnics and Station Farm House (north of the house) is in the ownership of a third party. Any attempt to put an access through the narrow garden area south of Station Farm House would be unacceptable as the road would be very close to both Station Farm and the neighbouring property and the garden walls would restrict visibility. It would also be almost directly opposite Meadowfield, thereby forming a cross-roads.
- In Questions 6, 10, & 12 reference is made to a submitted scheme. If "the submitted scheme" is a material factor in the assessment of the sites it should form part of the consultation and be freely available to consultees. As it stands the Parish Council are of the opinion that the "submitted scheme" should not carry any weight and should not predetermine or influence officers recommendations.
- In Question 8 it is stated "in terms of the character of this site, its rural, pastoral qualities would be lost through development; harming the character of the settlement".
- This site will affect the setting of the Grade 2 Listed church, churchyard and cemetery. (Qs 10 & 12)
- Although the existing Station Farm House is not listed it perhaps should be. It dates back to around 1860 and is a typical traditional farmhouse of that period. Any threat to the building or its immediate surroundings is unacceptable. There is a strong likelihood of important archaeological remains in the field. (Q13)
- The overall rating for "D Culture and Heritage" is "double minus/red", reflecting the concerns over the effect on the setting of the Church, existing house and possible archaeological remains.
- The geology of the site is double minus/red and there is a potential serious risk to the public water supply—should this site therefore even be considered for development? (Q25)

Please also see extracts from our "Submission to RDC" below.

PC comments Site 8 – Station Farm field, (pg 2)

1. The submitted site plan appears to indicate the existing Station Farm house & outbuildings would be demolished. This house dates to about 1860 and is a very important part of the character and street-scene of the village.
2. The site is very close to BATA mill, from which there is considerable noise from 6am to 10pm and sometimes continuing until midnight or later. Houses in Church Street can hear this clearly and complaints would be very likely if developed.
3. The whole site is too large and if all used would extend the village too far east.
4. There are problems with running sand in some parts, if not all, of this field. A deep hole appeared overnight when the foundations for Cornwell House were being dug, which resulted in the house having to be built on a concrete raft. This sand area continues across the road & caused houses where the entrance to Meadowfield now is to collapse when the drainage was put into the village in the 1950s.
5. Potential access to the site is narrow (unless Station Farm demolished) and would be in close proximity to Meadowfield, potentially creating great traffic problems at peak journey times.
6. There was a proposal in 1989 to develop this field (application 3/5/62/OA), which in Nov. 1989 was held in abeyance. After discussions between RDC, the Parish Council and the then owner it was eventually withdrawn, we believe in Oct 1993.
7. There may be important archaeology on the site. A resident remembers seeing a photo showing crop marks indicating a large building (possibly Roman villa). See also Google Earth.
8. The development of this site would extend the linear form of the village to the east. This would be contrary to its character and have an adverse impact of the setting of the listed church to the south.
9. Public comments expressed total opposition to development on this site.

Our Conclusions (pg 4) stated

We therefore expect :-

- that development should incorporate houses to meet local need.
- that sites chosen should fit in well with the existing village.
- that Amotherby should have to have a maximum of 15 houses allocated and that Swinton should expect some additional development.
- that development will not add to traffic problems in the village

We refer you also to:-

Appendix 2—Minutes of the Public Meeting on LDF Sites held on 1st Dec 2014 at 7-30pm

Appendix 3--Residents comments on Amotherby Sites from the Public Meeting 1st Dec 2014

Site 8—Station Farm field, (pgs 12/13)

For:-

- no comments in favour

Against:-

- No, because it is right in the village.
- This site is too large. Little or no access to the site. Would require access through the village & force traffic out via a one-way around the development.
- Totally unsuitable, would lead to more traffic in village & stretch services.
- Access would have to come onto Main Street through Amotherby. Again congestion issue with traffic already going through the village & from existing residents.
- We strongly object to this site—access issues into village,--traffic issues into village, heavy now,--drainage.
- Not in favour due to adding to traffic/congestion problems in the village.
- We strongly disagree with site 8 because of its position in the village. Any sites considered should be on the outskirts. Site 8 is too near the school & the traffic is already unacceptable.
- No. Not suitable, no access.
- No—not in Main Street—traffic already difficult.
- Access onto Main Street makes traffic problems worse.
- Definitely not no.8.
- Most inappropriate as it would appear to compromise Station Farm, a historic and attractive house which is part of the current character of the village, as well as requiring access onto Main Street.

2. Do you have any views on how we have selected these sites?

We restrict our comments to sites in Amotherby/Swinton, firstly on how Site 8 has been selected:-

The "Sites Consultation Summary—Service Villages" states on pg 3 that there is a "figure to plan for" of 116 houses, including a 20% buffer of 60.

- There are six Group 4 sites in other villages which will more than provide this number. (Ampleforth 21, Nawton 20, Rillington 27, Sherburn 4 + 8, Slingsby 73 = 153, plus a Group 3 site at Sheriff Hutton 15 = 168).
- Since there are no Group 4 sites in Amotherby/Swinton we feel that the inclusion of site 8 (Group 3) is purely an attempt to include another village in the distribution of development.
- We find it difficult to understand why site 8 has been preferred as sites 148 (Amotherby) and 341 (Swinton) are also Group 3 sites with, in theory, equal potential. See (Amotherby and Swinton Site Assessment Table).
- Given the very close proximity of Amotherby/Swinton to Malton/Norton the very small number of houses required would be far better built there, where facilities and sustainability are much greater.
- All three sites in Amotherby (8, 148 & 635) are classed as posing a serious threat to the public water supply. Why then are they even being considered?

Secondly, we wish to point out inconsistencies and errors in the Amotherby and Swinton section of the Full Site Selection Methodology document.

- Comparing the Group 3 sites (8, 148 and 341) and sites 635 and 538 (group 2) we find that the number of dark green, light green, pink and red sections, the +'s and -'s, in stages 2 and 3 are very similar:-

Site		8	No.+/-	148	No.+/-	635	No.+/-	341	No.+/-	538	No.+/-
Dk.green	++	15	47 +	13	45 +	12	45 +	13	50 +	14	42 +
Light green	+	17		19		21		24		14	
Pink	-	9	17 -	6	16 -	4	14 -	6	10 -	8	22
Red	--	4		5		5		2		7	
+ minus - total			30		29		31		40		20

Indeed on a purely mathematical basis and **assuming no errors** in classifying the colours/+'s & -'s of sections, sites 635 and 341 perform better than sites 8 and 148!

However, going through the SSM questions individually the following errors and critiques have been found:-

- Q1A --from site 635 to the local shop takes an average walker only 9 minutes.
--from site 635 to the Primary School takes 8.5 minutes.
- Q3 --site 148. It is stated that there are no footpaths along the frontage of the site. This is **incorrect**, there is a footpath which extends all the way to Appleton-le-Street.
--site 538. This site **does** have access onto a public highway and the section should not therefore be marked "double minus/red". See also our comments on this site in answer to your question 3.
- Q5 --site 148. No information on green infrastructure but this could be provided. The section should in our view be marked as + light green, as are other sites under consideration.
- Q8 (or should it be 9?) --site 148. Although adjacent to the AONB the site slopes down from the B1257 and much of the site is hidden by the hedge along the road. As there are no footpaths on the AONB in close proximity it would not adversely affect the setting of the AONB and the section should be marked as + light green, not - pink.
- Q25 --sites 8, 148 and 635 in Amotherby are all marked "double minus/red" with a "potential serious risk to the public water supply"—should any of these sites be considered for development when there are sites in Swinton where no such threat exists?
- Q27 --site 8. It is stated that there is no evidence of land instability, but this is **incorrect**. There is historical evidence of running sand in this area and buildings, where the entrance to Meadowfield now is, collapsing. While Jubilee House and Cornwell House, adjacent to Station Farm, were being built in 2001 subsidence within the foundation area occurred overnight. This resulted in Cornwell House having to be extensively piled, with the piles going down at least 15 metres before hitting a solid base. This must surely be a strongly negative indicator for this site.
- Q29 --site 8. This site is close to the BATA mill, which works from 6am to 10pm, and on some occasions during the year to midnight or after. Whilst the noise from the mill is not excessive in decibel levels (most of the time) there is a continual rumbling noise, which can be annoying. Noise mitigation measures can be applied to houses but not to gardens and so this is likely to cause nuisance and

affect the amenity of proposed occupants. There are likely to be complaints to BATA which could impact on their business.

- "I Overall rating for Amenity" –site 8. is lower than for other sites (148 & 635).
- Q46 –site 8. Whilst Highways consider access onto Amotherby Lane(Main Street) acceptable the residents of the village do not. All traffic from this site will have to go through the village, and as job opportunities in Amotherby are limited most occupiers of houses here will have to travel away for work.
–site 538. This site **does** have access onto a public highway and the section should not therefore be marked "double minus/red". See also our comments on this site in answer to your question 3.
- Q48 –site 148. The existence of a PROW on the site should not count against it, indeed it may be a positive benefit by dividing the site into logical areas of use.
- Q50 –all sites (8, 148,635 & 341). It is stated that "We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer." This is **Incorrect**, the lower parts of Swinton quite frequently suffer from sewage welling up into the street and some homes, usually in periods of heavy rain as the drainage system in both Amotherby and Swinton is of a combined nature. The sewers do not have the capacity to cope with more houses.
- Q52 – site 8 is marked "++ dark green" but it will have an adverse impact on the setting and surroundings of the Church (a community facility), it should be "– pink".
– site 148 is marked "+ light green", but the possibility of a school car park should be a positive advantage, it should be "++ dark green" at least.
- "M Overall rating for Community Facilities, utilities and infrastructure":-
– site 148 is marked "– pink" but in our view the footpath across the site and the potential for a school car park are positive advantages which should lead it to be marked "++ dark green".
– site 538 is marked "double minus/red" but owing to the error in Q46 this is wrong.

In conclusion, we think the SSM is seriously flawed in certain respects and that basing the selection of site 8 on this is completely wrong.

3. Do you think there are better sites for housing development in these locations, and why?

Please see below, after general points from our "Submission to RDC" of 2014 (*in italics*), the Parish Council's current comments and extracts from the "Submission to RDC" of 2014 (*in italics*), site by site.

Residents comments -- General points (pg11/12)

- ☐ *Amotherby is a linear village so development should be in keeping with the historic character of the village, not creating large estates behind housing currently in existence.*
- ☐ *Not in favour of any further development which will exacerbate traffic problems on Main Street.*
- ☐ *Sites should be on the main road or down towards BATA.*
- ☐ *Look to gain lower traffic flows through the village.*
- ☐ *Put up 30 houses & ensure you get additional access to reduce traffic flows through the village. This will benefit the village & give the council (RDC) what they want. The important bit is to choose the correct site that gives an additional roadway access.*
- ☐ *Anything built adjacent to BATA does run a risk of noise which would not be suitable to property development & would restrict a good local employer.*
- ☐ *We want none. Large 5 in parish plan wanting larger developments would be landowners who will benefit financially! Do not increase traffic in village. Drains already at breaking point. School parking problem.*
- ☐ *There are big housing estates being built already, do we really need any more housing in Amotherby, taking into account access to the school with further children attending putting pressure on class sizes, congestion into Malton & pressure on amenities in Malton such as the doctors.*
- ☐ *Obviously new housing is needed and it makes sense to spread it amongst the villages but it should be in keeping with the village and some should be affordable housing.*
- ☐ *My understanding is that the planning regulations change next April at which point plans submitted for new housing developments which have no means of being supplied by natural (mains) gas can no longer be built with LPG or oil as their heat source. This will mean that they will have to be built with a renewable energy like air source or ground source heat pumps or something like a biomass boiler, all of which will add an incredible amount to the build cost and in turn the selling cost of any houses.*
- ☐ *We recognise that there is a potential need for increased availability of housing in Amotherby and Swinton by 2027. We would favour an incremental and organic approach to growing the local housing stock through the use of infill development of brownfield sites. We feel strongly that if development is to take place, the responsibility should be shared equally between Swinton and Amotherby. If a single site development is the preferred option, we would favour*

a site on the B1257 (ie. site 148, 635 or 636) which could be accessed from the main Helmsley to Malton road. We do not favour any development whatsoever that requires access from and into Main Street and/or High Street. Amotherby already has very serious traffic problems owing to both very heavy school traffic and the general volume of traffic passing through the village, including BATA lorries. Anything that would exacerbate this situation further would be extremely detrimental to the village. There are many occasions when the village is completely log jammed with traffic and we feel it is only a matter of time before a serious accident will occur.

□ Following tonight's meeting we would say that the 2 sites we would most strongly support are nos. 61 and 636 as they both have access from the 1257 and seem to be the right size for up to 15 dwellings. Given that is the maximum development the village is prepared to accept, it would be a mistake to support a site big enough to take more than 15 as we could end up with much much more. The sites off the Main Street, 8 and 181 we would resist as they would both bring more traffic into an already heavily congested area, and both are big enough to take much more housing than is acceptable.

□ We feel it is important, when considering any development, that due regard is given to the nature and character of the two villages. It strikes us having seen the various sites proposed, particularly in Amotherby, that many of them are large and these would invite considerably more development than the 30 dwellings indicated. Development of sites of anything more than an acre or so would completely alter the feel of the village and we think these would be inappropriate, especially so with large-scale developments being currently constructed a few miles away at Broughton Rise in Malton and those contemplated by the FitzWilliam Estate on their High Malton site. Whilst those sites are large, they can be accommodated within a town rather more easily than a large development in relatively small villages. Neither Amotherby nor Swinton are 'pretty' villages but they have character which has grown over the years and has been added to by small-scale developments which somehow have fitted in. We don't want these villages altered beyond recognition and think that this is key to a way forward for the present proposals. There is obviously a need for new homes and very much so for young local families and we feel that this could be accommodated by small-scale developments and in-fill sites shared between the two villages. Smaller sites would be perhaps more attractive to smaller local builders who could perhaps build something more in keeping with local styles, rather than the formulaic larger developers, and thus preserve and add to the local sense of place. There are other considerations to be borne in mind in respect of local facilities, of which there are few. A key attraction in Amotherby is the village school which is very popular and attracts pupils from a wide area because of its reputation. This brings problems of its own in terms of traffic. The main street carries a fair amount of heavy traffic at the best of times and this is turned into a congested nightmare at school times – we live opposite the Meadowfield junction and getting in and out of our house at those times is difficult and sometimes, dangerous. Access to the school for buses and for parents to drop and collect children is difficult and unsafe and any suggestion of developing sites for housing which need access from the main street should be resisted as completely inappropriate for these reasons. Having said this, if a single larger site were to be thought more appropriate in order to attract a developer, then we would think No 148 the most appropriate. This would offer potential to give access directly to the school from the main Malton Road and thereby relieve the main village road of its congestion problems and make it much safer for children and parents to access the school. School not at capacity at present so with all the new houses in Malton & limited/ no capacity there children are likely to come to Amotherby, adding to the traffic problems. Catchment area children have priority over those from outside, so by building in Amotherby the school can potentially be filled with local children who will walk rather than drive. Isn't it better to keep school for local children by providing local houses?

Site 148

Current comments from PC

- Access possible from the B1257, keeping traffic out of the main village street.
- School access and parking possible, alleviating an ongoing serious problem within the village associated with parents picking up from school or attending school events.
- It would not be necessary to develop the whole field.
- The Roman road lies very close to the southern boundary where it would not be necessary to build. It would be possible for a new road to pass over this without serious damage. Much of this Roman road has already been built on along the B1257 corridor.

Extracts from our "Submission to RDC"

PC comments Site 148 – field south of the school (King's field) (pg 3)

1. The whole site is too large, but use of the lower flatter (northern) part would potentially give some benefit to the village.
2. The Roman road runs across the southern end of the field, not far below the B1257.
3. Access onto the B1257 at the south of the field, although initially attractive, could be problematic as the slope here is steep and would cause problems in winter conditions.

4. The development of this site would only be viewed as appropriate if it is accessed off the B1257, with a new access to the school provided. This has the advantage of not adding new traffic in High St/Main St. and would deflect school traffic away from the centre of the village. If RDC were to allocate this site the PC would want assurances that:-

a) access could only be off the B1257,

b) vehicle access to the school via Meadowfield would be closed off,

c) negotiations take place with the Education Authority with a view to providing an adequate (parent) car park for the school,

d) mechanisms would be put in place to ensure school parking/dropping off/picking up could not occur in Meadowfield, Cherry Tree Walk & Main Street.

5. Public comments expressed some support.

Residents comments Site 148—King's field, (pg 13)

For:-

We feel that this would be a good place to build 15 houses & a new road out onto B1257 & close of the road into Meadowfield & a new speed limit of 30mph on B1257.

Seems obvious plot to get rid of school traffic & provide scope to enhance the school.

Definitely yes, so long as access is off B1257 & car parking for school is provided.

If this site has access from the main Hovingham road this could be considered.

Would only be acceptable if access is from main road, not via Meadowfield.

Good for school extension, possible car park for school, but needs a new road onto B1257.

Could additionally provide access to the school from the main road with some parking, thus removing the problem of such serious congestion in the village resulting from school traffic.

Against:-

This site is far bigger than the requirement for 15 houses. Site is similar in size to Broughton Manor, so considerably larger than needed.

Not suitable given access, traffic, school congestion.

New access required—very expensive. Opens up strong possibility of very large scale development to make it viable (cost of all services).

Could exacerbate surface flooding problems in Main St & building here would destroy any chance of solving school parking problems. Not a good idea to have an access onto B1257 just within 40mph limit where visibility not good.

Site 635

Current comments from PC

- Access directly onto the B1257, keeping traffic out of the main village street.
- Continues the linear form along the north of the B1257 and links the Eastfield group of houses to the rest of the village.
- Existing adjacent development does not appear to compromise the groundwater source protection zone and mitigation could be achieved.
- The Roman road lies within this site but much of it has already been built on along the B1257 corridor. Would the loss of another section be overly detrimental providing proper investigation carried out? Houses were built over a Roman road in Malton after archaeological investigation in about 1990 (Castle Howard Road/Fitzwilliam Drive).

Extracts from our "Submission to RDC"

PC comments Site 635 – field west of Eastfield, east of Manor Farm (pg3)

1. Roman road crosses this field towards the southern boundary. Its line can be seen on the ground by the remains of a ridge and ditches.

2. Access direct onto the B1257 is potentially good, but this currently has a 40mph limit which is often exceeded. The pavement here is narrow and right beside this fast stretch of road.

3. The site is relatively close to Westlars (Malton Foods) with its associated noise problems.

4. Development of this site would not add to congestion in the Main Street.

Residents comments Site 635—next to Eastfield, (pg 14)

For:-

Positive view as not in village & access straight onto main road.

Better option—access onto main road so no disturbance to village traffic & no congestion problems, especially with school traffic in village at beginning & end of school day.

Favourable dependent on access directly on to B1257.

- Ideal site, access good.*
- Good/best.*
- OK. Access & public utilities can be phased.*

Against:-

- No, not good access onto road.*
- Very large, too much potential.*

Site 341 in Swinton

There are no previous PC or residents comments on this site as our Public Meeting in 2014 looked only at sites within Amotherby.

Current comments from PC

- Continues the form of the village.
- Adjacent to site allocated in last local plan which has since been developed as Meadowfields with no apparent amenity issues.
- Noise from the scrap yard is probably about equal to that at site 8, but is not continuous and lasts for a shorter period. The yard is open 8am to 5pm although may be operative from about 7-30am to 6pm. Noise mitigation measures can be applied to houses and gardens will be quiet in the evenings.
- No adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone identified by the Environment Agency.

Site 538 in Swinton

There are no previous PC or residents comments on this site as our Public Meeting in 2014 looked only at sites within Amotherby.

Current comments from PC

In the assessment site 538 has a very similar profile to Site 8. Its major failings appear to be at Stage 2 Q1A where the distance to the school is seen to be a major disadvantage. This is clearly perverse given the Planning Authority insisting that Amotherby (where the school is) and Swinton should be joined together to form a convenient community to satisfy the apparent need to create a Service Village. To now state that site 538 fails in its distance to the school is plainly ridiculous.

The second apparent failing, which according to the site selection study is terminal, is at Q3 where the Highway Authority considered that the site "has no direct connection to a highway maintainable at the public expense". On viewing the site and the submitted plan there clearly is a wide strip of land connecting the main body of the site to the highway. Unless the Parish Council have misread the plans or are not party to indications otherwise the site characteristics in terms of pure access to the existing highway are the same as site 8.

Regarding Q8 sites 8 and 538 are very similar in terms of their stated impact but they have been judged differently. Taking site 538 in isolation from those adjacent, which is what should happen, the impact should be the same as site 8 ie low landscape impact (+/light green) and not "-/pink" as assessed.

Overall site 538 is in the main damned by the highway consideration which appears to be inaccurate. This issue should be revisited so that a proper comparison with other sites in the "village" can be undertaken.

4. Are there any further sites listed below we should be considering for allocation?

Yes, all those below, especially the group 4 sites.

- Ampleforth site 160 (group 4)
- Hovingham site 643 (group 3)
- Nawton Beadlam site 173/252 (group 4)
- Rillington site 175 (group 3)
- Sherburn sites 283 & 264 (group 4)
- Staxton & Willerby sites 177 & 217 (group 3)
- Thornton le Dale site 109(group 3)

