

Mrs Malloy

Submission from Simon Thackray for Wednesday 26 September 2016.

Ryedale Plan: Local Plan Sites Document and Policies Map – Public Hearing.

I wrote to Ryedale District Council on 5 December 2017, in response to the public consultation on the 'Ryedale Plan: Local Plan Sites Document and Policies Map'.

I questioned the document's apparent reliance on predictive traffic modeling and suggested that the council was gambling on changes to vehicle emissions and improvements to Malton's air quality that may or may not happen over time.

My concern then, as now, is based on the fact that the Brambling Fields junction upgrade scheme, that underpins the Ryedale Plan, has failed to deliver the outcomes and outputs - in terms of the reductions in traffic movements and traffic congestion - that are required to enable the large-scale housing and employment land developments prescribed in the Plan.

I find it deeply concerning that the council has approved large-scale developments, and is intent on granting permissions for more, without first securing the '*critical changes to infrastructure*' on which the Ryedale Plan depends.

Until such time that the '*critical changes to infrastructure*' have been delivered, and in particular the headline-grabbing 33% reduction in traffic movements through Butcher Corner, Malton achieved (RDC: statement of Head of Economy and Housing, Julian Rudd, 7 October 2011.), further development in Malton and Norton should be put on hold to prevent any further increase in traffic congestion and any further deterioration of air quality in the Malton Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).

In the following pages I quote from Ryedale District Council reports, and other publicly available documents, to inform and illustrate my submission.

Below is a copy of my letter of 5 December 2017 to Jill Thompson, Principal Specialist Place:

"Dear Jill,

Thank you for your reply and clarification about the use of the Systra Final Report of May 2017 in the Ryedale Plan: Local Plan Sites Document and Policies Map public consultation process.

I have studied the Systra report and note that it, like many previous reports about the expected future levels of NO₂ in the Malton AQMA, relies heavily on predicted (modeled) improvements in vehicle emissions and subsequent reductions in NO_x emissions that may or may not materialise due to changes in vehicle technology.

2027 is a long way off, and I would not like Ryedale District Council to gamble the future health of my children by laying bets on the levels of NO₂ rising or falling. The concentration of NO₂ may fall but it also may rise, and if recent history has taught us anything (since the Malton AQMA was declared on 14 December 2009 - a full 8 years ago), it is that all previous predictions of a decrease in air pollution have been wrong.

Successive governments, and district and local councils are all guilty of standing in the

way of progress by refusing to bring forward legislation with teeth, or by failing to implement decisions already made to improve air quality. The health of the people of Malton and Norton has been sacrificed on the altar of local business bias for the past 4.5 years. I refer to the failure of NYCC and RDC to implement the HGV restriction over Norton level crossing, which is part of the still unfinished £6million Brambling Fields junction upgrade scheme.

I think, therefore, that the Systra report should, at best, be taken with a pinch of salt (or with a little water depending on taste). Some wishful thinking has clearly found its way into the mix and therefore I suggest that RDC should not risk our children's future health on the strength of what may, or may not, be the case in terms of NO₂ concentrations in 2027. It is only safe to predict the unpredictable.

If RDC promotes future development in the towns based on the over-optimistic findings of the Systra report, and gets it wrong, it will place the future health of the children of Malton and Norton at significant risk of harm.

Therefore we must deal with the known facts and concentrate on what we already know: In contrast to the predictive and uncertain nature of the above comments, the report DOES state that the Malton air quality will FAIL TO IMPROVE to meet the legal limit for the concentration of NO₂ at one receptor location. (The report softly refers to the "Objective limit or level" when, in fact, it is a Legally Binding Limit and should be described and treated as such). There is also a flaw in the Systra report findings caused by the omission of important data.

Malton and Norton Air Quality Assessment
Local Plan Assessment and Air Quality Action Plan
Recommendations:

Comparison of Highway Interventions

10.1.5

Within the AQMA, the complementary measures for both scenarios generally create a mixture of slight improvements or slight deteriorations in Nitrogen Dioxide and Particulate Matter concentrations at the various Receptors. This can be expected given that each measure will alter traffic distribution and thus effect pollutant concentrations at Receptors differently. The variation is therefore due to the net effect of the trade-off between the traffic reduction and the lower speeds (due to the reduced road capacity), which differ by location.

10.1.6

The exception to this pattern of 'small \pm change' is at Receptor 10 (Yorkersgate 2), where the 'All Measures' combination of measures is predicted to increase NO₂ concentrations significantly in both scenarios (in addition to some notable increases to Particulate Matter), which would give this location the poorest NO₂-related air quality (and is significantly worse than any location in the Do Nothing scenario). These increases outweigh the small benefits created elsewhere in the town by the package of traffic management measures."

The conclusion of Para 10.1.6 is not a trivial matter. The law requires that the concentration of NO₂ in the Malton AQMA reduces to 'within' the legally binding limit at ALL receptor locations, and thereafter it is expressly illegal to allow the limit to be breached. There is no margin for error.

Therefore, alongside the predictions of improvements in air quality as a result of changes to vehicle emission technology (and a possible, but by no means certain, increase in the use of electric vehicles), it is equally possible that the legal limit for the concentration of NO₂ may also be lowered.

It is universally accepted that there is NO safe concentration of NO₂ and it is, therefore, entirely possible that the legal limit for the concentration of NO₂ may be set much lower in 2027 as the dangers of NO₂ become more widely known.

To that end, I question the over-optimism of the Systra report, and, more importantly, draw your attention to its striking omission.

No account has been made in the Systra report for the proposed increase in scheduled rail services between Scarborough and York and the consequent increase in congestion and air pollution caused by the additional barrier closures. The increase in 'waiting' traffic on the approach roads from Welham Road, Church Street, Norton Road, Norton and Castlegate, all the way back to Butcher Corner, in Malton will have a significant impact on the future level of NO₂ in the Castlegate and Church Street sections of the Malton AQMA. It is entirely possible that this congestion will also cause additional delays and pollution on Yorkersgate and Wheelgate and Old Maltongate as the likely tailback of traffic has a knock-on effect.

The congestion and air pollution caused by the likely increase in the frequency of rail crossing barrier closures has not been accounted for in the Systra report and therefore the report is an unsound and unreliable document and should not be used as an evidence base in the current Local Plan Sites Document and Policies Map public consultation process until it has been reconsidered, recalculated, and amended accordingly. The omission of data from the Systra report makes the predictions of future NO₂ concentrations in the Malton AQMA wholly unreliable.

I request that the Systra report be re-done in order to take into account the planned or possible increase in scheduled rail services. The timing of the increase in the number of services is, in common with all the other data used in the Systra report, purely conjectural and a modelled prediction at this stage."

It is my considered opinion that the increase in congestion and NO₂ emissions that additional rail crossing barrier closures would cause, would impact negatively and severely on the air quality in the Malton AQMA and to such an extent that all future site allocations in Malton and Norton may prove untenable."

I received a reply to my letter as follows:

Dear Mr Thackray

Thank you for your comments. I will register these as representations on the Plan and they will be forwarded to the Inspector. I do need to point out that an assumption for

the increase in rail service/crossing down time was made in the assessment. In light of this I would be grateful if you could let me know if you intend to provide further representations before the deadline of the 22/12/17.

Yours Sincerely
Jill Thompson, Principal Specialist Place

Subsequent to the public consultation on the 'Ryedale Plan: Local Plan Sites Document and Policies Map', Ryedale District Council (RDC) and North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) ran a public consultation (in 2018), inviting members of the public to comment on ways to tackle the increasing traffic congestion in Malton and Norton. I commented in brief on each proposed option although I considered most of the suggested options to have little merit.

The dilemma facing Ryedale District Council today is that the increasing traffic congestion and predicted deterioration in air quality, for which the council is now urgently seeking a solution, has been caused by the decisions of the council itself.

The Ryedale Plan relied and depended (relies and depends) upon the *"expected outputs and outcomes in terms of traffic diversion and associated benefits"* of the Brambling Fields junction upgrade scheme. The shocking reality facing the council today is that the Brambling Fields junction upgrade scheme has failed to deliver the *'critical changes to infrastructure'* that were, and are, necessary to enable the delivery of the large-scale, Malton and Norton, housing development allocations in the Ryedale Plan.

The failure of the Brambling Fields junction upgrade scheme has caused the traffic levels in Malton and Norton to reach saturation point and exposed the councils' inability to deal effectively with the interrelated problems of traffic congestion and air pollution.

The catastrophe now unfolding in Malton and Norton has been caused by the failure of the £6 million Brambling Fields junction upgrade scheme.

The Ryedale Plan was, and is, entirely dependent on the delivery of the outcomes of the Brambling Fields junction upgrade scheme in order to facilitate the level of development prescribed in the Ryedale Plan. Yet, despite the failure of the Brambling Fields junction upgrade scheme to deliver the benefits that were promised, (a reduction in traffic movements through Butcher Corner, Malton of 'up to' 33% and other 'benefits'), the council has chosen to ignore the facts, and granted approvals for large-scale housing and industrial developments in Malton and Old Malton. The council has 'carried on regardless', assuming the right to implement the Ryedale Plan without the *"required critical changes to infrastructure"* being in place.

I refer specifically to the large-scale housing and industrial land developments approved by RDC in 2015. The data contained in the application documents listed in the following paragraph, confirms that the developments will lead to a worsening of air quality in Malton in the operational year 2020. Yet despite this fact, the council went ahead and approved the applications. This suggests to me either a blanket denial of the facts within Ryedale District Council, or that the council decisions are being driven by financial motives. Whatever the true motive for approving these developments, I believe that the health of the public is being put at risk by the planning decisions of Ryedale District Council.

Planning application 14/00426/MOUTE (New Livestock Market) was one of four co-joined

applications, the others being 14/00427/MOUTE (Housing on the Showfield, Pasture Lane), 14/00428/MOUTE (Housing on land south of Westgate, Old Malton) and 14/00429/MOUTE (Housing at Rainbow Lane).

The Air Quality Impact Assessment submitted in support of the above co-joined applications is contained within the 411-page Environmental Statement (Doc. Ref: 1225524). In it, the applicant admits that the concentration of Nitrogen Dioxide in Malton will increase to a level approximately 10% above the legally binding limit.

More specifically, the Air Quality Assessment submitted by the applicant predicts that the breathable air in Malton ('With Scheme') will breach the EU and UK legally binding limit values for the concentration of Nitrogen Dioxide in the operational year 2020, by a margin of +10% (44.1 micrograms/m³ - With 'Official' Emissions Reduction) or +59% (63.4 micrograms/m³ 'Without Emissions Reduction'). Due to 'unknown variables', the applicant concedes that the future concentration of Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) will most probably be somewhere between the two measurements i.e. 53.75 micrograms/m³.

The legally binding limit for the concentration of NO₂ is 40 micrograms/m³.

I objected to the application on the grounds that the cumulative impact of the co-joined developments will lead to a breach of the legally binding limit for the concentration of NO₂, and in so doing, will give rise to an unacceptable risk of harm to the health of the public. In my opinion, the approval was, and is, in conflict with Paragraphs 109, 120, 124 of the National Planning Policy Framework, UK and EU air quality law, and in conflict with the council's own Malton Air Quality Action Plan 2012.

I make no apologies for referring back to the Brambling Fields junction upgrade scheme, time and time again, because it has failed to deliver the outcomes on which the Plan depends.

Brambling Fields – the claims that underpin the Ryedale Plan:

Below are statements of the RDC Head of Economy and Housing, Julian Rudd, contained in his Executive Summary of 7 October 2011:

3.4 The Brambling Fields junction improvement alone does not solve all of the shortfalls in the highway network in and around Malton and Norton and it is important that this Council continues to work with partners and developers to address other outstanding infrastructure issues. However, it provides very significant benefits and there is no other potential highway infrastructure improvement that is comparable - in terms of costs, achievability, and changes to traffic movements - to meaningfully address the congestion, air pollution and road safety problems that exist within Malton or to provide internal road capacity for new development to provide jobs and homes at Malton and Norton. Consequently the Ryedale LDF is based upon this junction improvement being in place.

4.2 The other potentially significant risk of proceeding with the recommendation is that the completed final scheme does not deliver expected outputs and outcomes in terms of traffic diversion and associated benefits. This risk is mitigated through extensive and validated traffic modeling information that has demonstrated that the scheme, together with complimentary traffic management measures within Malton and Norton, will reduce traffic passing through Butcher Corner by up to a third. Furthermore, following

construction the impact of the scheme will be monitored by NYCC and the appropriate traffic management measures then introduced to achieve the required benefits from the scheme.

Below is a list of the benefits of the Brambling Fields junction upgrade scheme described by RDC Head of Economy and Housing, Julian Rudd, in his Executive Summary of 7 October 2011:

“5.19 The supporting information for the May 2011 planning application for the Brambling Fields junction improvement was based upon extensive data, including the 2004 and 2008 traffic models produced for NYCC. These have been calibrated and validated, in accordance with Government guidance, to reflect local traffic and journey patterns and to ensure that they are sufficiently robust to reliably assess the transport impacts of schemes and developments within Malton and Norton. These demonstrate a reduction in traffic flows at Butcher Corner of up to a third with the Brambling Fields junction and the complimentary measures in place, based on the design year of 2012. The planning application and the assessment of this by the planning authority confirmed that the junction scheme and complimentary traffic management measures would:

- Reduce NO2 concentrations at every receptor and monitoring location within the Malton Air Quality Management Area and reduce the number of annual mean objective exceedances of NO2 by 66%.
- Reduce traffic flows and therefore accident risk at Butcher Corner, where there have been seven accidents since 2006, five of which involved pedestrians. Proposed changes to the Butcher Corner traffic lights to introduce additional pedestrian phases as part of traffic management measures to compliment the Brambling Fields junction improvement would also reduce the accident risk.
- Facilitate other highways improvements in the centre of Malton / Norton and provide a more efficient access route to some strategic sites within Norton, including the Norton Grove Industrial Estate and other housing land allocations within the two towns.
- Provide relief to local junctions in the centre of Malton, which currently operate above their planned capacity;
- Reduce problems of with air quality and noise in the centre of Malton and the minimise the potential air quality and congestion impacts associated with planned developments elsewhere in Malton and Norton;
- Provide improved access to the town and communities in its rural hinterland
- Be likely to facilitate a suite of significant social and economic improvements to the residents of the area in respect of human health and economic opportunities.”

Six years after the opening of the Brambling Fields junction, the confidence level plummets:

The following statement is contained in the WSP Malton and Norton Infrastructure and Connectivity Improvements Study – Final Appendices: Appendix A – Policies and Strategies Summary - Page 9 of 10. (Approved by Ryedale District Council on 6 September 2018):

“The Brambling Fields junction improvement on the A64, to the east of Malton and Norton, was delivered in order to reduce traffic volume passing through Butcher Corner, as well as to limit the number of vehicles queuing back into the AQMA, and toward Butcher Corner, in Malton. **Since delivery of the scheme there has been a reported small decrease in traffic through the AQMA and Butcher Corner, along with an increase in HGVs using the route between Norton and the A64. Despite this, it is acknowledged that further measures are required to discourage freight [HGV] movements through**

the towns; these measures include a 7.5t HCV restriction across County Bridge which, as discussed in Section 3, was implemented in February 2018 as an 18 month experimental order; NYCC will monitor the impact of the order and consider if it should be implemented permanently. It is considered that if measures are not introduced that adequately manage freight [HGV] movements through the towns, the impact of additional freight [HGV] movements resulting from allocations for employment and housing development, have the potential to impact significantly on air quality, congestion, resulting delay, and erosion of character."

The Local Plan Strategy identifies the importance of ensuring there is an adequate supply of land and buildings to support existing high tech manufacturing activity, new and expanding businesses as well as attracting new and growing sectors. It is also recognised that there is a need for improved linkages with York's economy.

The LPS highlights that there are strategic transport improvements, identified by NYCC, that would help address issues of congestion and connectivity experienced in the town including:

- A junction at the A64 in the Broughton Road area;
- Improvements to the A64 Brambling Fields junction;
- A second Rail/River crossing from York Road to the Woolgrowers site;
- Improvements to the A64 junction at Musley Bank; and
- Scarborough Road to Beverley Road link.

It is noted, within the LPS, that the cost of these schemes is likely to be prohibitive to their implementation; however, **the level of development set out in its Local Plan could be delivered in the Plan period if the Brambling Fields junction improvement were provided together with a package of associated traffic management measures, improvement to junctions within the internal network and improved cycling and pedestrian facilities.** The LPS goes on to state that, in order to facilitate and support the longer-term growth in the towns, further strategic transport improvements will be required."

Conclusion:

1. The delivery of the Ryedale Plan **depended** (depends) on the *"critical changes to infrastructure"* that were supposed to be delivered by the Brambling Fields junction upgrade scheme. Those *'critical changes'* have not been delivered which has rendered the Plan unworkable. In fact, without securing the *'critical changes to infrastructure'*, the Plan is a dangerous document, promoting unsustainable development, leading to illegal air quality.
2. The inclusion of a link road between new developments in Norton and the A64 will not remove or counteract the increase in traffic congestion and vehicle emissions generated by the additional car journeys made by the residents of new developments who will shop locally. The main supermarkets, banks, and Doctors Surgery are all located in the town centre(s) for which the provision of a link road is irrelevant. The additional traffic generated by new developments will travel into Malton and Norton town centre, adding more vehicles and additional delays to an already congested and air quality sensitive town centre environment.

The increase in traffic movements and deterioration in Malton and Norton air quality, that the developments contained in the 'Ryedale Plan: Local Plan Sites Document and Policies Map' would cause, pose a danger to human health and threaten to undermine the quality of life of both the existing, and new, Ryedale residents.

3. 'Ryedale Plan: Local Plan Sites Document and Policies Map': Sustainability Appraisal And Strategic Environmental Assessment Site Selection Process and Policy Development: 5. Site Selection Methodology Stage 1 - Site Assessment Factors - Size of site, 5.1

In terms of seeking to ensure mutual social, economic and environmental benefits are secured through the delivery of new residential development, and proportionally assessing sites, the site size threshold is particularly important. In the first stage of the SSM, the site size threshold chosen for Service Villages was 0.15 ha (c. 5 units at 30 dph) and in the Market Towns 0.3ha (c.10 units at 30 dph) meant that sites capable of delivering less than this would not be taken forward through the allocations process.

A large number of the sites submitted were very small sites, which would only deliver one dwelling or at the most, a handful. Whilst such sites could be viewed as reducing impact on both the setting of settlements and the wider landscape, and the form and character of a settlement (SA Objectives C2 and C5, respectively); in reality they would still have some incremental impact on settlement form and character, which could be significant in sensitive areas, such as Conservation Areas. Of particular concern is that reliance on such sites place an incremental, but disproportionate, cumulative impact on the operation and delivery of key facilities, services and infrastructure.

Such sites bring no site-specific contributions, and limit delivery of affordable housing. These small sites would not have a requirement to provide housing, which meets the needs of Ryedale's elderly population, and the provision of on-site open space would also not be achievable. These are key elements of sustainability appraisal objectives A1, A2, A6, A3. Whilst a Developer could indicate that they would wish to provide for these matters, there is no legal basis for which the Council can then require delivery of such features if there is no policy basis, in terms of compliance with the Local Plan Strategy."

I disagree with the above statements. I think the arguments and justifications for site selection described in the above paragraphs are wrong and have been carefully worded to justify shoehorning development into Malton and Norton. In my opinion, small sites in villages do not have a disproportionate, cumulative impact on the operation and delivery of key facilities, services and infrastructure. On the contrary, small sites (small-scale developments) in villages support local facilities and help sustain local services. Inadequate infrastructure that may exist in the rural areas of Ryedale is not caused by the site selection process, but by the lack of maintenance and investment on the part of the county council. It is precisely the corralling and cramming of large-scale developments into Malton and Norton that has had a devastating and cumulative negative impact on key facilities, services and infrastructure. The site selection process methodology (i.e. Malton and Norton bias) has directly caused the increase in traffic congestion and deterioration in air quality in Malton and Norton that now exists.

4. I think Ryedale District Council should acknowledge, and learn from, its mistakes and turn its attention away from the over-development of Malton and Norton. The Ryedale Plan should adjust its focus to encourage sustainable new housing development and employment land provision across all Ryedale market towns and villages. This would enable the Plan to fulfill

its proper function – to provide sustainable housing and employment land whilst at the same time preserving, enhancing, and developing vibrant rural communities - of which Malton and Norton is a component part.

5. I disagree with the site selection methodology used to create the 'Ryedale Plan: Local Plan Sites Document and Policies Map'. I believe Ryedale needs and deserves protection from this Plan and that a new vision and new horizon, viewed through a wide-angle lens, is called for. The Plan should encourage new, unfettered development (by 'unfettered' I mean 'small-scale' housing developments that are not simultaneously *undermined by discriminatory Local Occupancy Conditions*) - that will support rural communities and small businesses (and community clusters), and enable them not only to survive, but also to thrive:

"Local occupancy clauses prevent small scale developments in our villages and are detrimental to the sustainability of rural life. I have met with Ryedale District Council and individual councillors on a number of occasions regarding this issue and have strongly recommended that they revise this policy."

Kevin Hollinrake, Member of Parliament for Thirsk and Malton, 12 April 2018.

6. Existing local rural services and facilities (few in number though they are), such as village post offices and village halls (some are used as rural touring arts venues) should be maintained and sustained and encouraged to develop in accordance with the vision of the NPPF. I believe that the Ryedale Plan conflicts with the NPPF. Either by design, or by default, the Ryedale Plan is draining the lifeblood out of small rural communities by blocking natural development and growth. The NPPF states that:

78. To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.

7. The Ryedale Plan has led to an exponential increase in new houses in Malton and Norton, which has caused a corresponding increase in the number of cars and increase in traffic congestion. The growth in traffic generated by new developments is unsustainable, and the impact is visible to the naked eye. Air pollution is at a dangerous level and already approved developments (and those still to be built-out) will cause Malton's air quality to deteriorate.

8. Changes should be made to the Plan's development priorities and Site Selection Methodology to enable small-scale housing to be delivered across the whole of Ryedale to prevent the slow-death of small rural communities, and to avoid further damage to the existing services and infrastructure, and further deterioration of the air quality, in Malton and Norton.

9. I would be happy to provide additional information to the Planning Inspector if so desired, and to share my thoughts and ideas for a new town in Ryedale that could be built on sustainable and environmentally sound principles.

Thank you.

Simon Thackray

The following is a list of some of the documents that have informed my opinions and conclusions (these are not necessarily referred to in the above text):

- **Malton Air Quality Action Plan, 2012.**
- **'Ryedale Plan: Local Plan Sites Document and Policies Map': Sustainability Appraisal And Strategic Environmental Assessment Site Selection Process and Policy Development: 5. Site Selection Methodology Stage 1 - Site Assessment Factors – Size of site, 5.1.**
- Ryedale District Council, **Malton Air Quality Steering Group minutes 2011 to 2017.**
- The Ryedale Plan – Local Plan Strategy - Section 6 – Physical Infrastructure and Community Facilities Page 102, Table 2. **Critical Improvements to Physical Infrastructure.**
- Report to Council on 7 October 2011, **Executive Summary - Head of Economy and Housing Julian Rudd - A64 Brambling Fields Junction Improvement – Final Approval and Section 274 and 278 Legal Agreement.**
- **Co-joined planning applications: 14/00426/MOUTE (New Livestock Market), 14/00427/MOUTE (Housing on the Showfield, Pasture Lane), 14/00428/MOUTE (Housing on land south of Westgate, Old Malton) and 14/00429/MOUTE (Housing at Rainbow Lane).**
- Environmental Statement relating to above can be found in documents list for **14/00426/MOUTE (Document reference number 1225524).**
- **Planning Inspectorate Appeal Decision Inquiry held on 31 March 2015. Site visit made on 1 April 2015 by Louise Phillips MA (Cantab) MSc MRTPI. Decision: 2 July 2015. Appeal Ref: APP/D3830/A/14/2226987 Land at London Road, Hassocks (Planning appeal dismissal on grounds including negative impact on air quality).**
- WSP Malton and Norton Infrastructure and Connectivity Improvements Study – Final Appendices - **Appendix A – Policies and Strategies Summary - Page 9 of 10.**
- Letter of objection from Simon Thackray in respect of planning application 14/00427/MOUTE (Housing on the Showfield, Pasture Lane), on the grounds that development will have a negative impact on the future air quality in Malton.
- Letter of objection from Simon Thackray in respect of planning application 14/00678/MOUTE (FME High Malton) on the following grounds:
 1. **The High Malton development of 500 houses would, if approved, have a negative effect on air quality in the Malton AQMA resulting in the AQMA failing to comply with EU limit values for Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂), in conflict with Para 124 of NPPF.**
 2. **The revised Air Quality Assessment submitted by the applicant has failed to calculate the cumulative impact on air quality from individual sites in the area in conflict with Para 124 of the NPPF.**
 3. **The development would undermine the objectives of the Malton Air Quality Action Plan 2012 (Action 8), 'requiring development proposals within or adjoining the Malton Air Quality Management Area to demonstrate how effects on air quality will be mitigated and further human exposure to poor air quality reduced.'**
- **Proposed HCV Restriction - Predicted Impacts.** Proposed Heavy Commercial Vehicle Restriction over Norton Level Crossing - Predicted Impacts on Pollutant Emissions. Paul Hunt, Ryedale District Council. RDV/EnvHealth/PVH/1.2/Feb 2016.
- **Kevin Hollinrake MP, Member of Parliament, Thirsk & Malton Constituency: 'Local occupancy clauses detrimental to the sustainability of rural life.'** 12 April, 2018.