

Mrs. Rachael Balmer
Planning Officer
Forward Planning and Conservation
Ryedale District Council
Ryedale House
Malton
North Yorkshire
YO17 7HH

Simon Jones
Highways England
Lateral
8 City Walk
Leeds LS11 9AT

Direct Line:

3rd December 2015

By email only

Dear Rachael

THE RYEDALE PLAN LOCAL PLAN SITES DOCUMENT SITES CONSULTATION

Thank you for your invitation to consult on the Local Plan Sites Document Sites Consultation. We have reviewed the document and would wish to comment on issues that are relevant to our interests. This response reiterates a number of issues discussed at a meeting with Ryedale District Council on 29 July 2014 and our previous comments on the Local Plan.

The Local Plan Sites Consultation Document for Ryedale details options for development which have been informed using the Site Selection Methodology. Our response only comments on Group 4 sites and the Group 3 sites which are identified as preferred sites.

We have not made comments on Group 4 and Group 3 sites which are not preferred sites or sites which are categorised as Group 2 or 1¹. However, if additional comments are required on sites within these categories please contact us.

Our key concern is to protect the primary role of the strategic road network (SRN) and to ensure its safe and efficient operation. We would therefore have concerns over any proposals or sites which could have a material impact on this. Department for Transport (DfT) *Circular 02/2013* sets out our role in the planning process.

¹ Group 1 - Sites which fail Stage 1 of the SSM and that are not considered to be suitable for allocation for the development types proposed.

Group 2 Sites where it is considered that there is no reasonable prospect/ very unlikely that concerns identified at Stage 2 of the SSM can be mitigated or sufficiently mitigated or, There are compelling reasons which indicate that a site is not considered to be deliverable/ developable

Group 3 Sites where issues have been identified as part of the Stage 2 assessment. Mitigation could be used to reduce impact/achieve an acceptable form of development on sites within this group if they are required to meet development needs.

Group 4 The site generally performs well across each of the stages of the SSM

Where sites will have a severe impact on the SRN, measures will be required to reduce and mitigate that impact. We have a number of planned improvements to the SRN funded as part of the Government's Road Investment Strategy (RIS)². These schemes will provide additional capacity at congested locations.

Sites which have the greatest individual impact will need to demonstrate that any committed RIS schemes are sufficient to deal with the additional demand generated by that site. Where committed schemes will not provide sufficient capacity or where we do not have committed investment, sites may need to deliver or contribute to schemes identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Construction of sites with the greatest individual impact should also be phased to take place following completion of the committed RIS improvements.

Malton and Norton

We have worked in partnership with you in the development of the Local Plan Core Strategy. The Malton and Norton Strategic Transport Assessment undertaken by you as part of this work included consideration of the A64 junctions at Malton and Norton. It concluded that improvements were required at the Brambling Fields junction to accommodate the Local Plan Core Strategy Development.

We would like to work with you to update this work based on the more detailed site information now available. Until this work is completed we are not in a position to provide detailed comments on the impact of sites within Malton and Norton upon the SRN.

Our initial review of the sites indicates that Sites 218 and 249 (located either side of Castle Howard Drive) are likely to impact upon the existing Musley Bank junction on the A64. No improvements are proposed at this junction which is currently only a partial movement junction with access to and from the south but no northbound access.

As part of the consideration of employment sites at Malton and Norton, we would support the safety concerns identified in relation to Site 248 given its proximity to the A64 at Musley Bank. In relation to the potential improvement at Musley Bank, although there is an aspiration locally to upgrade the junction, there is currently no scheme identified or proposal at this location.

² <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/road-investment-strategy>

Service Villages

Site 430 at Slingsby is not located within the vicinity of a junction with the A64 and is therefore not likely to have a significant impact on the SRN.

Site 638 at Rillington is not immediately adjacent to the A64 therefore we have no comments regarding site access. The development is quite small at 27 units and would not be expected to generate a significant increase in vehicular traffic.

Site 51 at Sheriff Hutton would access the A64 via junctions at Scotchman Lane for southbound traffic and Chestnut Avenue for northbound traffic. Both of these are unsignalised direct access junctions and accident records at these locations would need to be considered before development. However, the development is quite small (15 units) and would not be expected to generate a significant increase in vehicular traffic.

Site 8 at Amotherby is not in the immediate vicinity of the A64. Traffic from the proposed development using the A64 would enter Malton and likely use Musley Bank to travel southbound or the B1257 junction to travel northbound. Capacity at these junctions would need to be considered, taking into account proposed and committed development in Malton and Norton.

Summary

We would suggest that further technical work is required to establish the predicted traffic impact of the preferred development sites on the A64 junctions at Malton and Norton. We would like to work with you to identify this.

We consider that the sites identified within the Service Villages are unlikely to have a significant impact on the SRN due to their size and location. They do not raise any access or safety issues for us at this stage. However, as with all sites that would have an impact on the SRN, when these sites are brought forward for development appropriate transport assessments and travel plans would be required.

We hope that the above comments are helpful. Should you require further information or clarification, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours sincerely

Simon Jones

Yorkshire & North East

