

## **SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS AND CONCERNS**

### **General**

- Urge the Committee to reject the proposal
- Urge the Committee to take residents concerns into account
- Concerned/horrified by the plans
- Benefits the landowner not the people of Malton
- The democratic wishes of the people should trump the desire of the Estate to make large sums of money by destroying the quality of life for those who live there
- Concerned about who may occupy the properties
- The development/design will reduce existing property values
- Our property is not shown on the plans
- Insufficient consideration of the effect of the development on the Town
- Concerned about where the people will work
- Object to the loss of the vets
- The veterinary surgery is an accessible community asset which is ideally situated to serve the animal health of both town and country. It is disappointing that this use will be effectively evicted particularly as a stated aim of the scheme is to accommodate sustainable commercial enterprises alongside housing
- The existing location/accessibility of the veterinary surgery ensures quick response times in an emergency. The loss or reduction of the service will put at risk the well being of animals
- Conditions should be applied to the landowner and not the buyer as the estate may sell the site on
- Paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that planning permission should not be granted where 'adverse impacts outweigh the benefits of the scheme'
- Concerned about older neighbours (concerned about traffic and changing demographics) and who are unable to move
- The estate should offer funds for local projects/bursaries in return for the inconvenience the community will suffer
- Housing should be distributed elsewhere in Ryedale with less focus on Malton
- Housing should be built on land not fit for agriculture in other parts of Ryedale, as a new town/village
- Support/ endorse the objections of the West Malton Residents Group
- The application could result in significant environmental effects and the Council is urged to request an Environmental Impact Assessment
- Small local builders would be excluded from the scheme

### **Scale and Location**

- Object to the overdevelopment of Malton
- Object to the scale of the development
- Object to the location of the development
- The development is too much for Ryedale
- The creation of a 'New Town' adjoining existing housing and the AONB is irrational
- Housing needs would be better met through smaller scale/ evolutionary development – smaller developments in a number of locations need to be explored
- Is not in keeping with the Council's Plan which does not rely on providing housing on one large strategic area
- The impact of the scheme in combination with other development needs to be identified and considered/is unacceptable
- The town is at capacity whatever the Government is telling Ryedale to do
- The scale and intensity is too much
- Only a carefully planned extension to the town, taking account of local residents views and allowing local representatives to lead will the best results be achieved

- Granting permission may provide a disincentive for the Council to consider other proposals for new housing which could be used to invigorate run down/ unused areas within the Towns rather than spoiling countryside areas

### **Character of the area**

- Not in keeping with the rural nature of Malton
- The Town will lose its identity
- The charm and character of the town will be eroded/lost
- The character of the town/rural market town character should be preserved
- Malton will be spoilt by adding another town on the model of a 'soul-less' Poundbury
- Malton's reputation as a fine country town/ the vitality of the town for residents and visitors will be risked
- The beautiful western approach to the traditional market town would be totally ruined by what the estate itself concedes would be a 'New Town'
- The development will transform Malton from the independent Market Town the estate claims to support to an urban satellite for York
- The town has already changed so much over the last 20 years thanks to the estate and the local council
- In combination with current large scale applications, the character of the town is being destroyed
- The proposed roundabout will alter the character of Castle Howard Road
- Castle Howard Road has always been a special area on the edge of the town. The development will spoil it and it will become blocked from the countryside
- Accesses onto Middlecave Road would have a detrimental effect on the character of Middlecave Road at its quiet west end

### **Housing Need**

- There is not the need for this amount of housing/ why does Malton need more housing?
- There is not the need for this amount of housing in Malton and Norton and new houses should be spread across the District
- Question the need for development of this size in this part of Ryedale
- Don't sacrifice Malton and Norton to satisfy government quotas
- There is already ample housing in Malton
- If needed, houses should be built in Norton on the Woolgrowers Site
- People are not able to buy due to lack of jobs and finances
- Question whether there are sufficient jobs to support such a large influx of people – without employment people will turn to crime
- Even if Ryedale does not have a five year land supply, this does not mean that planning permission should be granted for any housing application ( see NPPF para's 49 and 14)
- Ryedale has a five year land supply and there is no urgency to approve this application based on housing need. Greater weight should be given to air quality issues
- The reduction in the affordable housing element means that the development does not meet Local Plan targets and affordable housing need identified locally

### **Proposed Uses**

- More industrial units are not required
- An unspecified amount of retail development is proposed which could impact on the vitality and viability of Malton Town Centre The competition will undermine the viability of the Town Centre
- Concerned about the impact of existing shops in the Town
- Question the need for more shops when there are empty shops in town

- Malton does not need another small town/ village centre with shops, a pub and industrial uses on the outskirts. Existing shops and pubs in Town and in surrounding villages are struggling and this would provide yet more competition
- No application of the sequential test in relation to Malton Town Centre
- Should require a more detailed analysis of the impact on the town and local businesses
- Lack of sequential test and impact assessment of the retail element of the scheme on Malton Town Centre means that the application fails to comply with national policy
- Outline proposal does not appear to limit the extent of the proposed commercial development
- There are empty shops elsewhere and space for rent on industrial estates and Malton already has a large number of public houses and halls in the town that are underutilised. These uses are not needed in this location.
- Unacceptable that huge chunks of rural land would be used for industrial and retail purposes when space exists for these elsewhere in the Town and on industrial estates
- If the scheme goes ahead it should only be for housing so that traffic is restricted to residents and would not include delivery lorries
- No specifics relating to delivery traffic
- Question the need for a pub when these are numerous in Malton
- Disagree with building a pub. Should build something more useful like a school, surgery or hospital
- How many pubs are lying vacant in Malton?
- Funding for this development should be diverted into the declining Town Centre

### Design

- The draft design is not sympathetic to existing residents with dwellings overlooking existing properties
- The scale and height of some of the proposed buildings could result in loss of privacy/ overlooking of people living nearby/in close proximity
- Some of the buildings are five stories high and they do not fit in with the surrounding area
- The Council's policy is that new development should be in keeping with the character of the town. How does 'Poundbury 2' fit into Malton?
- The application falls short of the police report (designing out crime)
- A separate community butting up against the existing town and damage to the rural outlook towards the AONB is a flawed concept
- The development is high density and is out of scale with other housing in the near vicinity/ not in keeping with the surrounding area
- The proposed four storey block of flats is inappropriate in a so-called village setting
- High density with predominantly terraced houses which would be more appropriate to a town centre development than an area adjacent to open countryside and an AONB
- Too great a density as happens on the outskirts of York where overcrowded but expensive suburbs are in conflict with the City's ancient past
- Design of the units and open space needs to be such that it does not impact negatively on what is a lovely approach to the town
- Because of closeness to the AONB and residential properties the Estate should be asked to erect a temporary structure of the tallest buildings in their proposed positions for all to see from all positions
- Take issue with the LVIA (paras 5.3.2 and 5.3.3) regarding views towards the site from homeowners. I can assure RDC that these are more than 'glimpses'. The whole area can be clearly seen. ( Invite the Committee to view this from our house so that the effect on existing home owners can be seen)

### **Biodiversity and Trees**

- Loss of farmland which supports a range of bird (including nesting skylarks and yellowhammers numbers of which are declining along with their habitat), insect and other wildlife
- Site supports special birds including grey partridge, lapwing and yellow wagtail
- Loss of trees and hedges will disturb wildlife
- No consideration has been made for the effect on wildlife
- Would disturb the Bats, Tawny Owls and Woodpeckers that reside in mature trees at the vets/ in and around Middlecave Road
- Ancient trees that bound the road will be removed
- Mature trees, hedgerows and natural habitats will be disturbed or destroyed
- Concerned about the mislabelling of trees on the drawings. Ask that these are amended to ensure tree locations and numbers are accurate
- The cumulative effect of the loss of trees would significantly alter the character and amenity of the area
- There should be no removal of trees along Castle Howard Road

### **Environmental Resources and management**

- Will result in the loss of productive farmland/ valuable agricultural land
- Will result in increased air, noise and light pollution
- In relation to energy and water demands, as a nation we do not have the natural resources to progress anymore and we will be putting future generations survival into difficulties
- Loss of agricultural land, the construction of buildings, the increase in population density and resultant urban activities will cause irreparable and permanent harm to the environment
- The hydrological efficiency of the sustainable drainage system both on a catchment scale and in severe weather conditions is largely unknown
- In combination with other development we are seeing a massive increase in roof and concreted area. With changing weather patterns to include more volatile weather the risk of severe flooding with run off is obvious and frightening
- If this is to go ahead, joined up thinking with the Environment Agency is needed to include dredging the Derwent (to the Ouse) or damage to people's homes is inevitable
- Object to the loss of Green Belt
- The natural beauty of Malton should not be sacrificed when there are brownfield sites available throughout the country
- The impact on the environment during construction and beyond will be inexcusable
- The area is the subject of an Environmentally Sensitive Area Agreement
- The application makes no request to change the use of land from either Green Belt or farming land and its owners claim Environmental Stewardship payments
- The report on agricultural land states that the land is good quality agricultural land and therefore it should not be used for this development

### **Landscape**

- The site is within 100m of the AONB boundary. There is no definitive detail on what will be on a site and it is difficult to say what the impact will be but it is likely to be detrimental
- Visual impact on the AONB should not be underestimated
- The development will result in a detrimental impact on the AONB/ cannot be anything other than detrimental to the AONB/ threatens to damage this precious landscape
- Will harm the setting of the designated (AONB) landscape
- Too close to the AONB
- Will impact upon the enjoyment of those using the public footpath network along the eastern edge of the AONB

- Will result in harm to the setting and enjoyment of the AONB and as such would conflict with national policy which requires that great weight should be given to the conservation of this landscape
- It is paramount that the AONB is protected from the visual pollution of constructing buildings that tower above the existing skyline and which impact negatively on the local scenery
- AONB's are special places. Proposing to build a vast settlement on the edge of the Howardian Hills seems nonsensical when there is no shortage of other sites situated on less precious land
- The development will harm the approach to Malton from an AONB which is currently aesthetically pleasing
- The development will reduce the gap between the built up area of the town and the AONB which will harm the setting of the AONB and impact upon the enjoyment of AONB users. As an outline application there is no guarantee that the extent of the open area alongside the A64 will be as extensive as shown
- In respect of the AONB the landscape assessment has fundamental shortcomings ( does not properly evaluate the impact of taller buildings and lighting/ no evaluation of the visibility of buildings at the heights proposed/ no evaluation of the contribution of the site to the setting of the AONB and the impact of this/ no evaluation of the impact on the AONB from the winter months when there is less tree screening/ no photographs from areas to the south of Castle Howard Road and from footpaths crossing the AONB
- The landscape assessment does not provide sufficient evidence of the impact from the Howardian Hills
- Without a direct link to the A64 more traffic is likely to pass through the AONB
- Commercial and retail development would be detrimental to the approach to Malton from the AONB
- A limit to the height of buildings and structures would reduce if not remove concern of changing the context of the AONB
- Development will impact on the rural setting of the town/ The rural setting of the town will be radically changed forever/ totally ruined
- The approach to the town from the west will be vastly different
- The landscape assessment has not evaluated the contribution the site makes to the landscape setting of the town or the effect of the proposal on the setting of the town
- The development would cause significant damage/ harm to the local landscape
- The upgrading/urbanisation of Castle Howard Road ( inc roundabout, kerbing, lighting, traffic volumes) will destroy the rural character and appearance of this route from the west
- Visual impact will effect the recreational enjoyment of the countryside
- Will detract from views from the public footpath
- Development of this scale in this location would have a devastating impact on the beautiful rural setting of the town which is its great appeal to visitors/ will not appeal to the tourist trade
- The Design and Access Statement describes the current use of the site as 'arable agricultural land' – for comparison a photograph of the view of the site is provided
- The construction period will change the context of the AONB and the Conservation Area through the presence and movement of heavy plant and vehicles
- The setting and enjoyment of the AONB would be harmed by a ten year build period adjacent to it
- The visual impact assessment needs to envisage impacts during as well as after the build period
- Traffic impacts would need to be assessed on their impact on the AONB during the build period as well as after it. Noise and vibration in a similar vein
- Malton originally developed in a natural basin and to expand Malton on to the higher ground will be very out of keeping
- Noise assessment demonstrates that there are no acceptable solutions to the issue of unacceptable noise across the site which would also be visually acceptable

### **Environmental Impact Assessment and Landscape**

- The degree of harm is far greater than the EIA suggests. Concur with the evaluation (of viewpoint 10 in the LVIA) that the magnitude of harm is high. The harm is permanent and irreversible but disagree that it is moderate adverse. Under the criteria in the document it would warrant a score of Major Adverse as it results in harm to a landscape which is important at a national level. It is clear from plates 11 and 12 in the document that this cannot be mitigated to anything like an acceptable level
- In other areas, the EIA has played down the likely impacts on the AONB;
  - The degree of harm from viewpoints 4, 5 and 6 is higher than the LVIA suggests and ought to be at least a medium/high impact.
  - The LVIA was undertaken in summer and the impacts in months with less tree cover will be greater
  - No evaluation of increased lighting levels upon the rural character of the AONB
  - The LVIA has underplayed the important contribution that hedgerows within the site make to the landscape in views towards Malton from the AONB. They unite these fields with the pattern of fields to the west of the A64 and as such contribute to the rural setting of the town from the AONB. The loss of these hedgerows would have a harmful effect on the AONB
  - The LVIA has underplayed the harm which the towers will have on the setting of the AONB. The towers are not of a form or design that one would normally expect to see in a North Yorkshire landscape and will appear as an alien feature so that the eye will be drawn to them which will make the development more intrusive.
  - The LVIA does not acknowledge the difficulties in evaluating the effects of an outline application where heights of buildings are unknown/ the location of the taller elements and landscaping is uncertain
- The mitigation measures proposed are inadequate and will not reduce the harm to the extent suggested. The development will still have a Major Adverse effect upon a landscape of national importance even after the landscaping has been in place for 10 years
- There is nothing in the application which will guarantee where the landscaping elements will be or what they will constitute so it is impossible on an outline application to guarantee that landscaping will reduce the level of harm
- The EIA has not properly evaluated alternative options or mitigation measures which could reduce harm to this nationally protected landscape. Other sites are available as alternatives and other possibilities for reducing harm should have been explored e.g. reduction in the size of the development by deleting those parts likely to cause most harm
- There is little evaluation of the scheme upon the landscape setting of Malton and no visualisation have been provided to the effect of the development upon the approach to the Town
- Latest (2015) LVIA /ES underestimates the impact on the landscape and harm to the AONB and contains pictures which make it difficult to make a fair comparison in different seasons

### **Heritage Assets**

- The construction period will change the context of the Conservation Area through the presence and movement of heavy plant and vehicles
- The significant increase in traffic and the large development will change the context of the Conservation Area.
- A relief road from Castle Howard Road to York Road would reduce if not remove the concern of changing the context of the Conservation Area from a rural setting to a thoroughfare
- Middlecave House is an attractive house in a rural setting enjoyed by walkers. The character of the house, its garden and rural location marking the start of the bridleway would be lost

- The veterinary buildings form a well-used heritage (Georgian) asset. Will this Georgian building be allowed to fall into disrepair and then be demolished? The scheme is a threat to the heritage asset and character of this area of Malton.
- The slicing of Middlecave House garden in two would be detrimental to the character of the area
- Middlecave House built in the 1840's is surrounded by fields and has a rural feel to it which would be lost to the proposed development

### **Amenity, Safety and Health**

- The period of building would subject the community to [unreasonable disruption/ noise/fumes/dust/pollution/ heavy vehicular traffic] for a significant period
- The construction/construction period/ effects of this will [have an unbearable effect on amenity/ affect quality of life / is not acceptable]
- Building for 10-12 years would not only subject the community to unreasonable disruption but would be occurring at a time when Malton is having success in promoting itself as a food capital and visitor destination. The development would have a negative effect on this effort.
- Case law exists which backs up our objection that the scale of the proposed development and the build out period will harm residential amenity
- A ten year build out period seems overly optimistic given existing slow build rates and there is a chance that the development could blight a whole childhood or whole retirement for adjacent residents
- When a persons quiet enjoyment of ones property and one's quiet enjoyment of the countryside is threatened for an extended period it is a matter for strong objection
- The scale of the development including 5 storey houses will mean existing residents will be greatly overlooked
- Proximity to existing dwellings will result in a loss of privacy
- Backs onto our property which already has minimum light due to protected trees
- The creation of a large roundabout in the vicinity of our shared private road will have a detrimental effect on visibility and will add to traffic congestion, noise and pollution
- Our property is adjacent to the new roundabout and we will bear the brunt of traffic connected noise and pollution
- The development of a new village next to existing residences will detract from the area that we currently enjoy living in
- The loss of the amenity value of this land is incalculable
- Will involve the loss of visual amenity not only for residents living near the site but for walkers and joggers from the wider area
- Will result in harm to the enjoyment and amenity of AONB users
- Will radically alter the character of the bridleway at the western end of Middlecave road resulting in harm to the enjoyment experienced by those using this route to access the wider footpath network
- Lovely views will be lost along with peace and tranquillity in the area
- Urban sprawl and light pollution will remove the vistas of attractive open countryside with a negative effect on human health
- The residential amenity currently enjoyed by those living in the area would be harmed by [ increased noise/ late night disturbance/ loss of privacy and overlooking/ increased vehicular movements and HGV's/ pollution and fumes/ increased street lighting]
- Would contravene the Human Rights Act which states that a person has the right to the peaceful enjoyment of their home and the right to respect of their private and family life
- Will have a significant detrimental effect on the quality of life of people living and working in Malton
- Traffic congestion will adversely affect local residents
- Children will be unable to ride bikes safely as a result of extra traffic

- Children will be unable to play in the garden without risking their health by breathing in dust and fumes from the building site
- Traffic, dust and noise will spoil my school holidays
- Please do not take away for ever our favourite path where we can walk in the country and ride our bikes safely
- I have cerebral palsy and use the path where the development is going to gain access to the countryside in a safe manner
- Any work that would put users of the rights of way between the AONB and Malton in danger from construction traffic needs to be considered given that most approach the AONB on foot. ( There are no footpaths at all on Middlecave Road on either side at its western end and none on its south side for much of its length)
- A considerable amount of construction traffic on Castle Howard Road would have a noise impact and increase congestion and danger at nearby junctions ( York and Horsemarket Roads) and routes ( through the AONB / all side roads into Middlecave Road and Castle Howard Road/ on Middlecave and Castle Howard Roads) and to secondary school children
- Safe crossing points and cycle pathways may need to be created at the risk of increasing motor traffic congestion in order to ensure better pedestrian safety
- Should require a more detailed analysis of the impact on residents
- Increased noise from the pub/ village hall/ shop will affect local residents
- No indication of what the industrial units will be used for
- The pub may have a serious impact on adjacent residents
- Retail and employment uses will generate regular lorry/HGV movements within a residential neighbourhood
- Commercial development is shown on the line of the bridleway adjacent to Middlecave Road which would necessitate a diversion of the bridleway if that actually happened
- Some restriction must be placed on the noise and pollution caused by this development both in terms of hours, volume and amount
- As a medical doctor I have grave concerns with the proximity of pylons and overhead power lines in relation to this development. There has been a great deal of research into the effect of power lines on health ( *research papers are cited*) which reveal considerable concern regarding potential dangers to health, including increased risks of childhood leukaemia, depression, lung cancer and skin cancer. Question whether any consideration has been given to advice by the Cancer Research organisation as to the dangers of housing built close to high tension pylons and cancer spots in young people
- Concerned that the landscaping of the site may contravene recommended planting distances
- The extra EMF produced by the residences themselves would put health and lives at risk
- Noise assessment has not demonstrated an acceptable solution
- Inability to meet residential noise standards may result in the applicant seeking further commercial space ( with further noise and traffic implications)

### **Services and Infrastructure**

- In combination with other development, existing permissions and applications, the impact of the development is a step too far. Without years of preparation the impact on services and the environment will be inexcusable
- Malton does not have the infrastructure to cope with such a huge development
- Impact on infrastructure should not be underestimated
- Vital that development of such a scale is only considered alongside a commitment to providing the necessary infrastructure. I do not see this being planned or conditional in the proposal and without it the Council will be liable for the intended consequences
- Existing problems ( drains/ schools/ hospital/ roads/ GP surgery) should be sorted out before new development takes place



- Will result in increased strain/ problems associated with [car parking/ school capacity/ the capacity of the Doctors surgery/ sewers and waste water treatment/ drainage/ dental services/ emergency services/ council services/ diminishing public transport services/ community infrastructure/ telecommunications/ waste management/ energy demands]
- Schools will be unable to cope with additional demand and existing pupils will suffer
- It has not been demonstrated that sewerage and drainage infrastructure is capable of accommodating discharges from development of this scale
- The stench from Butcher Comer is disgusting – what will happen when more homes are built?
- There cannot be more properties connected to the sewer which is already overloaded/backs up in storms
- Should be no additional loading of the sewers from Butcher Corner
- Concerned about the effectiveness of soakaways which may overflow and undermine the cutting on that side of the A64
- No capacity at GP surgery will lead to further delays in getting appointments
- Increases the need for improved services
- The capacity of [schools/ GP surgery/local supermarket] will need to be increased
- Unclear where the funding will come from to provide adequate services or that there is evidence to demonstrate that the demand on services can be met as required by the NPPF
- The infrastructure required for such a development is not detailed
- Infrastructure improvements should be at the expense of the landowner and not the general tax payer and this should be made a condition of approval
- The Design and Access Statement describes the development as balanced and self sustaining but none of the essential social services are provided for
- Will lead to the destruction of the veterinary surgery
- Question whether sufficient water supply exists
- The outline nature of the application provides no guarantee of the amount of open space
- Would create an isolated community too far away from current retail, transport and primary health care facilities without having to get in the car
- As a Sustrans volunteer, the developer should make a lump sum contribution to health and recreation in Malton including the provision of cycle access between the site and town
- The flooding of roads is a continuous problem and needs to be addressed

## **Highways and Air Quality**

### **General**

- The highway network will be unable to cope with the additional traffic
- No evaluation of whether the road network could accommodate the level of traffic generated in addition to other applications
- In combination with other development there will be traffic gridlock
- The existing roads are not designed for heavy volumes of traffic
- Will result in over 1,500 cars on the roads which cannot take the traffic
- In combination with other development it will result in a minimum of 1500 cars (9000 extra journeys per day) in Malton
- 6 traffic movements per day per household makes a total of 3,000 additional movements per day
- The houses will generate 3,000 new vehicular trips per day of which 12% can be assumed in each peak period and additional trips will be generated by the commercial components of the development
- Likely to result in a minimum of 600 cars plus commercial vehicles which at four journeys per day (ONS estimate an average of 6 journeys per day) would mean 2400 extra journeys on adjacent roads

- Increased traffic/ congestion will [detract from the attractiveness of the town and its desirability as a place to live/ affect tourism/ result in delays causing an unreasonable burden to residents and visitors/ cause delays to emergency vehicles/risk health/ degrade buildings/ have implications for the fine buildings on Yorkersgate that the Estate have invested in
- The impact of increased traffic on pedestrian safety needs to be carefully assessed
- Congestion will worsen [in Malton/ towards Castle Howard Road/ on the A64/ at Pasture Lane - increase traffic on Pasture Lane will be dangerous for the two Primary Schools]
- Will lead to congestion/ worsen congestion at [ the Broughton Rise -Newbiggin Junction/ Crescent Mount- Newbiggin / Castle Howard Road-Yorkersgate-York Road/ Butcher Corner/the Mount-Horsemarket Road-York road/ all ] junctions
- Improvements are needed to existing bottlenecks [Butcher Comer/ level crossing] before additional traffic is added
- A proper traffic management plan is required
- The town does not have sufficient parking to cope with the increase in cars
- Road damage will increase and [is not addressed now/ will place extra pressure on the already stretched Council
- Will result in rat running and increased traffic through existing streets [Horsemarket Road/ Pippin Road/ Middlecave Road/ Middlecave Drive/ Orchard Road / Maiden Greve] which will be [dangerous at school times/ damaging to property/ impact on quality of life for existing residents/ lead to road safety issues for residents, school children and hospital users]
- Would be concerned about any proposal to route traffic to the A64 via the Mount and pasture Lane to avoid Butcher Corner
- No detailed plans of the proposed access arrangements have been submitted
- Shops and business uses will increase numbers of HGV's and commercial traffic using residential streets with road safety implications
- The scale of retail and industrial development is not determined so there can be no conclusive answer as to whether the highways can cope
- A relief road connecting the top of Castle Howard Road to York Road would address many of the concerns relating to access
- Encouraging people to walk and cycle is not credible especially for those with young children, the elderly and sick
- New residents will drive into the Town Centre despite the proximity of the scheme to the Town Centre
- A frequent bus service at the very least is required
- Residents of the Orchard Road estate will have great difficulty in accessing/exiting the estate due to the volume of traffic
- There is no proposal to provide services (school, doctors, dentist) which will mean increased traffic in the town
- The dream of a discrete community having good walking, cycling and public transport credentials is laudable but it will achieve the opposite of sustainable living. Most new residents will travel to work using a mode of transport that is most practical for them
- Question the proposal to limit 2 bed houses to only one car. Residents will have more and this will lead to parking on neighbouring roads
- If the scheme goes ahead access should be for residents only and not provide a through road to elsewhere
- The amount of traffic and lack of parking will be oppressive in a rural environment
- The layout suggests that emergency access points will be restricted due to indirect routes through the site and limited muster points for emergency vehicles
- Castle Howard Road and Middlecave Roads are not suitable for construction traffic – a new set of slip roads off the A64 on Broughton Road or a connecting road to York road is required and contractors should be required to use these routes

- A new school near the development may assist traffic in the town centre but equally children using the new school may have to travel through already congested town centre roads to get to it
- Cycle track/ dual use track provision from the A64 overbridge to York Road and improvements to the York Road junction for cyclists and pedestrians should be secured and are of strategic importance to the Sustrans national network as changes to the route are being considered to include Malton and Norton
- Concerned that access is now being reserved
- No assessment of the impact on traffic of a school in this location
- The Travel plan is inadequate
- Funds are in place for the HGV ban/complimentary measures and there should be no financial inducement on the Council to accept money for this from this application
- HGV ban would need to be enforced
- The HGV ban has been sought before the effectiveness of the measure is known
- Proposed bus subsidy shows no guarantee of addressing peak time needs
- No new cycle lanes are proposed outside of the development
- NYCC has not provided any detail of the sort of parking restrictions that might affect local residents
- Object to mature trees being lost to provide access

### **Restriction to Middlecave Road**

- Restriction of access to Middlecave Road will result in rat running through existing areas to access Middlecave Road
- It is not clear how more than 450 homes will be prevented from using Middlecave Road
- No guarantee that 10% of the traffic will be put down Middlecave Road
- 10% of traffic down Middlecave Road is too much
- Can't support the measure for 10% of traffic down Middlecave Road until it is included in a detailed application

### **Middlecave Road**

- The Middlecave Road- Mount junction is poor
- Increased traffic on Middlecave Road will add to congestion at the Middlecave Road- Crescent Mount- Newbiggin junction which is very busy especially in term time
- The Transport Assessment claims no problems of queuing on Middlecave Road- Mount Crescent
- The volume of traffic using Middlecave Road will double
- Middlecave road is a quiet residential road
- Middlecave Road is the main access to Malton School and Malton Hospital
- Middlecave Road is very congested in the school rush hours
- Only pedestrian access should be allowed to Middlecave Road
- No detailed plans showing the improvements needed to facilitate access via Middlecave Road
- The western end of Middlecave Road is very narrow with on-street car parking and is incapable of accommodating additional traffic (particularly HGV's)/incapable of accommodating additional traffic without significant alterations which is likely to harm the quiet residential character of the road
- The width of Middlecave Road outside of my house is 3.5 m which is not wide enough for any HGV's to access the site
- Concerned about the congestion on upper Middlecave Road. The entrance to the west wing of the school and the road to the nursery are in close proximity. There is also a designated parking area for local residences near to these two entrances which restricts the road to a single lane and conceals access to the nursery. Raises concern about the safety and capacity of the road and will escalate the risk of accidents (contrary to para 31 of the NPPF)

- Making Middlecave Road a high traffic thoroughfare will increase road traffic risk for children using the nursery and school and who live along the road
- Details should be provided of the accesses required on the west end of Middlecave Road and to the bridleway
- Improvements to Middlecave Road to allow 'access only' from the hospital would help children to work and cycle to school in safety
- NYCC has not suggested a restriction on construction traffic using Middlecave Road
- A footpath cannot run along the south side of Middlecave Road as 77-85 is private property and this would encourage illegal trespass
- No proposals have been put forward to force traffic to stick to safe speeds on Castle Howard and Middlecave Roads

### **Castle Howard Road**

- HGV traffic will lead to the further deterioration of Castle Howard Road
- Castle Howard Road is currently a lightly trafficked Road
- 90% of the development traffic will be routed to Castle Howard Road which will add to the already large volume of traffic using Castle Howard Road
- Already the traffic on Castle Howard Road can be disruptive and potentially dangerous with regular rat runners ( including HGV's) from the Helmsley Road avoiding the traffic lights at Newbiggin- Pasture Lane
- Residents of Hollis Court will find it difficult to access Castle Howard Road as oncoming cars are not always complying with the speed limit
- Current difficulties when attempting to gain entry to Castle Howard Road ( from Hollis Court) would be greatly increased if 90% of the traffic is being channelled onto an already busy road
- Castle Howard Road is an alternative route for traffic when the A64 is closed due to accidents and is very congested when this happens
- Castle Howard Road is an attractive country road and does not cope well with increased traffic or larger vehicles. It will need to be widened which will change its character and appeal
- Changes to Castle Howard Road may result in higher traffic speeds
- Increased traffic on Castle Howard Road and improvements to Castle Howard Road would make it unattractive and dangerous to cyclists
- No detailed plans for the proposed access off Castle Howard road have been submitted
- Current road speed limits should be addressed along Castle Howard Road between the flyover and current 30mph zone or the risk of accidents will increase
- The narrow width of Castle Howard Road makes its use for access for construction traffic hazardous
- Castle Howard Road is not wide enough to take more traffic
- Concern for pedestrian safety as there is already a lack of safe crossing points on Castle Howard Road
- All of the houses should feed onto Castle Howard Road then onto York Road via a new link road
- The new roundabout on Castle Howard Road is almost on the boundary of my house and will lead to increased noise and air pollution in my area
- The layout of the proposed roundabout on Castle Howard Road will be dangerous for road users including tour coaches for Castle Howard and the AONB
- Castle Howard road is one of the few places where cycle routes out of town can be enjoyed. Additional traffic will reduce the amenity to the area and would add danger
- Traffic lights at Castle Howard Road-York road will add to congestion/ create a permanent traffic jam/encourage traffic onto less appropriate routes
- The existing Yorkersgate -Castle Howard Road junction is visually awkward

- A roundabout at York Road/ Castle Howard Road will cause traffic to back up Castle Howard Road and traffic to back up to Butcher Corner.
- The proposed mini-roundabout has insufficient capacity and a school on Castle Howard Road would take the junction over capacity

#### **Direct Access to A64**

- A [junction/ direct access] with the A64 should be made a requirement of the development/is necessary/is required to enable minimal disturbance to local residents
- It should be a condition that a slip road west onto the bypass should be provided for commercial/industrial traffic
- Traffic wishing to travel northwards on the A64 will have to travel through the Town Centre
- A new feeder road should be provided through the allotments to take any out of town traffic into York Road and the A64
- Residents of the proposed development will have to find employment outside Malton which results in a need for a link road between Castle Howard Road to York Road to relieve pressure on the Yorkersgate junction

#### **The Transport Assessment**

- The transport assessment has under-estimated the level of traffic which will be generated and there is little modelling of the impact on other roads throughout the town centre
- A realistic traffic survey needs to be carried out at different times, on different days and in different weather conditions
- The Transport Assessment claims that there were no problems of queuing on Middlecave Road/ Mount Crescent and the queuing that habitually occurs along Yorkersgate in the evening peak is not noted
- There are a number of fundamental shortcomings in the transport assessment which must question the weight which can be given to its conclusions. It was undertaken on a single day; the fifth and sixth forms were on study leave; it was market day when roads around the market are closed and traffic uses alternative routes. Levels of traffic are not likely to be representative of average movements – particularly during the autumn /winter months when there is greater usage of cars accessing the school
- The commercial traffic generated has been overlooked
- The traffic associated with the new school has not been modelled in combination with the proposed development
- The Malton and Norton Strategic Transport Assessment 2010 is not robust and any reliance on it for a base for developers or for any detail of the junctions is misplaced (report on the STA has been provided)
- The applicant has not done an assessment of the traffic impact of the scheme on Butcher Corner
- There are anomalies and disparities in the figures in the TA

#### **Air Quality**

- Air quality/ pollution will worsen/increase [at Butcher Corner/the Malton Air Quality Management Area
- There has been no evaluation of the impact on air quality at Castlegate
- The Air Quality Assessment has not demonstrated that the scheme in combination with other development will not worsen air quality. If other applications are approved before this application is determined this assessment would need to be revisited
- Contrary to the NPPF which aims to reduce pollution and support a transition to a low carbon economy
- The current cumulative air quality impact is unacceptable and contrary to EU law. Emissions would add to already illegal levels and no mitigation has been offered or secured

- Would have an unacceptable impact on air quality at Yorkersgate/ Railway Street by adding 10-20% to current traffic levels
- Will reduce air quality and pose a danger to human health by increasing the concentration of nitrogen dioxide in breathable air
- The application contradicts Policies SP17 and 18 of the local plan in relation to air quality, is inconsistent with para 124 of the NPPF and would undermine the objectives of the Air Quality Action Plan
- Only by removing the cause and source of the danger – by refusing the application – will the public be protected from harm
- RDC should adhere to its policies and ensure that no increase in nitrogen dioxide in the Air Quality Management Area as a result of this development or in combination with other development
- No confidence that the predicted falls in Nitrogen Dioxide in the air quality assessment due to vehicle improvements, will materialise
- Evidence that existing vehicle emissions are not complying with emission targets has been accepted by appeal inspectors elsewhere
- without predicted improvements in vehicle emissions Nitrogen Dioxide levels would exceed objective levels in the Air Quality Management Area
- Air quality assessment has failed to calculate the cumulative impact on air quality from individual sites in the area
- No evidence in the assessment of the effect that greater volumes of traffic will have on traffic speeds and hence emissions
- No quantification of mitigation measures has been undertaken
- The monitoring underestimates Nitrogen Dioxide at the highest ( readings) receptor locations and its trajectory therefore underestimates predicted levels
- The proposed HGV ban is no guarantee of meeting EU Ambient Air Directive Levels
- Concerned about inconsistency with air quality assessments undertaken for the Fitzwilliam Trust applications
- The applicant has admitted uncertainty over effectiveness of mitigation measures and has said that development impacts are overestimated. The information is inaccurate and unsound
- Should be rejected on the grounds of distinct and demonstrable possibility of a breach of the EU Ambient Air Directive limit values for Nitrogen Dioxide in the AQMA as a direct result of this application.
- HGV restriction is presumably to mitigate air quality issues but there is no proof of its likely impact

#### **Prematurity/ Relationship with the Development Plan**

- Granting permission would prejudice the proper consideration of where should go through the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan and removes the opportunity for the local community to determine where future development should be located.
- Granting permission would conflict with core planning principles that planning should be plan-led and should empower local people to shape their surroundings (para 17, NPPF)
- New development should be properly planned
- A decision on this speculative proposal should be deferred until the local plan is defined
- Waiting for the Neighbourhood Plan would be a more locally accountable way forward
- The proposal conflicts with the adopted Local Plan Strategy which supports housing on a mix of sites in a variety of locations rather than at one large strategic location – the scale of the proposed development is larger than that envisaged by the plan
- The application underlines RDC's promiscuous dash for the expansion of Malton and Norton at all costs, ignoring various local plans which have been carefully arrived at

### **Form of the Application**

- As an outline application, concerned that the applicants are not tied to anything proposed in their application
- there is no guarantee/ certainty / obligation on the Estate that the eventual development will be anything like shown in the accompanying material
- The publicity material is an indication of what might be built – there is no certainty
- Any planning authority worthy of their responsibilities should be pushing for a full application
- Such a large application obligates the Council to take a more active role. By requesting outline permission the landowners are asking the Council to give up that role
- Would prefer to see a detailed application/ a detailed proposal of what is planned is called for
- An application of such magnitude should be detailed otherwise there is too much uncertainty
- If consent is granted this should tie the developer to the development concept and not leave room to change or alter the plan
- Section 106 notices should be applied to ensure that the development would be as shown and that there is no misunderstanding or variation
- The land will be sold to developers with their own ideas for the land
- No guarantee that the Estate will not sell this site to a volume house builder for standard houses out of keeping with existing properties or turning it into an industrial estate or large shopping centre
- This is an outline application which can be altered to include industry, retail parks and other undesirable features in the future and which could axe the community facilities that may bring benefits
- Concerned that if outline permission is granted the mix of uses might change including additional social housing, shops and/or industrial units, to the detriment of the Town Centre
- Removes the control from residents/ the Council/ councillors to object to or the opportunity to support specific proposals that may be put forward later
- No certainty over the location of the housing areas/ employment areas/ open spaces/ retail and community uses
- No certainty over the amount of open space/ community facilities or retail units
- Lack of certainty around the amount of space for different uses means lack of detail about the amount of delivery traffic
- No certainty over the location and amount of different uses on the site all of which will have a significant impact on the existing community
- No guarantee about the size or height of buildings or any screening which makes visual impact assessment impossible
- Lack of detail means that it is impossible to determine the impact on the AONB or the rural setting of the Town
- No indication of how the amount of traffic using Middlecave Road will be restricted to the proposed 10%
- Lack of detail over the control of traffic, including HGV access
- Lack of clarity on fundamental issues (landscape impact, traffic management, location of uses , amount of space for different uses) which should be clear for any permission at all to be granted would not, in fact, have been addressed
- Find it impossible to understand or accept an Environmental Statement including a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment based on the effect of a development that has no definition
- The Estate should be asked to submit a defined development plan showing exactly what will be built, their design for each building and a programme for the completion of the site
- For a (red line) application to be acceptable the applicant need to show how much housing can be accommodated without harm to the AONB

## SUMMARY OF SUPPORT

- A fantastic looking development that can only enhance Malton. The layout and design look very easy on the eye and it would provide much needed housing in the Town.
- Support the proposed plans to deliver housing. For some time there has been a shortage of new housing in and around Malton, especially for those looking to get on the housing ladder
- The development will bring more life and culture into the town
- The development has clearly been well thought out and the provision for more local amenities to create a self contained community clearly shows that there will be little extra pressure on the town
- The people of Malton are some of the most welcoming that I have met while living in many parts of the UK and I am sure that integrating anew community into the area would be a great success because of this
- As a business manager the case for this development is clear. It is patently obvious that more people will help grow and develop Malton and the surrounding areas. Malton is on a clear course to become a shining tourism spot in the North Yorkshire crown to which this development will only help by bringing more consistent spends into the town proper
- Malton and Norton have wonderful business that are family owned and have continued to struggle against the growing tide of ‘out of town’ superstores and developments. The additional revenue that this development will bring will continue to contribute significantly towards the survival of these business
- The pressure on housing in the UK is widely documented. At some point in the future these types of developments are going to be forced upon us, better that we as a district can take the right decision and have this development on our terms
- Fully support this scheme as I think that it will enhance Malton in a very positive way. I would be very much in favour of moving there myself in future
- Support the application
- Utterly refreshing to see a housing plan with design at its heart. In comparison with the barracks built at Broughton Manor (and too many appalling developments throughout Ryedale) this scheme complements historic Malton. It uses the vernacular to create houses which are traditional yet innovative and local skilled builders instead of the big buck house builders with their insensitive ‘kit designs’. Ryedale District Council should use High Malton as the template for all upcoming development. It should have the courage to kick out plans which don’t enhance the uniqueness of Malton and its surrounding countryside. It is the Council’s duty to put pride of place at the heart of policy
- Unreserved support. The proposal along with other on-going improvements by the Fitzwilliam Malton Estate, an important step forward for the towns progression
- As a company in Malton employing quite a number of staff from the location, we are extremely excited with the proposals submitted by the Estate which will be to the benefit of Malton, Norton and surrounding areas. We hope the outline will be granted.
- The development would be a great benefit to the Town in which we both work and many of us live. Also, it is proposed in such an extremely tasteful and imaginative style in harmony with the Town.
- I am the manager of an architectural ironmongers on Showfield Lane. I would have to be in favour of this development, new homes in the area keeps me in work. Unfortunately whenever a new project goes ahead, local architects don’t even give us a chance to price the work never mind offer it to us. The contracts all go out of town and I have to go further afield for work