

## SITES CONSULTATION 2015

Representor	Comment
<b>S Branch Pickering Medical Practice Participation Group</b>	(response made before consultation started) The increase in population, will need to be reflected in the five year business plan. Need to be considered by the CCGs
<b>E. Cooper</b>	<p>(response made before consultation started) Site 480 is an area of archaeological interest, but based on archaeological digs no evidence has been found. Residents are favouring this site because of the access opportunity to the A64, and without going through the village.</p> <hr/> <p>Consider that the access is suitable.</p> <hr/> <p>Pleased to hear that site 177 is a low priority.</p>
<b>N. and M. Ward</b>	(response made before consultation started) Sites 481, 267 and 147. Concerned about traffic generation, particularly in the summer, and the infrastructure capacity of the settlement. People would also have to commute for employment.
<b>Huttons Ambo Parish Council</b>	(response made before consultation started) Council wishes to record that it considers the current development boundary (the western edge of submitted sites 113 and 21) to be the limit of the extension into the Parish of Huttons Ambo.
<b>Kirkbymoorside Town Council(response made before consultation started)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Site 10- retain for sports field extension</li> <hr/> <li>· 622- consider flooding issues could be addressed by adequate drainage and elevation measures</li> <hr/> <li>· 102 will satisfy the need for affordable housing</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Encourage development sites which would not jeopardise the character of the town and are in scale</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Sites to south of the A170 would encourage driving into town due to the poor crossing points</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Northern sites 201,345,431 would also see an increase in movement.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· 156, 56/467·</li> </ul>
	In considering sites: public rights of way should be enhanced; green space and access to it, architectural merit; environmental sustainability (Transition Town)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Want to see additional employment to support the housing growth. Ensure more employment land is made available.</li> </ul>

<b>M McCandless, Head Teacher of Ryedale School</b>	(response made before consultation started) . Seek to split the requirement between Swinton and Amotherby. Maximum 15 houses. Houses to meet Local Need. Development will not add to problems with traffic.
---	---

<b>Amotherby Parish Council</b>	(response made before consultation started) . Seek to split the requirement between Swinton and Amotherby. Maximum 15 houses. Houses to meet Local Need. Development will not add to problems with traffic.
	<u>Site 8</u> : would not want to lose Station House Farm- contributes to the street scene; BATA amenity issues; too large and extends too far east; sand and drainage issues; narrow access to main street; archaeological issues; eastward expansion- harm to setting of the Listed Church to the south; total opposition to this site.
	<u>Site 61</u> : old quarry, contamination; noise from factory; would not add congestion to main street.
	<u>Site 148</u> : large site, but could provide parking for the school; roman road runs along the south of the site; mechanisms would need to be applied to restrict parking on Meadowfield and associated streets; public expressed some support.
	<u>Site 181</u> : Safety concerns due to proximity to BATA; noise problems; no support for this site.
	<u>Site 371</u> : Working factory, public expressed opposition
	<u>Sites 381/612</u> : could accommodate development of 1 dwelling

	<p><u>Site 635</u> Roman to the south of the site, access onto B1257 achievable but would need speed reduction, close to Westlers (Malton Foods), would not add congestion to Main Street.</p>
	<p><u>Site 636</u> Join Swinton and Amotherby, within AONB</p>
<b>M Tanner</b>	<p>(response made before consultation started) I have gathered that the village has already had its quota, but in viewing the website the sites are site there. Is site 173/252 which would present significant access problems still being considered</p>
<b>Pickering Town Council</b>	<p><u>Site 347</u> site on rising ground but would not be prominent; Assumed access would be from A169. Large site and could accommodate a large number of dwellings.</p> <p><u>Site 387</u> natural choice for development, but there are some constraints: proximity to industrial estate and waste water treatment works, dealing with surface run off, and access/egress along minor roads.</p> <p><u>Site 200</u> complement the scheme on the other side of the road, site would have access to the main road.</p> <p><u>Site 116</u> Concerns: rising ground, attractive feature of the parish, would reduce the gap between Pickering and Middleton, should not be allocated.</p> <p><u>Site 504</u> key advantage of site is that it adjoins the A170.</p> <p><u>Site 110/146</u> site behind Ruffa Lane, access to the main roads would be along minor roads, with on street parking.</p> <p>Concerns that there is not enough land to be allocated for employment land</p>
<b>H Webster</b>	<p>(response made before consultation started) Concerned about scale of potential allocations: traffic issues, pressure on the over-subscribed school, limited facilities and services. Need to focus on established villages and towns.</p>
<b>R Jones</b>	<p>(response made before consultation started) Object. Concerns about the existing infrastructure: roads, schools, utilities; there are no community facilities. How would access be achieved onto the A170?</p>

<b>Beadlam Parish Council</b>	(response made before consultation started) site 639, access onto Gale Lane- traffic issues. Sites 147/267 Too large; access issues; 481: to large and access concerns, Concerned that sites represent a level a development which the facilities of the village cannot cope with, with the schools using temporary class rooms.
<b>A. and M. Scott</b>	(response made before consultation started) Concerns about impact on residential amenity, loss of view, property devaluing, cannot sustain large scale development: roads, utilities, drainage. Loss of good agricultural land. Limited existing facilities. Existing traffic concerns present with the road into Beadlam.
<b>A. Welland, C. Bellwood, J. G. Bellwood, L. Paton, D. Paton, K. Paton and M. Paton</b>	(response made before consultation started) No amenities, and poor bus service . 230 houses being built at Kirkbymoorside, with more too at Helmsley. Rising land, and no precedent of backland development. Loss of important views for residents. Already parking issues identified. Open spaces within the village should remain so.
<b>C . Legard, Scampston Estate</b>	Disappointed that no sites in Scampston being taken forward. Slow limited development would breath life into the village. Scampston is within walk/cycling distance of Rillington. Could small schemes be still considered despite not being included in this plan?
<b>J. Cook</b>	The letter refers to only allocating sites in the Market Towns and Service Villages, what policies would apply for those settlements outside these two areas.
<b>T. Dykes</b>	The range of land uses the Local Plan Sites Document appears to be relatively restrictive, in particular uses which do not relate to the settlement hierarchy, including energy/infrastructure uses.

<p><b>D. Hendley</b></p>	<p>The Planning Inspector's Report on the Examination into the Ryedale Plan - Local Plan Strategy (para, 122) in part found Policy SP18 sound because "more detailed aspects of the latest Planning practice guidance can be addressed in the LPSD" (the Local Plan). Since the adoption of the Local Plan Strategy, the Written Ministerial Statement on Local planning (June 2015), in part states that wind energy development should be located in areas of search, which are to be shown in the Development Plan - this has added more impetus for the Local Plan Sites Document to deal with planning guidance for renewable energy infrastructure. Potentially land could also be shown for other types of energy/infrastructure uses. My question therefore is, if representations are made in respect of 'areas of search' for wind in the Local Plan Sites Document will the Council therefore consider them, and as fully as representations for housing, etc. ?</p>
<p><b>L. Dyson</b></p>	<p>Concerned about the various sites submitted in Gilling East- will any of them come forward- there is poor drainage, not good access and no local infrastructure.</p>
<p><b>C. Wilson</b></p>	<p>Supportive of site 206 (Pickering) performs well through the accessibility criteria, relatively well screened area of western approach, schools are nearby with no main roads to cross.</p>
<p><b>P W Fisher Cundalls (obo various landowners in Wrelton, Middleton, Wilton, Newton upon Rawcliffe , Marton, Broughton and</b></p>	<p>I wonder if it is possible for you to let me know whether future housing proposals in the above villages are no longer being considered - and that these villages are being left to die!</p>
<p><b>Office of Rail and Road(Rail Regulation)</b></p>	<p>No comment to make on this particular document. ORR only requires to be consulted where there is impacts on main line railway, tramway or London Underground.</p>
<p><b>Rillington Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Concerns about the potential scale of development, although aware that not all sites are necessary. The school is at capacity, and increases to traffic will impact proportionately. It would be helpful if RDC can confirm which areas have been discounted, and those which are considered for possible development- then we will be better placed to provide a more constructive response.</p>

<b>J. Richardson of Pickering Participation Group</b>	<p>The practice is a key public service, despite being a private partnership. Need more effort being put into delivering infrastructure to support any of the proposals outlined in this consultation. There needs to be more consultation and engagement concerning the implications of such development. A presence needs to be established.</p>
<b>S E R Millward</b>	<p>Concerns about development on Knoll Hill at Ampleforth. Site had various sensitivities concerning landscape (AONB and National Park), settlement character, impact on Listed Buildings and Conservation Area, traffic issues, refused by a previous Inspector. Already has seen recent development.</p>
<b>N. Taylor</b>	<p>Concerns about development on Knoll Hill at Ampleforth. Site had various sensitivities concerning landscape (AONB and National Park), settlement character, impact on Listed Buildings and Conservation Area, traffic issues, refused by a previous Inspector. There is not the need. Already a number of properties are for sale for a long time.</p>
<b>S. Harrison</b>	<p>Concerns about development at Knoll Hill, steep gradient, speeding traffic. Is the site within the Conservation Area? and Where are the boundaries with the AONB? It is close to the boundary with the National Park. The houses off Station Road do not enhance the village, and have come before any increase in Service Provision. The existing bus service is under threat.</p>
<b>Willerby Parish Council</b>	<p>Concerned that original sites remain as potential sites. Only site residents have no objections to site 480 being developed, otherwise firmly object to the other sites.</p>
	<p>Can you confirm that all the sites (except 480) have been discounted.</p>

<b>S. Wormald</b>	Concerned about the development of sites 218/249 due to road safety and congestion, and this scheme will exacerbate existing issues.
<b>S. Frank</b>	<p>Sites to the north of River Derwent are preferred, the problem with developments in Norton is the already congested rail/river crossing.</p> <hr/> <p>At least one new school is required, so a large site would help to deliver this.</p> <hr/> <p>Northern Arc- need to attract large high street retailers to stop leakage</p> <hr/> <p>Use WSCP and land around for 6-7 large units and a budget hotel. How about a B&amp;Q with petrol filling station on York Road</p> <hr/> <p>Hope to see redevelopment of the livestock market, but don't consider that site can meet all needs on that site. Hope the old factory site on Welham Road progresses soon.</p> <hr/> <p>A science and technology park close to the A64 will be a big boost- hope the Food Enterprise Zone will become a reality soon. Better paid jobs are essential, and will stop young people moving away.</p> <hr/> <p>I wish to see much better transport and infrastructure. A new road/rail crossing might help, with footbridge and path between Scarborough Road and Old Malton. Town bus is woefully inadequate and does not encourage usage of public transport.</p> <hr/> <p>Would like to see the Town Council's merging, Malton and Norton are one community and should be recognised as such.</p> <hr/> <p>Need better mobile reception.</p>

<b>S. Miller</b>	<p>Concerned about sites 249/218. These were rejected by the planning committee. Need to impose the weight restriction on HGVs</p> <p>Traffic problems must be resolved before more applications can be considered</p> <p>Dualling of the A64 commence, with a roundabout at the west end of the bypass.</p> <p>Such a road could link into the Castle Howard Road</p> <p>Must improve the flow of traffic through Butcher Corner- to reduce both congestion and pollution.</p>
<b>Nawton Parish Council</b>	<p>522 Has been sold</p> <hr/> <p>55 has been built out</p> <hr/> <p>105 is too large and its development would harm the character of the settlement.</p> <hr/> <p>Site 173/252 is subject to a ransom strip, and the other sites would bring traffic problems</p> <hr/> <p>Beadlam, having had no recent development, and if development is to take place, it should be there; perhaps through the improvements to access situation at Beadlam School.</p> <hr/> <p>Permanently discount sites in Nawton for the above reasons.</p>
<b>Historic England</b>	<p>Outlines the importance of the extensive archaeological landscape of the Vale of Pickering - and should be considered in policy terms as being of equivalent status as a Scheduled Monument.</p>

Before allocating any of the following sites (184e, 578,579 ) the plan needs to have an approach to the consideration and treatment of archaeology in these sites. 184e, 578 and 579 Identified as being in an extensive archaeological landscape, the Vale of Pickering. Before identifying as an allocation, a programme of management of the site is required, to ensure management of potentially nationally-significant remains.

For each of the sites below the following needs to be done before the Site is allocated: Before allocating this site for development:-(1) An assessment needs to be undertaken of the contribution which this site makes to those elements which contribute towards the significance of the Conservation Area and the Listed Buildings in its vicinity and what impact the loss of this site and its subsequent development might have upon their significance. (2) If it is considered that the development of this site would harm elements which contribute to the significance of the Conservation Area or Listed Buildings, then the Plan needs to set out the measures by which that harm might be removed or reduced. (3) If, at the end of the process, it is concluded that the development would still be likely to harm elements which contribute to the significance of these designated heritage assets, then this site should not be allocated unless there are clear public benefits that outweigh the harm (as is required by NPPF, Paragraph 133 or 134):

Site 62 (impact on the setting of Old Malton Conservation Area, and the Listed Buildings which are along the frontage)

Site 324 (impact on the setting of Old Malton Conservation Area, development of the site would close the gap to 160metres between Old Malton and Malton.

Site 452. Malton Cemetery Chapel and Behren's Mausoleum are Grade II Listed Buildings, within 60m of the site. There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that "special regard" should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. If allocated, the Plan should make it clear that development proposals for this area would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this building are not harmed.

Endorse the Plan's approach to the network of historic field boundaries, and the intention to direct development away from the areas where the strip field system is relatively intact and legible.

116 The allocation of this site would narrow the gap between the main built-up area of Pickering and Middleton Conservation Area to 380 metres.

650 That part of the site which extends beyond the eastern edge of the existing built-up area of the town extends into a historic strip field system whose boundaries are still clearly legible. Given the significant contribution which this landscape makes to the setting of the town, the eastern part of the site should not be allocated.

198 With the exception of the loss of one boundary, the historic field pattern is still legible on this site and forms part of an extensive network of medieval strip fields between Outgang Lane and Malton Road. The loss of this area would result in harm to the historic field system to the south of the town and thereby harm its landscape setting.

205/387 With the exception of the loss of one boundary, the historic field pattern is still legible on this site and forms part of an extensive network of medieval strip fields that lies to the south of Firthland Road. The loss of this area would result in harm to the historic field system to the south of the town and thereby harm its landscape setting.

58 - Site is adjacent to the Kirkbymoorside Conservation Area.

Site 8 - The Church of St. Helen, 40 m south of the site is a Grade II Listed Building. There needs to be an assessment of what contribution to the significance of this Listed Building, and what effect the loss of this site, and its subsequent development might have upon those significances.

643-This site adjoins the boundary of the Hovingham Conservation Area and, in addition, there are a number of Grade II Listed Buildings to the east of this area. There needs to be an assessment of what contribution to the significance of these Listed Buildings, and what effect the loss of this site, and its subsequent development might have upon those significances.

175-This site lies 215 metres from the boundary of the Grade II\* Historic Park and Garden at Scampston Hall. National policy guidance makes it clear that Grade I and II\* Historic Parks and Gardens are regarded as being in the category of designated heritage assets of the highest significance where substantial harm to their significance should be wholly exceptional.

	<p>71- Pasture House Farmhouse (to the east of this site), Corner Farmhouse and the range of outbuildings to its rear to the north of this area) are Grade II Listed Buildings. If allocated, the Plan should make it clear that development proposals for this area would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this building are not harmed</p> <hr/> <p>51- This site adjoins the boundary of the Sheriff Hutton Conservation Area and the Churchyard of the Grade I Listed Church of St Helen and the Holy Cross. National policy guidance makes it clear that Grade I and II* Listed Buildings are regarded as being in the category of designated heritage assets of the highest significance where substantial harm to their significance should be wholly exceptional.</p> <hr/> <p>429 - This site lies within the Slingsby Conservation Area. Castle Farmhouse and Height Farmhouse, on High Street, are a Grade II Listed Buildings. The development of this area could also affect the setting of the ruins of Slingsby Castle which is both a Grade II Listed Building and a Scheduled Monument.</p>
<b>R. Harris</b>	<p>Concerns about landscape impact, proximity to National Park and AONB. Other more appropriate sites. Road safety issues.</p>
<b>Cushman Wakefield obo Royal Mail Group</b>	<p>Concerning sites 139 and 150. Object to Site Selection Methodology concerning amenity and impact on traffic movements. Want to ensure that the operations of Royal Mail are not fettered through, in particular, residential development. Should development be approved, the need for appropriate acoustic fencing and other mitigation measures would be required.</p>
<b>S, B and J Chestnutt</b>	<p>Sites 218/249 Impact on the Howardian Hills AONB - and statutory duty to</p> <hr/> <p>Access to A64 is a priority for development in and around Malton</p> <hr/> <p>Loss of good agricultural land</p> <hr/> <p>On-going issues with the sewerage system- new development will</p> <hr/> <p>Should distribute more housing to the villages to enable them to survive and progress.</p>

<b>R. Ibbotson</b>	Object to housing development on Castle Howard Road. Detrimental impact on Castle Howard Road, and damage the outlook of the AONB, protection of which should be a priority.
<b>T. Haurston</b>	Object to sites 616 and 111. Knoll Hill is a startling an natural feature of the landscape. Proximity to the National Park and the Howardian Hills AONB. Also traffic/road safety issues - steep gradient. Contributes to the Conservation Area. As a Service Village, the village should have no more than 2-3 houses a year.
<b>J and M Knight</b>	Consider that site 643 (Hovingham) should be category 2 site- and not considered further. Access onto B1257, opposite the York junction is dangerous. Harm the viability of Worsley Arms Farm, who needs access, and the proximity of houses to the livestock buildings. The farm also needs access to the rear. Scheme would destroy an orchard and allotments. These are impossible to replace. Drainage concerns- overloading the beck. Concerned about the mix, of the Pasture Lane development, none of the houses are occupied have children at the village school.
<b>J. R. Nursey</b>	(Flaxton) Development of the sites (other than site 20) major impact on the character and setting of the village, which is largely within a Conservation Area. These sites do not accord with the Council's strategy for Service Villages, which is based on there already being adequate sites available for outstanding housing demand. Housing sites in Flaxton would solely provide housing for commuters to elsewhere, very limited facilities, and a poor bus service. In particular 397, would be particularly visually obtrusive, in terms of settlement character, impact on the Conservation Area, the Church and existing properties. There are drainage concerns, being the lowest land around the village, and surface water gravitates to the area. Building, and increasing hard standing will exacerbate flood risk. Issues also around common land access.
<b>J. Smith</b>	West End, Ampleforth. Concerns. Road and facilities cannot cope with the increased population. Important contribution to visual amenity, abutting the National Park and the Howardian Hills AONB. Estate Development would be incompatible with the Conservation Area. There has been limited uptake of the existing new development. Suggests further planning permission is not required in this village, and certainly not on this site.

<b>P. Gill</b>	Object to sites 616 and 111. Knoll Hill provides beautiful views. Within AONB. Development would damage the character and appearance of an existing Conservation Area. If further housing is required, it should be through infill sites, and not the expense of the rural character of the village and the wider landscape in which it lies.
<b>S. Connor</b>          <b>J. Rutherford</b>	Object to sites 616 and 111, existing houses are for sale, and have been advertised at distance and at length (mentions in Sunderland) . People already commuting to other places for work. Should have 2-3 units a year. A significant development would irrevocably change the character of the settlement. In the 2002 Local Plan the site is outside Development Limits. Based on previous applications why is it even being considered. The site is within the AONB, in the Conservation Area.  It would be sacrilege to destroy the beautiful Knoll Hill. It has a deep beauty and special character as it rises perfectly on approach from the east.
<b>E. Cooper</b>	Sites in Staxton 177 - land for extension of sports facilities          The boundary hedges on Wains Lane mark the centenary of the land being awarded to the Parish when the land was enclosed in 1802-03.  Site closest to Mayfield Villas is favourable (480) . Archaeology on the site itself is limited. Helped excavations in the 1930s, highway access can be achieved.
<b>S. Shepherd</b>	30 homes in Abbey View, and other, smaller developments with several properties for sale, there is not a great demand for housing. Affordable housing is also provided. Site 616 is Knoll Hill is very attractive, and contributes to the Conservation Area. Highway access could be difficult, visibility is poor, slopes are difficult in winter, and as a caravan route to avoid Sutton Bank, in the summer this causes congestion.

<b>A Frank</b>	Supportive of both Castle Howard Road Sites (subject to a link road). Supportive of Norton Lodge site if the traffic problems can be over come. Perhaps greater public transport, is a Park and Ride feasible?
<b>S. Murrell</b>	Object to sites 616 and 111. Objections remain as in 2009, but for the fact that permission has now been granted for at least 40 dwellings. (Refers to the 2002 Local Plan Development Limits and settlement commentary) landscape harm; estate development- lack of integration with the village; road safety and traffic issues; no need for further housing in this area; inconsistent with the Conservation Area designation.
<b>M. Gray</b>	<p>Kirkbymoorside- allow option 1, redevelopment of Micrometalsmiths site and adjoining land for residential purposes to support the relocation of the factory. Consideration should also be given to small office buildings to house professional highly paid workers.</p> <p>Any new permission of 369 should require an upper storey for offices.</p> <p>Site 622 appears reasonable for employment land</p>
<b>C .and H. Rodda</b>	Site 616: Knoll Hill, within the AONB, adjacent to the National Park. Harmful to outlook of Oak Cottage, West End, bought for its views and tranquillity. The land is within an area of Conservation.
<b>G C Ridsdale</b>	Best site for Staxton, if we have to have new build housing, is site 480, owned by Mr. Hunnybell. On the fringe of the village, with easy access onto the A64 . School numbers would rise, but other than this there would be no upset of any other means.

<b>S. Read</b>	Ampleforth, proposed sites would destroy rural character. Specifically, sites 111 and 616: Knoll Hill, within the AONB, adjacent to the National Park, refused planning permission in the past. There is road safety concerns with a 14 % gradient. It is the caravan route for the A170 to avoid Sutton Bank. Focus on infilling, and there is the existing site which has permission.
<b>D. Powell</b>	Site 478- access to this site is down a single Private Track, leading to two properties. Sites 178,478, 537, 538, 566 would have their access onto East Street, which is not wide enough consistently for two vehicles and is used by the bus. The best site is 341, which is adjacent to Meadowfield Close, which was granted within the presence of the Scrap Yard.
<b>F. Ellis</b>	Ampleforth - Note that 9 sites are listed for potential allocation.
<b>K. Monkman</b>	<p>Site 218 - best site for future housing of the options: close to town, can get access to A64 without going through the Town Centre. Although close to the AONB, forms a natural extension to the town, there should be no light industrial component, only uses which serve the residents i.e. local retail and leisure.</p> <p>Site 249 - equally suitable, should also be set aside for additional primary school provision.</p> <p>Site 452 - Good site for retail development. Close enough to town centre away from the congestion of Butcher Corner. Similar schemes at Beverley and Thirsk have enhanced the town centre, not detracted from it.</p> <p>The large site to the east of Beverley Road is a good area for development, should be planning for the relief road between York and Scarborough Road. The link from Beverley Road to Scarborough Road should be phase 1 of this aspiration. Development of the site should facilitate that, and excellent site for a primary school.</p>

<b>R. and L. Beck</b>	Ampleforth sites 111 and 616:
<b>R. North</b>	<p>Confused that why there is sites on the maps, and that developments will be concentrated in the Market Towns and 10 Service Villages, but 'no decisions have been made'. If this the case, and no development will be allowed at Thorpe Bassett, why have these maps of the parish plans?</p> <hr/> <p>Whilst majority of development should take place within the Market Towns and Service Villages, small villages should be able to have occasional infill. Should the criteria for Service Villages be re-examined? for example West Heslerton has a pub and school and is on a regular bus route. Also the market towns have traffic/infrastructure concerns which need to be addressed.</p> <hr/> <p>Provided comments on sites in Thorpe Bassett.</p> <hr/> <p>Consider that the new site recommended off Low Moorgate in Rillington is quite acceptable.</p> <hr/> <p>There are some untidy areas of Westgate, and perhaps this area could be looked at for the provision of affordable homes, all of which would help sustain local Services.</p> <hr/> <p>How can small scale development take place in the 'Non Service Villages' to meet local needs and changing circumstances.</p>
<b>E. Banks</b>	424 Terrington - concerned about the scale, only infill should be considered, as it is not a Service Village. Scale of site is disproportionate, it's proximity to the school and the road is narrow without footpaths.
<b>Welham Park Residents Association</b>	<p>Observations on site 649:</p> <hr/> <p>We understand that the site is dependent on the link road being provided. However, there will still be a large increase of traffic on Beverley Road, and traffic will still go through the congested Mill Street to access the Station. Mill Street is narrow, within a residential area.</p>

There will be an increase in heavy goods vehicles and plant. There is already problems along the road with such vehicles.

578 dwellings in what is a small market town - would not be fair on residents and would change the character of the town forever. Such a large site would not integrate well with the existing communities, and place pressure on community facilities.

25% population increase in 15 years is too great.

Norton has limited shopping facilities, the increase in population would place pressure on those facilities, and many more people would cross into Malton.

The population increase will harm the ability of Malton to retain its old-world charm, and the ability to park and shop locally. Existing facilities may be replaced by brash, bigger facilities.

Doctors, dentists and hospitals are already struggling to cope, and this sudden large population increase would place an unacceptable pressure on these facilities placing residents health at risk.

Concerns regarding the provision of utilities, disruption to existing services, and the strains placed on existing infrastructure.

The presence of a new school is much needed, but would soon become full. People would drive their children to school- increasing traffic.

Site 649 is a large area of farmland - also has public rights of way, which residents use for recreation. The loss of this greenbelt and recreational amenity will be keenly felt.

Concerned about the disturbance of archaeological remains.

Concerned about the loss of longer distance views to the Wolds being lost, including the heights of some buildings

	<p>As the site would be built out over a number of years, having moving to a house on the edge of the countryside for peace and quiet, the loss of this would be very distressing.</p> <p>Not opposed to new development, but concerned about the scale of the development, and that in having such a large development the large influx of new residents will challenge community cohesion. Smaller developments encourage social interaction and are more easily absorbed into an existing community.</p> <p>The Resident's Association wish to be notified of any further plans, and if any application is to be decided by Councillors, representatives would like to speak at any meeting of the committee, and let us know as soon as possible of any such meeting.</p>
<b>S. Cooper</b>	<p>Great Edstone (472) Site is immediately to the south of the Saxon St. Michael's Church, site would interfere with the view of this and wider , long distance views to the Howardian Hills.</p>
<b>N. McGovern</b>	<p>Object to the submission sites in Gilling East (35,36,44,107) as: To the rear of existing properties,  Flood risk issues;  Wildlife; including several protected trees  Agricultural land;  Demolition of existing dwelling/creation of new access road;  Cawton Road is not a viable road;  Poor visibility of junction B1363, exacerbated by the pub on the corner.  Gilling East has no services;  Challenging market for selling homes, particularly family homes in the village.  Its a hamlet, not a village.</p>
<b>North York Moors Historical Railway Trust</b>	<p>North York Moors Railway is a leading attraction and provider of employment. Sustaining the attraction requires the means to improve the quality of the visitor experience, maintain infrastructure and equipment in a self-sustaining manner. Involving additional land are very limited, and it is the intention to focus on existing land holdings, particularly in Pickering, in the New Bridge zone. Looking at developing a Master Plan for Pickering which covers: · A partial solution to the current shortage of parking ; Development of a new visitor reception centre ; A car/coach drop off point in the existing car park of Pickering Station; Transfer of Carriage workshops to, and the construction of a carriage barn, on an area of land immediately west of the railway and north of the Trout Farm crossing. The above is subject to land acquisition and successful fundraising . In order to secure funding, it is important to secure funder confidence in the deliverability/developability of schemes. Whilst we have had a number of informal discussions with the Local Planning Authority, there is little reference to the railway in the Local Plan Strategy, and so we would seek to have the significance and planning needs of the Railway included in that iteration of the Local Plan Sites Document.</p>

<b>C. and S. Long</b>	Object to site 8 for the following reasons:
	Village school- periodic congestion when school is starting and finishing. Traffic is grid locked.
	BATA lorries leave at regular intervals
	The general volume of traffic has increased over the last 10-12 years
	Any site should avoid Meadowfields
	Access to site 8: concerns about width of access in proximity to Station House Farm and neighbouring property.
	The logical access is owned by a third party, on land between Zetechnics and Station Farm
	Disagree with Highway impacts (Q.46), what is the mitigation? there would be conflicts with existing factory traffic .
	Should not consider the demolition of Station Farm House, although not listed, it is an attractive, historic property which is part of the character of the village, and this should not be compromised.
	Site is too large in size- leading to further properties being built in the future.
	Special qualities, landscape setting, agree strongly that the rural, pastoral qualities would be lost through development, harming the character of the settlement.
	Proximity to the Grade II Listed Church- currently enjoys a peaceful setting which would be lost through development
	Potential important archaeological remains: Roman and Mediaeval
Potential risk to public water supply (ground source protection zone) (it refers to harm to water supply from food manufacturing )	

Noise from BATA is often heard on an evening, and into the night

land instability - during the building of Jubilee Ho. and Cornwall Ho, the latter need piling to a great depth

Not been able to view the submitted scheme - is this not available to view- it should be made available

Amotherby and Swinton have no group 4 sites, and yet there are 6 such sites in other villages, in addition to the group 3 site at Pecketts Yard in Sheriff Hutton.

See no reason for your preference of site 8 over site 341 in Swinton or 148 in Amotherby- both perform better in terms of amenity

in Q3, 148 there is an error, the pavement extends to Appleton le Street.

Group 4 sites at Ampleforth, Nawton/Beadlam, and Sherburn should be considered, and group three sites in Rillington, Thornton le Dale, Staxton and Willerby, Hovingham and Sherburn.

Q50. factual inaccuracy - there are issues with the drainage system in Amotherby and Swinton

Q52 -site 8 will have an impact on the church and its environs. 148 should have a higher rating owing to the potential for a school car park and direct access to the B1257.

	<p>We believe that there are a number of serious errors/flaws in the SSM and that it needs a lot more refinement</p>
	<p>148 although large only a portion would need to be developed, with the previously stated advantages</p>
	<p>635 - access directly onto the B1257</p>
	<p>341 - No adverse impact on Ground Source Protection Zone. Scrap Yard noise is an intermittent feature, and within normal working hours.</p>
	<p>538 - Disagree that the distance of Amotherby School should be viewed as negatively, given that many children already travel from Swinton to school. Furthermore there is a direct connection to a highway maintainable at the public expense</p>
	<p>Should develop at other group 4 sites.</p>
<b>S. Oswald</b>	<p>Site 324- the Extent of the site would represent a significant closure on the gap between Malton and Old Malton. It is critical importance to retain no further coalescence between the two settlements. Further closure of the gap will undermine any potential for an individual's understanding and interpretation of the historic development of the two settlements, which is important to understanding the separate evolution of the settlements. This has not being appropriately reflected in the site assessment.</p>
	<p>Retention of one relatively narrow field does not provide adequate mitigation for the detrimental impact that would result from development.</p>
	<p>The coalescence is significant, and has to be acknowledged as such in the Q11 of the SSM , it has been downplayed in the Consultation Document.</p>
	<p>Development of the site would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the St. Mary's Church, the tower of which can be seen from public rights of way surrounding the site.</p>

	<p>Significant loss of the landscaped setting to the west of Old Malton, which would result in the loss of clear views of St. Mary's. both from Rainbow Lane, and Westgate Lane. The loss of this would remove any potential for someone to understand the evolution of Old Malton and St. Mary's church which is Grade I Listed, and is afforded the strongest protection as a result. This impact cannot be mitigated, and will need to be reflected in. Q13 of the Site Assessment.</p>
	<p>Need to bring these views to Historic England, and report the outcome of these discussions.</p>
<b>P Riley</b>	<p>Castle Howard Road Site 218 - If other more appropriately serviced and situated sites ( Broughton Road, Pasture Lane, Norton sites) are developed this will meet the need</p>
	<p>Development at High Malton and Castle Howard Road (especially 3+ storeys) which would create an unacceptable and detrimental impact on the AONB.</p>
	<p>Landscape features, including mature trees, agricultural land and other habitats will be lost.</p>
	<p>Unacceptable level of traffic on residential roads, with need for a roundabout at the bottom of Castle Howard Road being detrimental to entrance to the town</p>
	<p>Air quality is already poor in areas, new development would only exacerbate this.</p>
	<p>Struggling sewerage system -would need significant investment, and affect traffic movements- affecting businesses in the town.</p>
	<p>Any development should have quick and easy access to the A64, without needing to negotiate residential roads and queue at junctions.</p>
<b>F. Wilson</b>	<p>Ampleforth sites 111 and 616:Development of an estate style would conflict with AONB principles designations; 40 houses with David Wilson Homes scheme, as a Service Village it should be 2-3 houses a year; development would completely change the character of the area; Knoll Hill is a particularly prominent attractive feature of the area; road access is hazardous, with steep gradient, particularly in bad weather or when the A170 is diverted.</p>
<b>L Dodsworth</b>	<p>Object to site 8 for the following reasons:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Village school- periodic congestion when school is starting and finishing. Traffic is grid locked.· Access to site 8: concerns about width of access in proximity to Station House Farm and neighbouring property.· The general volume of traffic (including business traffic) and speed is concerning</li> </ul> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Should not consider the demolition of Station Farm House, although not listed, it is an attractive, historic property which is part of the character of the village, and this should not be compromised.</p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· 148 is the preferred site, remove traffic problems. Would not spoil the village</li> </ul> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· 635 would also be a good site, and remove traffic problems</li> </ul> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· 538 - Disagree that the distance of Amotherby School is too far from Swinton, many children already travel from Swinton to school and further afield.</li> </ul>
<b>W. and L .Saggers</b>	<p>Ampleforth sites 111 and 616:A breeding pair of Curlew inhabit the two fields. Both adjacent, and part within the Ampleforth Conservation Area. Established agricultural use, important visual impact rural setting for the linear development of the village; development would completely change the character of the area; Knoll Hill is a particularly prominent attractive feature of the area; Development would conflict with AONB principles designations and was refused permission in 1987.</p>
<b>S. Robinson</b>	<p>Ampleforth Sites 111 and 616: Sites are important views and vistas into and out of the Conservation Area, identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal.</p> <p>Productive agricultural sites for pasture, hay and silage.</p> <p>14% gradient, poor road conditions in winter and makes for difficult driving conditions, an access on the hill would be dangerous.</p> <p>Knoll Hill important to the identify of Ampleforth, and the various historic and listed properties in proximity. particularly Fern Villa. It is enjoyed by both visitors and residents.</p> <p>The road separates these site from being in the National Park, and the sites are viewable at distance, from the other side of the valley.</p> <p>17 houses for sale in the village. Scheme of c.40 homes.</p> <p>History of planning permission being sought, and refused. The reasons for refusal remain unchanged.</p>

<b>J. Forbes</b>	<p>Object to sites 218 and 249 on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Significant visual impact on the setting of the AONB, with 4 Visual Impact Assessments failing to demonstrate that there would not be harm by the proposed development.</li> <li>· 249 is also a prominent and exposed site</li> <li>· Unacceptable, negative impact on attractive approach to Malton</li> <li>· Unacceptable impact on traffic: congestion, queuing, air quality issues, particularly at Butcher Corner with the AQMA.</li> <li>· Unacceptable impact on traffic on residential streets.</li> <li>· Noise levels from A64</li> <li>· 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 a school, shop pub.</li> </ul>
<b>M. Godwin</b>	<p>Object to sites 616 and 111:C.40 homes are already being built.  Knoll Hill provides wonderful visual amenity  The land provides pasture  Worried about the increase in traffic and consequent road safety issues  A Service Village it should be no more than 2-3 units per year.  There has been plans refused in the past  The sites are within the Howardian Hills AONB  Border the National Park  2002 Local Plan Development Limits- outside this  Sites are adjacent to the Conservation Area  Adverse impact on the local residents but also visitors to the area</p>
<b>I. Conlan</b>	<p>In considering sites take into account the following criteria, and why sites 218 and 249 are unsuitable:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sites should have vehicular four-way access on to the A64, without needing to pass through the centre of Malton or the AQMA. Congestion and the AQMA are key issues.</li> <li>Need a real strategy for improving public transport, and non-vehicular modes of travel- such as improving the connectivity between to the towns through foot crossings so that it more attractive to walk/cycle and less attractive to drive. Use of a 20mph speed limit. HGV ban must be enacted urgently, as of the other complementary measures.</li> <li>2. Sites should have careful regard to environmental sensitivities: such as visual impact on the AONB, Conservation Area, character of an area, flooding, sewage and drainage issue. Sites should be rejected where building houses affect the setting of the AONB, damage the character of the area, causes increased flooding to adjacent areas, or exacerbate sewage and drainage issues.</li> <li>3. Sufficient school places should be available on site or nearby for all children, irrespective of their faith, so that there is no increase in journeys exacerbating the issues of congestion and air quality. also in terms of Catchments, these should be defined to only Malton or only Norton, to reduce pressure on the crossing.</li> </ol>

On that basis, I object to the sites 218 and 249 on the following grounds.

· Site 218 Significant visual impact on the AONB; 4 Visual Impact Assessments failed to demonstrate that building on the site could be undertaken without significant unacceptable visual harm to the AONB, the landscaping scheme as part of the 4th assessment in itself had a substantial negative impact.

· Site 249 is also prominent and exposed from the AONB, the slope and existing vegetation provides a screen. 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.

· the site is unable to deliver affordable housing in line with council guidelines.

· I also have serious reservations about any sites in Old Malton until such time as the flooding issues are resolved to the resident's satisfaction, such as the installation of a permanent pump, and that the sewage issue is resolved that creates a stink at Butcher Corner.

· I also have reservations about sites in West Norton which are far from any 4 way access to the A64, and would likely pass through the AQMA to access westbound A64 or northbound directions.

· Smaller sites in Malton would likely have smaller traffic impacts than large sites, but would still negatively impact on the air quality of the AQMA where they would have to pass through to gain access to the A64, and therefore should also be turned down.

· I have strong objections about the use of Jacobs Strategic Transport Assessment to justify any building in Malton or West Norton because it fails to assess the afternoon peak when queuing is longest on Yorkersgate, and fails to measure the queuing we have observed. More detail is included in the report I prepared earlier this year (see following email). Even if accepted on its own terms, it specifically states that without the complimentary measures the level of development envisaged would represent an unacceptable impact on the highway network. I wish to further comment on sites once further information is published on air quality and traffic modelling.

. 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 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.

. The recent High Malton application shows that large building sites don't necessarily deliver affordable housing AND new school sites, and can have their own significant and unacceptable environmental and traffic impacts. With the right collaborations, other sites, including much smaller sites, could deliver the desired results. Bigger is not always better, perhaps small is beautiful. It is a large countryside and small development that attracts people to Ryedale. It is unfair as well perverse for the towns to shoulder a disproportionate amount of development, particularly Malton where the levels of nitrogen dioxide in the AQMA increases the rate of premature deaths every year in the town. It also impairs the lung capacity of young children PERMANENTLY. I know a young family who live IN the AQMA. There are many more who work there and breathe in the fumes 8 hours a day. New housing has LONG TERM implications for traffic patterns, congestion and pollution which are not easy to rectify.

**Councillor P. Andrews**

Had the Local Plan Strategy being Examined with allocations, the weaknesses of those policies would have been readily apparent.

At The Examination in Public (EiP) the Inspector did not allow evidence to be tested at cross- examination. He accepted the Council's evidence on highways issues- in spite of evidence produced to the contrary.

Malton and Norton had jointly prepared an interim Neighbourhood Plan.

Tested by a full public consultation. Central to this Plan were:

- opposition to a new superstore on the WSCP (Wentworth street Car Park)
- support for a smaller store and ancillary development at the Market Place
- No more than 1000 houses from 2011

As a result of the Examination, the Inspector agreed with the Council's housing figures, but the food retail requirement was conceded to be met by the livestock market proposal.

At the EiP I produced evidence on drainage and sewage. My recollection is that the Inspector said such matters would be taken into account during site evaluation, but that comment was not taken forward in his report.

Whilst I believe that the Plan is far from satisfactory, it is adopted, and so one has to accept it.

Submitted with this representation 4 exhibits submitted to the EiP:

- My comments on the Jacobs STA study;
- Report by A. Martin a highways engineering; on the Jacobs

---

STA.

- A joint report by the above individuals; and
- A report on drainage matters (anon) The Jacobs STA mention four "complementary measures" alongside the additional slip road at Brambling Fields to get traffic to use the A64 and Brambling Fields:

- Change in signal timings at Butcher Corner;
- Remove one traffic lane onto Castlegate approach to the junction at Butcher Corner
- A Vehicle ban on Railway St and Norton Road
- A HGV ban on vehicles crossing the level crossing at Norton- save those requiring local access.

These measures were modelled as being implemented, but they have not been undertaken, and I believe they will not be undertaken.

Regarding AQMA at Butcher Corner, it would appear the Council in breach of EU laws, and that further land allocations will exacerbate this.

Development since 2011 in Malton:

The Plan period runs from 1st April 2012-31st March 2027. The total number of houses required is 1800, (1500 plus the buffer of 300). Since then it is understood that permissions have been granted for 1,100. Leaving c.700 homes to be allocated.

This does not include the development permitted in 2011, particularly at the Broughton Rise Development, for 270 dwellings. So if one was to take that Plan Period from 1st April 2011, then the Council is committing to 2027 dwellings. Extraordinary expansion, bearing in mind Malton's historic layout, and land drainage. What has been imposed on both towns is a nightmare.

Had the Local Plan Strategy being Examined with allocations, the weaknesses of those policies would have been readily apparent.

At The Examination in Public (EiP) the Inspector did not allow evidence to be tested at cross- examination. He accepted the Council's evidence on highways issues- in spite of evidence produced to the contrary.

Malton and Norton had jointly prepared an interim Neighbourhood Plan. Tested by a full public consultation. Central to this Plan were:

support for a smaller store and ancillary development at the Market Place

· opposition to a new superstore on the WSCP (Wentworth street

· No more than 1000 houses from 2011

As a result of the Examination, the Inspector agreed with the Councils housing figures, but the food retail requirement was conceded to be met by the livestock market proposal.

At the EiP I produced evidence on drainage and sewage. My recollection is that the Inspector said such matters would be taken into account during site evaluation, but that comment was not taken forward in his report.

Whilst I believe that the Plan is far from satisfactory, it is adopted, and so

The Jacobs STA mention four "complementary measures" alongside the additional slip road at Brambling Fields to get traffic to use the A64 and Brambling Fields:

· Change in signal timings at Butcher Corner;

· Remove one traffic lane onto Castlegate approach to the junction

· A Vehicle ban on Railway St and Norton Road

· A HGV ban on vehicles crossing the level crossing at Norton- save

These measures were modelled as being implemented, but they have not been undertaken, and I believe they will not be undertaken.

Regarding AQMA at Butcher Corner, it would appear the Council in breach of EU laws, and that further land allocations will exacerbate this.

---

**Development since 2011 in Malton:**

---

The Plan period runs from 1st April 2012-31st March 2027. The total number of houses required is 1800, (1500 plus the buffer of 300). Since then it is understood that permissions have been granted for 1,100. Leaving c.700 homes to be allocated.

This does not include the development permitted in 2011, particularly at the Broughton Rise Development, for 270 dwellings. So if one was to take that Plan Period from 1st April 2011, then the Council is committing to 2027 dwellings. Extraordinary expansion, bearing in mind Malton's historic layout, and land drainage. What has been imposed on both towns is a nightmare.

Since April 2012 80 further dwellings have been permitted at Broughton Rise, with 300 houses at Showfield Lane.

The development at Showfield lane, and other sites was "enabling development" to support the delivery of the new livestock market at Eden Road, to date the livestock market has not relocated.

All the traffic generated by Broughton Rise and Showfield Lane housing development will exit the estate via a roundabout which will discharge either into Pasture Lane, or Broughton Road.

In spite of stating the Local Plan Strategy that food retail requirement has been met by existing permissions (Cattle Market area), the District Council remains determined to get WSCP sold and developed as a superstore, if this is achieved, it will only have one vehicular access and this will be from Pasture Lane.

The consequence of all these developments, if and when they are completed is that they empty new traffic is unsustainable in my opinion, and is bound to have a knock-on impact on other congestion hot spots such as the AQA at Butcher Corner.

---

**Credibility of the Ryedale Plan**

---

The Plan's credibility has been undermined by:

- . "Enabling development" which has planning permission to support the move of the Cattle Market, which does not seem to be progressing;
- . The District Council' own disregard for Ryedale Plan in regarding to WSCP;
- . Failure of the County Council to put into effect the "Complementary Measures" . Which were intended to be part of the Brambling Fields project;

· Overdevelopment of the town without making any adequate arrangements to improve infrastructure, particularly the drainage and sewerage system (combined) and problem with drainage water backs up and cannot escape after the flood doors in the river have closed.

· Evidence from residents which would seem to suggest that in preparing the plan Ryedale disregarded the impact of the development proposals of the AQA at Butcher Corner and adjacent and neighbouring roads.

There is an urgent need to revisit the Ryedale plan, but in the meantime damage limitation should therefore be an important element of the current site selection process.

### **Making sense of the Ryedale Plan in terms of Site Selection**

Current planned development is likely to strangle the town in terms of land drainage, sewerage and highways congestion.

There is an urgent need to separate traffic that wants/needs Malton Town Centre, and traffic that does not. To reduce the traffic, and improve the shopping experience.

One way to separate both types of traffic is to allocate new sites that have direct access to a 4 way intersection on the A64, at present there are only two intersections one at Old Malton, the second at Brambling Fields.

Direct access does not have to be adjacent, but near enough to allow traffic which does not want to enter into the town centre, the means not to.

The sites at Old Malton contribute heavily to flooding there. There is a surface water drain, which also links into a foul water. When the pump at Lascelles Lane ( which is only designed to pump foul water) is overwhelmed by the combination of surface and foul water at times, when the river is up and drainage water cannot escape through the river's flood doors and then back up into people's houses. No further development should be allowed to contribute to the problems there. This is notwithstanding Old Malton's direct access to a four-way intersection with the A64.

If one applies the above principles, the only large sites which have direct access to a four-way intersection with the A64 are those on the west side of Norton. These have direct access to Brambling Fields. Many of them are on the flood plain. But there is a site on Beverley Road which could provide substantial benefits if developed. These benefits could include a slip road and a new school. This site and adjacent sites would provide 700 houses, which is about the number of houses for which land is still to be allocated.

I believe that local District Councillors favour this site, and would therefore support it being put forward.

#### **Employment Development**

Disagree with the proportions. It does not make sense to allocate 90% of all new employment, when 50% of new houses are being built elsewhere. Land has been given permission at Eden House Road, and it is difficult to see why any more should be allocated at Malton and Norton.

#### **Retail Development**

Oppose any food retail on Wentworth Street Car Park. This is supported by the adopted Ryedale Plan (para. 5.21) and this is also supported by the comments on page 23 of the Sites Consultation Document.

I have submitted a joint report with Paul Beanland, prepared for the EiP. I dispute other figures which have been submitted since then.

**G. Goforth**

Object to sites 148, 181, 635 and 636 as being "Ribbon development. "

Would extend the village along access roads. 635 would remove the open space between houses, such open space differentiates a village from a 'built up area'. Development of the stack yard to Manor farm (west of 635) would be acceptable, but not the whole site. Site 8 is least intrusive, but probably unpopular with residents on the east side of main street, that is the consequence of 'infill' and this intrusion could be alleviated by careful planning.

<b>J. Harrison</b>	<p>Astonished that a consultation on the sites has taken place . I am aware that the response deadline for comment is given as 14th December, but as there seems to have been no effort whatsoever to publicise the consultation to local residents. Not in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement. Because you have only undertaken an online consultation.</p>
	<p>Site selection methodology's identification of Pecketts Yard as the preferred development site for Sheriff Hutton. The formulaic tick box approach used highlights the flaws of this process.</p>
	<p>A planning application was made at this site in summer 2015. This generated a robust response from the local community and numerous statutory agencies, resulting in a significant range of objections, difficulties and reasons why the application to develop 19 homes was entirely inappropriate at this location. I am sure you will have access to the responses which will enlighten you on how the proposal to build at Pecketts Yard was received. The application was withdrawn.</p>

It is therefore astonishing to find that Ryedale has, without any contact with the local community, re-opened this matter and is proposing this site as the one and only site suitable for development in Sheriff Hutton and I wish to register my objection in the strongest possible terms. You have not used the wealth of information gained in response to the 2015 planning application in the site decision-making process.

Proposing to set in stone via the Ryedale Plan an entirely unwelcome and inappropriate decision which has already been strongly objected to by the local community and other specialist agencies. For example, this includes Ryedale's Highways dept which identifies that the access road to the site is at places below the legal minimum width for a road.

	<p>Inform me simply and clearly of the next steps in this process (which seems to be designed to exclude local residents who will be affected by your decisions), I wish to know what happens next and when and how I can make sure my views are made known. I am appalled by the lack of sincerity displayed in this process and how, despite fine words about involving communities, your actions deliver decisions that directly impact on those of us living in Sheriff Hutton.</p>
<p><b>Malton and Norton Town Councils</b></p>	<p>Malton and Norton Town Councils are still to conclude their consideration of a jointly agreed response to the consultation. Outstanding information very relevant to the consideration process is awaited: assessments of the traffic impact from already approved developments; latest position on Air Quality Monitoring Programme; landowner intentions on certain sites. It is regretted that the Councils have been unable to conclude their consideration, but there will be the opportunity for submissions later to be considered. The Councils will together continue to consider the issue, hopefully in light of the information expected, with a view preferably to submitting a joint response, but if that is not possible, separate responses from each.</p> <p>There is great concern at the failure of The County Council to bring forward the complementary measures, with resulting congestion relief and air quality improvements, and disquiet at Ryedale District Council, as monitoring authority, and responsibility for the Air Quality Monitoring Area, is not pressing the case for the implementation of those complementary measures.</p> <p>Emphasise that ensuring that consideration of land/development allocations, should at its core, include an assessment of whether development would hinder/counter efforts to reduce and prevent congestion and poor or dangerous air quality, whether by traffic or sewage infrastructure deficiency.</p>
<p><b>Kirkbymoorside Town Council</b></p>	<p>Reiterate objection to inclusion of site 10, due to impact on the sports Site 102 would provide affordable housing</p>

Northerly sites such as 201,345,431 are also elevated and would also see an increase in vehicular movements as the return journey would be up hill.

Support 622 for employment land for industrial/business activity

Residential development on the south of the A170 would cause them to drive into town due to the poor crossing points- bringing further congestion and exacerbating the parking problems.

Strongly discourage the conversion of industrial sites to residential development.

Preferred sites for development:

Site 156- 30 houses

Sites 56 and 467 (some developments around Keldholme)

When considering any site the following should be prioritised:

Enhancement of public right of ways;

Green space;

Access to public open space;

Architectural merit;

As a Transition Town, environmentally sustainable buildings should be encouraged.

**Sport England**

Sport England would wish to avoid a situation where an adopted sites allocation document encourages certain types of planning applications which Sport England later has to object to as they are not consistent with our playing fields policy. We understand that no existing playing field sites are currently proposed. We also note that Malton Tennis Club site is not considered to be deliverable. In assessing proposed sites adjacent to a playing field, consideration should be given as to whether the allocation would prejudice the use of the adjacent playing field through being at risk of ball strike. This is particularly relevant to proposed residential schemes adjacent to cricket fields where the houses and residents are at risk of ball strike and therefore the cricket field constitutes a nuisance. In such circumstances. In such circumstances, ball stop fencing needs to be factored into the allocation. The design of fencing should be based on a risk assessment undertaken by a suitably qualified consultant.

<b>The Coal Authority</b>	No specific comments to make.
<b>Network Rail</b>	<p><b>Level Crossings</b> Safety, reliability and efficiency of the rail infrastructure are of paramount importance to Network Rail.</p> <p>We are working with Local Planning Authorities to reduce risks associated with crossings, either through closure, or improvements in connection with new developments.</p> <p>Encourage a policy statement which makes clear that no new crossings will be permitted, proposals which increase the use of Level crossings will generally be resisted and where development would prejudice the safe use of a level crossing, and alternative bridge crossing will be required, at the developer's expense.</p> <p>Site assessments must take account of the impact on level crossings, as part of transport assessment. A number of sites identified in the current local plan are close to level crossings , and we would expect a full risk assessment of the impacts of the development is completed and may mitigation funded as part of the development. Particularly for sites in Malton and Norton.</p> <hr/> <p>We ask that policy INF 2 is included: 1. The Council has a statutory responsibility under planning legislation to consult the statutory rail undertaker where a proposal for development is likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway or impact upon rail infrastructure.</p> <p>2. Any planning application which may increase the level of pedestrian and/or vehicular usage at a level crossing should be supported by a full Transport Assessment assessing impact and mitigation measures including assessment of closure; and</p> <p>3. The Developer should assess the impacts any development could have upon railway infrastructure.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Developer contributions</b></p>

Many stations and routes are already operating at close to capacity. A significant increase in patronage may create the need for upgrades to the existing infrastructure, including improved signalling, passing loops, car parking, cycle facilities, improved access arrangements, ticketing facilities or platform extensions. Network Rail is a publicly funded organisation with a regulated remit, and it would not be reasonable to require Network Rail to fund rail improvements necessitated by commercial development. It would be appropriate to require contributions towards rail infrastructure where they are directly required as a result of the proposed development and where acceptability of the development depends on access to the rail network. Network Rail therefore requires new developers to fund any enhancements to our infrastructure required as a direct result of new development any policy or guidance should specifically name 'rail infrastructure'.

In order to fully assessment impacts on a individual station basis, it is essential that a Transport Assessment is submitted for each planning application which quantifies in detail likely impacts on the rail network. To ensure that developer contributions can deliver appropriate improvements to the rail network we therefore request that any Policy or guidance on Developer Contributions in the LDP or any Supplementary Planning Guidance includes provision for rail.

The Policy and/or supporting Guidance should include the following:

- A requirement for developer contributions to deliver improvements to the rail network where appropriate.
- A requirement for Transport Assessments to take cognisance of impacts to existing rail infrastructure to allow any necessary developer contributions towards rail to be calculated.
- A commitment to consult Network Rail where development may impact on the rail network and may require rail; infrastructure improvements would be restricted to a local level and would be necessary to make the development acceptable. We would not seek contributions towards major enhancement projects which are already programmed as part of Network Rail's remit.

**Pickering Town Council**

The Council has discussed sites 200, 347 and 650 and agrees with the rationale which underpins the prioritisation that the District Council has given to them.

The Council accepts that 205/387 could be developed for housing, however it does have concerns about access/egress onto minor roads which are already difficult to negotiate due to parking, the potential number of units on the site could generate a number of vehicles.

The Council still has reservations about site 116, the rising ground on the north side of Middleton Road and the A170 is an attractive feature of this part of the Parish and development would reduce the open countryside between Middleton and Pickering.

The Council is pleased that site 650 has been submitted for consideration for allocation for employment and agrees with the District Council's appraisal as to its suitability.

<b>North York Moors National Park Authority</b>	<p>In terms of potential impacts on the National Park, only site allocations for the settlements of Pickering, Thornton le Dale and Ampleforth were considered due to their locations on the edge of the National Park.</p>
	<p><b>Site Selection Methodology</b></p> <p>The assessment clearly identifies the National Park and its setting as a potential development constraint due to its landscape sensitivity. It makes particular references to the impact potential development could have when located close to the boundary, and also sites which a 'proximal' with consideration given to scale, design and landscaping to avoid harming wider views and the setting of the Park.</p>
	<p>The results of this assessment align with the conclusions reach by our own officers and therefore the Authority considers that the Site Selection Methodology has been robust and satisfactorily identified the issues relating to the National Park and its setting. The Council has acknowledged the significant constraints with villages being either split with the National Park or mostly contained within it and the restrained levels of development which come with this.</p>
	<p>Would like to provide additional advice/comments to help strengthen the Council's position on those discounted sites which would have impacted on the National Park.</p>
	<p><b>Pickering</b></p> <p>Site 650, identified for employment, does extend up to the National Park Boundary. We have no objections to the southern extension of the site, which lies behind the existing industrial estate, however its projection eastwards is considered to extend beyond the existing development limits and out into open countryside where the site has the capability to be viewed in longer distance views. The location of industrial buildings and uses on the boundary of the National Park is likely to appear as a discordant feature in the wider landscape, and such it is considered to have a significant impact on the setting of the National Park and its special qualities.</p>
	<p><b>Thornton le Dale</b></p> <p>Any development north of the A170 is likely to have an impact on the setting of the National Park, and in particular the open and agricultural nature of the landscape. The Authority considers that site 109 could have potential for a small number of dwellings, primarily linear in form, fronting the highway and retaining the existing tree belt to help minimise wider impact and views.</p>
	<p>Site 465, further out from the edge of the village is however considered to form open countryside and as such the Authority would have significant concerns to the principle of development in this location.</p>
	<p>At present, the old railway line forms a strong physical settlement boundary to the south of the village. Site 82 would break beyond this, and extend the development into what is clearly open countryside and therefore raises concerns with the principle of development in this location.</p>

	<p><b>Ampleforth</b></p> <p>The Authority would raise significant concerns concerning development of sites 111 and 616. Attractive agricultural fields to the entrance of the village which add to the rural character of Ampleforth and the Conservation Area. The rising topography of these sites- increases their sensitivity to development. Any development would impact on views out of the National Park towards the Howardian Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and the inter-relationship of the these designated areas. This view was recognised in the Ampleforth CAAMP, and also lies within the Conservation Area Boundary. Open countryside. Would seriously impact on the setting of the National Park. Although 632 is further from the National Park boundary, the Authority would be concerned if large scale housing is proposed as this could have impacts on views both in and out of the National Park. This represents a relatively large scale housing development which is remote from the natural built up limits of the village. Smaller scale, linear development would be considered to be less intrusive.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Duty to Cooperate</b></p> <p>Authority considers that it has been suitably engaged in the process and overall the Council's approach to potential impacts on the National Park has been addressed through the Site Selection Methodology.</p>
<p><b>Leavening Parish Council</b></p>	<p>The Parish Council support the view of Ryedale District Council that sites should be discounted from this plan period. With the housing developments currently proposed for Preston Hill - sufficient to meet the housing needs of the village for the plan period. Site 45, Northside Works, Malton Road is currently used for local businesses and our view is that should be designated as "employment".</p>
<p><b>Selby District Council</b></p>	<p>No comments to make but would like to be kept up to date with all future progress on your local plan.</p>
<p><b>Allerston and Wilton Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Considered the sites in this document, and consider that Allerston and Wilton are totally unsuitable for the number and sizes of the sites for building. No services in either village, apart from the hourly bus service on the A170. Local school would not be able to cope with any increase of this size. No social infrastructure to support the number of sites. Allerston is on a private water supply, and this supply is unable to supply any more houses. Allerston and Wilton could only support very small developments of housing for local people preferably with some lower cost for younger local residents.</p>
<p><b>Natural England (initial and secondary comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Malton and Norton</b></p> <p>Site 649 (88), 218 (108/281), 324, 249, 578 and 579 - proximity to The River Derwent SAC and SSSI triggers Natural England's Impact Risk Zones. We note that a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening assessment has concluded Likely Significant Effect for the site and await the Appropriate assessment to whether these potential impacts can be avoided or mitigated for.</p>

---

Second response: we have used the incorrect terminology in our letter. We should have stated "Likely Significant Effects could not be ruled out".

---

Site 218 (108/281)- Natural England also has concerns with regards to the proximity of the site in relation to the Howardian Hills AONB. We recommend you discuss the site with the AONB partnership to obtain assurances that mitigation is capable of reducing impacts on the AONB to an acceptable level.

---

Second response: We are pleased to see this comment has been acknowledged, and await the outcome of discussions with the AONB partnership and the site submitter, the conclusions should be added to the consultation document.

---

Site 218 (108/281) is adjacent to the Malton Bypass cuttings SINC. This should be assessed in the Malton and Norton full SSM

---

Second response- we are pleased to see this has been acknowledged.

---

### **Pickering**

---

Site 116 - Newtondale Haugh and Gundale Slacks SSSI are 1.5 Km from this site, and are within an Impact Risk Zone

---

Second response: should further information be submitted then the SSSI should be considered, but as things stand Natural England have no further comments to make on this site on the site presumption this site does not progress beyond an option.

---

Site 347- Newtondale Haugh and Gundale Slacks SSSI are 1.5 Km from this site, and are within an Impact Risk Zone

---

Second Response: the existing PRoW, community park and open space should together ensure that issues should be minimalised and mitigation is deliverable. This should be referred to in the sites consultation document.

---

Site 650- Note the commentary on the eastern limb. Natural England is concerned about the potential for impacts on the setting of the National Park, particularly as no mitigation is mentioned. However, the sites consultation document states that " it is considered that the constraints of this part of the site can simply be avoided through the deletion of the eastern limb from the site's extent". This seems like a sensible suggestion, particularly as the site is far larger than the hectarage of land identified in the Local Plan Strategy to be identified for employment uses around Pickering,

Second response: Please to see that this. The impacts of this option would be greatly reduced.

Sites 200/387 (205) - No comments to make

**Kirkbymoorside**

Sites: 156,201,259,265,345,454,622- no comments to make on these sites

**Service Villages- preferred sites**

Secondary response: Thank you for the clarification.

Site 51 (Sheriff Hutton) adjacent to St. Helen's Church Yard and Old Glebe SINC, which includes Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) Habitat. This should be assessed in the full Site Selection Methodology.

Secondary Response: Thank you for the clarification. It is welcomed and should be included in the sites consultation document

430 (Slingsby), 638 (Rillington ) 8 (Amotherby) No comments to make

**Impact Risk Zones** IRZs referred to in this letter can be viewed on the magic website

Secondary response: we welcome the approach you outline.

**Mitigation:** A number of the selected sites require mitigation to reduce potential negative impacts on designated sites and protected species as referenced in the relevant SSM .Natural England has responded on the presumption that mitigation will be deliverable for each site and will achieve it purpose. If there are doubts as to whether this is possible, then the SSM should take this into account. This could take the form of including additional mitigation to maintain the scoring or reducing the scoring and potentially selecting other, more suitable sites.

Secondary response: We welcome this approach.

---

**Soils and Agricultural Land Quality**

---

For all the sites in Malton and Norton Size of the site is not provided in relation to the loss of Best and Most Versatile Land Q.23. This should be added so that impacts are better understood and to bring the site in line with assessments in this regard at other locations. Note that it appears that the proposed sites will result in a significant cumulative loss of agricultural land, including that classified as 'best and most versatile' . Paragraph 112 of the NPPF states that: "*Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality.*" Consequently we would request that the above policy is followed.

---

Secondary response: Pleased to see that this comment concerning site size has been acknowledged. Whilst wishing to see the loss of BMV land avoided where possible, Natural England understands that this will not always be possible and the lack of other options and other potential benefits of the development should be clearly stated for the preferred options where BMV land will be lost for justification.

---

**Assessment under the Habitats Regulations- Screening**

**Assessment:** We note that a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening assessment has concluded Likely Significant Effect for the sites in Malton and Norton. In relation to impacts on water quality through changes to surface water, and pollution from run off, and recreational pressure. We await the Appropriate assessment to whether these potential impacts can be avoided, and where negative impacts are unavoidable, it should be ensured that effective and deliverable mitigation can be provided,

---

Second response: we have used the incorrect terminology in our letter. We should have stated "Likely Significant Effects could not be ruled out".

---

Also note that links in paragraph 1.4 do not work, so they should be updated.

---

### **Sustainability Appraisal Methodology Update**

---

#### Landscape Character Assessment

---

The SA should be supported by an up-to-date LCA against which policies and allocations can be assessed. It is not identified within column two Key evidence of table 2 (Local Sustainability Issues).

---

Secondary response: We welcome the use an inclusion of LCAs to inform the SA.

---

#### Priority Habitats and Species (para.3.17)

Paragraph rightly identifies internationally, nationally and locally protected nature conservation sites. Whilst there may be an overlap, it should also highlight the existence of priority habitats. The NPPF states that the planning system should:

"promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations, linked to national and local targets, and identify suitable indicators for monitoring biodiversity in the plan;"

---

Secondary response: We note your comments and are happy for priority habitats to be dealt with through policy SP14.

---

**Objectives :** The Local Planning Authority should consider whether broader objectives would provide a more equitable assessment of an allocation's economic, social and environmental impacts. Given that the SA is examining the effects of allocations, are the objectives for the strategy still suitable? There are several indicators which are similar. For example economic objectives include maintain and enhance employment opportunities (B1), maintain and enhance vitality of the countryside (B2), and maintain and enhance factors conducive to wealth creation (B3). Similarly environmental objectives include reduce greenhouse gas emissions (C6), increase renewables (C7) and ensure that fossil fuel consumption is as low as possible (C10). The SA objectives should not unduly weight one sustainability issue (e.g. employment generation or combating the causes of climate change) through double counting within numerous objectives. Natural England notes that protection and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity, a critical consideration of an SA of allocations, is addressed within one objective. The SA objectives should be sufficiently broad to ensure that reasonable alternatives can be considered. For example an objective which focuses on renewable energy generation would not score a policy which reduces energy use highly, even though they both combat climate change. Broad objectives should be supported by targeted questions which address locally important environmental issues.

**Secondary response:** The comments in this regard are a repeat from our response of the 10 the march 2014. However, although some objectives remain similar, providing the inferred weighting is not undertaken on numeric or cumulative basis ( as in the protection and enhancement of biodiversity is not disadvantaged by being addressed in one objective) it is acceptable for these to remain unchanged.

**Alternatives:** If an allocation is likely to significantly affect a local site/priority habitat or protected species, Natural England would expect the SSM/SA to examine whether alternative sites which comply with the adopted strategy and avoid such affects can be allocated. If not what are the benefits of that location to its sustainability which outweigh the harm to the site/species. This information is essential otherwise an informed decision which complies with the 'avoid/mitigate/compensate' hierarchy cannot be made.

**Secondary response:** We note that the sites at Malton and Norton and other areas not listed as service villages are options and not preferred sites and that of the preferred sites in the Service Villages, it is unlikely that there will be any impacts on local sites/priority habitats and protected species. The Appropriate assessment will be useful for assessing impacts on European sites at Malton and Norton however note that this will not necessarily identify impacts on the reasons for designation for nationally designated sites or for the local sites/priority habitats or protected species although perhaps some of the information collected could be used for this purpose.

**Overview of the Sustainability Appraisal Commentary concerning**

No comments to make.

<p><b>East Riding of Yorkshire Council</b></p>	<p>We have a history of cooperating in the preparation of our respective Local Plans, particularly through the North Yorkshire and York Spatial Planning and Transport Board and Technical Officers Group. Both authorities are also part of the York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) area, and as such the Council recognises the important role that emerging Local Plan will have in helping to deliver the aims of the LEP's Strategic Economic Plan.</p> <hr/> <p>Welcome recognition on page 49 that Stamford Bridge has been identified as a Rural Service Centre in the Submission East Riding Local Plan. Through the Local Plan (Proposed Modifications) provision is made for 295 dwellings in Stamford Bridge over the period to 2029, which is being delivered by two housing allocations on the eastern edge of the village along the A166. Both sites have been granted outline planning permission and together meet the full housing requirement for Stamford Bridge.</p> <hr/> <p>It is noted that one potential residential site (ID 92) has been identified, as part of the Ryedale Local Plan Sites Consultation, within Gate Helmsley. This lies to the west of Stamford Bridge and is adjacent to the Parish boundary. The accompanying assessment states that the site is not supported as it is considered to be less sustainable than other sites already rejected by the East Riding Local Plan site process. This is aligned with the approach in the East Riding of Yorkshire Council's emerging Local Plan. Whilst the examination in public of the Local Plan is on-going, the Plan allocates sufficient land to support Stamford Bridge's role as a Rural Service Centre.</p>
<p><b>Sheriff Hutton Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Strongly object to any planning on site 51. The reasons are the same for the recent planning application: Long standing issues over the existing difficulties of the East End narrow approach to the site; the over development with the proposed number of houses within a relatively small area, emphasising the larger type of houses would be unlikely to attract families into the village; the limiting capacity of the existing water, drainage systems; close proximity to the historic church; affect on existing trees in the yard and loss of a number; proposed layout and density of building design with possible inadequate and inappropriate landscaping or means of enclosure considered to be unacceptable in overwhelming detail.</p> <hr/> <p>Consider that site 70- Land East of Cottage Farm should be investigated further.</p>
<p><b>Amotherby Parish</b></p>	<p><b>1. What are your views on the Council's preferred sites?</b></p>

**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, Kirkbymoorside 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 Zetechtics 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 when 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 1<sup>st</sup> Dec

Appendix 3--Residents comments on Amotherby Sites from the Public

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
- Totally unsuitable, would lead to more traffic in village & stretch
- Access would have to come onto Main Street through Amotherby. Again congestion issue with traffic already going through the village &
- We strongly object to this site—access issues into village,--traffic
- Not in favour due to adding to traffic/congestion problems in the
- 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
- 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

---

## 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:-See table in representations made. 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

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 (i.e. item 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 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.

Development of sites of anything more than an acre or so would completely alter the feel of the village. Whilst sites in Malton 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. 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. 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

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~~  
Residents comments Site148—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.

---

**Site 635**

- 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?

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 Westlers (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
- 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

---

<p>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.</p>	
<p>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. 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.</p>	
<p>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 i.e. low landscape impact (+/light green) and not "-/pink" as assessed.</p>	
<p><b>4. Are there any further sites listed below we should be</b></p>	
<p>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 &amp; 264 (group 4)  Staxton &amp; Willerby sites 177 &amp; 217 (group 3)  Thornton le Dale site 109(group 3)</p>	
<p><b>Slingsby, South Holme and Fryton Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Site Nos. 427,444,521 and 532 will be opposed by residents for a variety of reasons and we strongly recommend that none of these sites are developed.</p> <p>Site Nos. 429, 430 and 464 are acceptable to local residents and it unlikely that anyone would object to these three areas being developed for local housing.</p> <p>The Parish Council looks forward to seeing the final document detailing which areas have been rejected by RDC and those which are intended to remain for future development.</p>
<p><b>Howardian Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Manager</b></p>	<p>Slingsby Sites 430 and 464 - This site is on the fringe of the AONB but I feel that the visual impact would be limited as long as the site specific design of any development is sympathetic to the existing screening landscaping, particularly the avenues/belts of trees already present on the site.</p> <p>Amotherby- site 8 - no observations</p>

	<p>Malton Site 218/281 - As the recent planning application has demonstrated, development of this site would need to be carried out in a way that conserves and enhances the setting of the AONB. Notwithstanding the refusal of the Outline planning permission for the High Malton scheme I don't have any objections to the inclusion of this site on principle and I feel the constraints imposed by the proximity of the AONB, and therefore the sensitivity of the landscape, have been correctly recognised and assessed.</p>
	<p>Malton - site249 - I feel that the assessment of this site is correct, and that it has some constraints in relation to the AONB but that they are not as significant as those affecting site 218/281.</p>
	<p>Ampleforth - site 160- I agree with the proposal not to bring forward this site at the current time.</p>
	<p>Hovingham - site 643 - I agree with the proposal not to bring forward this site at the current time.</p>
<p><b>Ebberston and Yedingham Parish Council</b></p>	<p>From the nine locations mentioned, the Parish Council has decided that four may be considered for development. These are:</p>
	<p>113 and 487 - Yedingham- desire to promote building within the Yedingham village as development had been dormant for a long period of time in this village;</p>
	<p>435 - Ebberston Main street - possible area for development, any new build to be in character with surrounding dwellings within the village and to number less than 10.</p>
	<p>491 - Main Street/Mill Lane Ebberston, this location could be considered for development. Number of units would need consideration, the council would not accept the maximisation of dwellings per ha.</p>
	<p>The remainder of the site locations listed are not considered suitable or satisfactory for housing development for reasons of water retention, increased traffic movement and where vision restrictions apply with significant problems with access to sites. Additionally, where the site provides a large vista any big development would have an adverse effect upon the whole character and appearance of the village of Ebberston.</p>
<p><b>Amec, Foster and Wheeler obo National Grid</b></p>	<p>Continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of Plans and strategies which may affect out assets.</p>
	<p>There is one high voltage overhead line listed below within Ryedale District Council's administrative area.</p>
	<p>Electricity distribution is provided by Northern Powergrid. Northern Gas Networks distribute gas.</p>

There is one high pressure gas transmission pipeline within the administrative area of Ryedale. National Grid requests that any HPMHP (High Pressure Major Accident Hazard Pipelines) are taken into account.

Sites identified as being crossed by or within close proximity to Gas Transmission apparatus are sites:640,641,642 and 628.

Our underground pipelines are protected by permanent agreements with landowners or have been laid in the public highway for our licence. These grant us legal rights that enable us to efficient and reliable operation, maintenance, repair and refurbishment of our gas transmission network. Require no permanent structures are built over or under pipelines, or within a specified zone, and materials and soil are not stacked or stored on top of the pipelines.

Local Authorities have a statutory duty to consider applications for development in the vicinity of high pressure pipelines and to advise the developer on safety grounds on rules provided by the HSE Planning Advice for Development near to Hazardous Installations (PADHI).

Provide guidance on undertaking development in the vicinity of high pressure pipelines, and Gas Transmission Underground Pipelines- Guidance.

**Hovingham and Scackleton Parish Council**

Site 643

- Impact on businesses - Extensive mitigation will be required for the two businesses who will lose all or part of their land, and ability to do business in Hovingham:

The Nursery, run at the rear of Blue row would be totally lost by the development;

Worsley Arms Farm, currently occupied by an active pig/cattle house and is their only access for large vehicles, such as their combine harvester, into and out of, the farm.

- Adjacent to an active farm- generating noise and smells. The design and implementation of the dwellings must consider these environmental factors and future residents made aware.
- Pedestrian Access - access must be included from the New Development Mowbray Crescent and Blue Row through to car park of the Worlsey Arms Hotel. There will be safety consideration, especially through the restricted shared vehicle and pedestrian exit to Main/High Street by the Hotel
- Car parking- already a sensitive issue with residents of Mowbray Crescent and Blue Row. We understand that the proposed development includes parking for Blue Row, but for Mowbray Crescent there is no provision.
- Residents vehicles- The Pasture Lane development had insufficient parking provision. There must be realistic allowance for parking of resident's cars, availability of storage spaces and impact on adjacent residents and businesses.
- Young families- no families with young children have moved into the Pasture Lane development - most likely due to the price of the properties. Although it is not possible to engineer homes to particular group, additional consideration to attract younger families should be incorporated into development, particularly larger gardens and play areas.

- Traffic Exit at Junction with Malton Road - the traffic flow out of the development, including existing residents, will be considerable and currently is into an existing hazardous single lane junction with Malton road. There is also a steep slope up to the junction, challenging when queuing and in snow and ice.
- Development Traffic - the construction phase is likely to be spread over several years and all construction traffic would currently use the existing exist to Malton Road, sharing this with residents and businesses, causing significant potential congestion and safety concerns.
- SSM appraisal of sites, site 643 comprises group 2 sites 31N and 374. We believe that the concerns raised, including those regarding the proximity of Listed Buildings, apply equally to site 643.
- Orchard, gardens and allotments- development would destroy one of the last remaining orchards in Hovingham together with much used gardens and allotments, which have been cared for an will be lost by the proposed development.
- Allocation of new homes in Hovingham - we were told during the planning process for the new pasture lane that they would be Hovingham contribution to the Service Village provision for at least 15 years.

**North Yorkshire  
County Council**

**Strategic Policy and Economic Growth**

NYCC values the opportunity to engage with Ryedale DC on the selection of potential development sites and considers this to be part of our Duty to Cooperate. In addition to sites being in conformity with the adopted LPS in terms of overall scale and distribution of growth, priority should be given to sites that maximise the efficient and effective use of existing infrastructure.

Site selection should take an integrated approach that considers the range of sites available in relation to the overall package of infrastructure needs for the locality, the need for new or improved infrastructure that each site generates and the ability of the sites to contribute to meeting infrastructure needs. Where additional infrastructure capacity is required, the selection process should maximise potential to achieve efficient and effective delivery and use of new infrastructure.

One of the key priorities of the North Yorkshire Community Plan 2014-2017 is to facilitate the development of key housing and employment sites across North Yorkshire by delivering necessary infrastructure investments through partnership. As agreed, NYCC Officers will work with Ryedale DC to develop an Infrastructure Delivery Statement that will help achieve this.

In light of the infrastructure implications arising from site selection, consideration should be given to an early review of the CIL Regulation 123 list. This will help to support the Local Plan through Examination, and ensure that funding is available to address demand for new or improved infrastructure arising from selected sites.

**Malton and Norton**

The allocations for retail and employment uses appear sound. In light of the Cattle Market site 250 being identified as a mixed use and having consent for food retail, it appears that the Wentworth St Car Park (452) would be allocated a non food retail use. This is welcomed in terms of the need to maintain a balance between smaller independent retailers and larger multiples in the town, particularly in respect of food retailing. However, it will be important to ensure that the market is not stifled, and that there is scope for a breadth of offer at both ends of the market in order to support the retention of local trade.

#### **Kirkbymoorside**

The relocation and expansion of the Micrometalsmiths business within Ryedale or even North Yorkshire is welcome, but this should not result in the loss of employment land in Kirkbymoorside. The loss of this business in Kirkbymoorside would change the nature of the town in terms of the balance between employment and housing and it is not clear that alternative employment opportunities would be created in Kirkbymoorside in the future. The future expansion of Micrometalsmiths business should be supported however. The allocation of Micrometalsmiths site for housing seems acceptable although there is nothing to ensure that the company remains within the area.

Whilst 622, identified as additional employment land, could potentially mitigate the loss of the Micrometalsmiths site, it is not clear if the site is developable due to the flood risk, clarification is required or an alternative site.

#### **Pickering**

Support the employment proposals at site 650.

#### **Children and Young People's Service**

Given the level of additional housing proposed it is entirely likely, dependent on allocation decisions, that a new school site would be required for Malton, Norton and Pickering. We have no specific comments to make over the benefits of one site over another, however, we would generally expect that the larger sites would have greater potential to deliver land for education. We would therefore support a single larger site approach rather than a dispersed model of allocations.

#### **Highways (as Local Highway Authority)**

Welcomes the opportunity to contribute to the site methodology. The LHA has provided site-specific advice regarding accessibility opportunities and access. It should be noted that each site will still be required to demonstrate their access requirements and transport evidence through the planning application process. Applicants will be required to submit detailed transport assessments/statements and Travel Plans. RDC has acknowledged the need to consider the cumulative impact of site choices and has commissioned consultants to assess the impact of site on the Local Highway Network. As key consultees in the Local Planning process the LHA will continue to work with RDC Officers and their consultants to ensure the impact of the highways network is acceptable.

#### **Health and Adult Services (reduced response due to sensitivity)**

2011 Housing needs analysis: additional extra care schemes in Ryedale in Malton and Kirkbymoorside Malton- it should be ideally be in a location that is fairly central, has good access to local amenities, public transport etc. In a location where three-storey build could be supported.  
Kirkbymoorside - site area of 2 acres, it should be ideally be in a location that is fairly central, has good access to local amenities, public transport etc. In a location where three-storey build could be supported. In terms of CIL- our aspiration would be that this sits outside of the requirements for CIL otherwise if it was applied, the development may not stack up. Extra care schemes are a community resource and not just pure residential units.

#### **Heritage Service**

The historic environment should be a key consideration when producing the Plan. It should include the impact of development upon physical remains and their settings.

From an ecological perspective, we agree with the methodology that has been used in order to 'sift' submitted sites. The HR Screening report provides a good account of the potential impacts upon European Designated sites, including whether any impacts would be considered significant or not. Site allocations in Malton and Norton that have a close proximity to the River Derwent SAC will need careful assessment at the planning application stage, but we would agree that they should not be discounted from the Plan at this Stage.

We have briefly reviewed the preferred sites within the Service Villages and cannot see any strategic ecological issues that would prevent the sites from being included as allocations. There is one site at Sheriff Hutton that lies within close proximity of a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) known as Sheriff Hutton Castle. Whilst this does not prevent the site from being included as an allocation, any potential impacts upon the site would need careful consideration.

We do not have any landscape comments to make on individual preferred site that have been identified as potential options for sites in the Market Towns, other than that many are greenfield sites within or near sensitive landscapes and will continue to need careful assessment, and high standards of design if developed. Some sites are already considered to be not suitable, although no decisions have been taken. We are not able to suggest further or alternative sites for consideration.

The Site Selection Methodology appears to be appropriate and through, taking existing landscape-related evidence into account. Place-specific issues relating to landscape and green infrastructure have been picked up in the SA.

A slight discrepancy is noted. On page 85 of the SA under landscape Character is states that 50% of the area is covered by landscape designations. Whilst on page 87 is states that two thirds of the district is protected. It is unclear what is meant by either statement, in any case landscape character is not the same as landscape designation. The Vale of Pickering is considered on page 11, paragraph 3.17 to be a local area of high landscape value , however, it is the Fringe of the Moors area of Northern Ryedale that is of high landscape value. The Vale of Pickering is a significant landscape, but for its historic and archaeological value.

The Sustainability Appraisal does not mention the European Landscape Convention in its list of relevant policies, plans and programmes.

The broad Natural England Green Infrastructure mapping 2011 has been used in the study. There does not appear to be a District level GI strategy but perhaps this is under consideration.

---

**General comments on the Landscape Evidence Base**

The general evidence base for future Ryedale Local Planning could be updated in some respects. There are several existing local landscape character assessments that cover parts of Ryedale. Although some are not in a very accessible format:

The landscapes of Northern Ryedale 1999

The Howardian Hills AONB LCA (1991)

The Hambleton and Howardian Hills LPA LCA 2007

Our Landscape Today for Tomorrow, North and South Humber 1995  
(includes Yorkshire Wolds and Vale of York Areas)

The North Yorkshire and York LCA 2011, which identifies broad generic county-scale landscape, and provides an up-to-date background, including guidelines for managing landscape change. It is recommended that consideration is given to the preparation of a district scale LCA in accordance with current methodology that covers the District and identifies and confirms area or rural and urban landscape that are locally distinctive. It could provide a consistent baseline against which the effects of Local Plan policies could be evaluated, and form the basis of future sensitivity and capacity studies. The current study has taken the NYCC historic landscape characterisation into account, and relevant information from this could also be integrated into a future District scale LCA.

---

The existing district level landscape character evidence base can be confusing as LCAs may overlap or not match at borders, and can have gaps. A Special qualities Study of Ryedale's Market Towns was carried out in 2010, and this involved a partial review of the area's landscape character assessment, consolidating existing information that was available and relevant to the review. It took into account what residents valued about their local landscapes, and also looked at Green Infrastructure. Visually Important Undeveloped Areas in settlements are referred to in the SA but we did not manage to locate the study that these were derived from. Perhaps it was the Ryedale Plan: Local Plan Strategy Examination DDH20 Settlement Analysis 2012, that was referred to in the SA, but which we could not see on the website.

---

**Broad band connectivity**

In selecting sites it will be important to take into account the capability of connecting broadband infrastructure. All new sites (domestic and commercial) should enable superfast broadband to be built in. BT has a process which developers use to work up the solution for a new site.

Detailed advice is available via their web site:

<https://www.openreach.co.uk/orpq/home/contactus/connectingyourdevelopment/developnetwork.do>

---

**National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups**

It is noted that no attempt has been made to identify sites for Travellers. This is particularly disappointing in view of the fact that Policy SP5 in the adopted Ryedale Local Plan Strategy- Sites for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, is not compliant with national policy as set out paragraph 10 of DCLG's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, in that it offers no criteria to deal with planning applications which come before the Council, irrespective of need. This Sites Document could and should have taken the opportunity to properly address the needs of Gypsies and Travellers.

---

<b>A. and M. Waugh</b>	Object to sites 616 and 111. Within AONB, and borders the National Park, and part within Ampleforth Conservation Area. The area provides an attractive setting to the village, enjoyed by residents and visitors and thus supports the tourism businesses. No overriding need for housing given the recent development. Traffic and road safety with gradient and disruption when Sutton Bank is closed (it is the standard route for caravans), concerns about increased traffic for family.
<b>Huttons Ambo Parish Clerk</b>	<p>The Parish Council reiterates that any further encroachment into the Parish by the inclusion of site 248 would be inappropriate. The reasons are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The predominantly rural nature of the Parish, lying almost entirely within the Howardian Hills AONB. This rurality is the most appreciated characteristic of residents, as identified through the Parish Plan production.</li> <li>· The Low Lane junction with the A64 has been identified in the Parish Plan as being of major concern to residents. The Parish Council is committed to seek its improvement and development of site 248 could restrict operations.</li> <li>· Site 248 is adjacent to the Musley Bank A64 Junction. Any improvement to this junction would be severely impaired by an existing employment use.</li> </ul> <p>The Parish Council welcomes the recognition of these concerns in the application of the Site Selection Methodology and thence rejection of site 248 for development.</p>
<b>Cropton Parish Council</b>	Sites 399 and 400- object to both sites and advise: Access to site 399 would be via Church Lane which would be difficult, the junction between Church Lane and High Street has poor visibility and is not considered suitable. Site 400 lies on Back Lane to the south east of Greys Farm, Back Lane is narrow and winding. Any increase in traffic should be avoided. Site was reviewed by the Planning Inspectorate in 2044, they stated no further development of traffic increase on the Back Lane.
<b>Yorkshire Wildlife Trust</b>	<p>Overall impressed by the very thorough assessment of the sites in the Local Plan Document. The assessment tables show that the impacts on biodiversity of potential development on the various sites has been considered in some detail. In general the preferred sites appear to offer limited possibilities for damage to important habitats, protected species or designated wildlife sites.</p> <p><u>Malton and Norton Residential</u></p> <p>Malton and Norton Residential Preferred sites appear to have a low chance of impacting on biodiversity and a number are arable fields which will have little biodiversity interest. site 218 proximity to SINC of A64 verges, this could be easily buffered but consideration could be given to using habitat types and plant species present in the SINC for landscaping, and to enhance biodiversity. Happy with process of how the sites have been selected.</p> <p><u>Malton and Norton Employment</u></p> <p>The preferred sites 578 and 579 appear to be a reasonable distance from the River Derwent and to be on intensively farmed arable land so should not have too great an impact on biodiversity. SUDS schemes may help with biodiversity enhancement and ensuring surface water entering the Derwent in good quality.</p> <p>The Trust agrees with the decision to discount a large number of sites which were very close to the River Derwent. There would be a wide range of implications from more industrial development near to the Derwent, from flooding to effects on water quality and wildlife. No further sites should be</p> <p><u>Pickering</u></p>

Sites 116,347,205 and 387 do not appear to threaten biodiversity, site 200 has the potential to improve the green corridor along Pickering Beck as at the moment the intensive arable field has very little margin along the beck. GI could be planned to improve this, by looking at what other species are present in other parts of the Beck. Enhancements for bats could also be valuable.

Site Selection procedure has been thought. The Trust would expect mitigation for Great Crested Newts when or if site 199 is developed.

The Trust would agree in particular with the decision to not allocate sites 152,380, and 500 due to potential impacts on habitats and species. Sites near Keld Head Springs SINC would have the potential to impact on hydrology and water quality and nesting birds such as snipe.

Agree with inclusion of 650, and agree with the councils views on extent/size. The Great Crested Newt population will need to be carefully managed. A SUDS scheme designed for biodiversity with extra ponds and with a long term management plan might protect the population. Employment sites can protect wildlife if well designed as evening a weekend disturbance is limited. Planting and landscaping should enhance the nearby SINC.

#### Kirkbymoorside

Regarding Option 1, could the factory not be expanded on the same site? Is LEP funding available or similar? would redevelopment to residential involve contaminated land.

Regarding Option 2, these sites have a low possibility of impacting on

Regarding site 622, it is within Yorkshire Wildlife Trust's Living Landscapes and very close to the River Dove. Industrial development could be a source of pollution and there could be a loss of flood plain. The Trust would hope other more sustainable sites come forward or the Micrometalsmiths site is expanded instead.

#### Stamford Bridge

The Trust agrees with the approach. The other site proposed in Stamford Bridge (site 394) would be unlikely to be sustainable due to impacts on the River Derwent.

#### Preferred Site in Service Villages

Site 51 - Unlikely to impact on biodiversity

Site 430(464) Unlikely to impact on biodiversity, some hedgerows may be important and require protection in the landscaping.

638 - low possibility of impacting on biodiversity. The area around Rillington is important for rare arable weeds although these will be hard to mitigate for but should be considered in surveys.

8 - good quality hedgerows and hedgerow trees would need protection.

The Trust is happy with the methodology, and overall the Trust agrees with assessment of the sites which have been discounted. It is thorough, easy to understand and should provide a robust way to chose the most sustainable sites to allocate.

Issues which may need further assessment in Ryedale may include identifying small areas of unimproved grassland which will not have been surveyed as part of the SINC system. Such areas are likely to occur around the smaller settlements and be associated with important pre-enclosure hedgerows and grassland.

As already identified in the Screening Assessment under the Habitats Regulations there is also an issue in Ryedale of sites which may affect the catchment of the River Derwent, by impacting on water quality, amount of runoff or riparian habitat. These potential impacts to however appear to have been well covered in the site assessment methodology.

The Trust is happy with the conclusions of the Screening Assessment.

**Highways England**

We have made comments on group 4 and Group 3 sites which are identified as preferred sites. If you require additional comments on other sites please contact us. Our key concern is the safe and efficient operation of the SRN, proposals or sites which could materially impact on this. The A64 is the Trunk Road through the District. Where sites will have a severe impact on the SRN, measures will be required to reduce and mitigate the impact.

Sites which have the greatest individual impact will need to demonstrate any committed Road Investment Strategy (RIS) schemes are sufficient to deal with the additional demand. Where such schemes will not provide sufficient capacity or where there is no 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 committed RIS improvements.

**Malton and Norton**

As part of the Local Plan Core Strategy the Malton and Norton Strategic Transport Assessment (STA) considered junctions on the A64 at Malton and Norton. It concluded improvements were required at Brambling Fields .We would like to work with you to update this work based on more detailed site information now available. Until this work is completed we are not in a position to provide detailed comments on the sites within Malton and Norton upon the SRN. Our initial review of sites indicates that Sites 218 and 249 are likely to impact on 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.

	<p><b>Service Villages</b></p> <p>Site 430, not in vicinity of a junction with the A64, unlikely to have an impact on the SRN.</p> <p>Site 638 is 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 significant increase in vehicular traffic.</p> <p>Site 51, access the A64 at Scotchman Lane (south bound) and Chestnut Avenue (northbound) both are unsignalised, direct access junctions. 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.</p> <p>Site 8 - not within the immediate vicinity of the A64. However, traffic from the proposed development using the A64 would enter Malton and likely use Musley Bank to travel southbound or the B1257 junction northbound. Capacity at these junctions would need to be considered, taking into account proposed and committed development in Malton and Norton.</p> <p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>We consider that the sites identified in 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.</p>
<p><b>The Environment Agency</b></p>	<p>Overall very supportive of the documents, with the following comments to</p> <p><b>Flood risk</b></p> <p>Pleased to see that the site selection methodology appears to have resulted in the successful avoidance of development in flood risk areas, provided those parts of sites lying partially within a flood risk area are either removed for the site outline or the allocation is such that these areas are only used for open space/green infrastructure. if, for whatever reason, allocations with development in flood zones 2 or 3 are pursued, we recommend that the council produce a free-standing sequential test document to demonstrate the process that has been gone through.</p> <p>We note the reference is made to PPS25 in numerous places. As you will be aware</p> <p><b>Groundwater Protection</b></p> <p>Consider that qualitative assessment of whether the preferred sites/potential options for sites may have an impact on a groundwater Source Protection Zone is really positive and fully support this approach.</p>

Question 25 asks "Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone?" The four qualitative criteria could be made more clear, in terms of how each allocation has been against this. For example for sites 346 and 455 state "No response from the Environment Agency was requested. Hydrogeological Risk Assessment will be required". The sites are assessed as + and -- respectively, and it is unclear why there is a difference in outcome. To increase the transparency of the assessment it might be useful to clarify the assessment criteria, and we suggest the following as an example: **(++) Development is not located on a Principal Aquifer or in a Groundwater Source Protection Zone**  
**(+) Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a Groundwater Source Protection Zone but mitigation is possible to reduce the risk to groundwater pollution risk**  
**(-) Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a Groundwater Source Protection Zone but no risk assessment has been undertaken**  
**(--) Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a Groundwater Source Protection Zone and mitigation of the risk of groundwater pollution is not possible.**

Justification for the assessment should be included in the table. For example, it may be considered that the potential risks to groundwater from a residential development in Source Protection Zone 3 could be mitigated as both foul and surface water will be discharged into the mains sewer and potential construction impacts can be managed effectively. We recommend this type of information is included in the table.

We would object to certain types of development or activity in Source Protection Zone 1. Detailed guidance is provided in our guidance document (GP3) (attached a table summarising the Environment Agency's position was attached).

#### **Sites Consultation Document**

##### **Flood Risk**

###### **General comments**

Sequential approach to the selection of sites. Where sites are partially located in flood zone 2,3 or 3b, these should be removed from the site extent or conditioned that they are for green infrastructure/open space.

North Yorkshire County Council as (Lead Local Flood Authority) and the appropriate Internal Drainage Board (IDB) should be consulted regarding surface water run off and use of SUDS in new development. They are likely to request policies which dictate certain drainage design standards for Brownfield and Greenfield sites, with appropriate allowances for the predicted impacts of climate change.

Concur with the residential site assessment outcomes, and support the view that any sites in outcome groupings 1 and 2 should not be taken forward where flood risk is a factor. None of the sites in Group 3 that may be brought forward appears to have flood risk as a factor requiring mitigation.

However, if the Council considers other sustainability criteria outweigh flood risk issues, deciding to allocate land in flood zone 2 and 3, the decision process should be transparent with reasoned justifications for any decisions to allocate land in areas of high flood risk. Should any site be brought forward proposing 'more vulnerable' development within Flood Zone 3, the Council would need to undertake the Exception Test, including the need for a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment.

You should be aware that there will shortly be an update on guidance on how climate change needs to be considered, which will include guidance to be taken into account for Local Plans. This should be used to inform and update current policies and evidence base.

#### Food defences

To sustain and improve the flood risk measures currently protecting properties within the District, to manage risks from surface and groundwater as well as keeping pace with climate change, additional investment will be needed in coming years. Any Flood Defence Grant in Aid (FDGiA) money successfully secured will come with a strong expectation from Government that partnership funding contributions will be maximised to the best possible value from this source of funding, allowing this to be stretched further. It should be noted that FDGiA funds will only deliver the cheapest possible option for delivering the standard of protection deemed necessary for any particular area. Partnership funding can be used to top-up FDGiA funds to enable flood risk management measures to deliver benefits beyond flood protection.

#### **Site-specific comments**

##### **Malton and Norton**

Residential sites 649, 218 and 249 all lie within Flood Zone 1, and therefore fully support them being taken forward for allocation from a flood risk perspective.

Site 324 lies partially within Flood Zone 2, but as large areas of land are available in flood zone 1 a sequential approach to the layout of the site should be taken. The area of Flood Zone 2 should either be removed from the site outline or defined to be set aside for use as open space or green infrastructure.

Employment/retail sites 578 and 579, entirely within Flood Zone 1. Subject to appropriate surface water attenuation and runoff rates being specified, we support the allocation of these sites and support the removal of any other sites on flood risk grounds. No sites are being brought forward for retail allocation.

The flood risk management outlined above, under 'Flood Defences', in some circumstances will require the securing of land within development sites, including some sites proposed for allocation. The Environment Agency is working with other partners in a project led by North Yorkshire County Council to mitigate the impact of flooding from ground, surface water and watercourses in Malton, Norton and Old Malton. Whilst the details of the outcomes of the initial study are still in the early stages of planning, it is likely to progress these options. Early recommendations of the project suggest managing flows within the Riggs Road Drain catchment to help mitigate current issues in Old Malton. Sites 578 and 579 north of the A64 make up much of this catchment. The Partners in this project would like to be involved in early discussions regarding the layout of developments on this site and how watercourses and surface water features are managed to order to optimise benefits. If these sites are taken forward, we would like to have further discussions with you about the inclusion of appropriate requirements for developments to ensure the objectives for flood risk management in this area are fully supported. The over-arching principles will be to ensure that:

- Land needed for flood risk management purposes is safeguarded from any development which may prevent or hinder its delivery;
- Opportunities are maximised for developments to contribute in-kind to relevant flood risk management projects, for example through the provision of measures with wider flood risk benefits as part of the development;
- Opportunities are maximised for development to contribute financially to relevant flood risk management projects from which they will benefit, for example through cash contributions via s.106 or CIL.

---

#### **Pickering**

Residential sites 116,347 and 205/387 all lie within flood zone 1, and so from a flood risk point of view are suitable for allocation. Site 200 has an area of flood Zone 2. providing this area is removed from the site outline, or specified as an area of open space/green infrastructure.

---

Employment/retail- only one site is being brought forward for allocation, site 650. Provided that, as suggested in the site assessment tables, the eastern limb of the site which lies in Flood Zone 3, is deleted from the site outline, leaving the whole of the remaining area in flood zone 1, then we would support the allocation of this site on flood risk grounds.

---

Site Assessment outcome- support the non-allocation of sites that are placed in outcome groupings 1 or 2 for flood risk reasons. Of the sites placed in outcome grouping 3, only three have flood risk issues: 90,229 and 200. As other sites are available in flood zone 1, we recommend that a sequential approach is taken, and that these sites are not taken forward for allocation.

---

#### **Kirkbymoorside**

Residential sites- Option1 (454/259) and 2 (265,201,345 and 156) all lie within Flood Zone 1- and therefore support the allocation of these sites on flood risk.

---

Employment - site 622 has been proposed as an employment allocation. We are unable to support this site for allocation, and strongly recommend that it is not taken forward. The site is affected by Flood Zone 3b, according to the North East Yorkshire SFRA and backed up by the Derwent CFMP 1:20 outline.

---

The LPA should consider other sites for allocation taking a sequential approach to their selection.

### Service Villages

Amotherby and Swinton, Ampleforth, Nawton/Beadlam, Rillington, Sherburn, Sheriff Hutton, Staxton and Willerby and Thornton le Dale. All proposed sites in these settlements are located in Flood Zone 1. Any sites taken forward should adhere to the comments made in the general comments section above.

Hovingham- we concur with the outcome groupings in terms of flood risk. IF the site 643 is to be taken forward for allocation then a sequential approach to the layout of the site should be taken. The area of flood Zone 2 should either remain as open space/ green infrastructure, or the area is removed from the site boundary.

Slingsby - we agree with the outcome groupings made and support the non-allocation of any sites in groups 1 and 2 on flood risk grounds.

### Groundwater Protection

Sites identified through the site selection process are checked against ground water constraints and the results are as follows:

Malton and Norton		
Residential	649	Unproductive Aquifer, not in Ground Water Source Protection Zone
	218 (108/281) 249 324	Principal Aquifer, not in Groundwater Source Protection Zones
Employment	578, 579	Unproductive Aquifer, not in Groundwater Source Protection Zone
Pickering		
Residential	116,347	Principal Aquifer, Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1
	200	Unproductive Aquifer, not in Groundwater Source Protection Zone
	205/387	Most of the site Unproductive Aquifer, not in Groundwater Source Protection Zone. Small area of site on Principal Aquifer, Source Protection Zone1.
Employment	650	Unproductive Aquifer, not in Groundwater Source Protection Zone
Kirkbymoorside		
Residential	431,265	Majority of site located on Unproductive Aquifer, not in Groundwater Source Protection Zone.
	201	Located on both Unproductive Aquifer and Principal Aquifer. Not in Groundwater Source Protection Zone
	345	Principal Aquifer. Not in Groundwater Source Protection Zone
	454/259	Unproductive Aquifer. Not in Groundwater Source Protection Zone

Employment	622	Unproductive Aquifer. Not in Groundwater Source Protection Zone
Service Villages		
Residential	51	Secondary (undifferentiated) Aquifer, not in Groundwater Source Protection Zone
	430 (464)	Principal Aquifer. Not in Groundwater Source Protection Zone
	638	Unproductive Aquifer. Not in Groundwater Source Protection Zone
	8	Most of site on Unproductive Aquifer. Small area of site on Principal Aquifer. Not in Groundwater Source Protection

There are two sites which could pose an unacceptable risk to groundwater quality due to their location in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1. These are both residential sites in Pickering sites 116 and 347. The report does state that "The use of Sustainable Drainage Systems will require careful consideration" at these sites. However, further detailed information will be required at planning application stage, including a Hydrogeological risk assessment (HRA). This information is important that the information is submitted with the planning application.

Supporting information

Where applicable concerning Groundwater protection:

Hydrogeological Risk Assessment (HRA)

- Each stage or phase of development evaluate likelihood and consequences of each hazard.
- Intrusive site investigation and a period of groundwater monitoring
- Modelling to characterise the site hydrogeology in sufficient detail
- identifying sources pollution, pathways for the movement of pollutants and receptors.
- a tiered approach, working initially from qualitative to numeric as the risks are greater
- Consideration of uncertainties
- Appraisal of options for dealing with identified risks
- Should consider construction, and operation including proposed surface water and foul drainage schemes.

Surface water drainage scheme

Details of proposals to manage surface water

Practical measures that will be implemented to reduce identified risks to groundwater will also be required.

Foul water drainage scheme

Details of proposals to manage foul sewerage effluent

Practical measures that will be implemented to reduce identified risks to groundwater will also be required.

Construction Environmental Method Statement

Planning and

Site 635 and 636

**Design Partnership**  
**obo Mr. David Hume**

Submitted Preliminary layout plan
Response to consultation by Amotherby Parish Council
Hydrogeological, Hydrology and Flood Risk Assessment
Representation Document
Summary conclusions:
In response to concerns to SSM:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>· Between 8 and 10 minutes bus ride to Malton</li><li>· Confirm in conformity with the NPPF</li><li>· Within Flood Zone 1</li><li>· capable, available and deliverable for development within the next 5 years.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>· Had proposed to submit and application on site 635 but was withdrawn- uncertainty of the planning outcome and the affordable housing requirement represented a significant financial risk which the client was not prepared to bear.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>· note that principal reasons for the site's performance in the SSM were source protection zone issues (635) and coalescence and settlement character issues (636)</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>· Sets out that the principle of the site is compliant with national local</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>· Provides an FRA</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>· In terms of landscape character- agree with SSM on site 635.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>·</li></ul>
Disagree concerning site 636: "Site 636 has a mature but fairly low level hedge on its northern boundary that sits atop a low bank but together these make for quite a high screen for over half the length of the site as you travel along the road from Swinton. This hedge tapers out beyond this point and allows for glimpses of views to the South. It is felt that these issues could be dealt with by a well-conceived and executed landscaping scheme that enhances and allows glimpsed views in the same way. It is also worthy of note that the more favourable views are actually all looking the opposite way to the North (downhill) and not the South (up-hill) across this site. In terms of coalescence we feel that the existing landscape, topography and buildings around this site make this site readable as an extension of Swinton rather than Amotherby despite been outside the parish boundary of Swinton. The spatial qualities that help to visually separate these two communities is created by the two opposing open spaces formed by the field to the west of Site 636 and the expansive view to the hills across the field opposite, that opens up as you pass the listed farm travelling west. These landscape features together create the important visual break between the two communities that is read by the casual observer. This could be further emphasised by careful massing of any buildings on the site with a bias to the eastern end opposite the existing farm that will serve to amplify this effect. A well-considered scheme set back as far as practicable from the road would mitigate the impact on the Farmhouse."

	<p>The Environmental Risk Report concludes-  A risk level of VERY LOW is currently considered appropriate for the site with respect to potential risks to controlled waters (i.e. the underlying Principal Aquifer and Groundwater Abstractions) from any contaminants potentially present on both development plots. In summary, no significant sources have been recorded and potential risk is therefore considered to be limited.</p>
<p><b>Aspect Building and Civil Engineering Contractors Ltd.</b></p>	<p><b>Site 32:</b>I confirm my intention to apply for planning consent to develop the small piece of land the end of Pasture Lane. We anticipate residential development of one or two houses with access from Pasture Lane.</p>
<p><b>Mr. J C Fields</b></p>	<p><b>Site 109:</b>I still believe my contents which I believe as still current:  It is on the edge of existing development.  Bordered on two sides by public roads- so access is acceptable  Screened from public views by a shelter belt on the eastern extent  No issues concerning flooding  No archaeological features  Single landownership  Public transport is available- bus stop at the south of the site  Shops and services are available close to the site  Land is available</p>
<p><b>Savills obo MHA</b></p>	<p><b>Site 117/360 (649):</b>  The site submission has been reduced in extent covering the south western component which is immediately to the south. A indicative site layout to illustrate how the site could be developed in respect of the Strip Fields .The scheme proposes mixed uses, residential and community-related uses.</p>

The zone of tolerance of 25% has not been factored in to the supply calculations, and should be considered in terms of a requirement when looking at allocations. Instead of 750 should be 937 for supply.

There is a need to provide positively for growth around Pickering, and the allocation of this land would provide the opportunity for facilities complimentary to the Mickle Hill community such as health facilities. The size of the site has the potential to meet development needs and provide the additional amount of housing growth. Site can help meet shortfall in numbers to meet is objectively assessed housing need up to 2027, particularly since other sites have difficulties in delivery or constraints, as identified with each of the sites the Council has identified to date.

Development of the site would not conflict with any of the constraints highlighted in the SSM- and can avoid the HSE exclusion zone, and that development can be accommodate site features such as strip field systems as already demonstrated at the Mickle Hill Site to the north.

Development would accord with the settlement Hierarchy of the Ryedale Core Strategy (Spatial Policy 3)

Do not support the identification of 116,200,347,205/387. Their combined delivery is 670-717 homes, compared to the indentified need of 513 units of the plan period.

There are no known technical constraints.

The sites have constraints which could threaten the deliverability. The Council needs to undertake a more rigorous analysis of site capacity.

116- strip field system- coalescence with Middleton

200 - part of site in flood zone 2 - support this area being discounted

347 - access concerns and elevated position, with potential impact on heritage assets and setting of the town.

205/387 - majority of site is within 400m of WWTW, but note YW will accept up to 250m

Re-assess the new site extent through the SSM

It is relevant to note that site 117/360 has not been sifted out at stage 1 as the initial assessment records the site is coloured green, which means the development would conform to the LPS. Accessible to a wide range of services, with close proximity to leisure facilities and local shops. The site lies on a bus route.

Site has been reduced in size - and so no longer disproportionately large. Also a scheme would exclude the area covered by HSE advise against development.

Site is in flood zone 1- low risk of flooding-better than other promoted sites.

Regarding Strip Field Systems in the context of biodiversity, they could be retained and enhanced, in terms of special qualities, landscape and setting and culture/heritage .It is considered that an appropriate, sympathetic scheme could be designed, through the retention of the hedgerows. Needs to be balanced against the future development needs of the town.

Regarding community facilities/meeting needs/utilities/ access: Further information can be submitted in this regard. The site is of a scale that should provide a meaningful proportion of affordable housing, and provide complementary facilities to the Mickle Hill Development through the provision of a GP surgery or other facilities. The site is sustainably located and capable of delivery of other land uses. A broadening of the uses on site could provide the opportunity for local employment making a direct contribution to a strong economy.

<p><b>Savills Smiths Gore obo Mr J M Douglas and Mr RW Peacock</b></p>	<p>Supports the allocation of sites 578 and 579. Consider that these are a sustainable and logical extension to the Edenhouse Road scheme. Site submissions 582, 583, 584 and 585 are adjacent and could have a realistic, future role in supporting employment growth in this location. Recognise that this would be in a new plan period, but confirm that the sites are available for development.</p>
<p><b>F T Gooder</b></p>	<p><b>Sites (68) 542 and 543</b>  Failure of sites to progress stage 1 is disputed:</p> <p>Sites in Flood Zone 1  Harm to River Derwent SAC- should be an opportunity to reduce pollution risk. Beck is 1 mile from River Derwent SAC. Twice as far as preferred sites.  Impact on setting of St. Marys, Old Malton- the site cannot be seen from St. Marys, and is more distanced than the preferred sites.</p> <p>Beck House was first allocated as an employment site in the Ryedale Employment Land Review (2006), and performed comparably to the sites at Eden Camp.</p> <p>Considering redevelopment of 542- cost is high, including the costs of highways, site 543 is added as extra land for longer term, to improve the viability of the redevelopment in the short term.</p> <p>Highways, recent meeting with Highways England in terms of safe access on the redeveloped site from the A64 (SRN). A layout will be put forward for consideration by the Agency's Safe Roads Team, to satisfy a stage 1 Road Safety Audit.</p>
<p><b>Savills obo Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation and White Young Green obo Fitzwilliam Malton Estate</b></p>	<p><b>Site 208:</b> Brownfield. In existing settlement of Old Malton. Currently underutilised, generates limited employment opportunities and is commercially unsustainable, retention as an employment site is contrary to paragraph 22 of the NPPF.</p> <hr/> <p>Presents an opportunity to relocate an inappropriate and inefficient land use, and respecting it with high quality development to conserve and enhance the historic environment of Old Malton Conservation Area. The provision of a safe access is not insurmountable. The blue shaded area shows Thackeray's Yard in Blue with land also owned by FME and FTC in green. This provides opportunities to secure safe access.</p>
<p><b>Mr and Mrs Brown</b></p>	<p><b>Site 634:</b> We wish to continue working and living here. We recognise that the land will remain in the Development Plan so that at some point in the future, there will be potential for the conversion of farm buildings to business units, workshops offices etc.</p>
<p><b>P Sutor</b></p>	<p><b>Sites 539 and 7</b>  I understand why the Council's search for sites to meet its housing needs is concentrating on larger sites and is restricted to Market Towns and Service Villages.</p>

Regret the opportunity is not being taken to amend the existing Development Limits in the 2002 Ryedale Local Plan if needed. It is important that the required amendments as they will continue to be used in the smaller 'other' villages'.

As you know from previous correspondence I consider that there is an ambiguity between Inset Map 7 and 2.2 of the supporting text and this should be clarified. See for instance my summary email of 11 March 2013.

The other argument I have made is that the existing mid-20C agricultural buildings on site are an eyesore. They continue to deteriorate. Removal of them would be a benefit to the Conservation Area, as would be their replacement with appropriate development. Your Conservation Officer Emma Woodland agreed that their removal would be acceptable when commenting on planning application 05/00937/FUL.

**White Young Green  
obo Fitzwilliam  
Malton Estate**

**Site 248:**

Concerned about the scale of sites 578 and 579, well exceeds the outstanding requirement of 10.63 ha with the additional 8ha to be released during the life of the plan. The scheme at Eden House Road is not yet established, and so focusing on this site and the land adjacent could be unsustainable and undermine economic growth in the District. None of the evidence base documents regarding employment land and economic development are sufficiently up to date to provide assessment of the likely demand for land at the new business park at Edenhouse and no assessment appears to have been undertaken in this regard.

Some additional land should be allocated at Edenhouse, but the scale of this should be reduced /phased appropriately, and that land should be allocated at York Road. Site 248 is located adjacent to the existing York Road Industrial Estate, a well-established business park with excellent transport links. Planning permission has already been secured on part of the site with development underway, demonstrating demand in this location.

Concerns were raised regarding the access, FME have acquired a legal right to access site 248 from the adjacent employment site (details enclose). So access can be achieved safely.

Whilst improvements to the A64 are welcomed, this should not be at the expense of allocating site 248. Plans to configure the junction are at an early stage, and the scale of 248 is such that development can be achieved whilst still safeguarding land for future improvements. FME are willing to work with Highways England to agree an element of land to be safeguarded, based on appropriately evidenced junction designs and capacity assessments.

Should re-evaluate 248 and include it and the amount of land at 578 and 579 reduced. A more sustainable pattern of employment development, and phased, based on up to date evidence of demand.

**Stovell and  
Millwater Ltd. obo  
GR and E Hull**

**Site 341:**

Attaches response (Planning Statement/PS) of Dec. 2013. Site extent has not been extended to include Low Lane as requested in the PS. It is a track, and provides access to community facilities and businesses. The scheme would improve the road between the Meadow filed Close junction and the junction with the access road to the sports club, bringing it up to an adoptable standard.

Swinton is an accessible settlement with convenient access to Malton and a range of facilities

Provide affordable (35%) and elderly accommodation, which use of life time home standards, with improved links to the sports and social complex and commercial workshops.

The site is contained by mature hedgerow and tree planting, to the west are open fields, to the south and east development. Hedgerows on the boundary of the field would be retained, enhanced and extended as appropriate.

The scrap metal merchants has a 3-4m high mature hedgerow planting with trees along the western boundary. Views onto the site are limited to when the gates are open. It is not an intrusive use. Site is only open during the day. Do not consider that the amenity of residents is compromised by the presence of the scrap metal merchants.

**Constructive  
Individuals**

**Site 346**

Propose a scheme with 35% affordable housing. Been discussing the site with the Local Authority. It is our view that the comments and hence the scoring for this site do not accurately reflect the current position for the reasons below:

Q2D had a flood risk assessment been undertaken? Site is outside flood zone 2 and 3. FRA would be required as part of a planning application- no special provisions expected.

Q3 Do not contest that improvement in Low Lane is required, but through new development this can be achieved. The site does not include sufficient frontage to enable access of acceptable standards to be formed onto the public highway". The site frontage is 114m in length.

Regarding Green Infrastructure- it could certainly be provided, our original proposal discussed tree planting to blend with landscape and improve the microclimate. Hedging would be retained as far as possible.

Landscape Impact- originally submitted a 1 1/2 dwellings to minimise impact on the open countryside, with the use of natural materials. There are large buildings nearby the sports centre impact on the openness of the countryside and visually suggest a broader edge to the village. Recent development of barns and a dwelling with an agricultural occupancy tie. To argue that our proposed development is 'separated from the settlement' ignores the fact the fact that the settlement has grown adjacent to our site.

Q8- impact on nationally designed landscapes - identifies would harm the character of Swinton, but doesn't say how, landscape character references - this site is hidden from view by the B1257 and elongated nature of the village, and would be read visually simply as a northern part of the continuous village development. (Photos of farm buildings added)

Q10- capability to utilise existing landscape features-Low lane itself has substantial mature trees on both sites, which link the site to the main part of the village. There are a number of belts of trees, which run through the northern part of the village, which suggest former field boundaries.

Q13 impact on non-designated heritage assets - contest view that site would not pay reference to the existing character of Swinton. Site would set between the sports centre and the rest of the village. There is a desire to maintain a separation of the villages along the B1257, and so development will have to be along the north, and should focus new development where these streets join low lane, and to the north of this. Developments which run counter to this pattern, Cherry Avenue/Pearson's Yard) are more harmful to the character of the village.

Happy to engage archaeology professional concerning an archaeological methods statement.

Q21: density. Consider that site contain 24 2-3bed houses and 2 bed bungalows.

Q35- resilience to climate change. - proposals are based on Passivhaus design and specification, which is extremely robust in the face of climate change, avoidance of overheating, and minimising of heating needs in the winter.

Q40. attraction of balanced living and or working population reducing inequality of opportunity- Council referred to " no details have been provided concerning the nature and type of dwellings that are proposed. On site affordable housing would need to be provided. The proposal showed an initial mix of 2 and 3 bed houses and 2-bed bungalows, supported by later correspondence confirming interest from a local social housing provider.

Q42, affordable housing, SSM refers to 2009 scheme, refers to limited potential for delivery. No evidence is given as to why the potential for delivery is seen as limited.

49. SSM states proposals seek to improve Low Lane, which provides access to the sports pitches and sports centre- but then fails to acknowledge this as a positive measure contributing to community facilities, utilities and infrastructure.

50. SSM identified within 400m of a WWTW. The Yorkshire Water facility is a pumping station. Furthermore the original proposal stated:" The proposals will.... include major improvements to surface water drainage to eliminate current flooding problems. This will be combined with sustainable drainage systems and rainwater collection within the new housing site".

Q56. Category 3 in SHLAA, Owner and prospective developer has continued development with social housing providers with a view to having a ready development partner should the site be considered part of the local Plan.

<b>D. Whattam</b>	<b>Site 194:</b> Q46 refers to two access points to two individual properties, this is incorrect, the access point to the north of 72 Welham Road (an old car track) also serves as an access point to this property, especially the rear garden. It forms part of the property deeds since the late 1800s. As part of the deeds it clearly is identified as a distinct and important part of the property and therefore any access/usage of it should be done in the knowledge of what rights this property enjoys over said access points.
<b>S Helme, R M Simonson, C J Coats and K E Burgess</b>	<b>Site 40 (158)</b> Proposed that the site be used for retirement flats. (submitted sketch of proposals). It could be a care home (employment for local people). Three-storey scheme was a major objection by neighbours, but a two storey scheme could be adequate, could have various garden areas to provide amenity and recreation. Developers interested in the pleasant, central site could begin work soon. No major problems with the site apart from coalescence between Kirkbymoorside and Keldholme. These places would easily retain their own identifies, and there are also two houses at the Kirby Mills end of the site. If one additional, attractive building fulfilled a need, surely that is an important mitigating fact and with gardens all round, the building would not fill the whole site. It seems to be a sad waste of a small piece of land which is not even a public open space, and is only visible from the top of a double-decker bus, which it could be put to good use to serve the community.
<b>J K Billingham</b>	<b>Site 414:</b> Semi-developed, containing a large bungalow, detached double garage and assorted outbuildings, with grassland and mix of tree planting of 1.4acres. Adjacent to the plot is a replacement dwelling. Extensive development to the west of the plot, directly opposite this site. Would have minimal impact on the character of the surrounding area, whereas the new estate has had a significant impact. The plot is sloped, reducing the visual impact from the road. Site is well screened with mature trees and hedges. Development of single storey construction will complement the existing development, with construction materials selected accordingly, with locally sourced labour and materials. With its screening it has the same visual impact on the approach to Pickering as it did in 1986, and additional development would do very little to diminish this.
<b>S. C. Wright</b>	<b>Site 652:</b> Confirm that land is still available as future building land at any time in the future. As and when development fills up in other areas. Site is deliverable and developable and would tidy up the village boundaries and tidy an otherwise untidy area.

<p><b>C. Wilson</b></p>	<p><b>Site 206</b> and those immediately adjacent. Fit well within the accessibility criteria of access to public transport, school, health and employment for site selection. In addition they provide an opportunity to provide additional housing in Pickering in an area which is relatively well-screened and located within the natural road boundaries. This should allow the development to occur with minimal impact on the attractive western approach to Pickering. Suitable for family housing with junior and senior schools nearby and no main road to access schools.</p>
<p><b>P Sutor obo B Newcome</b></p>	<p><b>Site 125:</b> Regrets the site is regarded as too small to be considered for housing in this Service Village. It could have allowed a neglected site in a visually important location viewed from the village to be approved. The adverse impact on the landscape is overstated, as it is well below the rising ground of the site. Site is higher than the adjacent block, so would not flood easily. The lack of provision of affordable housing should not be seen as a reason to reject the site, as an off-site commuted sum could be used.</p> <p>There are two PRoWs adjacent. The footpath to the west is across the beck, and would not be adversely affected. Neither would the RUPP to the east (the access to Ellis). No need to transect the PRoW. Much of the reasoning for the rejection revolves around the trees. There are no actual trees of any significance on our plot. They do overhang and appear to be in the plot on Google Maps- perhaps this is how the site has been assessed. We would want to ensure retention of the trees, to preserve the rustic charm of the site. Accessibility- remains grey suggesting no assessment. The site is in the up to 5 minutes walking time category.</p> <p>"There is an existing timber building, which the site submitter proposes to replace with a new dwelling. It is unlikely to cause wider landscape impacts by virtue of its size, but an adverse localised impact would be present. Q.11- disagree with this, suggest neutral impact. Q13. disagree that it would be intrusive development in the street scene, as no archaeology within the vicinity of Rillington, however, we accept that it must be legally addressed. respectfully suggest "development would not adversely affect".</p> <p>Q16 E site is capable of incorporating low carbon technologies such as voltaic panels.</p> <p>Q3 contradicts with the assessment for Q3, "conflicts with anticipated playing pitch access. One small dwelling access teed off the adequately wide playing field access road; its not really likely to cause any conflicts. Q53 respectfully suggest that, given the responses above, that the "The site has no adverse impact etc." or at the very least "Site does not have</p>
<p><b>L. Coulson obo Mrs P Barber and Mr B Booth</b></p>	<p><b>Site 417:</b></p> <p>Submit that site should be considered as an alternative housing allocation. With the access issue resolved, it performs generally well through each of the stages of the SSM, and mitigation can be used to achieve an acceptable form of development, and much needed housing in this part of Norton. Access information: existing (southern) site access onto Welham Road is to be retained as a emergency vehicle and pedestrian /cyclist access. Proposed new access off Beechwood Road, on the corner between Leat House and 1 Beechwood Road. Consider that in light of access details the site should be reconsidered. The access proposed by Sanderson Associates meets required standards, and is within the control of the vendors. The emergency access also has an established right of way. The access could serve between 100-400</p>

Reconfirm no known constraints (ownership, planning or technical).  
Opportunities to provide appropriate mitigation and enhancement.  
Discussions taking place with potential developers regarding an Option Agreement, and its deliverability is therefore confirmed.  
Representation summarises the housing requirement and distribution issues pertinent to Norton as per the adopted LPS, and other planning policy requirements and consideration.

LPS states that it would **not** rely on the identification of Strategic Sites, but use a range of small, medium and large sites. 4 large sites are proposed to be allocated to provide circa 1,500 dwellings. It is questionable whether this is in accordance with the adopted Strategy.

Of the four sites, three are in the same ownership. Caution should be applied to an over-reliance on a small number of landowners to deliver housing land supply.

Note that the site performs mainly in positive way. Subject to the submission of the FRA.

Whilst it is known that the Council wishes to focus much of the new housing in Malton, there is still a requirement for housing sites in Norton. The implications for the wider highway network will require examination in due course, and potentially some contribution may need to be provided towards the Welham Road junction improvements as set out in the Local Plan Strategy. Betterment for the local community, and would be acceptable in principle to the vendors, subject to other policy/development requirements.

Majority of the site is currently contained by existing housing and the residential development of the site could be seen as a 'rounding off' of this part of Norton. The infilling of the site could be developed in an attractive way that carefully protects and respects the amenity of the surrounding dwellings, whilst also providing a green and ecologically sensitive scheme. A well-designed scheme would provide an attractive setting for properties. Some element of the Beck would in all likelihood be incorporated into the design layout. Unique opportunity to create an exceptional housing development, using the natural resource of the Beck at its heart. Create an attractive sustainable green lung (amenity area).

An initial sweeping ecological assessment, will full survey of affected species would be undertaken during the appropriate season, and commissioned in due course.

The site is designated a group 2 site due to access delivery is not demonstrated to be viable, nor consideration of the remediation of the fish ponds. Sanderson Associates have designed what they consider to be a satisfactory access solution, they can also in due course provide information about the remediation of the fish ponds and FRA . The remediation of the historic fishponds, together with the integration of the Beck, and provision of green amenity areas as part of the comprehensive development of the site, would provide an opportunity to enhance the ecology and natural environment. We believe that the site provides a unique opportunity to create a sensitive housing scheme that is ecologically and landscape led, with habitat creation and/or enhanced measures implemented on or close to the site. These can only be created as part of the residential development and we advocate that this opportunity should not be missed.

**Evolution Town Planning obo the North Cotes Farm Limited (Watts Family) and Carr Family**

**Sites 319,320,321,322,645,646,648 (Watts Family) 103,187 and 302 (Carr Family)**Sites proposed in various configurations. Proposing the site as a single unit, landowners will work together to provide a comprehensive scheme. Should be allocated for the following reasons:

Vehicular access from Welham Road between properties 143 and 147, emergency from Whitewall. Site has good access to the town.

Sustainable location being on the edge of Norton. Residential development has occurred to the north, and there are residential properties in the form of detached, two story properties. The land is therefore screened from the south. Land is well related to the built up area of Norton, would not be visible in the wider landscape due to the homes along Welham Road, and the buildings and woods along Whitewall. Consider the land to be a logical location for development when considering the landscape impact, because it is well-contained by existing features. The ribbon development along Welham Road already gives the locality a suburban character. Filling in behind this development in an area that is not visible to the wider landscape would be a logical extension to the built up area.

The north and west are established woods which contain the area within the landscape. The land is divided into three grazed fields. Inside the field boundaries there are no features except for the wood in the north east corner (proposed to be retained and used as a public area of open space). The land is isolated from the wider landscape by houses and woods. Norton extends by ribbon development along the east of Welham Road in a continuous line of houses to the junction with Whitewall. Development behind this frontage would be screened by trees to the east and south. Any development in this location would be isolated from the wider landscape whilst still being well related to the built up area of Norton .

Land is grade 3, making it suitable for development, by not being one of the higher grades. Also site is not subject to any designation as a SSI, SAC or Scheduled Monument. Limited ecological value, largely being confined to field boundaries and hedgerows.

The Council has suggested that development of the land would cause substantial harm to the setting of listed buildings. There are two Grade II Listed Buildings in the vicinity of the site. Both are on Whitewall and front the road: Whitewall House and outbuildings and Whitewall Cottage and Stables. These are opposite side of the road. Whitewall Cottages are partially screened from the site by the modern properties on Welham Road. Immediately to the east of Whitewall are two non-listed modern bungalows and a pair of Semi-detached homes. the setting of the listed building has therefore already changes significantly over time. Development can easily be designed to protect the setting of Listed Buildings to the south. Do not consider that a well-designed, laid out and landscaped development would cause substantial harm to the listed buildings as the Council suggests. Sensitive design will mean that substantial harm will not occur. This would mean that the benefits of the proposal would be weighed against the impact on the Listed Buildings. The benefits include provision of market and affordable housing, alongside open space, and the economic impacts of new development, and these benefits would outweigh any impact on the listed buildings from a well-designed development.

New development can be designed to safeguard the setting of these listed buildings. For example, by locating open space or undeveloped land close to the listed buildings so that the character of the buildings fronting countryside is preserved. A strong hedge along Whitewall or an area of open space or paddocks in front of the listed buildings would contain the views around the buildings. If hedging were provided along the back of the homes fronting Welham Road the setting of the Listed Buildings would be improved. The setting of the listed buildings comprises Welham Road and to road Whitewash Corner Hill to the west. These roads have modern buildings or trees along their frontages. To the south are outbuildings and gardens of the listed buildings and a modern home fronting Whitewash Corner Hill. To the north are the modern homes on the corner of Whitewall and Welham Road with a large outbuilding to the rear of these homes that is side on to Whitewall. These screen Whitewall Cottages from the site submission. Views of the fields are dominated by the rear gardens of the properties on Welham Road. There is no hedge along the edge of the field to limit views across the fields to the Listed Buildings.

**PB Planning obo  
Wharfedale Homes**

**Site 252:**

- Adjacent to the built up area of Nawton north and east.
- Strong, defensible landscape boundaries to south and west.
- Site within 400m of a number of services and facilities, including the secondary school, Ryedale School.
- Site can be accessed by Beckett Close, and is 200m from the bus stops on the A170.
- Site is within Flood Risk 1.
- No detailed/technical planning policy matters that would preclude development of the site.
- Enclosed drawing covering the following matters:
  - Size, layout and configuration capable of supporting a sustainable housing scheme of up to 30 homes to meet a range of needs'
  - 35% affordable housing contribution (11 units- based on current policy requirements)
  - Appropriate vehicular access can be taken from Beckett Drive, with new proposed pedestrian and cycle connections to existing linkages to the north of the site
  - Enhanced boundary landscaping along the western and southern boundaries of the site.
  -

Consider that site can deliver a high standard of design that protect and enhances the local character and setting. The site largely enclosed on all sides with strong boundaries, and other potential housing sites in the settlement would have more of an impact on the countryside

- Deliverability: Suitable- located in a suitable location, as identified above
- Availability: site is available for development now. Wharfedale Homes have an interest in the site and by virtue of this submission are expressing an intention to develop the site for residential use.
- Achievability: viable housing development can be delivered on the site within the next 5 years. Prior to the progression of development sites, Wharfedale Homes undertake a thorough marketing and economic viability assessment of each site, including an assessment of site-specific abnormal costs. The site is considered to be achievable for residential development within the next 5 years. Our assessment findings corroborates RDC's own assessment undertaken in their selection of preferred housing sites
- The RDC's SHLAA identifies the site as being a category 1 deliverable residential site with the potential to provide 27 dwellings.

Nawton, with Beadlam is a Service Village in SP1.

- Consider that in terms of what the sites at Service Village are proposed to do- this site fulfils the identified characteristics.
- Policy SP2 seeks to identify 10% of all new homes at the Service Villages, and in distributing that 300 homes across the 10 service village groupings, would be 30 dwellings per settlement.
- On the site assessment process, Beadlam and Nawton would score higher than a number of other Service Villages, and so should be allocated more that 30 dwellings over plan period, especially as the settlements are not proximal to the National Park or AONB, or other High Landscape Value designations.

Comparing with RDC proposed housing options, the Council have only identified four potential housing allocations with the identified Service Villages.

- Agree with all but one of those choices: Site 430(464) Land East of the Balk and South of Aspen Way. (73 units max)
- Whilst we agree that the level of new homes to be distributed to each of the Service Villages shouldn't be a purely quantitative assessment, specific regard should be had to SP 1 which sets out development sites will be identified by the Council.
- Consider that on account of the additional facilities that are available at Nawton/Beadlam, and the reduced impact on the character of the village and landscape setting, a proportion of the site in Slingsby should be off-set and the site in Nawton come forward, or be allocated in addition, given it can be considered a more sustainable and deliverable residential site.
- Strong argument for the future allocation of Beckett Close, Nawton Site on account of the following:
  - The number of local facilities and services, in particular, the presence of Ryedale School;
  - No known technical constraints to the site which would preclude development of the site
  - Site would not have an adverse impact on the character of the village or the wider landscape setting due to its location in the context of the village's settlement form.
  - All the above was noted by RDC in their own assessment of the site.
  - The site is 1% of the District's identified housing needs, a scale which would not be detriment to the spatial strategy of the District, and thus the site could be allocated without the need to reduce the size or lose other proposed allocations across the District. Its allocation could also provide further flexibility.

**O'Neil Associates  
obo Thomas Crown  
Associates**

**Site 423:** Brownfield site -semi-derelict agricultural buildings. Highly sustainable location- 5-10 minutes walk of Malton Train Station , schools, shops and local facilities

- The Council's SSM confirms that the allocation of the site would be consistent with the Local Plan Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy. These representations confirm that allocation would be in conformity with the NPPF. Other than flood risk (95% of site in Flood Zone 3- rest in flood zone2) the site performs extremely well in the SSM.- These representations demonstrate all outstanding concerns on flood risk can be successfully addressed and mitigated.- The site should be included as a housing allocation in the Local Plan.

The site is capable of development, available for development and deliverable within the first 5 years of the Plan.

Disagree that the site has multiple access issues. Highway Authority have responded to planning application with no objection subject to conditions.

A technical solution is available to reduce the flood risk to an acceptable level. The mitigation scheme ensures dwellings will not be affected in the event of flooding. Density- can be acceptably achieved, the technical solution does not compromise density.

Disagree that the flood risk concerns should outweigh the Brownfield status of the site.

SUDS scheme can address the flood risk and critical drainage area.

Measures to address climate change are incorporated.

Concerning affordable housing, viability is a normal part of the assessment of any site, conclusions as to the deliverability of affordable housing cannot be made at this stage of the process.

The Site is to be accessed from Lakeside Way, to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority.

The technical solution demonstrates that development can be made flood resilient and resistance, including safe access and escape routes, and that any residual risk can be managed, including emergency planning, and gives priority to the use of sustainable drainage systems.

Currently absorbs 2344m<sup>3</sup> water

- Raise the access road 19.01AOD
- east of the road filled to 18.93 AOD to lift properties 12-23 above flood level
- west of road reduced to 17.2 AOD houses 1-11 will be constructed with sub floor voids, allowed to flood
- Parking areas and road filled with polypropylene creates (95%) void and surfaced over for car parking.

In the event of a flood to 18.93 AOD the volume of water stored is 2454m<sup>3</sup>,

Site can be developed without loss of flood storage volume.

SuDs report: Soakaways solution is feasible.

Driveways and parking areas to be constructed using permeable paving and drain to ground.

Roof water from the proposed dwellings will drain into individual private soakaways in the garden of each property 5 m from any building.

Highway will be drained to an adopted soakaways or to existing adopted sewer network with below ground attenuation is required, subject to the relevant approvals.

Sequential test undertaken, and exception test.

Provided information about evacuation routes, and alleviation measures

Savills obo Halifax  
Estates and Brewis

Site 655 and 184 (various) (new ID 660)

**Family**

· 105ha of mixed-use allocation in LPSD. Land is available for development and committed to working together to deliver a comprehensive scheme. the east boundary is defined by the A64- which provides transport links and access. The area is put forward for re-appraisal following agreement between the owners of the land to promote the to meet development requirements over the Plan period and beyond. Create a robust urban extension site.

· The zone of tolerance of 25% has not been factored in to the supply calculations, and should be considered in terms of a requirement when looking at allocations.

· The Council's 4 identified sites have a number of issues which remain to be addressed and if any sites should be delayed in delivery there needs to be sufficient number of sites allocated to ensure the delivery plus excess anticipated by the LPS Inspector. If he Council fails to properly meet objectively assessed housing needs it will fail the tests of soundness in failing to be consistent with the overarching adopted Local Plan Strategy, and risks that it will be not 'effective'. similarly, the employment land requirements need to be addressed in accessible and suitable locations. the proximity of this land to the A64 provides a suitable location for such uses.

The SSM is a blunt tool, as it does not appear to acknowledge in the assessment process how development might address matters such as providing land uses which enhance a sites' sustainability criteria, or reducing boundaries to avoid issues of flood risk. We recommend that the next stage is more robust in this respect.

---

(655) The site scores negatively on the impact on the highway network and significant transport infrastructure improvements required. The comprehensive development solution where owners work together would provide infrastructure improvements and employment uses could be located towards the recently improved A64 junction as part of a comprehensive development area on this eastern fringe of the Town. There is the potential for the area to link into the new road link planned as part of the sites 649/651 to provide integrated planned development and the combined length of Scarborough Road frontage between the two landowners could provide for highway improvements.

---

Site 655 negative score on basis of flood risk and impact on setting of St. Mary's in Old Malton. Avoid through containing development to the south of the railway line, and including only compatible uses within Flood Zone 3. The existing bank to the railway offers protection to the south of the Railway. Build development to the south of this boundary would also avoid visual impact on heritage assets of Old Malton and its setting.

---

The site scores negatively in the Council's assessment of the basis of accessibility of schools, doctors etc. this could be scored more positively through the consideration of a large comprehensive allocation, as economies of scale would provide the opportunity to include facilities as required. The site has regular bus services to the train station and town centre.

- Site scores medium landscape sensitivity and that trees and hedgerows could be retained.
  - Site scores negatively in relation to the existing settlement boundary and be isolated development edge inconsistent with settlement form, this would be overcome with a more comprehensive development approach.
  - The site scores negatively in relation to being in a critical drainage area. There is no reason to suggest that this could be addressed through mitigation.
  - The site scores negatively on the impact on the highway network and substantial assess mitigation required. This assessment has been based on the assessment of land to the north of the railway
- 

Site 184 - has only been considered for employment uses and the negative scores for impact on the setting of heritage assets are likely to have been considered positively had the assessment been undertaken for residential uses. The sites 184a-c score negatively on the basis of flood risk and setting of St. Mary's' Old Malton. This can be overcome by developing south of the railway and using flood compatible uses, this would avoid visual impacts on the heritage assets. The site scores negatively in the Council's assessment of the basis of accessibility of schools, doctors etc. this could be scored more positively through the consideration of a large comprehensive allocation, as economies of scale would provide the opportunity to include facilities as required. The site has regular bus services to the train station and town centre.

---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>184d- scores negatively on the basis that commercial development could:-           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant tree loss</li> <li>Impact on residential amenity</li> <li>Not compatible size for employment</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Re-appraising the site a comprehensive proposal with residential uses would result in a positive score for this element</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>184e scores negatively due to the impact of commercial development would have on the setting of Norton Grove Stud. A comprehensive development solution to this location would provide the opportunity for compatible uses such as residential in proximity to the Stud Buildings.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Carter Jonas obo Hovingham Estate</b></p>	<p><b>Site 643:</b>Submission also contained scoping and draft Hovingham Master Plan. Revised site extent to 374.Concerns lack of conformity with the vision, objectives and spatial development strategy within the Local Plan Strategy and national government guidance. The lack of sustainability appraisal of the approach adopted towards the service villages. Hovingham is a Service Village (Local Service Centre), and identified as a tertiary focus for growth. Policy SP2 identifies that the main source of new housing in Hovingham will be in and adjacent to the built up area and redevelopment of previously developed land and buildings within Development Limits. It states allocations "will be made having taken account of the outstanding commitments at each location at the point at which the Local Plan Sites Document is prepared." In this regard there are no 'outstanding commitments' in Hovingham. Equally "sites to be distributed as far as possible, amongst all villages in this category" is an objective, but of course within the parameters of The Vision and possibly achieving broader sustainability objectives such as heritage benefits/considerations.</p>
---	--

No objections to the allocations in principle, However significant concerns in regards to distribution across the settlements. The LPS states that sites will be distributed across the villages (SP2). However, the sites document is proposing to concentrate 59% of the planned growth over the whole of the plan period on the village of Slingsby. This does not represent an equitable division of growth, but a disproportionate focus, irrespective of whether such settlements have recently seen development.

The Sites Document states that it is not proposing to bring forward any planned growth within Hovingham, and focus development in settlements where there has not been any recent residential development, with an effective moratorium elsewhere. Contrary to local and national policy. The role of the Sites Document is realise the vision, objectives and development strategy of the Local Plan Strategy. It should be in conformity with the Local Plan Strategy, which states that sites will be distributed across the 10 service villages. This has been subjected to public examination and sustainability appraisal. There has been no material change in circumstances to justify this significant deviation from the adopted Development Strategy. The approach seems to be premised on the basis that there is a maximum amount of development that can be delivered with the Service Villages, which cannot be breached. However, such an approach is clearly contrary to the Framework requirement to 'significantly boost the supply of housing' and need to 'support thriving rural communities'. Insufficient flexibility to meet the housing needs in this part of Ryedale, and fail to reflect the traditional pattern of development within the range of service settlements across the District. Contrary to the objectives of the LPS and NPPF. The NPPG makes clear that all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by local evidence. Clearly no such evidence has been provided which demonstrates why Hovingham is unsuitable for expansion. As a counterbalance, we would suggest that the Council should seek to identify additional sites in all the Service Villages. The Council should bring forward our client's site 643 for housing to ensure the vibrancy and vitality of the village of Hovingham as well as meeting local housing needs over the plan period.

The soundness of the approach for the Council in terms of its treatment of 'Service Villages' is significantly flawed because it has never been subject to a sustainability appraisal.

The site borders Hovingham Conservation Area, and a number of Grade II listed buildings. It is accessed via Mowbray Crescent, with agricultural buildings to the north and open countryside to the east. Residential

~~development is to the west and south.~~  
There are no public rights of way which cross the site.

The SSM identifies that there are allotments on the site. They are not allotments. They are individual garden licenses for domestic garden purposes. Alternative provision to the south of Mowbray Crescent, or elsewhere as part of the Hovingham Master Plan- the existing playground area. The land is currently rented to various residents, including occupants of Mowbray Crescent under a garden license for domestic

Consider that the site would be suitable for a medium-density scheme, in keeping with the neighbouring residential properties and wider village. The site could accommodate up to 30 dwellings, subject to providing an appropriate relationship with neighbouring built development, and active (agricultural buildings). The agricultural buildings could remain in situ as part of the anticipated incremental development of this site until a time when the prospect of relocation is available buildings away from dwellings is realised if necessary. this is not an undue constraint on the delivery of the site. The commercial uses within the traditional range of buildings are key to the sustainability of the village and would remain unaffected. Development could consist of a mix of dwellings: (1-2 storey) and tenures with small and medium sized family houses, including a significant element of affordable housing,

Properties would be arranged to take account of the setting of neighbouring listed properties and working agricultural buildings and give rise to improved access arrangements for those existing properties upon Mowbray Crescent.

The existing hedgerow on the eastern edge of the site could be preserved and reinforced through additional planting and the creation of a significant landscape buffer and development edge.

The vehicular access to the site would be taken from Mowbray Crescent with possible pedestrian links to the side of the Worsley Arms, giving access to the heart of the village and permeability to the site.

Our client has commissioned an access appraisal which demonstrates that the site is fully deliverable from a highway perspective for the quantum of development proposed. However, if highway improvements to Mowbray Crescent are required (width and alignment) they could be carried out on land owned by the client.

It is anticipated that the site would be developed on a phased basis, in year 5 of the plan period, for the growing local need and in light of the recent development - which the local authority makes reference to as a reason for not allocating land.

Consider there is a need to allocate land for housing within Hovingham to ensure it can enhance and maintain its local services, and there is a clear heritage imperative given the wider obligations of the Estate in terms of heritage conservation and community building.

The Council has stated that there is no requirement for further sites to be brought for housing in Hovingham because the housing need has already been substantially met by recent housing developments in the village. However, most of the recent development in Hovingham was, in reality suitable for retired individual and couples and high income families from outside the district. There is no evidence that this development would meet all the indigenous housing needs in Hovingham and its hinterland, with local families and young adults who wish to remain in the village. This reflected informal discussions undertaken with Hovingham Parish Councillors, in November, where a need for smaller properties was identified to help bolster the local school role from the resident population of Hovingham and not outlying areas. Therefore there is a critical need to bring forward additional housing within the village to deliver the vision and objectives of the Local Plan in terms of rebalancing the population structure as well as meeting local housing needs and requirements.

Site 643 is: is fully deliverable:

1. Be available now;
2. Offer a suitable location for development now
3. Be achievable with a reasonable prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within 5 years and in particular that the site is viable.

Our response has been informed by the site selection methodology. In that respect we consider that rating is incorrect and should be a category group 4 site against the SSM as outlined below- providing the local authority with 7 deliverable sites in total across the service villages at this level.

The site is available, no legal impediments, need for third party ownership or known constraints that would impede deliverability. Our client is committed to bringing forward the site when required by the Local Planning Authority. It is Deliverable. Deliver significant public benefits, particularly in regards to meeting local housing needs through the delivery of a mixture of housing types and tenures including affordable housing, housing suitable for the elderly. Enhancing the setting of the Conservation Area, and reinforcing the positive role of the Hovingham Estate in this

Achievability: Para.47 of the NPPF states that to be achievable, there should be a reasonable prospect of housing will be delivered on the site within 5 years, and is viable. This site is such as site, within this or a longer timeframe, if required by the Local Authority and that there are no insurmountable constraints what would prevent deliverability of the site. As a leading Agency, Carter Jonas considers that there is a market demand for housing development on the site.

Consistency with planning policy: The site is adjacent to the built up area of Hovingham (defined as a Service Village), adjacent to Development Limits. The Site could accommodate up to 30 dwellings (extending beyond the present plan period)

Highway considerations: Transport Assessment (2009) considering access- Since the site extent was reduced- in respect of concerns. Mowbray Crescent has sufficient capacity to deliver the proposed development, with modifications to the existing highway width/alignment within the ownership of the Estate. The local highway network has sufficient capacity to serve the proposed development.

Accessibility: The site is well related to the village and enjoys a high level of accessibility - easy walking distance of primary school, community centre, church, public house bakery and tearooms.

#### Physical constraints

Site is greenfield, relatively flat, and regularly shaped. It is recognised that development would abut up to an existing farmstead. An appropriate landscape buffer between the farm and residential properties to ensure that there would be no loss of amenity to the residential properties or equally loss of utility for the farm. Never the less, given the rural location of the site, a level of activity from such an agricultural use would not be unexpected in this location. As indicated previously, the incremental development of this site would enable alternative options for the siting of this agricultural use which would be possible given pending available alternative options within the Estate land ownership (the occupant being an existing tenant).

#### Flood risk

The site is in Flood Zone 1, and therefore not subject to flooding. The attached FRA demonstrates that surface water drainage could be effectively managed on the site, through a SuDs drainage scheme.

#### Infrastructure Capacity

Site would benefit from existing utilities serving the neighbouring residential properties.

#### Ground Conditions

Since the site has been used as an ancillary garden land, there is no reason to suggest that the site would be subject to any form of contamination, and non prohibitive.

Landscape Impact: Site is contiguous with the existing built up area, and the Development Limits are adjacent to the site. Bordered on two sides south and west by development and farm buildings to the north. The site has little intrinsic landscape value and the mature hedgerows on its eastern boundary would provide a clear defensible development limit. Site is well-related to the existing pattern of development and would represent an appropriate consolidation and rounding off of the south eastern edge of the village. The site is visually contained and would respect the traditional form and character of the area. The proposed development would not impinge on any landscape designations, or heritage constraints. It would not lead to the incongruous outward spread of development. Impact on AONB- recognised as being of high significance. Small domestic garden areas to the south of the modern farmyard. Would not lead to encroachment of development into the surrounding countryside or the AONB. Consider that the site holds negligible significance to the wider AONB. (noted variance between the 2002 inset map and the Howardian Hills Map )

Attached heritage report demonstrates development to the north of Mowbray Crescent would be possible without undue harm both to the landscape setting of Hovingham, the immediate locality, and also designated heritage assets within/adjacent to the site. clear capacity and ability for the site to accommodate further development and be well-integrated into the existing fabric of the village. It would result in potential enhancement in this regard and no substantial harm. The general topography of the site, the orientation of heritage assets and presence of intervening development would enable development to be accommodated within this context without any negative impact on heritage significance. Suitable parameters could be established as part of the planning framework to minimise the impact on the historic environment still further and mitigate the effects of existing features which may not add to the prevailing character of the Conservation Area and its setting. The Estate is mindful of the need to devise a suitable detailed scheme within the parameters of the proposed site, which itself is identified so as to minimise harm in the first instance. A positive and active role as custodian is taken by the Estate, as evidenced by their involvement in the Pasture Lane development and other ad-hoc schemes in the village.

Heritage Report: Impact on designated heritage assets- Listed Buildings. • Coach House to Worsley Arms Hotel – Grade II

- Lumley House, High Street – Grade II
- Worsley Arms Farmhouse – Grade II
- Worsley Arms Hotel – Grade II

These Listed Buildings are within the context of the potential residential land allocation.

It is evident that the general significance associated with the listed buildings under review is of Medium Significance given the above initial categorisation. This puts the significance and importance of these heritage assets in context as a starting point. Given the location and general extent of the site under consideration as part of this assessment it is considered that the main focus of attention is the likely consequences in terms of impact upon their significance should the identified site be allocated for development.

These particular heritage assets are Grade II listed and in active use; presently used as hotel, business premises and residential properties. These buildings are largely front onto High Street and their significance is considered to lie in their aesthetic and historical/associative value to the village as a wider entity as opposed to stand alone landmark buildings. They are attractive limestone buildings which are good examples of mid to late 19th Century architecture exemplifying the prosperity of the village as a result of its role as a Victorian Spa destination. The general layout emphasises their group value and significance of their immediate setting as a consequence. Existing land uses and development to the south and east do not positively contribute to significance in this respect and, if anything, detracts from this setting. This is particularly so with regards to the large agricultural building which defines the eastern edge to this complex at present. Equally, ad hoc development and use for garden purposes dilutes the transition to open countryside in this area and does not relate well to character and appearance of the rest of the village or specific listed buildings under consideration. The historic in depth individual plot divisions to the rear of properties fronting onto High Street have long been lost visually/physically (in terms of boundary realignment) and functionally (in terms of multiple users) diluting the significance in this respect of this area.

The principal and most important aspect of the setting of these buildings is to the west and north thus away from the site under consideration where historic plot layout and building form remain. As such it is considered that these listed buildings have medium sensitivity to change to the historic environment to the west and north i.e. the current green space used a 'beer garden'.

The aspect and significance of setting to the south and east of the heritage assets is less defined and largely obscured from important public views and is therefore considered to be of 'low sensitivity' in this respect. As such, the main sensitive aspects of these heritage assets, in terms of views onto and from, is away and distinct from the proposed development site. The consequence upon the setting (the key element of significance in this respect) will be a 'slight impact' of insignificant consequence upon the heritage assets in this regard, or at the very worst 'moderate impact' dependent upon the quality and sensitivity of any forthcoming development scheme at the detailed level. Appropriately detailed layout proposals are capable of resolving this in due course.

There are considered to be no substantive requirements to ensure that the significance of the identified heritage assets are preserved or enhanced or any harm reduced or mitigated above and beyond the preparation of an appropriate scheme of development at the detailed planning stage should the site be allocated for residential development.

Heritage Report: Impact on designated Heritage Assets -Conservation Area The village is also a designated Conservation Area, which covers the majority of the village and the parkland to Hovingham Hall. This designation also has implications for any future proposals. The Local Planning Authority has a duty to ensure that the special architectural and historic interest, its character and appearance, are preserved and enhanced. The Conservation Area only directly abuts the south western edge of the site. It is also worthy to consider the wider context and role of the Hovingham Estate as custodian of a substantial proportion of the village (and significant heritage assets). This places an obligation upon the Estate to facilitate sensitive change over a longer timeframe than the Local Plan (on an intergenerational basis) with a bigger picture being appreciated in this respect.

The Hovingham Conservation Area covers the majority of the village, except for the proposed development site and the adjacent Mowbray Crescent. This would suggest that the proposed development site is considered to be of lesser importance to the historic character and appearance of the village. The Conservation Area is characterised by late 19th Century properties constructed from local limestone with largely pantiled roofs. The post war development upon Mowbray Crescent, due to the elevated position, design and external appearance give rise to such being overly prominent within the setting of the conservation area; especially when viewed from the north across the eastern outskirts of the village. It is also seen, at present, as an adjunct to the village that would benefit from being suitably integrated into the wider settlement. The open land to the north is fragmented and discordant in visual terms and somewhat at odds with the formality of the remainder of the village.

The Hovingham Conservation Area is considered to be a heritage asset of medium to high significance because of its architectural and historic interest as a coherent entity. However the proposed development site itself is considered to hold negligible historical significance in terms of the setting of the Conservation Area – its exclusion reinforcing the legitimacy of this area being the focus for future positive change. The field eastern field boundary would be enhanced where possible through further structural planting to provide a definitive edge, thereby combining with the retained agricultural building complex to largely screen and contain the development from any important public views from the east and north. The proposed development site is not considered to provide any significant wider contribution to the character or appearance of the village. Any new development would be seen within the context of existing residential development forming Mowbray Crescent. The public views of the Conservation Area, from Public Rights of Way to the north, would be partially obscured by the existing intervening hedgerows which run alongside the path. Equally, development of a suitable scale and layout would be an improvement on the current views towards Mowbray Crescent which do not reflect the underlying character and appearance of the Conservation Area. It is considered therefore that there would be a slight impact upon the conservation area, given the identified capacity for appropriate change in this area, with significant opportunity for

Heritage Report archaeology : The available archaeological data indicates that there are strip fields within relatively close proximity to the site. However aerial photographs and historic maps demonstrate that there are no features of archaeological interest within the site itself. Equally, the earthwork remains of the field divisions survive in an incomplete state and, at best, is of local archaeological interest. The potential residential development of the land subject to this report is not anticipated to have any impact on significant archaeological heritage assets.

<b>North York Moors National Park Authority</b>	<p>New site submission Thornton le Dale 662: It seemed apparent that the Council has sufficient number of sites put forward to meet the need and as such, none of the sites in Thornton le Dale were likely to be allocated, is this still the case?</p> <p>Prominent entrance to the village. Presence of trees provide screening to the Care and Retirement Home. Easthill Farm house is now a farm shop and holiday cottage business. There is limited small scale development at the site and property retains an agricultural/farm land setting.</p> <p>Development of this site is likely to result in the removal of the trees. The visual impact of residential development in this location is likely to create a more urban appearance which will have a negative impact on the current agricultural nature of the immediate and wider landscape and the rural character of the village.</p>
<b>Norton Town Council</b>	<p>Representation on site <b>656</b>: A large parcel of land lying between Langton Road and Beverley Road and to the south east of Langley Drive. Members were firmly against the potential development, as with all other sites in the town at this time as significant problems still remain. These significant problems relate to traffic congestion, air quality, inadequate sewer capacity, flooding and drainage and these should not only be addressed, but fixed before any development takes place in the town. This site does not have any bearing with the current shape of the town.</p>

<b>Norton Town Council</b>	Representation on site <b>660</b> : The site is a large parcel of land lying to the east of Norton adjacent to the Norton Grove Industrial Estate and stretching as far as the a64 bypass. Members were firmly against the potential of development, as with all other sites in the town at this time as significant problems still remain. These significant problems relate to traffic congestion, air quality, inadequate sewer capacity, flooding and drainage and these should not only be addressed, but fixed before any development takes place in the town. This site is of an inappropriate size and also does not have any bearing worth the current shape of the town. Please note and record these objections.
<b>Kirkbymoorside Town Council</b>	Representations on site <b>657 and 661</b> : The Town Council would reiterate the comments provided in support of the nearby site 622 and retains its support of industrial/employment development of this site.

<b>Sheriff Hutton Parish Council</b>	Representations on site <b>658</b> : Parish Council request that this site is unsuitable, citing the following reasons: serious concerns over sewage and drainage issues on this site; There is no clear access and access onto this site would be dangerous; The site already has a history with planning applications with two previous applications being rejected due to the site being unsuitable for development.
<b>Mr B Corfe</b>	Site 205/387, South of Firthland Road.
	I have serious issues regarding the plan as it appears in RDC documentation dated 2015, which are largely connected to vehicular access to and from town.

	<p>At the moment, residents on the Barratt estate where I live (including Greenlands Rd, Garden Way and many other connected roads) have two options if we wish to travel into the centre of Pickering or to head East out on the A170 or A169. Any residents of the proposed development would have the same routes to negotiate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. We can head towards the A170 via Firthland Rd using Greenlands Rd to enter it. We then encounter the curving length of Firthland road heading East - due to parked cars and the curve it is not possible to see approaching traffic and with cars parked on both sides of the road it is always necessary to hope that there is a gap between the parked cars to duck into when another car approaches. Then we have a Z-bend to enter Vivis Lane, skirting the back of the Council Road Depot after which we encounter the new Lidl Supermarket car-park. This is regularly full, with cars queuing to enter and exit and blocking access to traffic trying to reach the traffic lights onto the A170.</li><li>2. We could use the single-track Anchorite Lane (which starts opposite the entrance to the proposed development) with the potential hazards of traffic trying to enter the single lane from the A170 at the same time, plus the issue of exiting onto the busy A170 with very limited view in either direction due to parked cars, plus the real probability in holiday periods of stationary queues of traffic heading East towards the centre of town.</li></ol> <p>Clearly, both of these options are far from satisfactory even with the present volume of traffic using them.</p>
	<p>Vehicles wishing to head West along the A170 from my estate have two options:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Anchorite Lane, as above, single lane/ single file traffic, then joining the West-bound traffic stream with very limited visibility of approaching traffic to the right.</li><li>2. Further West via Firthland Rd then Manor Drive, again through a welter of cars parked on either side of both of these roads.</li></ol> <p>My main objection to the proposed development: of a very large quantity of extra traffic, from 300+ families, trying to use the present completely inadequate access into and out of this section of the town. In my view this is unsustainable with the present road layout.</p> <p>As it is at present, with current levels of traffic, both I and a good few of my neighbours, resort to using the country lanes from Goslipgate south - Mill Lane and/ or Haygate Lane, to avoid the existing snarl-ups which prevent us accessing town in a straightforward way. (I appreciate that this is not a very sensible option from several points of view - increasing traffic past very rural properties and risking single file traffic and requiring reversing in places, however at busy holiday times it is sometimes necessary). This situation can only deteriorate if there is a large quantity of extra traffic.</p>

	<p>Although it is unconnected to the above issues, I am also concerned with some of the advertising material being circulated by Persimmon Homes, regarding the planned development/s in Pickering. For example, prospective customers are being told that there are multiple GPs' surgeries in town (not true, indeed it is common at present to have to wait 3 weeks for an appointment with a doctor at the sole surgery in Pickering); that there is a cinema (it closed several years ago) and that a new school will be built, whereas NYCC Education Committee have ruled that none is required at present.</p>
<p><b>Nineteen47</b></p>	<p>Supports the identification of site 666 as an allocation for c.40 dwellings. Site is adjacent to a Local Service Centre. Site is adjacent to site 156 which is identified as a option choice. A concept master plan is submitted, demonstrating permeability into site 156. Two pairs of bungalows are proposed to rear of existing housing for amenity considerations: existing trees and hedges will be retained. Provides a good mix of housing, including bungalows, smaller 1,2 and 3 bedroom housing and some larger 4-5 bedroom family dwellings. The site is subjected to a site assessment (see specific representation) which identifies that the site should be accorded group 3 status. Committed to delivering a plan-compliant level of affordable housing and CIL contributions. Site demonstrates good accessibility to services and facilities. Compatible with adjacent residential and recreational land uses. Consider that if 156 is excluded from the VIUA designation, then this site could be reasonably undertaken, and this is also relevant to the site being currently in the Area of High Landscape Value. The loss of the Strip Field can be mitigated with landscaping. Access to be achieved from Swineherd Lane, but also potentially through 156. According the site is suitable - as evidenced by representations; the site is available for development without constraint or impediment; achievability: the site can be delivered on the site in 5 years. The site can be demonstrated as being deliverable. Critiques the other site options of 454/259 around deliverability and connectivity issues. The size of site 265 resulting is lack of delivery of affordable housing, and being more detached from the settlement, and in respect of 201 poorer accessibility, elevated- skyline development, limited contributions, and 345 also having similar constraints, without access details and being in a mineral safeguarding zone.</p>