

## Charlotte Bogg

---

**From:** joy forbes  
**Sent:** 14 December 2015 10:53  
**To:** Charlotte Bogg  
**Subject:** Consultation response

Dear Jill Thompson

Re: Sites Allocation process, public consultation

I object to both the large West Malton sites, 218 and 249, on the following grounds:

- **Significant visual impact on setting of the AONB**, a nationally recognised landscape. In the High Malton application there were 4 Visual Impact Assessments which failed to demonstrate 4 times that building could happen on that site without an unacceptable and significant visual impact on the AONB. The final assessment, which increased the landscaping element, led to the landscaping itself having a substantial negative visual impact, cutting off views whilst still failing to screen the development effectively. The view of the AONB officer was one of consistent objections to all 4 Visual Impact Assessments. The CPRE and Natural England also objected. As there is a footpath to the south as well as the North of the Castle Howard Road (running towards Mosley Bank stables), on higher ground, the site 249 is also prominent and exposed from the AONB and difficult to screen without unacceptable visual impacts. It is also separate from the rest of the built form of Malton: as viewed from the AONB. The existing edge of Malton is scarcely visible and effectively well screened by the slope of the land, by distance, and by vegetation, in contrast to site 249, which is very clearly visible from the AONB. The footpaths on the AONB around this area attract not just residents from West Malton but from all over the area, in my view they are the best areas for walking accessible on foot from the whole of Malton and Norton, its loss would lead to people driving to find similar quality of walking, in terms of views and tranquillity, to the detriment of the tranquillity and air quality of the environment we want to preserve.
- Unacceptable negative impact on the attractive approach to Malton along the Castle Howard Road, and the negative impact on the character of the townscape on the edge of West Malton of building on high ground. This applies to both sites.
- **unacceptable impact of traffic** on congestion, queuing and air pollution on Butcher Corner and **Yorkersgate in particular**, which are in the Malton AQMA and in breach of EU Ambient Air Directive legal limits for nitrogen dioxide. Traffic would have to pass through the AQMA to reach destinations to the north and east of Malton such as Pickering and Scarborough. This applies to both sites. The traffic is illustrated on the attachment pictures as evidence.
- unacceptable impact of traffic on residential streets: traffic would have to pass through residential streets to access the A64 in either direction. Middlecave Road is narrow and already affected by a large amount of traffic related to the secondary school and hospital, and queuing traffic at its base which is getting worse as more traffic heading towards the Broughton Manor development on the lower part of Middlecave Road queuing towards the Mount Crescent/Broughton Rd/Pasture Lane traffic lights blocks it from exiting in that direction. The pictures attached to my next email will show the situation last year, but it has got worse since then. The insistence of Highways on the need to widen Castle Howard Road in the High Malton application would negatively impact on the character of the road, and the 70% increase in traffic would also negatively impact on congestion, noise and air quality for local residents.
- noise issues: the sites experience high levels of noise from the A64 that break noise guidelines for residential development.

I do not accept that it is not possible to develop affordable housing in rural locations, with access to public transport and services such as school, pub, shop. Villages such as Terrington REQUIRE new housing to ensure viability of existing services, to fill all the empty places in more and more of our rural schools, whilst town schools are full to bursting. Many villages need some sensitively sited building to ensure the viability of the pub, the shop, and to maintain or improve the bus services. Public transport improves or dwindles in line with government policies as well as market forces, but the community (and work opportunities) still exists in rural areas, to ignore rural developmental needs is slowly strangling the lifeblood of many many villages. There is plenty of space in Ryedale to comfortably absorb the increased housing needs in rural areas without overwhelming the towns infrastructure and building on inappropriate plots.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Yours sincerely,

Joy Forbes