

SITES CONSULTATION 2015 (INCLUDING LATER SUBMISSIONS)

Representor	Comment	Ryedale District Council Summarised Response
S Branch Pickering Medical Practice Participation Group	(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	Discussions regarding capacity of settlements to accommodate the quantum of development was discussed with the then PCT, and consultation of the surgeries. The sites consultation sought to identify if a particular configuration of sites. The draft plan will enable CCG's to reflect given of settlements in their business plans.
E. Cooper	(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.	After the meeting with the Parish Local Planning Authority wrote to the owner of site 480. The contents of that letter made reference to the Parish Council's preference for site 480. It also stated that two key issues had been identified with the site, and that further material would need to be provided, in order to assess whether the site was capable of being considered further. This was in respect of: Highways and Archaeology:
	Consider that the access is suitable.	The first matter relates to the provision of an access which is satisfactory to both the Highways Authority, but also Highways England, who are responsible for the A64 Trunk Road. Both these organisations raised serious concerns to a planning application at this site back in 2007.
	Pleased to hear that site 177 is a low priority.	Site 177 has archaeological sensitivities. The second matter relates to the known presence of important archaeological assets in the immediate locality. Because of this sensitivity, Officers asked for trial trenching (which would be discussed with the archaeological consultants and informed by geophysical survey). Material has been submitted to consider these issues further, and it identified a level of archaeology which precluded the development of the site.

N. and M. Ward	(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.	Nawton and Beadlam are identified in the Local Plan Strategy as a Service Village, and therefore capable in principle of being attributed a proportion of the housing requirement. None of the sites in Beadlam performed well in the Site Selection Methodology. Given recent developments in Nawton, and the Service Village Tier in general, it is not considered necessary to make allocations at this settlement as part of the Local Plan Sites Document.
Huttons Ambo Parish Council	(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.	This site now has planning permission for an extension to the York Road Industrial Estate.
Kirkbymoorside Town Council(response made before consultation started)	· Site 10- retain for sports field extension	Site 10 has performed poorly through the SSM for a range of reasons. There is no capability for the land to be taken forward as an extension to the sports field, but the land is adjacent.
	· 622- consider flooding issues could be addressed by adequate drainage and elevation measures	Site 622, being substantially in Flood Zone 3 fails the sequential test, as land is proximal to that which is within flood zone 1.
	· 102 will satisfy the need for affordable housing	Affordable housing will also be sought on other allocations, subject to the policy in the Local Plan Strategy
	· Encourage development sites which would not jeopardise the character of the town and are in scale	Acknowledged, the Local Planning Authority has used the SSM to articulate the impact of sites on the form and character of settlements.
	· Sites to south of the A170 would encourage driving into town due to the poor crossing points	improved connectivity with the town to the north of the A170 would be a requirement of development to the south of the road
	· Northern sites 201,345,431 would also see an increase in movement.	Sites 201 and 345 were not consulted upon in isolation. They are not as accessible as other sites, such as 156.

	<p>· 156, 56/467.</p>	<p>note that 156 is supported; sites 56 and 467 are adjacent to Keldholme, a separate settlement in its own right, and not physically related to Kirkbymoorside.</p>
	<p>In considering sites: public rights of way should be enhanced; green space and access to it, architectural merit; environmental sustainability (Transition Town)</p>	<p>Acknowledge need for enhancement of green infrastructure/PRoW and environmental sustainability. Local Plan strategy provides the framework for this. Key principles of sites will be established in the Local Plan Sites Document.</p>
	<p>· Want to see additional employment to support the housing growth. Ensure more employment land is made available.</p>	<p>Policy SP6 provides the policy framework for considering further employment land, and does not preclude its release even when (in the case of Kirkbymoorside) permissions have met the residual plan figure for employment land.</p>
<p>M McCandless, Head Teacher of Ryedale School</p>	<p>(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.</p>	<p>The site (481) is considered to be of a substantial size, no details have been provided to demonstrate the means of access. Nawton Beadlam, as a Service Village has already had a recent housing scheme which is considered to have fulfilled the Local Plan Strategy requirements for housing to be distributed equitably across the Service Villages</p>
<p>Amotherby Parish Council</p>	<p>(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.</p>	<p>The Development Plan (Local Plan Strategy) does not place a quantum on the site yield at each Service Village. Development in Swinton has occurred prior to this Plan Period. It is considered that Swinton Sites have more constraints associated with them. Houses which are affordable would be subjected to the occupancy cascade. Sites will need to satisfy the highway authority in terms of satisfactory access. It is considered that the development requirements can be met through and appropriate combination of sites.</p>
	<p><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.</p>	<p><u>Site 8:</u>The Site Selection Methodology identified these sensitivities with this site, but that there was potential in principle for them to be appropriately addressed. However, since the consultation the landowner has not demonstrated that the constraints of the site have been capable of being satisfactorily resolved.</p>
	<p><u>Site 61:</u> old quarry, contamination; noise from factory; would not add congestion to main street.</p>	<p>Noted, these are matters which are identified in the SSM.</p>

	<p><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.</p>	<p><u>Site148</u>: performed reasonably well through SSM, but was subject to land ownership complexities. This has now been resolved. The site has less sensitivities than site 8, and , but land owners are accepting of an access off the B1457; and providing land for a school kiss and drop facility. Parking restrictions would be considered by the Highway Authority.</p>
	<p><u>Site 181</u>: Safety concerns due to proximity to BATA; noise problems; no support for this site.</p>	<p>Site 181: Acknowledged.</p>
	<p><u>Site 371</u>: Working factory, public expressed opposition</p>	<p>Site 371: Acknowledged</p>
	<p><u>Sites 381/612</u>: could accommodate development of 1 dwelling</p>	<p><u>Sites 381/612</u>: not altering development limits, incremental coalescence; not contributing any wider plan- requirements</p>
	<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 635</u>: Ground source protection zone sensitivity, acknowledge other matters, but traffic would still be capable of going through the Main Street.</p>
	<p><u>Site 636</u> Join Swinton and Amotherby, within AONB</p>	<p><u>Site 363</u>: Acknowledged, and site is identified as VIUA.</p>
M Tanner	<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>	<p>Documentary evidence has been received which identifies an access that can be achieved. The site has performed well through the assessment process. However, given the amount of recent development undertaken in the settlement, no further sites are being considered for development at this settlement. The consultation must still allow the ability to comments to be made on all the sites submitted.</p>
Pickering Town Council	<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>Site 347 Acknowledged. The Site Assessment Process has identified that this would be an appropriate allocation when considered against development options.</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>Site 387 Acknowledged. This site has sensitivities which can be addressed, except would result in the loss of the Strip Field Systems. The site is not needed based on the numbers to plan for, and because land for a school at Pickering is no longer needed.</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>Site 200 Acknowledged. The Site Assessment Process has identified that this should be an allocation.</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>Site 116 - acknowledge that there are some identified landscape sensitivities with this site.</p>
	<p><u>Site 504</u> key advantage of site is that it adjoins the A170.</p>	<p>Site 504 - consider that coalescence issues outweigh the potentially easier access onto the site.</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>Site 110/146 - site does not have a identifiable, available access.</p>
	<p>Concerns that there is not enough land to be allocated for employment land</p>	<p>At the point this submission was made, limited sites had been submitted for employment land. The Local Planning Authority has now received site submission 650, which is considered (with modifications) to be an acceptable site, which would be capable of meeting the employment land requirements in the Local Plan Strategy</p>
<p>H Webster</p>	<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>	<p>Nawton and Beadlam are identified in the Local Plan Strategy as a Service Village, and therefore capable in principle of being attributed a proportion of the housing requirement. None of the sites in Beadlam performed well in the Site Selection Methodology. Given recent developments in Nawton, it is not considered appropriate to make allocations at this settlement as part of the Local Plan Sites Document.</p>
<p>R Jones</p>	<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>	<p>Nawton and Beadlam are identified in the Local Plan Strategy as a Service Village, and therefore capable in principle of being attributed a proportion of the housing requirement. None of the sites in Beadlam performed well in the Site Selection Methodology. Given recent developments in Nawton, it is not considered appropriate to make allocations at this settlement as part of the Local Plan Sites Document.</p>

<p>Beadlam Parish Council</p>	<p>(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.</p>	<p>Nawton and Beadlam are identified in the Local Plan Strategy as a Service Village, and therefore capable in principle of being attributed a proportion of the housing requirement. None of the sites in Beadlam performed well in the Site Selection Methodology. Given recent developments in Nawton, it is not considered appropriate to make allocations at this settlement as part of the Local Plan Sites Document.</p>
<p>A. and M. Scott</p>	<p>(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.</p>	<p>Nawton and Beadlam are identified in the Local Plan Strategy as a Service Village, and therefore capable in principle of being attributed a proportion of the housing requirement. None of the sites in Beadlam performed well in the Site Selection Methodology. Given recent developments in Nawton, it is not considered appropriate to make allocations at this settlement as part of the Local Plan Sites Document.</p>
<p>A. Welland, C. Bellwood, J. G. Bellwood, L . Paton, D. Paton, K. Paton and M. Paton</p>	<p>(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.</p>	<p>Nawton and Beadlam are identified in the Local Plan Strategy as a Service Village, and therefore capable in principle of being attributed a proportion of the housing requirement. None of the sites in Beadlam performed well in the Site Selection Methodology. Given recent developments in Nawton, it is not considered appropriate to make allocations at this settlement as part of the Local Plan Sites Document.</p>
<p>C . Legard, Scampston Estate</p>	<p>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?</p>	<p>Scampston is still considered within the Ryedale Plan, but not in terms of making allocations of land for development purposes. As an identified 'Other Village', in the Local Plan Strategy, there are specific circumstances where new residential development may be possible (Policy SP2). Any such development would also be subject to a Local Needs Occupancy Condition. As a Estate Village of considerable character, much will depend on the siting, design and other matters of detail.</p>

<p>J. Cook</p>	<p>Two letters in 2015 and 2016 various matters re, affordable housing, unhappy with referring to only allocating sites in the Market Towns and Service Villages, what policies would apply for those settlements outside these two areas. Site 132 is available and can be brought forward in a policy compliant manner. Keldholme should be considered as part of Kirkbymoorside.</p>	<p>Keldholme is in the Parish of Kirkbymoorside, but a settlement in its own right. Keldholme also has its own Development Limits which, identify in policy terms where residential development in principle could be achieved. The confusion of the presence of Keldholme on the 2002 Proposals Map has now been made clearer by the settlement having its own map. Both the 2002 Local Plan, and the recent Local Plan Strategy have consistently identified that the separation of the two settlements is an important feature of the setting of both settlements and for other settlements of a similar situation. Policies SP1 and SP2 of Local Plan strategy have already established the approach for the distribution of residential development, and employment land.</p>
<p>T. Dykes</p>	<p>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>	<p>The policies of the Local Plan Strategy will be relevant in their entirety, as the plan should be read as a whole, but for the Spatial Strategy, and therefore the general locations for Development providing a framework of most land use purposes. The Local Planning Authority is committed to establishing a wind energy area of search for that specific use.</p>

<p>D. Hendley</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>The scope and content of Development Plan Documents is set out in the Local Development Scheme (LDS), and those documents, if they are to meet one of the legal tests of soundness, must be made in accordance with the LDS. This consultation is to provide information and observations on the sites we have had submitted for the Local Plan Strategy's (LPS's) key development requirements which are for housing and employment land, and this is a key element of the Local Plan Sites Document as set out in the LDS. Given the LPS was adopted 4 years ago, the Local Planning Authority is keen to progress allocation of housing and employment sites. As you note, the written ministerial statement was written in June 2015, in light of this, the Local Planning Authority has decided to revise the LDS and produce a further DPD on Renewable Energy, Local Carbon Technologies and Building Sustainability – given the rescinding of the Code for Sustainable Homes as well. This is to ensure timely production of the Local Plan Sites Document continues, whilst meeting the requirements of the guidance. Indeed, none of the sites submitted as part of the various call for sites undertaken for the Local Plan Sites Document have explicitly been available for consideration as a site for Renewable Energy. Accordingly, the Local Development Scheme has been revised , to indicate a timetable for the production of this document, and we will be undertaking a call for sites for renewable/low carbon energy technologies when the Local Plan Sites Document is advanced.</p>
<p>L. Dyson</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>The Local Plan Strategy sets out the Spatial Strategy, which does not identify Gilling East as a Service Village. The village is considered under SP2 as an Other Village, and not subject to allocations.</p>
<p>C. Wilson</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>Site 206 did not perform as well as the option sites due to the identified harm to the setting of Keld Head Conservation Area. The site is also an existing VIUA which the Local Planning Authority has sought to retain. Also, the Local Planning Authority has chosen to propose the option sites from larger sites, where the sites have the capacity to demonstrate wider community benefits.</p>

P W Fisher Cundalls (obo various landowners in Wrelton, Middleton, Wilton, Newton upon Rawcliffe , Marton, Broughton and Fadmoor.	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!	The settlements referred to (Wrelton, Middleton, Wilton, Newton upon Rawcliffe, Marton, Broughton and Fadmoor) are not in the Service Village tier but in the 'Other Villages' tier. The Local Plan Strategy also sets out, in Policy SP2, how residential development will be treated in principle in the 'Other Villages'. This policy provides scope for small scale, limited development meeting local needs, subject to a Local Needs Occupancy Condition. Exception sites may also be another scenario where residential development may come forward.
Office of Rail and Road(Rail Regulation)	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.	Noted.
Rillington Parish Council	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.	The Consultation Document identifies that of the four preferred sites, there is one preferred site 638 at Rillington, a potential additional 17 units. Since the 2015 Consultation planning permission has been obtained on this site. It is now identified as a commitment.
J. Richardson of Pickering Participation Group	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.	Discussions regarding capacity of settlements to accommodate the quantum of development was discussed with the then PCT, and consultation with the surgeries. The sites consultation sought to identify if a particular configuration of sites.
S E R Millward	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.	No sites have been consulted upon as preferred sites in Ampleforth. This is primarily due to the recently granted scheme at the village. Sites 616 and 111 have also performed poorly through the Site Selection Methodology, This is primarily due to the adverse impact on settlement character/impact on the Conservation Area/ Impact on AONB/NYMNP.

N. Taylor	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.	No sites have been consulted upon as preferred sites in Ampleforth. This is primarily due to the recently granted scheme at the village. Sites 616 and 111 have also performed poorly through the Site Selection Methodology, This is primarily due to the adverse impact on settlement character/impact on the Conservation Area/ Impact on AONB/NYMNP.
S. Harrison	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.	No sites have been consulted upon as preferred sites in Ampleforth. This is primarily due to the recently granted scheme at the village. Sites 616 and 111 have also performed poorly through the Site Selection Methodology, This is primarily due to the adverse impact on settlement character/impact on the Conservation Area/ Impact on AONB/NYMNP. The sites are within the AONB, and part of 111 is within the Conservation Area.
Willerby Parish Council	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.	The sites consultation includes all the sites that have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for consideration. It is an important element of the production of Development Plan Documents to allow representations to be made by all parties who have an interest in development matters in the District.
	Can you confirm that all the sites (except 480) have been discounted.	We have sought further clarification on site 480, but the significant issues regarding road access and archaeology remain unresolved And it is considered that none of the other sites can be taken forward as an allocation for deliverability/suitability concerns.
		The Consultation Document identifies that Sites 177, and 217 offer some potential, but not in their current extent. The Agent was informed of the Local Planning Authority's concerns, and after the sites consultation correspondence was received. However, archaeological evaluation was undertaken, and showed a significant amount of archaeology, and so they are also viewed in a similar vein to that of 480.

		The Parish Council would be made aware if there is changes to the circumstances regarding the sites, then the Local Planning Authority would consider whether a site can be considered acceptable, to ensure that all Service Villages are considered as equitably as possible in terms of taking a proportion of the housing requirement as set out in the Local Plan Strategy. Based on the position at Publication the housing requirement at the Service Villages has now been met by commitments and completions.
S. Wormald	Concerned about the development of sites 218/249 due to road safety and congestion, and this scheme will exacerbate existing issues.	These sites are option choices- further information is required about the deliverability and developability of these, and other option sites. Superimposed upon this will be traffic impact modelling work with Air Quality Impact Assessment. The results of the traffic modelling shows that a Norton-focus meant that junction capacity at Malton and Norton was capable of accommodating planned levels of growth.
S. Frank	Sites to the north of River Derwent are preferred, the problem with developments in Norton is the already congested rail/river crossing.	The rail/river crossing is acknowledged as a 'pinch point'. The option site in Norton is so on the basis that the link road between Scarborough and Beverley Roads would be delivered. Sites in Malton would also increase traffic movements through Malton. The transport modelling work has identified that a Norton-focus provides the best means of ensuring junction capacity is capable of accommodating planned levels of growth.
	At least one new school is required, so a large site would help to deliver this.	Acknowledged. This was one element of the option choices including larger sites.
	Northern Arc- need to attract large high street retailers to stop leakage	Noted. The Local Planning Authority is providing the policy framework to inform retailer's decisions around relocation.
	Use WSCP and land around for 6-7 large units and a budget hotel. How about a B&Q with petrol filling station on York Road	The WSCP site is not currently available for retail development, but the land is within the Northern Arc area.
	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.	Noted. The Town Centre Commercial Limits have been extended to include the Livestock Market redevelopment site. The former Dewhirst's site is also identified as a commitment.

	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.	Acknowledged. The Food Enterprise Zone is now in place.
	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.	Strategic infrastructure - including the provision of a road-rail crossing is identified as being needed to meet longer-term plans, but is c.30 million pounds. However, proposals are being investigated to improve connectivity to the railway in other means.
	Would like to see the Town Council's merging, Malton and Norton are one community and should be recognised as such.	This is not a matter for the Local Planning Authority. Malton and Norton are preparing a Neighbourhood Plan together
	Need better mobile reception.	Noted. The Local Planning Authority has engaged with mobile reception providers to improve reception, and the Council has invested in Broadband
S. Miller	Concerned about sites 249/218. These were rejected by the planning committee. Need to impose the weight restriction on HGVs Traffic problems must be resolved before more applications can be considered Dualling of the A64 commence, with a roundabout at the west end of the bypass. Such a road could link into the Castle Howard Road Must improve the flow of traffic through Butcher Corner- to reduce both congestion and pollution.	The planning application considered the planning merits of the specific scheme proposed on the site. The consideration of the site through the Development Plan process considers (at this stage) the site on more general principles. The sites have not been taken forward as allocations on the basis that technical evidence supported the allocation of alternative site choices at Malton and Norton.
Nawton Parish Council	522 Has been sold	The Local Planning Authority has recognised that through recent completions Nawton/Beadlam have achieved a level of development which would be in general conformity with the spatial strategy in the Local Plan Sites Document. Whilst some of the sites have performed better than others, the sites consultation has not actively pursued a further site at these settlements. In the SSM , none of the sites in Beadlam have performed as well as some of the sites in Nawton. The Local Plan Sites Document is not proposing allocations at Nawton or Beadlam.
	55 has been built out	
	105 is too large and its development would harm the character of the settlement.	
	Site 173/252 is subject to a ransom strip, and the other sites would bring traffic problems	

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.

Permanently discount sites in Nawton for the above reasons.

Historic England

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.

As part of the undertaking of the Site Selection Methodology information about the existing Heritage Environmental Record (HER) was provided by the archaeological unit of the County Local Planning Authority, to bring an initial awareness of archaeology. The site assessment process has identified sites with archaeological sensitivity. Application of the NPPF, Local Plan Strategy and Local Plan Sites Document will in the course of planning applications identify a framework for management of archaeological remains, identify a management approach to ensuring appropriate evaluation and preservation. The Selection Methodology does consider, albeit in concise terms, the key impacts on the significance of both designated, and non-designated heritage assets. It is there to 'flag up' any areas which will need further consideration. The Local Plan Sites Document will be accompanied by material which supports the production of the document, which will expand in greater detail how allocations will not harm to such assets.

<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.</p>	<p>As part of the undertaking of the Site Selection Methodology information about the existing Heritage Environmental Record (HER) was provided by the archaeological unit of the County Local Planning Authority, to bring an initial awareness of archaeology. As sites progress through the various stages of consideration, increasing detail will be required to be submitted to establish any likely archaeological significance beyond that establish in the HER. It should be noted that the Local Planning Authority have identified through the site assessment process that site 184e makes a significant contribution to the setting of Norton, by providing a parkland/equestrian style setting for Norton Grove Stud, which although not a designated heritage asset, nevertheless provides a distinct, atypical and attractive entrance to Norton, and helps to screen the adjacent Industrial Estate. Sites 578 and 579 are identified as a broad location, since the majority of the employment land supply is delivered by commitments and completions. As such as part of the development principles-archaeological evaluation will be needed to consider the sites when their extent is identified.</p>
<p>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):</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority is aware of the obligations regarding the special regard to be had concerning impact on those elements which contribute to the significance of Listed buildings.</p>
<p>Site 62 (impact on the setting of Old Malton Conservation Area, and the Listed Buildings which are along the frontage)</p>	<p>Noted. This site is not being proposed as a potential allocation.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. As a result of further site visits, this site has been identified as a Visually Important Undeveloped Area due to the contribution to the significance of the St. Mary's and because it ensures that Old Malton as a settlement remains distinct, and contributes to the setting of Old Malton Conservation Area.</p>
<p>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 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.</p>	<p>Noted. This site is not being proposed as a potential option for allocation.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted. This site is not being proposed for allocation. The site selection methodology, identified that there were sensitivities with this site, in terms of the Keld Head Conservation Area, which is proximal and the presence of Strip Fields. The potential for coalescence with Middleton was also identified as being harmful, and that if the site was to progress, it would be not to its currently proposed extent.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Officers acknowledged as part of the Sites Consultation that the eastern limb of this site submission would be visually prominent, and would be extending beyond the built-up form of the town into very prominent strip field systems. Site 650 has been now reduced in extent- with the deletion of the eastern limb.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted. This site is not identified for allocation.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This site was proposed as a potential option for allocation in 2015. In examining the strip field systems in this area, the nature of the field patterns, the topography is such that whilst this area has historic field patterns, they are not as distinct as other sites. In considering development sites, much of the land around Pickering has strip field systems, and according, the Local Planning Authority has applied the approach of examining the intactness and prominence of those strip field systems. However, the site, due to the current residual requirement, lack of need for a school, is therefore not being identified. The site is not being taken forward as alternative sites are considered to be more appropriate site choices.</p>
<p>58 - Site is adjacent to the Kirkbymoorside Conservation Area.</p>	<p>This site is subject to an extant planning permission.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted. The SSM identified that material would need to be submitted which examines the significance of the site in terms of its contribution to setting of the church, and appropriate mitigation. There are other site constraints- in particular noise, which have not been satisfactorily resolved, so that the site is not being progressed as an allocation.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The sites consultation identified that no site would allocated at Hovingham, on the basis of the development at Pasture Lane. Of the sites submitted, 643 performed better than other submissions at the village, but the Local Planning Authority was aware that there are significant heritage sensitivities with the site, and that in order for the site to be progressed as an allocation, information would need to be submitted which defines the significance, sets out whether there would be harm, and if so, how that is mitigated. Such information has not been forthcoming.</p>

<p>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>	<p>The site selection methodology identified that proximity to the Scampston Hall Historic Park and Garden would need to be considered further. Another site (638) has been chosen as a preferred site for delivering housing in Rillington, and this has now obtained permission.</p>
<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>	<p>Site 71 has been the subject of a planning permission, the planning permission considered the impact on the significance of the Listed Buildings proximal to the site.</p>
<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>	<p>The Site Selection Methodology identifies the significance and contribution of the Grade I Listed church which is to the immediate south of the site. It is considered that the site can be developed without compromising in any manner the significance of the church. However, clearly the siting, landscaping and design of the buildings will need to reflect this. This has now been considered through a planning application which was approved with consultation from Historic England.</p>
<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>	<p>This site is not identified for allocation. This is This is This is primarily due to the presence of Listed Buildings (farm houses) on the site, which would only allow for a sensitive conversion scheme of appropriate outbuildings, which was sensitive to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area of Slingsby. The Site Selection Methodology also acknowledges the proximity to Slingsby Castle. Another site (430/464) is identified as an allocation.</p>
<p>R. Harris Concerns about landscape impact, proximity to National Park and AONB. Other more appropriate sites. Road safety issues.</p>	<p>No sites have been consulted upon as preferred sites in Ampleforth. This is primarily due to the recently granted scheme at the village. Sites 616 and 111 have also performed poorly through the Site Selection Methodology, This is This is primarily due to the adverse impact on settlement character/impact on the Conservation Area/ Impact on AONB/NYMNP. The sites are within the AONB, and part of 111 is within the Conservation Area. Both sites are now identified as an Visually Important Undeveloped Area in the Local Plan Sites Document.</p>

Cushman Wakefield obo Royal Mail Group	<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>	<p>These sites have performed not as well as other sites (in part to their proximity to the industrial estate) and as such they are not being considered for allocations for residential or employment development. The Local Planning Authority considers that the Site Selection Methodology has appropriately identified that residential development in close proximity to an established, unfettered industrial estate would be mutually harmful to potential residents and existing operations. It is why the sites have not been taken forward as option choices, as part of the 2015 consultation. Highways impacts could only be considered in summary and around principle, at this early stage. Sites are not identified for allocation for any use.</p>
S, B and J Chestnutt	<p>Sites 218/249 Impact on the Howardian Hills AONB - and statutory duty to</p> <p>Access to A64 is a priority for development in and around Malton</p> <p>Loss of good agricultural land</p> <p>On-going issues with the sewerage system- new development will</p> <p>Should distribute more housing to the villages to enable them to survive and progress.</p>	<p>The site has been considered as an option site in 2015, based on the principle of the site for housing. The Local Planning Authority is aware of the sensitivities concerning the proximity/relationship of the site to the Howardian Hills AONB. Yorkshire Water, the Statutory Undertaker for the provision of water supplies and foul drainage have confirmed that whilst new capacity will need to be provided through reinforcement, there are no capacity issues. Transport modelling identified that a Malton-focus would result in greater pressures on the wider junction network. The loss of agricultural land has to be balanced against other planning considerations- such as access to services and facilities, and the delivery of such services. This is also one of the reasons why the spatial approach of the Local Plan Strategy has concentrated on the settlements with a good level of services and facilities. The previous Local Plan distributed more housing to the villages, and this did not result in improved services/facilities in those settlements. The Local Planning Authority considers that there are more suitable alternative sites to meet the development requirements. Taking account of a range of information and evidence.</p>

<p>R. Ibbotson</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority is aware of the sensitivities concerning the proximity/relationship of the site to the Howardian Hills AONB. Information has been sought by the Local Planning Authority from the site submitter to obtain assurances that the impact on AONB through the development can be acceptably mitigated. This relates to matters of scale, design, and landscaping. These matters were the subject of reasons for refusal as part of a planning application for which a specific design scheme was indicated as part of the proposal. The sites are also subjected to transport modelling and air quality impact assessment. As result of the sites assessment work, for the plan period a single site in Norton (649) is identified as the main allocation at the Principal Town for meeting the residual requirement.</p>
<p>T. Haurston</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>No sites have been consulted upon as preferred sites in Ampleforth. This is primarily due to the recently granted scheme at the village. Sites 616 and 111 have also performed poorly through the Site Selection Methodology, This is This is primarily due to the adverse impact on settlement character/impact on the Conservation Area/ Impact on AONB/NYMNP. The sites are within the AONB, and part of 111 is within the Conservation Area. They have been identified as part of a Visually Important Undeveloped Area.</p>
<p>J and M Knight</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>No sites have been consulted upon as a preferred site in Hovingham. This is primarily due to the recently constructed Pasture Lane scheme. The site area of 643 was submitted in response to the concerns that Officers raised about the constraints regarding the existing site submissions. Acknowledge that there are sensitivities with the site submission, that would need further exploration were the site to be considered further.</p>

<p>J. R. Nursey</p>	<p>(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.</p>	<p>As an 'Other Village' Flaxton is not proposed to receive an allocation. Acknowledged that given the lack of key facilities, including public transport, the settlement was not considered as a Service Village.</p>
<p>J. Smith</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>No sites have been consulted upon as preferred sites in Ampleforth. This is primarily due to the recently granted scheme at the village. Sites 616 and 111 (at West End) have also performed poorly through the Site Selection Methodology, This is primarily due to the adverse impact on settlement character/impact on the Conservation Area/ Impact on AONB/NYMNP. The sites are within the AONB, and part of 111 is within the Conservation Area. The site has been identified as part of a new Visually Important Undeveloped Area.</p>
<p>P. Gill</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>No sites have been consulted upon as preferred sites in Ampleforth. This is primarily due to the recently granted scheme at the village. Sites 616 and 111 (at West End) have also performed poorly through the Site Selection Methodology, This is primarily due to the adverse impact on settlement character/impact on the Conservation Area/ Impact on AONB/NYMNP. The sites are within the AONB, and part of 111 is within the Conservation Area. These sites have been identified as part of a new Visually Important Undeveloped Area.</p>

<p>S. Connor</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>The sites consultation includes all the sites that have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for consideration. It is a early stage of consultation. The Local Planning Authority identifies how the sites have been assessed, and does not exclude sites from being consulted upon. It is an important element of the production of Development Plan Documents to allow representations to be made by all parties who have an interest in development matters in the District.</p>
<p>J. Rutherford</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>No sites have been consulted upon as preferred sites in Ampleforth. This is primarily due to the recently granted scheme at the village, deemed to meet the requirement of the Local Plan Strategy. Sites 616 and 111 (at West End) have also performed poorly through the Site Selection Methodology, This is primarily due to the adverse impact on settlement character/impact on the Conservation Area/ Impact on AONB/NYMNP. The sites are within the AONB, and part of 111 is within the Conservation Area. The sites have been identified as part of a new Visually Important Undeveloped Area.</p>
<p>E. Cooper</p>	<p>Sites in Staxton 177 - land for extension of sports facilities</p>	<p>Note the Parish Council's intentions for site 177, which our understanding is that the land is not in the Parish Council's ownership. The Site Selection Methodology identifies that there are sensitivities and the extent of the site was asked to be reduced. As response was received, but the level of archaeology on the site precluded development.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>After the meeting with the Parish Council Officers wrote to the owner of site 480. The contents of that letter made reference to the Parish Council's preference for site 480. It also stated that two key issues had been identified with the site, and that further material would need to be provided, in order to assess whether the site was capable of being considered further. This was in respect of: access and archaeology. No material has been submitted to consider these issues further.</p>

S. Shepherd	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.	No sites have been consulted upon as preferred sites in Ampleforth. This is primarily due to the recently granted scheme at the village, deemed to meet the requirement of the Local Plan Strategy. Sites 616 and 111 (at West End) have also performed poorly through the Site Selection Methodology, This is primarily due to the adverse impact on settlement character/impact on the Conservation Area/ Impact on AONB/NYMNP. The sites are within the AONB, and part of 111 is within the Conservation Area. The sites have been identified as part of a new Visually Important Undeveloped Area.
A Frank	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?	Acknowledged. The Malton and Norton residential site options have been subjected to further highway modelling and Air Quality Impact Assessment. This work concluded that the Norton focus, with the link road would mean that junction capacity would be able to support planned levels of development. A Park and Ride is a strategic infrastructure consideration which a single development would not be able to be expected to be delivered. However there is nothing in principle which would prevent a transport operator from providing such a service.
S. Murrell	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.	No sites have been consulted upon as preferred sites in Ampleforth. This is primarily due to the recently granted scheme at the village, deemed to meet the requirement of the Local Plan Strategy. Sites 616 and 111 (at West End) have also performed poorly through the Site Selection Methodology, This is primarily due to the adverse impact on settlement character/impact on the Conservation Area/ Impact on AONB/NYMNP. The sites are within the AONB, and part of 111 is within the Conservation Area. The sites have been identified as part of a new Visually Important Undeveloped Area.
M. Gray	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.	Note support for option 1. However, the Local Planning Authority has been unable to establish whether the option would support the relocation of the factory.

<p>Any new permission of 369 should require an upper storey for offices.</p>	<p>The land (denoted 369 and the Micrometalsmiths site and adjacent land) have not be submitted for use as Offices, without explicit confirmation, the Local Planning Authority cannot impose a use as part of the allocation process for which the Local Planning Authority has no evidence that such a use is deliverable or developable in that location. No information has been submitted concerning 369, and the information from site 454/259 is for the development of housing.</p>
<p>Site 622 appears reasonable for employment land</p>	<p>Concerning 622, there is outstanding significant flood risk matters, which have not been resolved. No response has been received by the landowner or their agent, with the regards to provide a Flood Risk Assessment, with mitigation measures identified. The Environment Agency objected to the inclusion of this site. Site 657 has now been developed and meets the residual requirement.</p>
<p>C .and H. Rodda</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>No sites have been consulted upon as preferred sites in Ampleforth. This is primarily due to the recently granted scheme at the village, deemed to meet the requirement of the Local Plan Strategy. Sites 616 and 111 (at West End) have also performed poorly through the Site Selection Methodology, This is primarily due to the adverse impact on settlement character/impact on the Conservation Area/ Impact on AONB/NYMNP. The sites are within the AONB, and part of 111 is within the Conservation Area. The sites have been identified as part of a new Visually Important Undeveloped Area.</p>
<p>G C Ridsdale</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>After the meeting with the Parish Council we wrote to the owner of site 480. The contents of that letter made reference to the Parish Council's preference for site 480. It also stated that two key issues had been identified with the site, and that further material would need to be provided, in order to assess whether the site was capable of being considered further. This was in respect of:</p> <p>The first matter relates to the provision of an access which is satisfactory to both the Highways Authority at the County Council, but also Highways England, who are responsible for the A64 Trunk Road. Both these organisations raised serious concerns to a planning application at this site back in 2007.</p>

		<p>The second matter relates to the known presence of important archaeological assets in the immediate locality. Because of this sensitivity, Officers asked for trial trenching (which would be discussed with the archaeological consultants and informed by geophysical survey).</p>
		<p>No material has been submitted to consider these issues further.</p>
S. Read	<p>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.</p>	<p>No sites have been consulted upon as preferred sites in Ampleforth. This is primarily due to the recently granted scheme at the village, deemed to meet the requirement of the Local Plan Strategy. Sites 616 and 111 (at West End) have also performed poorly through the Site Selection Methodology, This is primarily due to the adverse impact on settlement character/impact on the Conservation Area/ Impact on AONB/NYMNP. The sites are within the AONB, and part of 111 is within the Conservation Area. The sites have been identified as part of a new Visually Important Undeveloped Area.</p>
D. Powell	<p>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.</p>	<p>Amotherby and Swinton a considered together as a Service Village. Overall, at least one site in Amotherby performed better than those in Swinton. The Highways Authority commented on the sub-standard access for both the sites you have referred to, and for 341.</p>
F. Ellis	<p>Ampleforth - Note that 9 sites are listed for potential allocation.</p>	<p>No sites have been consulted upon as preferred sites in Ampleforth. This is primarily due to the recently granted scheme at the village, deemed to meet the requirement of the Local Plan Strategy.</p>
		<p>The sites consultation includes all the sites that have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for consideration. It is a early stage of consultation. The Local Planning Authority identifies how the sites have been assessed, and does not exclude sites from being consulted upon. It is an important element of the production of Development Plan Documents to allow representations to be made by all parties who have an interest in development matters in the District.</p>

		Site 160 remains the site which performs best through the Site Selection Methodology, but it is not identified as a preferred site for the reason above.
K. Monkman	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.	Note support for 218, which cannot access the A64 in an eastbound direction without going through the built up area of Malton. The proximity of the AONB is one aspect, but it is also the capacity of the site to accommodate development. Light industrial units are those which can exist without harm to the residential amenity of residents. Note support for 249 as providing a school, but the site and the wider field plays an important part in the setting of Malton. Note support for the use of 452 for retail development. The Northern Arc identifies this area (in the Local Plan Strategy) as being suitable for town centre uses. Note support for Beverley Road in respect of the site's ability to deliver a link road, and land for a school.
	Site 249 - equally suitable, should also be set aside for additional primary school provision.	
	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.	
	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.	
R. and L. Beck	Ampleforth sites 111 and 616:	No sites have been consulted upon as preferred sites in Ampleforth. This is primarily due to the recently granted scheme at the village, deemed to meet the requirement of the Local Plan Strategy. Sites 616 and 111 (at West End) have also performed poorly through the Site Selection Methodology, This is primarily due to the adverse impact on settlement character/impact on the Conservation Area/ Impact on AONB/NYMNP. The sites are within the AONB, and part of 111 is within the Conservation Area. The sites have been identified as part of a new Visually Important Undeveloped Area.

R. North	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?	The sites consultation includes all the sites that have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for consideration. The Local Planning Authority identifies how the sites have been assessed, and does not exclude sites from being consulted upon. It is an important element of the production of Development Plan Documents to allow representations to be made by all parties who have an interest in development matters in the District.
	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.	Local Plan Strategy was adopted in 2013, after a lengthy Examination in Public; it defines the Spatial Strategy and settlement Hierarchy; and there are no plans to revisit that document within the short term. The 'no decisions have been made' refers to the status of the sites submitted as part of this consultation, and the work towards the Local Plan Sites Document, which will set out the allocations and other site-specific policies and be the second part of the Ryedale Plan- to accompany the Local Plan Strategy. This work has now been completed, and the allocations identified.
	Provided comments on sites in Thorpe Bassett.	Thorpe Bassett, like many smaller settlements in Ryedale is an 'Other Village' where the Local Planning Authority is not seeking to make any allocations.
	Consider that the new site recommended off Low Moorgate in Rillington is quite acceptable.	Noted.
	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.	Policy SP2 of the Local Plan Strategy sets out the circumstances in principle where residential development would be considered appropriate outside of the allocations process. It is not clear which areas are being referred to. Some sites along this street have been submitted. Sites can still be considered as Exception Sites.
	How can small scale development take place in the 'Non Service Villages' to meet local needs and changing circumstances.	Policy SP2 of the Local Plan Strategy sets out the circumstances in principle where residential development would be considered appropriate, and this considers 'Other Villages'.

E. Banks	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.	Terrington , like many smaller settlements in Ryedale is an 'Other Village' where the Local Planning Authority is not seeking to make any allocations. Policy SP2 of the Local Plan Strategy sets out the circumstances in principle where residential development would be considered appropriate, and this considers 'Other Villages'.
Welham Park Residents Association	Observations on site 649:	This is the Council's proposed main allocation at Malton and Norton (Principal Town)
	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.	Whilst some traffic would still go through Mill Street, to avoid the congestion the site's residents and those visiting the site will use Scarborough Road. The link road is both essential for the proposed allocation, and delivers wider benefits- as evidenced through the highway modelling work.
	There will be an increase in heavy goods vehicles and plant. There is already problems along the road with such vehicles.	The movement of heavy goods vehicles and plant will be controlled through conditions on operation.
	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.	The site would be built out over a period of years, and as part of the planning process will be expected to mitigate the impacts on infrastructure, facilities and services. The Local Plan Strategy identifies over 1500 news homes will be built in Malton and Norton. Over 1000 are either built or have planning permission.
	25% population increase in 15 years is too great.	The site would be built out over a period of years. Properties will meet a range of buyers, including those who live in the town in unsuitable accommodation. There is no specific, direct correlation of 25% population increase.
	Norton has limited shopping facilities, the increase in population would place pressure on those facilities, and many more people would cross into Malton.	Malton and Norton are the Principal Town, Norton has a smaller town centre than Malton, the increase in population may result in a drive to increase facilities in Norton; increased use of facilities in Malton; and based on current retail activity there will be internet shopping, and it would be unrealistic to not expect residents to travel to places like York for shopping, and they can access the bypass without entering the town centres.

<p>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.</p>	<p>Malton's traditional market town experience is part of a wider strategy to increase the vitality and viability of the town centre, the historic fabric and listed buildings mean the ability to provide modern shopping formats is constrained, but that other areas in and close to the town centre could provide modern retailing formats to provide more retail choice to meet a range of needs of those living in Ryedale.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Discussions with the CCG have identified that increases in population are factored into capital programmes, but it has identified a shortage of doctors, as a national issue.</p>
<p>Concerns regarding the provision of utilities, disruption to existing services, and the strains placed on existing infrastructure.</p>	<p>Utility providers area aware of general increases in the number of homes, and have a rolling five-year capital programme which allows the increase in homes to be factored into their development plans. The Developers have undertaken detailed discussions with utility providers around the delivery and phasing of infrastructure.</p>
<p>The presence of a new school is much needed, but would soon become full. People would drive their children to school- increasing traffic.</p>	<p>It is anticipated that the school would be provided through CIL and will be designed to be expanded over time. Some parents will use the car to take their children to school, but the majority will find walking more attractive, and practical.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The masterplan shows the retention of the public right of way. The loss of agricultural land has to be balanced with the need to provide land for new homes in a sustainable location, and provide wider community benefits. In terms of biodiversity there would be a net gain in terms of biodiversity, and wider recreational opportunities on the site would be expected.</p>
<p>Concerned about the disturbance of archaeological remains.</p>	<p>Archaeological evaluation has identified no significant remains, but there are measures which can be applied to ensure that better understanding archaeology can be achieved.</p>
<p>Concerned about the loss of longer distance views to the Wolds being lost, including the heights of some buildings</p>	<p>The heights of buildings can be investigated to ensure that the scale of buildings is commensurate with the pre-existing built fabric. The scheme is for dwellings, which are unlikely to exceed two storeys- which is the same height as dwellings on the recent Cheesecake Farm scheme, and similar to the prevailing build character.</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.	Disruption and noise of construction is managed through conditions which control the activity to that which is acceptable. Acoustic matters are a material planning consideration, but those which concern construction are mitigated through controlling days and hours of operation.
	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.	A development site of this size would be phased out over a period of years, allowing the residents both existing and new to form new, and expanded communities.
	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.	Noted. It is not possible to notify one specific group or party or individual about the meeting of Council, as this would be preferential treatment. It is not within the constitution of the council to have public speaking at a meeting of Council. The Residents association will be notified of the Publication of the Plan, and representations made at that point will be sent to the Planning Inspector. A representative can attend, and participate in the Examination In Public if they so wish, providing the Inspector is aware of their intentions.
S. Cooper	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.	As a Other Village, the Local Plan Strategy identifies no allocations to Other Villages. Accordingly, the site has not been considered through the site selection methodology.

<p>N. McGovern</p>	<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>	<p>As a Other Village, the Local Plan Strategy identifies no allocations to Other Villages. Accordingly, the sites mentioned have not been considered through the site selection methodology.</p>
<p>North York Moors Historical Railway Trust</p>	<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>	<p>The Local Plan Strategy sets the strategic approach for guiding development. The purpose of the Local Plan Sites Document is to provide the second part of the Local Plan Strategy to identify land for housing and employment (B uses) (not tourism uses), with some site-specific protection/amplification policies. It is not proposing to revisit thematic issues such as tourist enterprises (because also of need to maintain parity with other tourist enterprises). None of the parcels of land mentioned have been submitted for consideration to be included in the LSPD. The Local Planning Authority recognises the contribution of the NYMR to the economy of not just Pickering, but many of the surrounding villages. The Local Plan Strategy supports in principle development required as part of tourist attractions. The Master Plan would be part of that process.</p>

C. and S. Long	Object to site 8 for the following reasons:	The Highways Authority have not advised the Council that there is a level of development which would cause a conflict with the operation of junctions in the vicinity of the site, including the existing uses and levels of traffic which operate through the village
	Village school- periodic congestion when school is starting and finishing. Traffic is grid locked.	Acknowledged.
	BATA lorries leave at regular intervals	Acknowledged
	The general volume of traffic has increased over the last 10-12 years	noted.
	Any site should avoid Meadowfields	Only the Highway Authority has the authority to restrict parking
	Access to site 8: concerns about width of access in proximity to Station House Farm and neighbouring property.	Noted. The Local Planning Authority has been advised that the width and position of the access is acceptable, but Officers have been concerned that there is insufficient width past Station House Farm (including the loss of parking and outbuildings for that property). This has not been satisfactorily addressed.
	The logical access is owned by a third party, on land between Zetechnics and Station Farm	The Local Planning Authority has received information from this landowner about the means of access
	Disagree with Highway impacts (Q.46), what is the mitigation? there would be conflicts with existing factory traffic .	The Highway Authority are satisfied with the nature and position of the access. The Local Planning Authority is guided by the Highway Authority.
	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.	No proposals have sought to demolish this dwelling. The LPA would concur that this house does make a significant and positive contribution to the street scene.
	Site is too large in size- leading to further properties being built in the future.	At a theoretical yield of 19 units, it is below the indicative number that could be reasonably expected to be delivered at a Service Village, based on the Local Plan Strategy identifying 300 dwellings for the 10 Service villages. In assessing the sites
Special qualities, landscape setting, agree strongly that the rural, pastoral qualities would be lost through development, harming the character of the settlement.	The SSM noted that there would be a loss of the features of the existing field, which could have setting issues for the Church, but the fields, whilst being rural in character themselves do not intrinsically contribute to settlement form and character.	

Proximity to the Grade II Listed Church- currently enjoys a peaceful setting which would be lost through development	The SSM identifies the sensitivity concerning the setting of the church, but considers that a scheme could be achieved which did not harm the setting or the significance of the church.
Potential important archaeological remains: Roman and Mediaeval	Further technical work would need to be undertaken- this is identified in the SSM. Geophysical Survey would be required.
Potential risk to public water supply (ground source protection zone) (it refers to harm to water supply from food manufacturing)	The Environment Agency has advised that the propensity for the contamination varies across site 8. with the southern component of the site being more vulnerable, and the northern part less so: a Function of both distance and drift geology, accordingly the site has a lower vulnerability than other sites such as 148 and in particular 635. The residential use would require certain mitigation measures but would not preclude the development of the site in principle.
Noise from BATA is often heard on an evening, and into the night	The SSM identified that the presence of BATA could have significant amenity considerations, but that these could be appropriately addressed. A noise survey was requested, and provided. It identified significant noise issues, which without a reduction in the site extent could not be satisfactorily mitigated. No reduction in site extent has been proposed, but acoustic mitigation has been proposed, which in the view of the Local Planning Authority is not appropriate for a rural area, and does not allow residents to reasonably enjoy their property in a rural setting.
land instability - during the building of Jubilee Ho. and Cornwall Ho, the latter need piling to a great depth	Land instability matters will need to be considered and addressed as part of any planning application, and will be considered in detail through Buildings Regulations.
Not been able to view the submitted scheme - is this not available to view- it should be made available	This information is available on request. The Local Planning Authority is intending to display any material submitted as part of the development plan process to available on the Local Planning Authority's website.

<p>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.</p>	<p>The identification of sites into broad groupings (1-4) provides the ability to clearly rate the sites individually. However, the Local Plan Strategy seeks to, as equitably as possible, distribute the housing requirement across the Service Villages, that means where villages have recently seen further development, despite the presence of group 4 (or 3) sites, there are no preferred sites in these settlements.</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>Amenity is but one of many matters which would need to be considered. In the time since the 2015 Sites Consultation further information has identified that site 8 is no longer capable of being identified as an allocation; site 341 in Swinton still performs poorly, and site 148 has performed better, through the submission of further information about developability and deliverability.</p>
<p>in Q3, 148 there is an error, the pavement extends to Appleton le Street.</p>	<p>Noted. There is a footpath, but in terms of its width, it is narrow and not a standard width pavement, in terms of the response from the Highways Authority.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The identification of sites into broad groupings (1-4) provides the ability to clearly rate the sites individually. However, the Local Plan Strategy seeks to, as equitably as possible, distribute the housing requirement across the Service Villages, that means where villages have recently seen further development, despite the presence of group 4 (or 3) sites, there are no preferred sites in these settlements.</p>
<p>Q50. factual inaccuracy - there are issues with the drainage system in Amotherby and Swinton</p>	<p>We will discuss this with Yorkshire Water, who provided the response the development can only be required to mitigate the impact of that development, and not increase surface runoff rates above that of the pre-existing situation.</p>

<p>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>	<p>The question is correctly interpreted for both sites, the impact is about functional impact on a community facility. The potential impact on the church is concerning its setting from the point of view as a designated heritage asset. This is considered in another part of the SSM. Site 148 has shown plans providing facilities to the school, but it is also a significantly larger site than was originally envisaged , it considered that the single + was cautiously positive, based on the above.</p>
<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>Disagree that there is significant errors/flaws in the assessment in principle, but will check on matters of clarification through this consultation and in light of new material.</p>
<p>148 although large only a portion would need to be developed, with the previously stated advantages</p>	<p>In terms of delivery of the site, because of the costs of car park and the access road, and in terms of comprehensively planning the site, the whole site would be considered and not a parcel of the site. The Local Planning Authority has been clear that it would not look to artificially reduce the extent of sites, as such site area of 148 would not be reduced.</p>
<p>635 - access directly onto the B1257</p>	<p>Site 635 is in very close proximity to the private water supply of the Wrestlers/Malton Foods site. Also, the drift geology here is highly transmissive, and as such the Environment Agency considered this would be a highly vulnerable to contamination.</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>Site 341 - proximity to the Scrap Yard is a material consideration- new residents can view the activities as a nuisance. There are no planning controls to restrict the hours of operation. The Highway Authority have objected to further development off this road, it is un-adopted, and not capable of being adopted.</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>The isochrones map the distance as a function of time, and are a factual measurement. Therefore the -- rating could not be amended because it is fact. Amotherby and Swinton they are twinned as a Service village for the fact that they share the School/Shop and so this is identified in the Local Plan Strategy. The SSM identifies why the accessibility rating is at this level.</p>

<p>Should develop at other group 4 sites.</p>	<p>The identification of sites into broad groupings (1-4) provides the ability to clearly rate the sites individually. However, the Local Plan Strategy seeks to, as equitably as possible, distribute the housing requirement across the Service Villages, that means where villages have recently seen significant development or recent planning approvals, despite the presence of group 4 sites, there are no preferred sites in these settlements. For example Sherburn has planning permission for 73 dwellings. Group 3 sites have been chosen at other settlements, should no group 4 sites be available.</p>
<p>S. Oswald</p> <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>The Local Planning Authority has re-evaluated the contribution of the open fields of site 324 in respect of their contribution to the setting of the Grade I Listed St. Mary's Church, and the ability of the land to ensure that the village of Old Malton, and its Conservation Area, remain distinct from Malton. It is considered that the open fields play an important role in the understanding of the significance of St. Mary's Church, as a building of status, and religious activity, and its importance within both Old Malton, but also beyond. Views of the a wider extent of the church than previously achieved showed a greater extent of the church to be viewed, allowing a clearer understanding of the scale of the church in relation to the vernacular village. The site also offers important open land which allows the village of Old Malton to remain distinct, and separate, whilst submissions identified that land could remain open, undeveloped, or treed, this would still leave an insufficient gap to appreciate the settlement identity of Old Malton. As such the site is identified as a VIUA for these reasons.</p>

	Need to bring these views to Historic England, and report the outcome of these discussions.	
P Riley	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	The Sites Consultation identified a combination of option sites which exceeded the residual requirement, and through the assessment of the sites, the sites have been identified meet the residual requirement. The Local Planning Authority has considered the principle of the site's development through the consultation. Other sites performed better, and have been identified as allocations on that basis to meet the residual requirement.
	Development at High Malton and Castle Howard Road (especially 3+ storeys) which would create an unacceptable and detrimental impact on the AONB.	Noted, the open quality of the site, and the trees to contribute to providing an important transition from the AONB to the edge of Malton. The site does contribute to the setting of the AONB.
	Landscape features, including mature trees, agricultural land and other habitats will be lost.	Noted, the open quality of the site, and the trees to contribute to providing an important transition from the AONB to the edge of Malton.
	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	The strategic transport modelling has identified that a Malton-focused scenario of development does increase junction congestion across other junctions.
	Air quality is already poor in areas, new development would only exacerbate this.	The Air Quality Study which compared the Malton-focus and Norton-focus scenarios bring the least increase in air pollution, identified that both schemes were broadly similar in their effects, and that in due course also taking into account that in time vehicle technologies, there will also be a improvement vehicle emissions.
	Struggling sewerage system -would need significant investment, and affect traffic movements- affecting businesses in the town.	Yorkshire water are aware of the Local Plan Strategy, and strategic development aspirations, and are aware of the potential sites and their capacity to link into existing networks.

	Any development should have quick and easy access to the A64, without needing to negotiate residential roads and queue at junctions.	Site assessment looks at a range of considerations including impacts on traffic. The Local Plan Transport modelling work has identified combinations of sites which help to reduce the potential for increased junction congestion on those junctions which are not already congested with traffic. That work concluded that a Norton-focus with the link road ensured that junction capacity could accommodate planned levels of growth.
F. Wilson	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.	No sites have been consulted upon as preferred sites in Ampleforth. This is primarily due to the recently granted scheme at the village, deemed to meet the requirement of the Local Plan Strategy. Sites 616 and 111 (at West End) have also performed poorly through the Site Selection Methodology, This is primarily due to the adverse impact on settlement character/impact on the Conservation Area/ Impact on AONB/NYMNP. The sites are within the AONB, and part of 111 is within the Conservation Area. These areas have now been identified in the Local Plan Sites Document as a Visually Important Undeveloped Area.
L Dodsworth	Object to site 8 for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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 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.	The Highways Authority have not advised the Local Planning Authority that there is a level of development which would cause a conflict with the operation of junctions in the vicinity of the site, including the existing uses and levels of traffic which operate through the village. The Local Planning Authority has received information from the adjacent landowner about the means of access. No proposals have sought to demolish this dwelling. The LPA would concur that this house does make a significant and positive contribution to the street scene.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 148 is the preferred site, remove traffic problems. Would not spoil the village 	<p>Site 148 identifies wider community benefits, but it is also a somewhat larger site than was originally envisaged to be delivered at the Service Villages. Artificially reducing the extent of the site would be likely to threaten the delivery of the wider benefits that have been indicated, but also would make the development more challenging to integrate with the village, based on access being required from the B1257. It is considered that on balance this site performs well, and subject to site-specific considerations- which are identified in the Development Principles.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 635 would also be a good site, and remove traffic problems 	<p>Site 635 is in very close proximity to the private water supply of the Wrestlers/Malton Foods site. Also, the drift geology here is highly transmissive, and as such the Environment Agency considered this would be a highly vulnerable to contamination. Traffic problems experienced in Amotherby, as a result of congestion at school start/finish, would not be resolved solely by a site accessing off the B1257.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 538 - Disagree that the distance of Amotherby School is too far from Swinton, many children already travel from Swinton to school and further afield. 	<p>The isochrones map the distance as a function of time, and are a measurement. Therefore the -- rating could not be amended because it is fact. Amotherby and Swinton they are twinned as a Service village for the fact that they share the School/Shop and so this is identified in the Local Plan Strategy, and in the SSM- it identifies why the accessibility rating is at this level.</p>
<p>W. and L .Saggers</p> <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>	<p>No sites have been consulted upon as preferred sites in Ampleforth. This is primarily due to the recently granted scheme at the village, deemed to meet the requirement of the Local Plan Strategy. Sites 616 and 111 (at West End) have also performed poorly through the Site Selection Methodology, This is primarily due to the adverse impact on settlement character/impact on the Conservation Area/ Impact on AONB/NYMNP. The sites are within the AONB, and part of 111 is within the Conservation Area. These areas have now been identified in the Local Plan Sites Document as a Visually Important Undeveloped Area.</p>

<p>S. Robinson</p>	<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. Productive agricultural sites for pasture, hay and silage. 14% gradient, poor road conditions in winter and makes for difficult driving conditions, an access on the hill would be dangerous. 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. 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. 17 houses for sale in the village. Scheme of c.40 homes. History of planning permission being sought, and refused. The reasons for refusal remain unchanged.</p>	<p>No sites have been consulted upon as preferred sites in Ampleforth. This is primarily due to the recently granted scheme at the village, deemed to meet the requirement of the Local Plan Strategy. Sites 616 and 111 (at West End) have also performed poorly through the Site Selection Methodology, This is primarily due to the adverse impact on settlement character/impact on the Conservation Area/ Impact on AONB/NYMNP. The sites are within the AONB, and part of 111 is within the Conservation Area. These areas have now been identified in the Local Plan Sites Document as a Visually Important Undeveloped Area.</p>
<p>J. Forbes</p>	<p>Object to sites 218 and 249 on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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. · 249 is also a prominent and exposed site · Unacceptable, negative impact on attractive approach to Malton along · Unacceptable impact on traffic: congestion, queuing, air quality issues, particularly at Butcher Corner with the AQMA. · Unacceptable impact on traffic on residential streets. · Noise levels from A64 · 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. 	<p>No sites have been consulted upon as preferred sites in Ampleforth. This is primarily due to the recently granted scheme at the village, deemed to meet the requirement of the Local Plan Strategy. Sites 616 and 111 (at West End) have also performed poorly through the Site Selection Methodology, This is primarily due to the adverse impact on settlement character/impact on the Conservation Area/ Impact on AONB/NYMNP. The sites are within the AONB, and part of 111 is within the Conservation Area. These areas have now been identified in the Local Plan Sites Document as a Visually Important Undeveloped Area.</p>

<p>M. Godwin</p>	<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>	<p>No sites have been consulted upon as preferred sites in Ampleforth. This is primarily due to the recently granted scheme at the village, deemed to meet the requirement of the Local Plan Strategy. Sites 616 and 111 (at West End) have also performed poorly through the Site Selection Methodology, This is primarily due to the adverse impact on settlement character/impact on the Conservation Area/ Impact on AONB/NYMNP. The sites are within the AONB, and part of 111 is within the Conservation Area. These areas have now been identified in the Local Plan Sites Document as a Visually Important Undeveloped Area.</p>
<p>I. Conlan</p>	<p>In considering sites take into account the following criteria, and why sites 218 and 249 are unsuitable:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Site assessment looks at a range of considerations including impacts on traffic. The Strategic transport modelling has identified that a Malton-focused scenario of development does increase junction congestion across other junctions. For direct access to the A64 is not something which is required to meet development requirements. It should be noted that any such scheme would increase traffic movements in the locality.</p> <p>Any decision to implement the package of complementary measures will be made by the Highway Authority. The District Council will work with NYCC to improve cycling and walking within the towns. The Local Planning Authority is aware and supportive of the work on the Neighbourhood Plan which is seeking to improve the physical integration of the towns which makes using the car less attractive.</p> <p>The site selection process has identified the sensitivities in respect of all the sites which have been subjected to the Site Selection Methodology, and that through development and various mitigation measures- some of which are identified as Development Principles- there will be no adverse impact on matters of acknowledged sensitivity, through the use of appropriate mitigation measures.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>The capacity of schools is the responsibility of the Local Education Authority- and discussed with the Local Planning Authority in respect of future needs has been undertaken. The choice of school is also a matter of parental choice, as well as catchment. The Council has discussed the implications of the sites with the County Council and they are satisfied with the proposed allocation of 649 with the land for the school- and the expectation that the school will be delivered on the site through a combination of CIL and wider funding.</p>
<p>On that basis, I object to the sites 218 and 249 on the following grounds.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>· 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.</p>	<p>The planning application considered the planning merits of the specific scheme proposed on the site, and the impact of that proposal. The consideration of the site through the Development Plan process considers (at this stage) to consider the site on more general principles. The site assessment process has identified the sensitivity of the site's capability to affect the setting of the AONB. The Norton site (649) has a significantly less landscape sensitivity.</p>
<p>· 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</p>	<p>Noted. The site selection methodology identified the landscape sensitivities on the site, and it is noted that the wider field which is part of site 249, to the west is particularly prominent.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>Noted. The open fields have landscape sensitivity- but they do not affect/influence the setting of Malton. That said, the sites are prominent and their development would require particular consideration around the scale of the development, and any landscaping.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>The strategic transport modelling has identified that a Malton-focus would have a greater impact on junction capacity. Butcher Corner's junction capacity will remain at capacity due to the role of the junction in traffic movements round the towns. A Norton-focus will allow junction capacity to accommodate planned levels of development.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>The strategic transport modelling has identified that a Malton-focus would have a greater impact on junction capacity. Butcher Corner's junction capacity will remain at capacity due to the role of the junction in traffic movements round the towns. A Norton-focus will allow junction capacity to accommodate planned levels of development.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> noise issues: the sites experience high levels of noise from the A64 that break noise guidelines for residential development. 	<p>The noise from the A64 is an important acoustic consideration in respect of amenity considerations for prospective residents, and any proposals where a noise survey has indicated concerns would be required to reduce land take, use noise attenuation measures, and not consider the use of in-house technologies which restrict the reasonable enjoyment of the property.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site is unable to deliver affordable housing in line with council guidelines. 	<p>The planning application proposed a level of affordable housing which was not capable of being considered plan-compliant. The Council has not received assurances that an acceptable level of provision can be achieved.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>The Council is both aware of the flood risk on site 324, which removes part of the site from consideration, but also the surface water issues, and that any proposal would need to ensure that run-off rates are at least to greenfield rates or reduced further. Yorkshire Water has advised the Council that the smells are a result of transit movement, and that there is no issue with movement of sewerage, although capacity will need to increase with development, and that is factored into the rolling 5-year capital programme. This site has now been identified as a Visually Important Undeveloped Area due to the impact development would have on the setting of Old Malton, the Conservation Area of Old Malton and the setting of the Grade I Listed St. Mary's church.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>Noted, and acknowledged that the sites on western Norton would have to pass through the centre of Norton, or cross the river/rail crossing, with consequent impacts on the movement of traffic and junction capacity.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>Smaller sites still cumulatively generate the same amount of traffic, their location can influence the impact on air quality, without the ability to secure key infrastructure requirements such as land for a school.</p>

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.

The Local Plan Sites modelling work has been available to view since the summer of 2016 and the Air Quality Modelling since May 2017. The Air Quality Assessment work has identified that either a Malton Focus or Norton Focus had a similar impact on Air Quality, which will improve with technological advances in the fleet. The modelling work is not a precise assessment of each junction and the consequences of traffic movements individually from each site. It tests different scenarios, and concluded that a Norton-Focus would ensure that junction capacity could accommodate the planned growth over the Plan period.

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 Local Plan Sites Document is second part of the Ryedale Plan, and is guided by the principles set out in the Local Plan Strategy (LPS). The LPS is wholly supportive of the principle of affordable housing provision in rural areas, when there is need for such housing identified, and it is well related to existing villages. The lack of such provisions is in part due to landowners waiting for the outcome of the Local Plan Sites Document- to see if they can achieve market housing on the site (and ensure a better return). The ten Service Villages identified in the LPS (for Market and Affordable Housing) have usually three of the facilities you have identified, or share such services with a proximal settlement- had more villages met the requirements; this number would have increased. The Council's People team, advises that a significant proportion of affordable housing is required in the Towns, because it is simply more affordable to live there, and this is where people want to be to access services and facilities. Furthermore, even significant housing schemes in a rural area do not in themselves either improve provision of wider community facilities, nor bring about sufficient population to make such services viable. This was evidenced through the approach of the previous Local Plan, and is in part due to the significant costs of service delivery compounded by a dispersed rural area. There are also statutory requirements to consider in respect of the presumption of preservation and enhancement of designated heritage assets: larger scale developments at many of Ryedale's villages will have a detrimental impact on the setting, appearance and character of such areas. Such issues will need to be considered in the scoping of a future Local Plan for Ryedale, and are not part of the scope of the Local Plan Sites Document.

. 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.

Air Quality is a major public health concern. Government guidance is that a range of sites should be considered for meeting development needs in an area, and in terms of the performance of the Plan-that has occurred. The Local Plan Strategy is the adopted development plan, and has moved away from a previous pattern of dispersal. This was because such an approach had meant increased reliance on travelling by car to access services and facilities in the market towns, lack of affordable housing provision, the need for which is greatest in the market towns to reduce the costs of accessing jobs, facilities and services. Larger sites have more capacity to provide wider community benefits and infrastructure that are simply not possible with smaller sites, which, given the housing requirement in the plan, cumulatively still have an impact on services and infrastructure. The Local Planning Authority have now identified the configuration of sites for allocation, which include a large site submission, which confirms delivery of a plan-compliant level of affordable housing, provides the land for the school; which do not increase air quality concerns in the AQA; and through the Local Plan Sites Document set out a policy for the implementation of vehicle charging technology capability within the build-programme of sites; and measures are being taken through organisations out-with the Local Planning Authority to reduce air pollution in Malton by applying the complementary measures. Further improvements will come as vehicle emission reduction technology improves (and when diesel cars are phased out) this will also improve air quality.

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 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 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

The Local Plan Sites Document is second part of the Ryedale Plan, and is guided by the principles set out in the Local Plan Strategy (LPS). The LPS is wholly supportive of the principle of affordable housing provision in rural areas, when there is need for such housing identified, and it is well related to existing villages. The ten Service Villages identified in the LPS (for Market and Affordable Housing) have usually three of the facilities you have identified, or share such services with a proximal settlement. The Place Team advises that a significant proportion of affordable housing is required in the Towns, because it is simply more affordable to live there. Furthermore, even significant housing schemes in a rural area do not in themselves neither improve provision of wider community facilities, nor bring about sufficient population to make such services viable. The previous Local Plan had such an approach.

<p>STA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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. <p>These measures were modelled as being implemented, but they have not been undertaken, and I believe they will not be undertaken.</p> <p>Regarding AQMA at Butcher Corner, it would appear the Council in breach of EU laws, and that further land allocations will exacerbate this.</p>	<p>(Submission included material which was submitted and considered as part of the Local Plan Strategy. This material is not being reconsidered.) Responses are provided to specific representations made in response to the Sites Consultation.</p>
<p>Development since 2011 in Malton:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Broughton Road is included, since the site commenced in 2012.</p>
<p>Had the Local Plan Strategy being Examined with allocations, the weaknesses of those policies would have been readily apparent.</p>	<p>The soundness of the plan was tested and examined.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>Examination in Public is not where cross-examination takes place. That said the Inspector is within their rights to ask questions about the methodology employed in evidence production. They also read through a considerable amount of evidence prior to the EiP in order to establish the process for examination. Material submitted during the hearing sessions is at the Inspector's discretion, the material produced was not provided to the Local Planning Authority as part of the Publication of the plan.</p>
<p>Malton and Norton had jointly prepared an interim Neighbourhood Plan. Tested by a full public consultation. Central to this Plan were:</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>support for a smaller store and ancillary development at the Market Place</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · opposition to a new superstore on the WSCP (Wentworth street Car 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · No more than 1000 houses from 2011 	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted. The LMS is identified in the Town Centre Commercial Limits.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority has conducted on-going discussions with both Yorkshire Water, the Environment Agency, Internal Drainage Board; and the Local Lead Flood Authority in respect of matters regarding sewerage capacity, water quality, and surface water drainage, and flooding. This has been considered on a site -by site basis</p>
<p>Whilst I believe that the Plan is far from satisfactory, it is adopted, and so</p>	<p>noted.</p>
<p>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:</p>	<p>This was produced for the evidence base of the Local Plan Strategy. A new Transport modelling exercise has been undertaken to test development scenarios.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Change in signal timings at Butcher Corner; 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Remove one traffic lane onto Castlegate approach to the junction at 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · A Vehicle ban on Railway St and Norton Road 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · A HGV ban on vehicles crossing the level crossing at Norton- save 	
<p>These measures were modelled as being implemented, but they have not been undertaken, and I believe they will not be undertaken.</p>	<p>The Highways Authority are working towards implementing the complementary measures</p>

<p>Regarding AQMA at Butcher Corner, it would appear the Council in breach of EU laws, and that further land allocations will exacerbate this.</p>	<p>A direct link between development and air quality exacerbation is not present. The Local Planning Authority has undertaken transport modelling of different development scenarios, and from this air quality assessment to ensure that Air Quality implications are fully considered, and that an AQA for the site as part of any planning application would be required. The findings concluded that whilst a Norton- focus scenario resulted in better junction capacity, but the air quality remained similar for both schemes, but that over the Plan period air quality will improve.</p>
<p>Development since 2011 in Malton:</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The land supply is for 1800 dwellings, the plan figure is 1500 dwellings, and whilst the plan is clear that the figure should not be treated as a ceiling, there is a mechanism in the plan which would restrict district wide oversupply beyond 250 homes per year.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The development at Broughton Road is included.</p>
<p>Since April 2012 80 further dwellings have been permitted at Broughton Rise, with 300 houses at Showfield Lane.</p>	<p>These schemes are netted off the residual amount.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The residential development is still plan-compliant in principle, under the operation of SP1 and SP2.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>All the permission granted permission have been subject to their own individual transport assessments, and been included in the recent Local Plan Transport Modelling as either commitments or completed schemes.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority is not aware of a subsequent planning application for any development at Wentworth Street Car Park</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>All the permission granted permission have been subject to their own individual transport assessments, and been included in the recent Local Plan Transport Modelling, and in terms of broad locations were considered through the Strategic Transport Modelling.</p>
<p>Credibility of the Ryedale Plan</p>	
<p>The Plan's credibility has been undermined by:</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · "Enabling development" which has planning permission to support the move of the Cattle Market, which does not seem to be progressing; 	<p>The residential development is still plan-compliant in principle.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The District Council' own disregard for Ryedale Plan in regarding to WSCP; 	<p>The Ryedale Local Plan Strategy, identifies the Northern Arc as an area of opportunity for further town centre uses</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Failure of the County Council to put into effect the "Complementary Measures" . Which were intended to be part of the Brambling Fields project; 	<p>The County Council has delayed the complementary measures, but that does not effect the operation of the Local Plan Strategy in dealing with applications</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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 an cannot escape after the flood doors in the river have closed. 	<p>The Local Planning Authority has conducted on-going discussions with both Yorkshire Water, the Environment Agency, and the Local Lead Flood Authority in respect of matters regarding sewerage capacity, water quality, and surface water drainage, and flooding. This has been considered on a site -by site basis.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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. 	<p>The AQMA evidence formed part of the evidence base of the Local Plan Strategy.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority would strongly disagree with this statement, in due course the Local Plan Strategy will be reviewed, but the plan is NPPF compliant, has a robust housing figure (with support of an up to date SHMA), and the site selection process is following through the principles of the LPS, and Sustainability Appraisal of the sites.</p>
<p>Making sense of the Ryedale Plan in terms of Site Selection</p>	
<p>Current planned development is likely to strangle the town in terms of land drainage, sewerage and highways congestion.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority has conducted on-going discussions with both Yorkshire Water, the Environment Agency, the Internal Drainage Board, and the Local Lead Flood Authority in respect of matters regarding sewerage capacity, water quality, and surface water drainage, and flooding. This has been considered on a site -by site basis.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority have a policy framework to consider the location of retail activity, and frame the extent of convenience and comparison retailing. Retailers play a significant role as they determine where they consider there is sufficient demand for their product.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Plan transport modelling has identified that a Malton-focused scenario of development does increase junction congestion across other junctions. There are a range of considerations to take into account when considering site for development, impacts on the road network are an important consideration.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Changing traffic movements and restriction of access directly is a matter for the Highway Authority. The Local Planning Authority must be satisfied that individually and cumulatively traffic movements do not increase junction waiting times.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority has conducted on-going discussions with both Yorkshire Water, the Environment Agency, Internal Drainage Board and the Local Lead Flood Authority in respect of matters regarding sewerage capacity, water quality, and surface water drainage, and flooding. This has been considered on a site -by site basis. The Strategic transport modelling has identified that a Malton-focused scenario of development does increase junction congestion across other junctions. However, a requirement such as this places long-term pressure on particular parts of the settlement, with unintended consequences for the growth of the towns.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted. The sites on the east of Norton would have better access to the A64. The Local Plan transport modelling has identified that a Malton-focused scenario of development does increase junction congestion across other junctions. There are a range of considerations to take into account when considering site for development, impacts on the road network are an important consideration.</p>
<p>I believe that local District Councillors favour this site, and would therefore support it being put forward.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Employment Development</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The relationship between quantum of land supply for housing, and that for employment is not proportional. The employment land supply figure reflects the demand for business to be located close to key transport nodes.</p>
<p>Retail Development</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Wentworth Street Car Park is identified within the Northern Arc, and area identified as providing opportunities for town centre uses.</p>

	I have submitted a joint report with Paul Beanland, prepared for the EiP. I dispute other figures which have been submitted since then.	Noted. This was considered at the Examination of the Local Plan Strategy
G. Goforth	Object to sites 148, 181, 635 and 636 as being "Ribbon development. "	Noted. Ribbon development is single depth, and is not a type of development which is considered appropriate in land efficiency, design and ensuring settlements maintain their identify in current planning policy. In looking at development proposals, the site would be expected to form an integrated and cohesive form of 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.	Noted. Site 8 has been identified as having particular sensitivities with noise.
J. Harrison	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.	The Local Planning Authority has welcomed comments on sites since 2009. Consultation events for planning policy production are necessary to help manage the production of the documents, which is often over a considerable time frame. The Sites Consultation in 2015 was followed in 2016 by a Consultation on VIUAs, representing non-formal stage of consultation. The Local Planning Authority amended the Local Development Scheme 2015, and prior to Publication, amended the scheme again to reflect the timeframe for planning policy preparation, and for the Local Plan Sites Document, this is November 2017 for Publication and for Submission March 2018 and Adoption December 2018.

<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>The application of the Site Selection Methodology is, by virtue of its nature, a more objective appraisal process. It does not indicate how a site should be developed. This site now has obtained planning permission, and is under construction.</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>	<p>The Local Planning Authority was aware of the concerns which were raised about the planning application submitted in 2015. These concerns around access and design needed to be resolved. This does not prevent the consideration of the site as a allocation for housing land, although it means that further information is required to satisfy the LPA that the site is deliverable and developable. The matters were addressed in the submission of subsequent application.</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.

The consultation undertaken in 2009 was the largest planning consultation event ever undertaken by the Local Planning Authority. For 2015 sites consultation the forward planning team did: prior to the consultation e-mailed the Parish Councils on the 10 September, stating that we would be undertaking consultation in October-November, concerning the work on assessing sites for allocation, and that if they could ensure that their meeting programmes would be able to provide a response to consultation. Sent over 1500 letters and emails on the 2 November to bring awareness of the consultation, this included statutory consultees, other organisations, including Parish Councils and any members of the public who had requested to be added to the consultation database. . Access to the material prepared included all the documents being available on line, and at the District Council Offices. Key documents were also available throughout the consultation at the Libraries in Helmsley, Kirkbymoorside, Pickering, Malton and Norton within their opening hours. For the reasons outlined in the SCI it is not possible to notify each household within Ryedale of Planning Policy consultation. We also sent out a press release to the various press organisations, disappointingly the only coverage was made in 'The Mercury' which was on the 9 December. . We notified the Parish Council of the consultation on the 2 November, and a few days later, we sent a printed poster out to each Parish Clerk and asked them to display the posters about the sites consultation on public notice boards. The Local Planning Authority does not have the resources to post notices at each of the Parish Notice boards, we rely on the respective Parish Councils supporting their communities in making responses by posting the material we send them. Responses to the site have been provided by the Parish Council

<p>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>	<p>The Local Planning Authority is aware of the concerns which were raised about the planning application submitted in 2015. These concerns around access and design needed to be resolved. This does not prevent the consideration of the site as a allocation for housing land, although it means that further information is required to satisfy the LPA that the site is deliverable and developable. The site has now obtained planning permission.</p>
<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · We responded to the individual and asked how they considered the process for consultation could be improved. As result of the response received we identified that we would consider: · Notifying those people who had commented on any recent planning application which concerned a preferred site · As part of future consultations, put site notices up for the proposed sites to increase the local community's awareness. These do have, however, considerable resource implications. <p>The planning permission consideration process and the production of the Development Plan which contains allocations of land are two separate matters. This is firstly, in terms of matters of process and legal requirements. But it is also in how the sites are judged in terms of planning matters: a planning application considers the merits of the specific development proposals of the site alone, against the Policies in the Development Plan. The Development Plan Process comparatively looks at sites in terms of their principle for development, and whilst it will of course consider matters of detail such as access, and heritage matters, residential amenity, flood risk (and others), it asks can these matters be appropriately addressed? The identified allocations of land are accompanied by a list of key development principles. Allocation of land does not automatically confer the granting of planning permission. Planning permission must still be obtained. The site in question now has planning permission.</p>

<p>Malton and Norton Town Councils</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.</p> <p>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>The District Council has been working with the County Council as Highway Authority to bring the complementary measures into effect. The site assessment work has engaged Yorkshire Water who are satisfied that the level of development has been factored into their rolling capital programme, and they will be considering any site specific mitigation as part of the on-going plan work, and those sites subject to allocation, the resulting planning applications. The Council has commissioned Local Plan Transport Modelling, and Air Quality Modelling which has identified which sites perform best in terms of junction capacity, and that in terms of Air Quality, there will be a net improvement in air quality irrespective of a Malton-focus or Norton-focus.</p>
<p>Kirkbymoorside Town Council</p>	<p>Reiterate objection to inclusion of site 10, due to impact on the sports field.</p> <p>Site 102 would provide affordable housing</p> <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.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>This was one of the reasons why a mixture of sites were considered for option 2 because these sites (201 and 345) (431 was not identified) were considered to have a reduced accessibility compared to other sites to the east and west of the settlement (the A170 providing a barrier to southern sites).</p>

Support 622 for employment land for industrial/business activity	This site has not been taken forward due to failure regarding the sequential test. Developments have meet the outstanding requirement at Kirkbymoorside.
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.	Improved crossings can be made a requirement to improve the accessibility credentials of a scheme, if required. It is noted that sites 201,345 and 431 are, by virtue of their distance and elevation, more likely to have residents who use vehicular access. This was why the Local Planning Authority considered that if the option 1 was not deliverable or developable, option 2 would need a mixture of the above-mentioned sites with site 156, a site which has good levels of accessibility.
Strongly discourage the conversion of industrial sites to residential development.	Noted. The area which contains the Sylatech site is not an industrial estate per se, it is a long-standing industrial site for a specific user. The Local Planning Authority has been unable to confirm the relocation of the business. The Rack Systems scheme has met the residual requirement, but other proposals could be considered within the context of SP6 of the Local Plan Strategy.
Preferred sites for development: Site 156- 30 houses Sites 56 and 467 (some developments around Keldholme)	Noted, however the Local Planning Authority identified in the Local Plan Strategy that coalescence with Keldholme would not be considered appropriate, which sites 56 and 467 would lead to.
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.	Acknowledge that these matters are important in ensuring that new developments can provide both opportunities for recreation, and ensuring that the quality of the built environment is enhanced. These elements will be considered through the Development Principles and Local Plan Strategy.

<p>Sport England</p>	<p>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, 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.</p>	<p>Noted. As noted by Sport England, no sites are proposed on existing sport facilities. Also, no preferred sites (or option sites) are adjacent sports pitches (including those for cricket). However, given the size of some sites, the need for formal sports pitch provision may be required and as such the need to consider, and prevent ball strike nuisance will need to be addressed.</p>
<p>The Coal Authority</p>	<p>No specific comments to make.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Network Rail</p>	<p>Level Crossings Safety, reliability and efficiency of the rail infrastructure are of paramount importance to Network Rail. We are working with Local Planning Authorities to reduce risks associated with crossings, either through closure, or improvements in connection with new developments. 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. 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 nay mitigation funded as part of the development. Particularly for sites in Malton and Norton.</p>	<p>No sites, either as preferred or option sites, require absolute access across the railway track at a level crossing. Drivers may chose to use the single, established, County Bridge crossing between Malton and Norton this has been explored through the submission of a Transport Assessment for Site Options in Malton and Norton. The Norton Focus ensures that the capacity of junctions are able to accommodate planned levels of growth. Junctions at/over capacity remain so.</p>

<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>	<p>The Transport Modelling work was undertaken to take into account crossings, as was the Air Quality Assessment. The Local Validation Risk requires the submission of Transport Assessments on schemes which would materially increase traffic movements. It is not considered necessary to add this wording into the Local Plan Sites Document, when such matters are considered by technical evidence produced at the Development Plan Stage, and when planning applications are submitted.</p>
<p>Developer contributions</p>	
<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'.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>As part of the production of the Development Plan, including the Local Plan Sites Document, and more importantly the Local Plan Strategy, we have consulted with Network Rail to allow observations on the option choices for Malton and Norton, the settlements with the principal links to the railway line. The District is served by a single station (Malton) in Norton. The infrastructure items mentioned in this response are not specific to the impacts of specific development, but general improvements. The Local Planning Authority operates a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charge, and therefore, collection for strategic infrastructure projects and improvements will be expected to be through CIL, as set out in Policy SP22 of the Local Plan Strategy and the Regulation 123 list. The District Council is responsible for the disbursement of any CIL Revenue, and the setting of the scope of the monies generated. As such they would need to understand how the proposed development generates an impact and what infrastructure is sought to address that impact. This is so that decisions around how CIL is spent reflect the most urgent and significant priorities, in conjunction with the other infrastructure requirements that the District Council considers are important infrastructure.</p>

	<p>The Policy and/or supporting Guidance should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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. 	<p>The Council is focusing on producing the Development Plan. Regulations require that commuted sums cannot be collected separately, and must be through the CIL charge, which is fixed.</p>
Pickering Town Council	<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority has been advised by the Highway Authority that satisfactory access is achievable. As part of potential allocation of this site the traffic movements will be identified and discussed with The Highways Authority in greater detail.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted, the Local Planning Authority is aware that of the option choices for Pickering, this is the most visually sensitive of the sites. We have asked the site submitter for clarification on the sites deliverability and developability. This site has now been discounted based on sensitivities and lack of need.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted. The Eastern Limb has now been deleted.</p>
North York Moors National Park Authority	<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>Noted.</p>
	Site Selection Methodology	

<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>Noted.</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>Noted</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>Noted, and welcomed.</p>
<p>Pickering</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>Acknowledge that concerning site 650, the eastern limb would represent a discordant feature, and as part of the consultation document the limb was identified as being of concern and that its removal would ensure that the site could progress as a preferred allocation. The Site Submitter has responded to those concerns and deleted the Eastern Limb.</p>
<p>Thornton le Dale</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>Noted, Taking into account recent planning permissions at Hurrell Lane, we do not consider that a further site for residential development is necessary. Many of the sites submitted on land around Thornton le Dale performed poorly in the Site Selection Methodology.</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>Noted, and acknowledged</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>This site was discounted due to HSE Advise Against Development</p>
<p>Ampleforth</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>	<p>No sites have been consulted upon as preferred sites in Ampleforth. This is primarily due to the recently granted scheme at the village, deemed to meet the requirement of the Local Plan Strategy. Sites 616 and 111 (at West End) and 632 have also performed poorly through the Site Selection Methodology, This is primarily due to the adverse impact on settlement character/impact on the Conservation Area/ Impact on AONB/NYMNP. The sites are within the AONB, and part of 111 is within the Conservation Area. These sites have now formed part of the Visually Important Undeveloped Area. Regarding site 632, the Local Planning Authority would be concerned about the merging of Ampleforth Village with the Ampleforth Abbey complex, which could occur through any ribbon/linear development.</p>
<p>Duty to Cooperate</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.	Noted
Leavening Parish Council	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".	Noted. Site 45 is already in operation through existing business activities. As such there is no requirement in planning policy to define the site in policy terms as a site allocation.
Selby District Council	No comments to make but would like to be kept up to date with all future progress on your local plan.	Noted.
Allerston and Wilton Parish Council	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.	Allerston and Wilton are not in the Service Village tier but in the 'Other Villages' tier. The Local Plan Strategy also sets out, in Policy SP2, how residential development will be treated in principle in the 'Other Villages'. This policy provides scope for small scale, limited development meeting local needs, subject to a Local Needs Occupancy Condition. Exception sites may also be another scenario where residential development may come forward.
Natural England (initial and secondary comments)	Malton and Norton 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.	Concerning sites in Malton and Norton, the Local Planning Authority would like to clarify that in the absence of detailed information for the Screening Assessment as part of the HRA the study concluded that Likely Significant Effects could not be ruled out. Not that there were Likely Significant Effects. As such the sites are to be subjected to Appropriate Assessment on that basis, through the submission of detailed information concerning potential impacts on the River Derwent as set out in the HRA screening. The Appropriate Assessment confirmed no likely significant effects.

Second response: we have used the incorrect terminology in our letter. We should have stated "Likely Significant Effects could not be ruled out".	Noted.
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.	Acknowledged. The proximity of the site to the AONB is a particularly significant consideration concerning the principle of the site to be considered as capable of being progressed from a option site, to a preferred site. This sensitivity was identified in the Site Selection Methodology. Based on the indicative design scheme and landscape visual impact assessment prepared as part of the planning application that was recently considered on the site, adverse impact on the setting of the AONB could not be satisfactorily mitigated. However, the LPA advised the site submitter that further material would need to be submitted satisfactorily mitigate the impact. That information has not been forthcoming.
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.	The site has not been taken forward as a proposed allocation. Other sites performed better in the site assessment process.
Site 218 (108/281) is adjacent to the Malton Bypass cuttings SINC. This should be assessed in the Malton and Norton full SSM	Noted, and acknowledged, this has been considered through the SSM, the A64 cutting site would not be affected by development on adjacent land.
Second response- we are pleased to see this has been acknowledged.	Noted.
Pickering	
Site 116 - Newtondale Haugh and Gundale Slacks SSSI are 1.5 Km from this site, and are within an Impact Risk Zone	This site was proposed as an Option in the consultation. Further information has been provided to the Local Planning Authority about the availability/deliverability/developability of the site, but not in respect of particular sensitivities. The Local Planning Authority has not taken this site forward as an allocation based on sensitivities and lack of need.
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.	Noted.

<p>Site 347- Newtondale Haugh and Gundale Slacks SSSI are 1.5 Km from this site, and are within an Impact Risk Zone</p>	<p>At 1.5km distance there would be no direct impacts on the SSSI. Both valleys have public rights of way access through parts of them with part of Newtondale is owned by YWT as a reserve. Recreational pressure is a potential indirect feature, but there is a network of paths. There is a community park which is under development on Whitby Road, opposite the site and there will be a need to ensure that open space walking activities is made available on the site.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>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,</p>	<p>Acknowledged. The Site Submitter has now deleted the eastern limb, and the site is identified as an allocation for employment land</p>
<p>Second response: Please to see that this. The impacts of this option would be greatly reduced.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Sites 200/387 (205) - No comments to make</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Kirkbymoorside</p>	
<p>Sites: 156,201,259,265,345,454,622- no comments to make on these sites</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Service Villages- preferred sites</p>	<p>The Service Villages were the only residential sites to be identified as preferred sites, the other housing sites are options to be tested, and from which the residual housing requirement will be met.</p>

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.	Noted. The SINC qualifies under semi natural neutral grassland scoring. The Glebe does not qualify by itself and St Helen's church yard is an active churchyard, development to the north would not impact on the management of the churchyard and therefore the biodiversity of the SINC.
Secondary Response: Thank you for the clarification. It is welcomed and should be included in the sites consultation document	Noted
430 (Slingsby), 638 (Rillington) 8 (Amotherby) No comments to make	Noted.
Impact Risk Zones IRZs referred to in this letter can be viewed on the magic website	The Local Planning Authority has already been evaluating the impacts of sites on designated sites, but we will evaluate any preferred/option site against these Impact Zones to demonstrate in a number of ways that there are no adverse impacts on sites of acknowledged importance. The Impact Risk Zones are a test of whether a proposal would require consultation from Natural England, as it stands all preferred option and preferred sites have been considered by Natural England.
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.	Where mitigation is required, then development principles identified in the context of specific sites will be identified. Evidence will be required to demonstrate any impacts, and mitigation measures accordingly. The SSM does identify any sensitivities which will need to be taken into account. It will be updated as further information is made available.
Secondary response: We welcome this approach.	
Soils and Agricultural Land Quality	

<p>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: <i>"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."</i> Consequently we would request that the above policy is followed.</p>	<p>Noted. The assessment process is undertaken on the basis of size of site (which is identified at the start of the SSM). It can be added into the specific question response to improve clarity. In the Local Planning Authority's consultation Document is clear that particularly for Malton and Norton best and most versatile agricultural land will be required to be used to meet the requirements of the Local Plan Strategy. The Local Plan Strategy, adopted in 2013 identified that it was not possible to avoid the use of greenfield sites in meeting its development requirements (paragraph 3.7), but that the Local Planning Authority would prioritise the use of areas of poorer quality land (as required by the NPPF) where possible. No land is grade 1, c.26 ha is grade 2, and because of the inability to separate grade 3 and into 3a and 3b on the Magic there will be a proportion of sites within 3a. Paragraph 7.27 outlines that the loss of BMV land is managed and avoided when balanced against other sustainability considerations which will need to be taken into account in guiding new development. In a rural area such as Ryedale with a paucity of sustainably located Brownfield sites which are deliverable and developable, in order for the deliver of any strategy which involves the release of land for development there will be a loss of BMVL. This loss of land is adjacent to the District's most significant settlements, because these are in settlement Hierarchy identified as being the appropriate locations for new development. The Local Planning Authority has acknowledged that loss, and in striking the balance, those larger sites will also bring wider community benefits including the delivery of affordable housing, open space, and bring wider benefits including Green Infrastructure. Also, in clarifying the response, you have referred to sites in Market Towns as being preferred, this is not the case, they are options, and from this the residential requirement will be met. The Local Planning Authority will where possible prioritise Brownfield land, indeed the preferred employment allocation at Pickering (site 650) is a Brownfield site, as is a site at Kirkbymoorside (site 265)</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted. This will be undertaken through the Sustainability Appraisal in the SSM and in the settlement-specific background papers.</p>

<p>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,</p>	<p>Concerning sites in Malton and Norton, the Local Planning Authority would like to clarify that in the absence of detailed information for the Screening Assessment as part of the HRA the study concluded that Likely Significant Effects could not be ruled out. Not that there were Likely Significant Effects. As such the sites are have been subjected to Appropriate Assessment on that basis, through the submission of detailed information concerning potential impacts on the River Derwent as set out in the HRA screening. As a consequence of this the Local Planning Authority have now confirmed that based on mitigation measures identified there are no likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites.</p>
<p>Second response: we have used the incorrect terminology in our letter. We should have stated "Likely Significant Effects could not be ruled out".</p>	
<p>Also note that links in paragraph 1.4 do not work, so they should be updated.</p>	<p>Noted. They will be updated.</p>
<p>Sustainability Appraisal Methodology Update</p>	
<p><u>Landscape Character Assessment</u></p>	
<p>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).</p>	<p>The Site Selection Methodology applies explicitly Landscape Character Studies which cover the District. The Local Planning Authority would contend that whilst the assessments were prepared at different times, they remain fit for purpose, and provide a robust consideration framework for considering where the key 'drivers for change' are : allocations of employment land and residential land at the edge of the Market Towns and Service Villages. The Landscape Character Assessments used will be referenced in table 2, and a brought together in the Special Qualities Study which was endorsed by the Inspector in the Examination of the Local Plan Strategy.</p>
<p>Secondary response: We welcome the use an inclusion of LCAs to inform the SA.</p>	

<p>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;"</p>	<p>This is set out in the Local Plan Strategy, in policy SP14 adopted in 2013.</p>
<p>Secondary response: We note your comments and are happy for priority habitats to be dealt with through policy SP14.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority is concerned by the view that Sustainability Framework objectives should be changed at this stage in the production of the Ryedale Plan, particularly from a strategic perspective. The Sustainability Appraisal process for considering allocations has been an on-going process since the adoption of the Ryedale Plan- Local Plan Strategy. It is important to remember that The Strategic approach to development is set out in the Local Plan Strategy, which was adopted in September 2013. Consultation with Natural England in 2014 identified that whilst the overall strategic objectives remain relevant, a finer grained, SA framework would be needed to deal with settlement/site specific matters. This has been undertaken. The inferred weighting is not undertaken on a numeric or cumulative basis, and it is so defined that reasonable alternatives can be considered.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>The SA process has collated the findings of the SA, but it is important to remember that the options are also considered in the SSM- the operational element of the SA for the sites, and so any significant detrimental impacts are considered in the SSM, and so in the testing of Options in SA, significant adverse impacts have been ruled out.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The SSM process considers iteratively whether there is likely to be a significant effect on a site of biodiversity value . None of the preferred sites are capable of having any adverse effect on site /species of acknowledged importance. it identifies whether mitigation is necessary/capable of being implemented. The option sites at Malton and Norton will tested through the Appropriate Assessment, through the submission of detailed information about the nature of proposals, and how impacts will avoided, and if necessary mitigated. The Appropriate Assessment has confirmed No Likely Significant Effects. The SA of the Sites Assessment and Policies has also tested alternative options.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This has been considered through the SSM, and the Habitat Regulations Screening Assessment.</p>
<p>Overview of the Sustainability Appraisal Commentary concerning the</p>	
<p>No comments to make.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

East Riding of Yorkshire Council	<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>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<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>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<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>Noted</p>

Sheriff Hutton Parish Council	<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>	<p>It is noted that the Parish Council object to the principle of the site. However, the matters referred to relate more to the withdrawn planning application. The Site Selection Methodology has considered the site in principle. This is notwithstanding that there are two sensitivities concerned with the site which are the Grade I listed church adjacent to the site, and the narrow access to the site. However, these two matters the Local Planning Authority considers can be appropriately considered. Planning permission has now been obtained on the site.</p>
	<p>Consider that site 70- Land East of Cottage Farm should be investigated further.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority corresponded with site submitter for site 70, with no reply. The site has now been submitted again, with a different agent, and whilst the Local Planning Authority have not identified the site as having potential- concerns identified through the SSM that the site does not relate well to the existing village. Nor has there been the submission of any information about the site's development.</p>
Amotherby Parish Council	<p>1. What are your views on the Council's preferred sites?</p> <p>· 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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority welcomes the views of the Parish Council, and the concerns raised by the Council. These concerns have informed the Site Selection Methodology, and highlight the need for further clarification on matters around access, heritage assets, noise and density of development. Clarification has been sought and received in respect of a noise assessment which has identified serious concerns regarding the resulting residential amenity of the prospective residents. This has lead to site 8 not being considered as an allocation.</p>

<p>· 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.</p>	<p>The Highway Authority had no concerns regarding the provision of the access. This site is no longer identified as an allocation, this is around noise issues.</p>
<p>· We have some doubts about access to this site being satisfactorily achievable. We believe that part of the logical potential access between Zetechnics 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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority has received information from this landowner about the means of access from their land- it is not established whether the site submitter is in agreement to use the land. This site is no longer identified as an allocation, this is around noise issues.</p>
<p>· 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.</p>	<p>The submitted scheme material is available to be viewed. The site selection methodology and site considerations in general are informed by evidence. Where information is submitted this informs the assessment process, and it can influence the sites' consideration, positively, or raise concerns and then further information is required to establish what, if any mitigation measures are required. Submissions have been made in terms of indicative schemes. These are publically available on request, and are now digitised and available on line. The evidence provided needs to be sufficient to establish the principle, but if concerns are raised by the nature of the material, then this could affect the site's ability to progress.</p>

<p>· 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”.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority acknowledge that for many sites there will be a degree of adverse impact, because through the development there will be a loss of a currently open field. The SSM identified that there is a sensitivity. This site is no longer identified as an allocation, this is around noise issues.</p>
<p>• This site will affect the setting of the Grade 2 Listed church, churchyard and cemetery. (Qs 10 & 12)</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority has sought to obtain observations on the setting of the Listed Church. The SSM identified the sensitivities of the Church, and as such further information is required to enhance understanding of this issue. This site is no longer identified as an allocation, this is around noise issues.</p>
<p>· 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)</p>	<p>Department for Culture Media and Sport are responsible for listing buildings/features through Historic England. No proposals have sought the demolition of the property, which the Local Planning Authority acknowledge in the SSM that this house does make a significant and positive contribution to the street scene. This site is no longer identified as an allocation, this is around noise issues.</p>
<p>· 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.</p>	<p>The rating system used in the Site Selection Methodology does not confer by the presence of a red response that that per se would discount the site from further consideration. It very much depends on the matter in question, and through the submission of further information this rating could change. This site is no longer identified as an allocation, this is around noise issues.</p>
<p>· 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)</p>	<p>The Environment Agency has advised that the propensity for the contamination varies across site 8, with the southern component of the site being more vulnerable, and the northern part less so. A function of both distance and drift geology. Accordingly the site has a lower vulnerability than other sites such as 148 and 635. It is still identified as being a (--) due to the varying sensitivity- which will need to be considered. This site is no longer identified as an allocation, this is around noise issues.</p>
<p>Please also see extracts from our “Submission to RDC” below.</p>	
<p>PC comments Site 8 – Station Farm field,(pg 2)</p>	<p>This site is no longer identified as an allocation, this is around noise issues.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>The Farmhouse is not indicated as being demolished, but outbuilding are proposed to be demolished. This site is no longer identified as an allocation, this is around noise issues.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority is aware that BATA represents a amenity consideration, and a noise assessment is required to evaluate the impact of noise across the site. The SSM identified that the presence of BATA could have significant amenity considerations, but that these could be appropriately addressed. A noise assessment has been produced which has identified that noise levels would be adverse, and the proposed mitigation measures are not reasonable as they do not allow a person to normally occupy their home in a rural situation.</p>
<p>3. The whole site is too large and if all used would extend the village too far east.</p>	<p>The site is contained by existing development, and at an indicative yield of 19 units this is not an unreasonable level of development. However, the site submission information has nearly doubled this, which concerns Officers. This site is no longer identified as an allocation, this is around noise issues.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted, and acknowledged. This information will be passed onto the site submitter to respond to. Land instability matters will need to be considered and addressed as part of any planning application, but are usually considered in detail at the building regulations stage. This site is no longer identified as an allocation, this is around noise issues.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Officers have asked for further information to be provided about the access. This site is no longer identified as an allocation, this is around noise issues.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>The presence of previous planning history does not preclude future development considerations. It must be considered within the context of the Local Plan Strategy. Planning history, whilst being a material consideration is not in itself a reason to discount a site. There is over 20 years since the application. Furthermore, the application was not determined. Also the policy position taken in a past Development Plan, may not be relevant in the consideration of allocations as part of the current Development Plan.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted, and acknowledged. This information will be passed onto the site submitter to respond to. Further technical work would need to be undertaken- this is identified in the SSM, and identified by the County Local Planning Authority's heritage/archaeology unit- but not from a point of necessarily precluding development. This site is no longer identified as an allocation, this is around noise issues.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>It is considered that the site is well contained within the existing village form. Assessment of the site concluded that the existing development surrounds the field on three sides, and whilst the proximity of the church was a significant matter to be considered, this was in terms of how development could be orientated and positioned. This site is no longer identified as an allocation, this is around noise issues.</p>
<p>9. Public comments expressed total opposition to development on this site.</p>	<p>The Council is aware that this site has received more objections than support for its development. The Local Planning Authority must examine the nature of those objections as to whether they represent material planning considerations which cannot be addressed in a satisfactory manner. This site is no longer identified as an allocation, this is around noise issues.</p>
<p><u>Our Conclusions (pg 4) stated</u></p>	
<p>We therefore expect :-</p>	
<p>· that development should incorporate houses to meet local need.</p>	<p>There will be an affordable housing contribution on site. The site submission for 148 recognises the provision of affordable housing.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> that sites chosen should fit in well with the existing village. 	<p>Site 148 is adjacent to the edge of the settlement, with access to be provided from the B1257. The site will allow the delivery of a range of market and affordable homes with land for a children's play area and a kiss and drop for the school. With suitable landscaping the site will both physically and functionally fit well within the village.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> that Amotherby should have to have a maximum of 15 houses allocated and that Swinton should expect some additional development. 	<p>The Local Plan Strategy does not artificially set a housing requirement on each service village, or service village grouping. Swinton has seen more recent development (Meadowfield and Pearson's Yard) which have occurred recently but prior to 2012 (commencement of Plan Period) . But also in examination of the sites in both settlements, two sites perform better overall than site 341 in Swinton. The sustainability appraisal process informs site assessment, to ensure that the best performing sites are taken forward as allocations.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> that development will not add to traffic problems in the village 	<p>The proposed allocation, site 148 provides an access to the school, with parking for parents and a drop off without going down the main street. This will be a benefit to existing and future traffic movements.</p>
We refer you also to:-	
<u>Appendix 2</u> —Minutes of the Public Meeting on LDF Sites held on 1 st Dec	
<u>Appendix 3</u> --Residents comments on Amotherby Sites from the Public Meeting 1 st Dec 2014	
Site 8—Station Farm field, (pgs 12/13)	
Please see comments above for this site- this site is now not identified as an allocation.	
For:-	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> no comments in favour 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Against:-	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No, because it is right in the village. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Totally unsuitable, would lead to more traffic in village & stretch 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access would have to come onto Main Street through Amotherby. Again congestion issue with traffic already going through the village & from 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 the school	
· 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 village, as well as requiring access onto Main Street.	
2. Do you have any views on how we have selected these sites?	
We restrict our comments to sites in Amotherby/Swinton, <u>firstly on how Site 8 has been selected:-</u>	
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.	The Local Plan Strategy seeks to, as equitably as possible, distribute the housing requirement to the Service Village Tier, subject to the site-specific considerations. Those villages within that tier were identified in the adopted 2013 Local Plan Strategy. It should be noted that Staxton and Willerby, have only group 2 sites, as such no sites are currently proposed at this settlement. Sites given group 3 status where there are no group 4 sites in that settlement can still be considered. It is expected that such sites will be accompanied by development principles, to ensure that at the stage of planning application submission, sensitivities identified can be properly addressed. The settlements of Ampleforth, Nawton, Sherburn and Thornton le Dale have already seen the granting of recent planning permissions, and recent completions. Slingsby is a site for 34 dwellings.

<p>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 in the full representations.</p>	<p>The group 3 status is to help identify potential sites. The sites do not have equal potential, based on their performance through the Site Selection Methodology, and their deliverability and developability is site specific . Specific comments are responded to below. It is of absolute importance that sites are considered on their merits, and that the SSM is not viewed as providing a quantifiable assessment process for site selection. Site 8 is now identified as a Group 2 site, and site 148- with deliverability issues resolved, has been identified as a group 3 site, and is identified as an allocation.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This matter goes back to the spatial strategy, and the approach of the distribution of development. This is set out in the Local Plan Strategy, and is not under review. With the operation of the buffer land for 1800 homes is to provided in Malton and Norton- which was identified as being an appropriate level for the capacity of those towns.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>The Environment Agency has advised that the propensity for the contamination varies across site 8, with the southern component of the site being more vulnerable, and the northern part less so. A function of both distance and drift geology. Accordingly the site has a lower vulnerability than other sites such as 148 and 635. Site 635 was more sensitive than site 148. Due to the residential uses, techniques are available which can ensure that contamination risk can be eliminated.</p>
<p><u>Secondly</u>, we wish to point out inconsistencies and errors in the Amotherby and Swinton section of the Full Site Selection Methodology document.</p>	
<p>· 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!</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority would strenuously desist any interpretation of the Site Selection Methodology which looked purely at the ratings from an arithmetic approach. The assessment framework was not designed to operate in such a way. The Site Selection Methodology, and the questions it poses is a means of site assessment to identify and compare sites, but not from a view of how many greens vs. reds. It is careful examination of nature of the features being considered.</p>
<p>However, going through the SSM questions individually the following errors and critiques have been found:-</p>	

<p>· 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.</p>	<p>The isochrones map the distance as a function of time, in zones, and are an average measurement. It is likely that for some sites the actual measurement may be less than the average, or indeed more. Amotherby and Swinton they are twinned as a Service village for the fact that they share the School/Shop and so this is identified in the Local Plan Strategy, and in the SSM- it identifies why the accessibility rating is at this level.</p>
<p>· 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.</p>	<p>Noted. There is a footpath, but in terms of its width, it is narrow and not a standard width pavement, in terms of the response from the Highways Authority.</p>
<p>–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.</p>	<p>The Highways Authority have identified that the proposed access is not sufficient. Information has been provided which shows the ability to access the street, but the layout of the site would still be unacceptable.</p>
<p>· 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.</p>	<p>This needs to be considered within the context of the Public Right of Way.</p>
<p>· 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.</p>	<p>The consideration of this aspect may change depending on information which is submitted concerning the scale, massing and design of buildings, including the layout, landscaping and tree planting. The nature of the scheme (such as building heights) itself can have a significant impact on the impact of setting of the AONB. Since this has not been established, the pale pink response recognises the precautionary approach.</p>
<p>· 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?</p>	<p>The Environment Agency has advised that the propensity for the contamination varies across site 8, with the southern component of the site being more vulnerable, and the northern part less so. A function of both distance and drift geology. Accordingly the site has a lower vulnerability than other sites such as 148 and 635, but it is highlighted under the double red to indicate that there is a sensitivity. This can be addressed at the planning application stage through the submission of a Hydrogeological Risk Assessment.</p>

<p>· 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.</p>	<p>Now that the Local Planning Authority has this information, it can be added into the consideration process. It will be necessary for a geotechnical report to be provided to demonstrate how an ground instability can be mitigated. It is not an absolute constraint (unless there is no solution available).</p>
<p>· 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).</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority is aware that BATA represents a significant amenity consideration, and a noise assessment was sought to evaluate the impact of noise across the site. At the time of the consultation, the SSM highlighted the potential sensitivity with mitigation, as the noise assessment has not been undertaken. The noise assessment undertaken has identified particular, significant acoustic sensitivities, without satisfactory mitigation. Resulting in site 8 being unable to be taken forward as an allocation.</p>
<p>· 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.</p>	<p>The site has an indicative yield of 19 units, and whilst the access would be onto the Main Road, and thus cars would drive through the village, there is no way of preventing any vehicle travelling through the village, unless by a traffic order. This would be applicable to any site brought forward in particularly Amotherby and/or Swinton . The traffic problems are also time limited.</p>
<p>--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.</p>	<p>As stated above. The Highways Authority have identified that the proposed access is not sufficient.</p>
<p>· 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.</p>	<p>The presence of, or indeed creation of, a PRoW would be beneficial. Where are development could effect the course or presence of PRoW that has to considered as being detrimental. The presence of the PRoW means that in developing the site there is a extra complexity where such routes run across this. At the time of compiling the SSM, there was no layout scheme to consider the impact of development upon the PRoW.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>We will discuss this with Yorkshire Water, who provided the response the development can only be required to mitigate the impact of that development, and not increase surface runoff rates above that of the pre-existing situation.</p>
<p>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”.</p>	<p>The question is correctly interpreted, the impact is about functional impact on a community facility. The potential impact on the church is concerning its setting from the point of view as a designated heritage asset. This is considered in another part of the SSM.</p>
<p>-- 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.</p>	<p>148 indicated potentially providing facilities to the school, but it is also a significantly larger site than was originally envisaged, it considered that the single + was cautiously positive, based on the above matters. Consider the response is correct. The site cannot be considered a being artificially reduced. On that basis the site is larger than envisaged as part of the spatial strategy, but no in itself a reason to artificially reduce the site extent. The PRoW transverses the site, and so would need realigning, and at the presence of a facility to support the school through a car park or 'kiss and drop' has only been identified as potential.</p>
<p>“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”.</p>	<p>148 indicated potentially providing facilities to the school, but it is also a significantly larger site than was originally envisaged, it considered that the single + was cautiously positive, based on the above matters.</p>
<p>Site 538 is marked “double minus/red” but owing to the error in Q46 this is wrong.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority is advised by the Highway Authority. They have identified that the access is sub standard. Access is available, but the layout would be adverse.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority disagrees that there is significant errors/flaws in the assessment, but will check on matters of clarification. The sites consultation was clearly undertaken to represent a point in time: site 8 being considered as the preferred site represents its performance so far. Further information has been provided on site 148, which can now be re- evaluated and further information submitted has changed the evaluation of site 8. Resulting in Site 148 being identified as the proposed allocation.</p>
<p>3. Do you think there are better sites for housing development in</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>.</p>
<p>Residents comments -- General points (pg11/12)</p>	<p>.</p>
<p>. 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.</p>	<p>The preservation of the village's form can be undertaken through some at depth development, it is not appropriate to perpetuate linear, frontage development- otherwise known as ribbon development</p>
<p>. Not in favour of any further development which will exacerbate traffic problems on Main Street.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority will be guided by the Highway Authority in terms of acceptable levels of traffic movements and access considerations.</p>
<p>. Sites should be on the main road or down towards BATA.</p>	<p>New residential development cannot be within the HSE zone identified at BATA.</p>
<p>. Look to gain lower traffic flows through the village.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority will be guided by the Highway Authority in terms of acceptable levels of traffic movements and access considerations.</p>
<p>. 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.</p>	<p>The role of SSM is provide evidence which indicates better performing sites</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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. 	<p>As discussed above, noise from BATA will require further consideration.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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. 	<p>Noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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. 	<p>The housing estates in Malton and Norton, and other larger settlements are to respond to their housing requirements.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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. 	<p>This is the general approach that is being sought for providing housing in the Service Villages.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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. 	<p>This is a matter for building regulations. The Local Plan Strategy seeks to ensure that new dwellings are as energy efficient as possible.</p>

<p>· 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.</p>	<p>Traffic could still access main street via the B1257. Access to the site would need to be from the B1257, with associated visibility splays to consider the 40 mph.</p>
<p>· Following tonight`s meeting we would say that the 2 sites we would most strongly support are no's, 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.</p>	<p>It is unfeasible to consider development of the site for 15 units, with an associated car park, road access, and the considered planning of the site. The Local Planning Authority could not impose restrictions on parking/dropping off in Meadowfield Close, as that is a matter for the Highway Authority. Site 61 is not considered to be deliverable, and site 636 would merge Swinton and Amotherby together.</p>

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.

Information has been submitted post the 2015 consultation regarding site delivery and developability, and is available to view on the web site. Smaller sites (had such sites been available) would still have had a cumulative impact on services and traffic. Policy SP16 requires good design irrespective of the size of the site. With school places, due to parent choice there is inherent complexity, and it is not possible to proportionally define or ascribe local children attending a local school. It is reasonable to expect that a significant number of children will attend their local 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 children who will walk rather than drive. Isn't it better to keep school for local children by providing local houses?

Matters regarding school places is considered by the Local Education Authority. Malton/Norton education requirements are being addressed in those settlements- where development is expected. Site 649 identifies land for a school.

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 Street. 5. Public comments expressed some support.

The Local Planning Authority has asked the site submitters Agent to provide further information about how site 148 could be developed. This information has been submitted post the 2015 consultation, but is available to view on the web site. The Local Planning Authority is not artificially reducing sites, and where sites are providing other, wider benefits, this will need to be factored into site viability. The information provided has informed the assessment process, and when compared to other sites site 148 performs well in the SSM. It is therefore proposed as an allocation.

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.
- ~~New access required—very expensive. Opens up strong possibility of~~

Whilst the site is not comparable to Broughton Manor (c.340 dwellings), it would be a site delivering more than 15 dwellings. The Local Plan Strategy does not stipulate that sites should be artificially reduced or split. The Local Planning Authority has to balance the delivery of the wider community facilities with the housing which is required. Indicative maps have identified c.44 units. The details of how the site is to be considered are being evaluated, as new site information has been submitted. Compared to other sites, the site now is performing well, and has been identified as an allocation.

<p>Site 635</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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? <p>PC comments Site 635 – field west of Eastfield, east of Manor Farm (pg3)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>Residents comments Site 635—next to Eastfield, (pg 14)</p> <p>For:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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. <p>Against:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · No, not good access onto road. · Very large, too much potential. 	<p>Noted, the site has fewer constraints than other sites, but the reason for the site's discounting from being considered for potential allocation was the Ground water Contamination issues, as the site is in very close proximity to a private water supply for food manufacture. This is a sensitivity.</p>
<p>Site 341 in Swinton</p>	

<p>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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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. 	<p>Site 341 - proximity to the Scrap Yard is a material consideration- new residents can view the activities as a nuisance, and would provide a poor outlook for the residents of such a scheme. Noise mitigation measures on a site of that size would either provide an unacceptable outlook, or prevent reasonable enjoyment of the property; such as being unable to open windows on a summer's evening. The Highway Authority have objected to further development off this road, it is un-adopted, and not capable of being adopted, and whilst information has been submitted, that actually demonstrated the lack of capability.</p>
<p>Site 538 in Swinton</p>	
<p>There are no previous PC or residents comments on this site as our Public Meeting in 2014 looked only at sites within Amotherby.</p>	<p>Through on site assessment the Local Planning Authority consider that site 538 is more open than site 8 where you to compare such sites. It is considered that from distant views, site 538 would be a much more visually prominent site development, and would not be well integrated into the built form of Swinton. The fields of site 8 do not influence the setting of the settlement.</p>
<p><u>Current comments from PC</u></p>	
<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 isochrones map the distance as a function of time, in zones, and are an average measurement. The SSM identifies that for Amotherby and Swinton they do share currently share facilities, in terms of the school and the shop. It is a fact that they are more than 15 minutes walk, but that in itself is not a reason to discount the site. Other matters were factored in were the lack of an acceptable access and being more open.</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>the Local Planning Authority is guided by the advice of the Highway Authority. They consider that a suitable access cannot be delivered.</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>The Local Planning Authority stands by the rating due to the more open nature of the site, and ability to view it from Broughton.</p>
<p>4. Are there any further sites listed below we should be considering</p>	
<p>Yes, all those below, especially the group 4 sites. Ampleforth site 160 (group 4) Hovingham site 643 (group 3) Newton Beadlam site 173/252 (group 4) Rillington site 175 (group 3) Sherburn sites 283 & 264 (group 4) Staxton & Willerby sites 177 & 217 (group 3) Thornton le Dale site 109(group 3)</p>	<p>The identification of sites into broad groupings (1-4) provides the ability to clearly rate the sites individually. However, the Local Plan Strategy seeks to, as equitably as possible, distribute the housing requirement across the Service Villages, that means where villages have recently seen significant development or recent planning approvals, despite the presence of group 4 sites, there are no preferred sites in these settlements. For example Sherburn has planning permission for 73 dwellings. Group 3 sites have been chosen at other settlements should no group 4 sites be available because the principle of development has been identified as being acceptable, and that mitigation is achievable/available . The Sites in Staxton and Willerby have not been taken forward due to initially, a lack of response in terms of reconsidering site extents, and secondly, the level of archaeology which is present on both sites. As such these sites are now Group 2 sites.</p>

Slingsby, South Holme and Fryton Parish Council	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.	Noted, 521 in Fryton, would not accord with the spatial strategy. The Local Planning Authority has assessed the other sites and through the SSM: there were irresolvable constraints.
	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.	492 is a site which is predominantly within Development Limits, but has two listed farms on the site- and as such only the principle of conversion could be considered. Note that sites 430 and 464 are considered acceptable. There will be a mixture of market and affordable housing on the sites.
	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.	Noted.
Howardian Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Manager	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.	Noted, and acknowledged that the landscaping will be important in the context of this site.
	Amotherby- site 8 - no observations	Noted
	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.	Noted. The site's contribution to the setting of the AONB is a significant sensitivity. When considered against other Option Choices, this site has not progressed further to the identification and allocation of more suitable sites to meet the residual requirement.
	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.	Noted. This is reflected in the site selection methodology
	Ampleforth - site 160- I agree with the proposal not to bring forward this site at the current time.	Noted

	Hovingham - site 643 - I agree with the proposal not to bring forward this site at the current time.	Noted
Ebberston and Yedingham Parish Council	<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>	Both Ebberston and Yedingham are identified as 'Other Villages', in the Local Plan Strategy, there are specific circumstances where new residential development may be possible (Policy SP2). Any such development would also be subject to a Local Needs Occupancy Condition
Amec, Foster and Wheeler obo National Grid	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.	Noted. The Local Planning Authority has employed the Health and Safety Executive's PADHI+ software and risk evaluation to evaluate sites in close proximity to the high pressure gas pipelines identified in this response. All the sites referred to have been evaluated for their risk, based on the proposed use. None of the site identified have been progressed as options for a number of reasons, including their proximity to the high pressure gas pipelines. The Local Planning Authority notes that the preferred site for employment land, site 650 at Pickering, is proximal to the pipelines, but not at a distance where there is any risk identified. The site is also in the ownership of Northern Gas Networks, who are in operation to the west of the site, and who submitted the site for consideration.

	There is one high voltage overhead line listed below within Ryedale District Council's administrative area.	Noted.
	Electricity distribution is provided by Northern Powergrid. Northern Gas Networks distribute gas.	Noted, both are consultees
	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.	Noted.
	Sites identified as being crossed by or within close proximity to Gas Transmission apparatus are sites:640,641,642 and 628.	Noted. Other sites went put through the HSE software also include a number of other sites. These sites have been discounted through the assessment process for their proximity to such pipelines and for other matters.
	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.	Noted.
	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 Consultation Document has set out that allocations of land in Service Villages where recent development has occurred should be taken into account. The Local Plan Strategy sought to as equitably as possible distribute the housing requirement. Since Hovingham has recently experienced the Pasture Lane development, an allocation would not be appropriate. As part of the compilation of the SSM, the Local Planning Authority identified significant
	The Nursery, run at the rear of Blue row would be totally lost by the development;	

<p>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.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Pedestrian Access - access must be included from the New Development Mowbray Crescent and Blue Row through to car park of the Worsley Arms Hotel. There will be safety consideration, especially through the restricted shared vehicle and pedestrian exit to Main/High Street by the Hotel.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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.

concerns with regards to the setting of Listed Buildings and flood risk in earlier submissions (374). As a result the site submitter revised the site extent as a response to these principal concerns. Site 643 is a site extent which covers a much smaller extent than 374, which wrapped round the Worsley Arms Complex of buildings. As such the site assessment is not the same as for N31 or 374. The Local Planning Authority is aware that the site presents sensitivities, particularly concerning the visual relationship between the Worsley Arms complex and, and the proximity of the farm. The Local Planning Authority notes the concerns with the access. The Highway Authority have not commented on the acceptability of the access for this site extent, but in connection with site 31/373 they identified the access as acceptable. The position would have been clarified, but for the fact that no allocations are needed at Hovingham within the Plan period due to the recently completed Pasture Lane scheme.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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 and 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. 	
<p>North Yorkshire County Council</p> <p>Strategic Policy and Economic Growth</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Plan Strategy - spatial strategy sought to maximise the efficient and effective use of existing infrastructure. The Local Plan Strategy, and as such the general approach to the distribution of development has been established. In the interim, a number of planning permissions have been granted, the Local Plan Sites Document will identify sites to meet residual requirements.</p> <p>The SSM provided detail where possible, but for many site submissions information of that level of detail in terms of infrastructure provision is not outlined. However, in terms of utilities the Local Planning Authority has sought information from utility suppliers, who are aware of the overall plan requirements, and the option choices and preferred choices have been the subject of discussions with utility providers.</p> <p>The site selection process has identified where there are opportunities for delivery of key infrastructure, such as land for schools, open space provision, and key infrastructure which is necessary for the development to come forward.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority has approved the use of the CIL charging schedule, the Local Planning Authority has no immediate plans to review the Regulation 123 List which outlines by settlement what are potential (depending on the location of development) key infrastructure requirements. The Council is nevertheless pleased to work with the County Council in a strategy for targeting the monies collected through CIL, and if necessary Members will consider whether revisions are necessary.</p>
<p>Malton and Norton</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This site is not being proposed as an allocation. This is set out clearly in the Sites Consultation Document. It is identified within the Local Plan Strategy as part of the Northern Arc. Which identifies the area which includes both the Livestock Market the Wentworth Street Car Park, and identifies the area as being suitable for town centre uses. The former livestock market site has an extant planning permission for retail development and meets the quantitative retail capacity for the plan period. The area that is covered by that permission is identified as being part of the Town Centre Commercial Limits.</p>
<p>Kirkbymoorside</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The Option 1, relocation of Sylatech, with use of associate land is not identified as the allocations to meet the residual requirement. The ability of the land formerly identified as expansion land has been retained (without Development Limits). The Rack Systems scheme has met the allocation of land for employment purposes, other land could be considered on its merits, under policy SP6.</p>

<p>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 on an alternative site.</p>	<p>Environment Agency have requested that this site is discounted, because the site fails the sequential test. The site has now been discounted. Since the Sites Consultation planning permission has been sought, and obtained on the land to the north, which was an extant allocation from the 2002 Local Plan.</p>
<p><u>Pickering</u></p>	
<p>Support the employment proposals at site 650.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><u>Children and Young People's Service</u></p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority is not allocating land above the Local Plan Strategy housing requirement and the 20% buffer. The Local Planning Authority has, for those settlements referred to, three sites where land has been explicitly identified for the provision of a primary school. The provision of secondary education would be supported by the collection of CIL. The Local Planning Authority seeks clarification as to what is meant by "dependent on allocation decisions". The Local Planning Authority was of the view that the location of the new school was dependant on the location of the sites chosen. But that if the requirement was split between the settlements, then land would required for a new school at both Malton and Norton.</p>
<p><u>Highways (as Local Highway Authority)</u></p>	

<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted. the Highway Authority have advised on the capability and accessibility of sites, and there has been local plan transport modelling undertaken, which the Highway Authority have been involved in, and the Local Planning Authority are confident that sites are deliverable and developable. the Norton-focus has performed better in terms of junction capacity being able to accommodate planned growth.</p>
<p>Health and Adult Services (reduced response due to sensitivity)</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority has not sought to identify land for the specific provision of this type of community facility. It is a very specific use. Schemes have already come forward in Pickering and Norton, a site is identified in Helmsley. The Local Planning Authority will support the County Local Planning Authority in their identification of sites for Extra care schemes. Extra care is not market housing and so would not be liable for the CIL charge.</p>
<p>Heritage Service</p>	

<p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority has sought preliminary archaeological advice from the County Local Planning Authority in respect of known archaeology, to inform the Site Selection Methodology (SSM). The SSM has also identified that for the Vale of Pickering there are particular archaeological sensitivities which have been identified. No sites have progressed where significant archaeological evidence has been identified, and the Local Planning Authority will be preparing as part of the Local Plan Sites Document and archaeological general principles to assist in the material to be submitted as part of any planning application. The significance of designated, and non designated heritage assets has also been outlined in the SSM.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted. The HR Screening concluded that in the absence of evidence, Likely Significant Effects could not be ruled out. As such for sites in Malton and Norton, an Appropriate Assessment has been undertaken to identify if there are any LSE which cannot be avoided or mitigated. This has been determined in the advance of publication of the Local Plan Sites Document, and cannot be left to be considered at the Planning application stage. It is a test of soundness that Plans are compliant with legislation. The Appropriate Assessment confirmed that based on the site features, in combination effects and mitigation measures that there would be no significant effects on the SAC.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted, the site in close proximity to Sheriff Hutton Castle was discounted due to the size of the site.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted. In the production of the Development Plan, Local Plan Strategy, identified that greenfield land would be required to meet housing requirements. The Sites Consultation was to help establish the complexities of site assessment, and that in looking at sites there were matters of judgement concerning suitability. The Local Planning Authority is aware that some sites considered as option choices did have particular sensitivities, and in the months following the consultation, such sites were compared against the other sites. The Local Planning Authority is satisfied that the sites which are being taken forward have a level of impact on the landscape and setting of the towns and villages which is appropriate in principle, and development principles have been identified were necessary to ensure that any matters of sensitivity could be addressed.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>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 stages 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.</p>	<p>There is no discrepancy. The Local Planning Authority is aware that Landscape Character is different from a designation. Landscape character, by function of its definition (within the European Landscape Convention), covers the entire district. The indicator for Landscape Character requires quantifiable data, which is the extent to which the District is covered by landscape designations. In this respect it is national designation, as a comparator to England and Wales. Within Ryedale, there is the Howardian Hills AONB covering about 20%. The National Park part of Ryedale has its own Planning Authority which covers a third of the district with the AONB. Together, this is c. 50% of district which is nationally designated. There also local landscape designations which in 2013 was a further c.20% in land coverage. This has now increased to c.30% with the inclusion of the Vale of Pickering as part of the adoption of the Local Plan Strategy (Policy SP13) as being an area of landscape valued locally (and has the same status at the Area of High Landscape Value of the Fringe of the Moors and the Wolds Area which refers to the original designation in the Local Plan 2002). The figures will be updated on page 87, and clarification provided that it is national designations on page 85.</p>

<p>The Sustainability Appraisal does not mention the European Landscape Convention in its list of relevant policies, plans and programmes.</p>	<p>The European Landscape Convention has been added.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority have committed to bring forward a GI strategy, this will be informed, in part by the site submissions that are taken forward as allocations. The Local Planning Authority intends to produce a GI Strategy which will be informed by the allocations. Due to resources, the allocations work is the priority of Place Team.</p>
<p><u>General comments on the Landscape Evidence Base</u> 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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority is not preparing new district wide Landscape Character Assessment. It has not the resources, and will tailor landscape character assessment work to where development pressures are greatest. Further LCA work will be undertaken to consider renewable energy - including wind turbines. The document produced for the Examination DDH20, a consolidation of existing studies, is now available to view in the Evidence Base part of the Ryedale Plan web site. Through the preparation of the Local Plan Strategy the Local Planning Authority defended its position for the use of the suite of existing LCAs, with the Special Qualities Study which covered the land experiencing the greatest development pressure. The Historic Landscape Characterisation work has been utilised in the assessment of sites, and the preparation of the Local Plan Sites Document.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>The Special Qualities Study does not review the LCA, it adds a finer grain of assessment and brings together existing studies. The NYCC Historic Landscape Characterisation informed the Special Qualities Study, and informed the SSM, in principally identifying Mediaeval Strip Field Systems. The Visually Important Undeveloped Areas were originally designated as part of the Local Plan 2002. The Local Planning Authority has undertaken a light-touch review of these designations, and proposed some amendments and factual updates, and the proposed designation of a small number of new VIUAs. There is a background paper on VIUAs, which is not a landscape character designation, but is around how spaces have influenced the form and character of our settlements.</p>
<p>Broad band connectivity</p>	
<p>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</p>	<p>Noted. The website link is developer-orientated. The Local Planning Authority will expect developers to have engaged with BT Openreach in their capacity as broadband installer. Policy SP10 of the Local Plan Strategy supports the provision of broadband equipment, subject to SP13 (Landscapes) and SP20 (Design and amenity as part of general Development Management Considerations)</p>
<p>National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>This sites consultation has been focused on allocations for housing and employment, no sites have been submitted to be considered as sites for Gypsy and traveller communities. The Local Planning Authority has completed a needs survey for Gypsies and Travellers, which was undertaken to comply with the Planning Policy for Traveller sites. It confirmed that no sites were required. The strategic policy framework as identified in Policy SP5 is concerned with the provision of appropriate accommodation for the Gypsy and Traveller communities. It also does provide a framework for assessing sites should they be submitted , and will be considered against the criteria set out in SP5 and national policy.</p>

<p>A. and M. Waugh</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>No sites have been consulted upon as preferred sites in Ampleforth. This is primarily due to the recently granted scheme at the village. Sites 616 and 111 have also performed poorly through the Site Selection Methodology, This is primarily due to the adverse impact on settlement character/impact on the Conservation Area/ Impact on AONB/NYMNP. They have been identified as being part of a Visually Important Undeveloped Area.</p>
<p>Huttons Ambo Parish Clerk</p>	<p>The Parish Council reiterates that any further encroachment into the Parish by the inclusion of site 248 would be inappropriate. The reasons are: - 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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. · Site 248 is adjacent to the Musley Bank A64 Junction. Any improvement to this junction would be severely impaired by an existing employment use. <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>	<p>The Local Planning Authority acknowledges that full development of site 248 (part is subject to planning permission), would be a significant constraint on any future major junction improvements.</p>
<p>Cropton Parish Council</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Cropton, like many smaller settlements in Ryedale is an 'Other Village' where the Local Planning Authority is not seeking to make any allocations. Policy SP2 of the Local Plan Strategy sets out the circumstances in principle where residential development would be considered appropriate, and this considers 'Other Villages'. Concerns regarding access and traffic safety are a material consideration should the sites be subject to planning applications.</p>

Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	<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>Noted.</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>Sites in Malton and Norton are subject to Appropriate Assessment (AA) which will consider evidence which sets out measures to avoid/mitigate impact on the water quality and recreational pressure on the River Derwent SAC. SUDS will be an integral feature of the AA process. The Local Planning Authority will be advising as part of development principles the necessary biodiversity improvements. These comments have been added into the SSM, as a factor to consider.</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>Noted.</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 considered for potential allocation.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<p><u>Pickering</u></p>	<p>See above.</p>
	<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.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Site Selection procedure has been thought. The Trust would expect mitigation for Great Crested Newts when or if site 199 is developed.	This site is not being progressed as an allocation. Site 199 has secured planning permission, and as part of that, mitigation for the Newts was identified and conditioned as part of the planning permission.
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.	Noted.
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.	Noted, and the Local Planning Authority is aware of the need to incorporate Great Crested Newts- optimal habitat. The Local Planning Authority have identified that there is a meta population of Newts in the locality and their preservation needs to be ensured. The site is heavily contaminated, and has the potential to severely harm the Newt population in its current state.
<u>Kirkbymoorside</u>	
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.	The land in ownership of Micrometalsmiths is constrained. There are also a number of existing residential properties which would have justified amenity concerns if the site operations were enlarged/expanded. The adjacent land is in separate ownership. The land is contaminated and would be subject to remediation.
Regarding Option 2, these sites have a low possibility of impacting on biodiversity.	Noted.
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.	This site has now been discounted due to the level of flood risk.
<u>Stamford Bridge</u>	
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.	Noted
<u>Preferred Site in Service Villages</u>	

Site 51 - Unlikely to impact on biodiversity	Noted, ecological surveys expected. A SINC site is proximal, but it is a church yard with a management plan.
Site 430(464) Unlikely to impact on biodiversity, some hedgerows may be important and require protection in the landscaping.	Noted. Hedgerows have been identified in the SSM as being an important feature on the site. Ecological surveys expected.
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.	Noted, ecological surveys expected.
8 - good quality hedgerows and hedgerow trees would need protection.	Noted. This site has now been discounted due to noise issues.
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Noted. The Local Planning Authority does not have the resources available to undertake survey work on sites which are not being explicitly considered as part of the development Plan production. The Appropriate Assessment has consider further impact on the River Derwent SAC. Where there is clear opportunities for habitat enhancement, these will be identified in the Development Principles.
The Trust is happy with the conclusions of the Screening Assessment.	Noted.

Highways England	<p>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.</p>	<p>As part of the production of the Local Plan Strategy, the quantum of development were modelled through the Malton and Norton Strategic Transport Assessment. As a follow on to that work, individual and cumulative site options have been modelled. Which has indicated that a Norton-Focus allows junction capacity to accommodate planning rates of growth, and this utilises the Brambling Fields grade separated junction.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted. The Norton Lodge scheme will be phased, and the link road will be delivered in accordance with the Transport Assessment which outlines the phased delivery of the site.</p>
Malton and Norton		
	<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted. The Local Planning Authority has now discussed the findings with Highways England of the site-specific modelling work which the Local Planning Authority commissioned. This modelling work does not model impacts on the A64 junctions per se, as that was undertaken as part of the STA, which looked at a range of site options for town to consider the quantum of development, but junctions within the town. It will provide an indication of junction usage. It is important to note that the to plan for figure has not changed since the adoption of the Local Plan Strategy, and the key element of transport infrastructure required, the grade separated Junction at Brambling fields has been provided, which Highways England recognised was a key element of infrastructure necessary to deliver the plan. The findings showed that a Norton-focus allows junction capacity to accommodate planned levels of growth.</p>

<p>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>	<p>Noted. As part of the Broad Location for employment land- this would access the A64/A169 and as a development principle no impact on the safe operation of the SRN.</p>
<p>Service Villages</p>	
<p>Site 430, not in vicinity of a junction with the A64, unlikely to have an impact on the SRN.</p>	<p>Noted.</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>Noted. The site in Rillington is served by a signalised junction onto the A64.</p>
<p>Site 51, access the A64 at Scotchman Lane (south bound) and Chestnut Avenue (northbound) both are signalised, 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>Noted. Sheriff Hutton is distanced from the A64, but is likely to access the road as described, although for Sheriff Hutton, York is a more likely destination.</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>Noted. The site has an indicative yield of c.19 units. Both Amotherby and Slingsby could use similar routes to access the A64, particularly to avoid the Barton Hill crossing.</p>
<p>Summary</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>The Local Planning Authority is not undertaking further modelling of junctions on the A64, but will be modelling internal junctions. As the Malton and Norton STA evaluated junction capacity on the scale of development, with the existing operating junctions. The findings of this has been presented to Highways England.</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>Noted. The production of a transport assessment and travel plan will be required as part of any planning application on any of the proposed allocations.</p>
<p>The Environment Agency</p> <p>Overall very supportive of the documents, with the following comments to make:</p> <p><u>Flood risk</u></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 this document has expired</p> <p><u>Groundwater Protection</u></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>	<p></p> <p>Noted. The Local Planning Authority is intending to avoid in principle sites with identified, elevated flood risk. Site 200 has part of a the site which is in flood zone 2 which is identified within the site outline, but identified as being area suitable only for open space and green infrastructure or landscape buffering- not for development. The examination of flood risk from a settlement-specific perspective will be incorporated into background papers and also into the Sustainability Appraisal Site Assessment and Policies Document.</p> <p>Acknowledged. The SSM was produced in advance of the national planning guidance, which superseded the technical guidance on assessing flood risk which was retained as part of the NPPF. We will remove such references an update them accordingly.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

<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.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. The Local Planning Authority consider that the suggested framework of questions provides a clearer means of interpretation of the level and nature of potential to impact on water resources of acknowledged sensitivity. However, in order to do this, the Local Planning Authority may require further information from the Environment Agency. In relation to specific sites. The Local Planning Authority did not ask the Environment Agency to provide responses for every site submitted that was subjected to the SSM, only those which is considered had some potential. These are two such sites. On the basis of the consideration of adjacent/proximal sites, the Local Planning Authority took a precautionary approach. However, it will review the assessment in light of these site ratings</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This has been undertaken where the information is available.</p>
<p>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).</p>	<p>Acknowledged, the Local Planning Authority has asked for further information where this concerns such sites. Discussions have been had with the Environment Agency to establish that for residential development a Hydrogeological Risk Assessment can be provided at the planning application stage.</p>
<p>Sites Consultation Document</p>	
<p>Flood Risk</p>	
<p>General comments</p>	

<p>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.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. This has been undertaken in relation to site 200, Pickering.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>We have consulted these organisations on the site allocations work, and they have provided their views in respect of surface water. SuDs use will be expected on all sites allocated, subject to any technical provisions in respect of reducing contaminated run-off for the Derwent SAC and the Ground Source Protection Zone level 1 sites.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted. Site 200 has an area of Flood Zone 2 which is excluded from the developable area.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted. The Local Planning Authority would be please to receive details of such guidance. The Local Plan Strategy is not under review, but allocations are considered on the most up to date flood risk matters and have performed well in this regard, and will be subject to Flood Risk Assessments in due course as part of the submission of application.</p>
<p><u>Food defences</u></p>	

<p>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.</p>	<p>Both the County Council and the various IDBs which cover the Ryedale Area have been consulted. The LLFA have provided information on the preferred and option choice sites concerning surface water flood risk, and mitigation it will be referred to in development principles concerning all allocated sites. The Council is not proposing to review policies of the Local Plan Strategy. However, in the development principles information could be included about resilience to climate change.</p>
<p>Site-specific comments</p>	
<p><u>Malton and Norton</u></p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority will not be adopting an approach of seeking to allocate land in flood zones 2 and 3. The District, within the context of the Spatial Strategy, can identify a range of sites which are in the lowest level of flood risk, to meet housing requirements. Accordingly, this means that flood 2 sites would fail the Sequential Test. In applying the Exceptions Test, clearly, there is no site(s) for which it is impossible to not locate development in the areas of highest flood risk.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted. Site 324 has an area of flood zone 2, as part of the Sites Consultation 2015, that recognised that this area of land would need to be excluded. This site is no longer being taken forward for allocation.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted. We have identified that appropriate surface water management will be a development principle.</p>

<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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. 	<p>The District Council was involved in the 'Slowing the Flow' project at Pickering, which has been recognised, nationally, in protecting Pickering itself from flooding. It recognises the importance of flood resilience and avoidance for local communities. The Council would need to be confident that with declining Local Government Budgets, the Partnership Funding is clearly defined. CIL monies could be spent on delivering strategic flood protection schemes, were the case for their implementation made robustly, as they form part of the CIL Regulation 123 List. Green Infrastructure will be an important means of delivering flood management/residence with wildlife and recreational benefits. The Council can only insist through s.106 monies infrastructure which is specifically provided on site to alleviate the impact of the proposed development, as required by the tests of securing planning obligations. The Council consider that there will be a number of competing strategic infrastructure projects for which the case will be made to the charging authority for which the CIL revenue is most critical at that time.</p>
<p>Pickering</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Acknowledged, the SSM recognised that this western component of the site (200) would be excluded from the 'developable' area, and used for landscaping/screening/green infrastructure. It would also provide a buffer to the Listed Mill which is on the other side of the Beck.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted. Acknowledged, The site submitter has amended the site extent to delete the eastern limb.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted. For site 200, which is an option choice, The Local Planning Authority would exclude flood zone 2 from the developable area, and require it as green infrastructure.</p>
<p><u>Kirkbymoorside</u></p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>noted.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This site has now been discounted due to the level of flood risk.</p>
<p>The LPA should consider other sites for allocation taking a sequential approach to their selection.</p>	<p>These principles are noted, and the Local Planning Authority will meet with the Environment Agency to discuss how these can be considered , in light of the comments made above.</p>
<p><u>Service Villages</u></p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

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.			Noted.
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.			Noted.
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 Zone	

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 of 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

Acknowledged. The Local Planning Authority consider that the suggested framework of questions provides a clearer means of interpretation of the level and nature of potential to impact on water resources of acknowledged sensitivity. In light of the comments made on sites 116 and 347 the Local Planning Authority has sought further information from the Site Submitters. As a result of discussions with the Environment Agency, the site is for residential use, which has a reduced risk compared to other land uses. Hydrogeological Risk Assessment would be required, but at the planning application stage.

Planning and Design

Site 635 and 636

Partnership obo Mr. David Hume

<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Between 8 and 10 minutes bus ride to Malton · Confirm in conformity with the NPPF · Within Flood Zone 1 · capable, available and deliverable for development within the next 5 years. 	<p>The function of the Local Plan Sites Document is to ensure a deliverable and developable supply of housing land. The SSM identified all sites submitted around Amotherby and Swinton as being compliant with the settlement hierarchy, however that is not a reason to allocate a site. These sites have particular constraints identified with them. Updated information on Flood risk and surface water drainage.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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. 	<p>noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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) 	<p>noted</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Sets out that the principle of the site is compliant with national local planning policy. 	<p>This is to be established through the SSM, Sustainability and Background Papers- both individually and comparatively.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Provides an FRA 	<p>noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · In terms of landscape character- agree with SSM on site 635. 	<p>noted.</p>

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."

The reasons for the site's grouping remain for site 636. It has been identified on numerous occasions that Amotherby and Swinton wish to remain identifiable as settlements, development of this site would build up the last field on the southern side of the B1257. The response provided seeks to deemphasise the coalescence by referring to the open, and attractive views to the south, purporting that the site would be read as an extension to Swinton rather than Amotherby by keeping a gap at the western extent of the site. The response also describes that the scheme would be as set as far back as possible. This does not replicate the built form of either Amotherby or Swinton, and would not be an efficient use of land. Furthermore, it is considered that the development of the field would adversely affect the setting of the Listed Farmhouse which is adjacent, on the opposite side of the road. The Local Planning Authority must give full weight to impacts on Listed Buildings, as required by statute.

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.

The findings of the report would need to be considered by the Environment Agency.

<p>Aspect Building and Civil Engineering Contractors Ltd.</p>	<p>Site 32: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>Much of site 32 has been developed out, the remaining element is within established development limits. Whilst it is not proposed to retain the allocation designation, the Development Limits are not being re-defined, and so the land will remain within the Development Limits . Any planning application will be considered on its merits against the Local Plan Strategy, and any material considerations.</p>
<p>Mr. J C Fields</p>	<p>Site 109: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>At the time of the sites consultation, the sites submitted in Thornton le Dale, site 109 performed the best, notwithstanding that there were some constraints identified with the site through the SSM process, none of which were insurmountable. Thornton le Dale has recently experienced a small amount of new residential development on a Brownfield site, with changes to occupancy conditions. Since the sites consultation a Brownfield site, with less sensitivities that site 109 has been submitted for consideration, site 662, which has been identified as a site for residential development.</p>
<p>Savills obo MHA</p>	<p>Site 117/360 (649):</p>	

<p>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>	<p>The Local Planning Authority identified that the Mickle Hill Strip Field System, and the associated land, is an exceptional example of a medieval strip field system which makes a clear and significant contribution to the setting of Pickering. In assessing the sites through the site selection methodology process the Local Planning Authority has considered both the level of intactness and visual contribution is exceptional. Other sites had either no strip fields, or their state had become degraded, and these sites were chosen in preference over the land at Mickle Hill. Such is the sensitive, significance, and by virtue of this response, subject to development pressure, the Local Planning Authority is identifying the entire site as a Visually Important Undeveloped Area. This has been endorsed, albeit informally at this stage by Historic England. An important feature of the strip fields is the intervisibility, which is lost through development. This is precisely what has already occurred at the MHA retirement scheme on the north western part of the Mickle Hill Strip Field Complex. It is not just about retention, it is the appreciation of the asset.</p>
<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.</p>	<p>The approach proposed by Savills is not correct. The Zone of Tolerance is not part of the land supply. That is the role of the 20% land supply NPPF Buffer which is factored in, and which does not have to be proportionately provided at Pickering. It is a mechanism within the Plan to positively manage the supply which will be allocations and some windfall. To actively include this in the supply would, in effect be raising the housing supply target over 55% above the plan requirements. This would be a new plan. The Zone of Tolerance operates on the basis that it is a flexible buffer which allows the delivery of an annual 25% uplift on the 200 homes per year across the District as set out in the Local Plan Strategy, without a deduction in the following 5 years of supply. This helps to respond positively to the small-scale windfall developments the Local Planning Authority will experience above and beyond the identified allocations/commitments which meet the Housing land requirements of delivering the 200 homes per year. The Local Planning Authority has taken into account existing permissions, in accordance with the NPPG.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>The need for growth is not disputed, but the Local Planning Authority does not agree that site 117/360/649 represents an appropriate site. This is outlined in the SSM, when compared with other sites available for consideration. Other sites have been identified as allocations which perform better in the SSM and SA process.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Regarding the integrity of the Strip Field System the Local Planning Authority will strenuously assert that the harm to Mickle Hill Strip field System cannot be mitigated, because of the loss of intervisibility. This is actually demonstrated by the development to the north, which was granted permission because the need to provide housing (in the absence of a 5 year land supply) outweighed the identified harm to the heritage asset.</p>
<p>Development would accord with the settlement Hierarchy of the Ryedale Core Strategy (Spatial Policy 3)</p>	<p>Sites in the proximity of Pickering would all comply with the principle established in the Settlement Hierarchy of SP1 in the Local Plan Strategy (The Development Plan) . That in itself is not enough to establish whether a site is acceptable.</p>
<p>Do not support the identification of 116,200,347,205/387. Their combined delivery is 670-717 homes, compared to the identified need of 513 units of the plan period.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority identified more option sites than needed to meet the residual requirement. The Sites Consultation was to consider which sites should come forward for development.</p>
<p>There are no known technical constraints.</p>	<p>Notwithstanding the fact that there may be unknown constraints, the Local Planning Authority is firmly of the view that the loss of the Strip Field System cannot be mitigated.</p>
<p>The sites have constraints which could threaten the deliverability. The Council needs to undertake a more rigorous analysis of site capacity.</p>	<p>The purpose of the Sites Consultation was to gain further information about the developability and deliverability of the proposed option and preferred sites. The information derived from the consultation is informing the assessment process further.</p>

116- strip field system- coalescence with Middleton	The SSM identified some sensitivities, and further information has been submitted. The site is not required, and has been not taken forward as an allocation.
200 - part of site in flood zone 2 - support this area being discounted	The area of flood zone is very limited, to the extreme western extent. It would not impact significantly on the developable area, and actually provides important wider benefits including an ecological and setting buffer for the Listed Mill and Pickering Beck. The site submitter recognises the need to exclude this area of land.
347 - access concerns and elevated position, with potential impact on heritage assets and setting of the town.	The Local Planning Authority identified some sensitivities around this site, and material has been submitted which demonstrates those sensitivities can be addressed. The landform and the setting does not adversely affect the setting of the town and heritage assets.
205/387 - majority of site is within 400m of WWTW, but note YW will accept up to 250m	The site is in agricultural use, there are no contamination issues. Yorkshire water are satisfied with the proposed arrangement of using the land for sports pitches and land for a school within the buffer zone. Land for a school is significant. Part of the site is subject of a planning application. The remaining site is not required, and has not been taken forward as an allocation.
Re-assess the new site extent through the SSM	The site 659 - the extent proposed has been considered through the SSM, and this has identified that a number of outstanding issues remain, which are not present on the sites which have been identified for allocation.
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.	The stage 1 is a very generic and high level sift. Passing stage 1 is clearly not the only determinant in considering whether a site is appropriate for allocation. The SSM is not just about plan compliance it is about the determination of the most sustainable sites for development, and is the sustainability appraisal in action. The site has a range of issues which mean that it is not the most suitable of sites to be brought forward for development.
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.	The SSM sets out the findings of applying the HSE concentric zones PADI +. The revised site extent has been assessed and it is still an 'Advise Against Development"

<p>Site is in flood zone 1- low risk of flooding-better than other promoted sites.</p>	<p>Accepted that Flood Zone 1, but over 1 ha sites automatically require a FRA to be provided to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency in terms of dealing with surface water, to ensure no increased flood risk elsewhere. None of the option sites have flood zone 3, and only one has a small area of flood zone 2, which would need to be excluded. So sequentially the Local Planning Authority's option sites perform equally well concerning flood risk matters.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>As discussed earlier, the retention of the hedgerow is not enough to protect their contribution to the setting of the town. It is their intervisibility which is such a key feature. The development at Mickle Hill has totally lost the ability to read the hedgerows within the landscape. Given the fact that there are other, less sensitive sites, the Local Planning Authority would seek to develop those to meet development needs. The site is a continuation of the Mickle Hill Scheme, and would, having open fields to either side, be a discordant limb development projecting southwards from Pickering.</p>
<p>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>	<p>The site proposed as option sites were, on balance some of the larger site submissions, precisely to achieve wider community benefits. All the submissions will be expected to deliver plan-compliant levels of affordable housing . Whilst the delivery of community facilities such as a GP surgery is welcomed in principle, but such facilities need to be sustainably funded for their continued operation, particularly in terms of staffing. The concerns of this site, 649, or its other derivatives would not be outweighed by the delivery of a GP/health facilities when other, more accessible sites could be found within the build up area of Pickering. The Local Planning Authority has identified site 650 as the preferred site for employment land, and the plan has a framework for supporting employment development within established development limits.</p>
<p>Savills Smiths Gore obo Mr J M Douglas and Mr RW Peacock</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>Noted.</p>

<p>F T Gooder</p>	<p>Sites (68) 542 and 543 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>The reason why the sites performed poorly in the SSM was their lack of proximity to Malton and Norton. Sites 578 and 579 are adjacent to the recently approved Eden house Scheme. The matters of Flood Risk and Setting of Heritage Assets were not commented upon by the Local Planning Authority. The respondent has confused their site submissions with other site assessments. The Employment Land Review commented on sites in operation. It does not identify the site as an allocation. Nor does the Local Plan Strategy identify the site as a core employment site to be retained. It is a historic intensive agricultural operation. Since the site failed stage 1 for lack of compliance with SP1 of the Local Plan Strategy irrespective of the parts of the site which have buildings situated upon them, the access on to the A64 is a sub-issue. However, were a planning permission submitted for the development on the site, the access would be a very significant matter. The access is currently sub-standard, but the site submitter identified that a safety audit had been completed, but to date it has not been provided to the Council for consideration.</p>
<p>Savills obo Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation and White Young Green obo Fitzwilliam Malton Estate</p>	<p>Site 208: 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>	<p>Site 208 is a modest parcel of Brownfield land on the edge of Old Malton. It is not identified in the Plan as an employment site to be retained. Much of the site submission is already identified with Development Limits. It is of a size which is unlikely to bring significant wider benefits such as affordable housing. As such the Local Planning Authority maintains that this site is not an appropriate site for allocation, but the redevelopment of this site for residential purposes in principle, is not at odds with the Local Plan Strategy. Indeed the site has been in this situation of being within Development Limits since the 2002 Local Plan.</p>

	<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>The site assessment process can only respond to evidence if it is available. No information at the time of the site assessment demonstrated an access to consider. The map accompanying this letter still does not identify an access point. The wider land, shaded in green, merely demonstrates land ownership and does not identify the position of an access relative to the proposed site, existing properties, the highway, and allow the Local Planning Authority to consider matters pertaining to considering the character and setting of the Conservation Area. As such the creation of an access to the site on that basis is far from being capable of being considered acceptable. The Highway Authority were consulted on the ability to deliver an access, and they concluded that it is not capable of delivering an acceptable access.</p>
Mr and Mrs Brown	<p>Site 634: 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>Noted, the Local Planning Authority was aware that the potential for the site coming forward was limited. The Local Planning Authority consider that the site is not re-allocated, but that the Development Limits would not be re-adjusted so that the site could be considered for commercial uses in due course.</p>
P Sutor	<p>Sites 539 and 7</p> <p>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>	<p>There is to be no whole-scale review of the Development Limits. SP1 of the Local Plan Strategy confirms the status of the adopted saved proposals maps from the 2002 Local Plan as being retained in principle.</p>

<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'.</p>	<p>The total housing land supply is being met from sites around the Market Towns and Services Villages as set out in the Local Plan Strategy (SP1) (The Development Plan). Policy SP2 identifies that in Other Villages sites within Development Limits will be subject to Local Needs Occupancy Restrictions. Accordingly, there is no basis on which to amend any Development Limits unless there has been a change in the status of the land i.e. it has been developed, or because it has become an allocation/commitment. Amendments to Development Limits other than to record a change in circumstance mean a change in the spatial policy approach. That is not the purpose of the Local Plan Sites Document. Amendments to the Development Limits (2002) will be made as a result of:- Completed (built out) schemes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Sites identified as Commitment sites (i.e. with planning permission); and · Site allocations for housing/employment development schemes only. <p>Accordingly, this will be undertaken as part of the production of the Policies Map (and insets) which will accompany the Local Plan Sites Document and Local Plan Strategy. The intention of this is set out in paragraph 3.10 of the Local Plan Strategy. The recently adopted Helmsley Plan has allocations, and has its own Policies Map, and is the sister document to the Local Plan Sites Document.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>We have had no responses which describe the Development Limits as incorrect and causing policy confusion (i.e. for example splitting a dwelling in two). This clearly is a different matter to a dwelling or parcel of land (including domestic curtilage) being not included within the Limits, which would have been a conscious decision to exclude that land for planning reasons. The ambiguity you refer to concerning Inset map 7 and the text, has been examined by the Local Planning Authority. It is clear that there is no ambiguity and the Development Limits are drawn to retain open land that would otherwise be subject of development pressure. This includes some visually important undeveloped areas, and the land to west of Main Street, including your client's land, which is identified as being in the Conservation Area.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>The state of dilapidated, modern farm buildings and their adverse effect on the Conservation Area may be a fact, but it is not in itself a material consideration which would lead to a departure from the established Development Plan. Such buildings can be removed from the site if they are so dilapidated by other regulatory frameworks.</p>
<p>White Young Green obo Fitzwilliam Malton Estate</p> <p>Site 248:</p> <p>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 Edenhuse and no assessment appears to have been undertaken in this regard.</p> <p>Some additional land should be allocated at Edenhuse, 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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that sites 578 and 579 are a larger land take that would be expected for the residual employment land, there is however, the need to bear in mind that there will be reductions in the developable area to deal with surface water and pylons. These sites represent the direction of travel, with a planning permission on Eden House Road, and being served by a Grade- separated junction which does not require traffic in a north-bound state to go through Malton, which is the case at York Road. The sites represent a longer-term aspiration, and clearly would require phasing due to their size. They are accordingly identified as a Broad Location, rather than a specific site allocation.</p> <p>Planning permission was secured in 2010 at York Road, 7 years later, there are still a number of vacant areas on the site. The transport links are not as flexible as those where sites have a fully grade separated junction off the A64 by which to access sites. Sites would have to come into Malton to access an east bound direction.</p> <p>It is helpful know that access rights are available to access the land for which planning permission has been given. However, the existing land approved at York Road was subject to a transport assessment, which was stringent in how many vehicles would be using the access. The Highway Authority have confirmed that the entirety of 248 requires two access points, which is not achievable on the site without being off the A64 at the Musley Bank Junction. This would not be supported by Highways England.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>Because of the fact that there is no firm proposals or to create such a grade separated junction, there is still a need to be mindful of the potential. Safeguarding the land is a means to ensure its protection, but in the absence of a detailed study, the precise land-take cannot be ascertained.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority has undertaken traffic modelling. Vehicles needing to travel east would still have to go through the town centre. Vehicles at 578 and 579 would not need to go through the town centre.</p>	
<p>Stovell and Millwater Ltd. obo GR and E Hull</p>	<p>Site 341:</p>	
	<p>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.</p>	<p>This response is made on the most recent representation and the 2013 scheme submission.</p> <p>The map identifies the extent of Low Lane to be considered. In the text it does describe it as a general upgrade between the Meadowfield Close junction and the junction with the access road to the sports club. The Local Planning Authority (and Highway Authority) cannot assume what this would precisely mean. A map should be provided demonstrating in detail the means of access and any road improvements, in cross section, including the legal capability to widen any road. Even from the preliminary scheme, Low Lane remains not as wide as the roads proposed within the estate. Furthermore the Local Planning Authority would need to understand the viability of such a scheme. Road infrastructure costs are very substantial, particularly in taking a road to an adopted standard.</p>
	<p>Swinton is an accessible settlement with convenient access to Malton and a range of facilities</p>	<p>Acknowledged, this is why Swinton and Amotherby are twinned as a 'Service Village'.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>The intention to provide 35% affordable housing with Life Time homes Standards are clearly in compliance with the Local Plan Strategy, but the Local Planning Authority is not convinced that the financial viability is available to meet the proposal as identified in this representation.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority would need to be satisfied that any landscaping scheme, and boundary treatment was in keeping with the character and appearance of the settlement it is not convinced that extending boundary fencing or screening would resolve Officers concerns.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The Scrap metal merchants is legitimately operated, and currently has regular hours of operations, but is not subject to restrictions on its hours of operation. Hours of operation could change, and intensification of use could occur, which could lead to a 'statutory nuisance' which the Local Planning Authority could enforce against. Fettering the operation of the site. Also at two storey units, eastern elevations would look onto the scrap yard, which at the time of visiting on site contained rusting piles of metal piled up against, and above, the western boundary, which is fenced to a considerable height. The Local Planning Authority needs to be satisfied that the occupants of future properties have an acceptable outlook afforded to them. Currently, the built Meadowfield Close manages to avoid any proximal views of the site. This site would not be able to achieve that, and presents challenges in terms of efficient use of the land in terms of considering layout, design and amenity considerations. A boundary treatment which screens the site does not create an visually inclusive, well-integrated scheme, which reflects the character and features of Swinton. Furthermore, the layout submitted in December 2013 is of very poor design, and would not be considered acceptable, or even practicable in its implementation.</p>
<p>Constructive Individuals</p>	<p>Site 346</p> <p>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:</p> <p>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.</p>
	<p>The SSM is not a numerical approach, it noted the proposed affordable housing. The key concern with this site is the fact that it is separated off from the main settlement, accessed down a sub-standard road.</p> <p>The SSM identified that it was not in flood zone 2 or 3 but that a FRA may be required to assess surface water run off. This is required by the Environment Agency to establish surface water attenuation.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority (and Highway Authority) cannot assume what is meant in terms of "improvement of Low Lane". A map should be provided demonstrating in detail the means of access and any road improvements, in cross section, including the legal capability to widen any road for both Low Lane and Lowfield Lane. All that is submitted is the site extent, no details are provided of how the road would be improved. Furthermore, the Local Planning Authority would need to understand the viability of such a scheme. Road infrastructure costs are very substantial.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority is aware that Green Infrastructure could be provided, and this is applicable to many sites, and the absence of information would not necessarily be a reason to discount the site.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The buildings which are referred to are historic agricultural and community buildings, which are expected features in the open countryside. Officers have viewed the site, and maintain that this area is experienced as being out with Swinton , and the development of residential development, irrespective of the height of the buildings, would not be physically related to Swinton.</p>
<p>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)</p>	<p>Disagree. The SSM identifies that the harm identified is localised, and concerned more with settlement form, and that it is a site which is physically and visually distanced from the site. The SSM recognised that impact on the designated landscapes of the AONB and national park would be negligible.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The SSM commentary still stands. No landscaping scheme has been provided. The presence of trees on Low Lane is a landscape feature which is outside the site extent, and whose presence would be undermined in terms of road widening. The site is visible from longer distance views.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>Remain of the view that development of this site would not pay regard to the historic form of Swinton. Site is currently surrounded from all aspects by open fields (save for the eastern elevation).</p>
<p>Happy to engage archaeology professional concerning an archaeological methods statement.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Q21: density. Consider that site contain 24 2-3bed houses and 2 bed bungalows.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority has made theoretical density assumptions, which given the scheme proposed 1.5 storey schemes, it is considered that c.16 dwellings is a more realistic density to that of 24.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted, the Passivhaus features were considered in other aspects, but note that resilience to climate change is multi-faceted, but that being able to efficiently manage thermoregulation of the property is one such aspect. This needs to be considered within the wider performance of the site through the SSM.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This response is standardised based on policy compliance. The proposal could be assessed against the information provided in 2009. Discussions would be required to see if the proposal was meeting identified needs within the Parish, but that would be done through the submission of a planning application.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The limited potential for delivery is concerning the number of affordable homes based on compliance with SP3 and the Local Planning Authority's own assessment of yield . Not limits in terms of delivery on site.</p>

	<p>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.</p>	<p>Material with the submission indicated such a proposal, but there is no evidence which confirms that aspect of the proposal in any detail. Furthermore, officers would consider that improving Low Lane and Lowfield Lane which provides access to the sports facilities would render the scheme unviable. Officers acknowledge this should be added to the SSM to explain why there is no recognition in the SSM of any positive benefit.</p>
	<p>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".</p>	<p>The proximity of the WWTW/pumping station is not necessary a matter which would render the scheme unacceptable in principle. It is noted that the submission identifies that surface water flooding is an issue on the site, despite having Flood Zone 1 status, which makes it even more pertinent to have a Flood Risk Assessment undertaken on the site.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>The 2009 SHLAA is scheduled to be updated. All sites will be reconsidered. The presence of a ready development partner is not enough to consider a site part of the Local Plan.</p>
D. Whattam	<p>Site 194: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.</p>	<p>The rights to access are a civil matter, and not within the remit of the Local Planning Authority to make comment upon. The SSM identifies that the site submission identifies specifically that access route. There is also the access to the south. It is an observation based on the submitted material how the site submission is accessed at present, not in terms of which properties can/cannot utilise the access.</p>
S Helme, R M	Site 40 (158)	

**Simonson, C J Coats
and K E Burgess**

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 identities, 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.

The use as a community facility would not overcome the Local Planning Authority's concerns regarding the overdevelopment of the site, and in developing the site further contribute to coalescence between Kirby Mills, Keldholme and Kirkbymoorside. This is identified within the Local Plan Strategy as being a particular sensitivity for Kirkbymoorside, and with a range of less sensitive sites to be considered for such uses. The site is an important green wedge, providing a distinct open space between the settlements. The water colouring does not provide the Local Planning Authority with a clear position on matters such as: access, parking, relationship to neighbouring properties, siting of the building the ratio of building to residual open space. Notwithstanding this, Officers have viewed the site, and do not consider any building, and particularly of significant scale and form should occupy this site. The site although being flood zone 1 has high surface water flood risk.

<p>J K Billingham</p>	<p>Site 414: 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.</p>	<p>The development referred to is a scheme granted consent in 2010, in the absence of a 5 year land supply, and undertaken in accordance with the principles of the emerging Development Plan. The Local Planning Authority is not undertaking a whole-scale review of Development Limits, and where site-specific circumstances have not changed, then the Development Limits will not be adjusted. On the elevated land to the south of Whitby road, the development Limits only go as far as Highfield House and do not include those dwellings beyond this point. The response indicates that the site as the same visual impact as it did in 1986. In considering sites for allocation, sites which have progressed to the option stage are sites which in landscape/settlement form an character terms are less sensitive, and have the clear capacity to deliver key priorities of the Ryedale Plan which include provision of a range of affordable housing tenures, green infrastructure and public open space, land for primary schools. These are important features which the Local Planning Authority must seek in where it allocates land for new development. Site 414 has both landscape sensitivity, and is also not of a size which the Local Planning Authority considers is an appropriate focus for releasing land for housing. Officers have been to the site, and viewed it from a number of publically accessible vantage points.</p>
<p>S. C. Wright</p>	<p>Site 652: 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>	<p>The Local Plan Strategy sets out the Spatial Strategy, which does not identify Wombleton as a Service Village. The village is considered under SP2 as an Other Village, and not subject to allocations.</p>
<p>C. Wilson</p>	<p>Site 206 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>This site, and those site submissions immediately adjacent to the site were assessed through SSM, and they performed poorly for two interrelated reasons, the first is the identified harm to the setting, character and appearance of Keld Head Conservation Area. The Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to ensure that development does not compromise the Conservation Area. Furthermore, the site (alone or in combination with other adjacent sites) is not of a size which would bring any demonstrable community benefits which are achievable on larger sites.</p>

**P Sutor obo B
Newcome**

Site 125: 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. 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. "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". Q16 E site is capable of incorporating low carbon technologies such as voltaic panels.

In order for the Local Planning Authority to manage consideration of sites for allocation, it needed to impose a threshold so that sites which offered a meaningful level of housing, including affordable housing, would be considered. At 0.08ha this is a very small site. As such, any other site matters are not outweighed by the site's size given it is only capable of a single dwelling. This is the principle reason for the site's failure through the site selection methodology. The site was viewed on site by officers who consider that the site is prominent within the street scene. Building on this site would need very careful consideration, particularly due to the site's elevated position relative to the road. The trees which border the site could still be affected by development on the site, and remain a material consideration. No details of the scale, massing or design of the building have been provided, nor details of the means of access. The dilapidated state of the existing building, whilst being unfortunate, is not in itself a reason to grant permission for a development. Otherwise such an approach could be used as a matter of principle, and undermine the established approach of the Development Plan. It is noted that the hedge which borders the site is well maintained. The (lack of) use of green technologies is not the reason for the site's poor performance through the SSM.

<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 significant adverse impact etc." would be more appropriate.</p>	<p>Officers continue to have reservations about the access with a publicly accessible sports facility. The site was only assessed through the SSM in brief terms, due to the site size.</p>
<p>L. Coulson obo Mrs P Barber and Mr B Booth</p> <p>Site 417:</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 properties.</p>	<p>Before the LPA could comment on this, the access would need to be considered by the Highway Authority. Whilst access is a significant matter, there is also the need to consider what impact a site has on the strategic transport network. Sites on Welham Road contribute significantly, and adversely to congestion problems in the crossing locality. Conversely sites which have the capability to access Scarborough Road without going through town place much less strain, despite being bigger sites, on the road infrastructure network.</p>
<p>Reconfirm no know 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 summaries the housing requirement and distribution issues pertinent to Norton as per the adopted LPS, and other planning policy requirements and consideration.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority consider the matters of flood risk and impact on the River Derwent remain technical considerations which need further investigation. The Flood Risk however is a significant matter, as the site would fail the sequential test as sites are available which are of low flood risk.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>It is important to note, that in terms of the Spatial Strategy planning permission has already been granted on a range of site sites, reflective of the spatial approach. Strategic Sites are sites which are integral to the delivery of the Plan, the Local Planning Authority is considering a range of sites, and not a strategic site. The Local Planning Authority has consciously chosen larger sites due to the ability of such sites to deliver wider community and infrastructure requirements. The Local Planning Authority has not chosen which sites should progress at the towns, but consulted upon options. The LPA must respond to and reflect the nature of the site submissions that the Local Planning Authority has to provide views on. It also identified that there is a residual requirement to meet. Having granted permission for nearly 1100 homes at Malton and Norton. Only two sites, of very different sizes are proposed as allocations.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Of the four option sites, two sites are within the Fitzwilliam Malton Estate, with the other being the Fitzwilliam Trust Corporation, which is a different company and the third is a group of Landowners and developers. This is a function of landownership. Site 450 is owned by the District Council.</p>
<p>Note that the site performs mainly in positive way. Subject to the submission of the FRA.</p>	<p>The presence of the FRA is particularly important consideration. Within the site assessment process balanced choices can be made about which sites progress. However, sites with a flood risk of more than Flood Zone 1 are immediately disadvantaged because of the Local Planning Authority's need to sequential consider allocation of land for development to those areas of least flood risk. Whilst the majority of this site is in flood zone 1, there are also pockets of flood zone 2 and 3, as identified in the SFRA, which, based on advice from the Environment Agency would need to be avoided, because of the availability of land in flood zone 1. It is also a tributary to the main river, and identified within the Critical Drainage Areas. This means that the FRA would be particularly complex and parts of the site would be discounted, or become land-locked. The implications for the Derwent would require a Habitat Regulations Assessment, and based on the assessment undertaken in terms of screening, an Appropriate Assessment would be required.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority has granted permission for a number of residential schemes in Malton. The findings of the transport modelling, have helped the LPA in considering where best to deliver the residual requirement for housing at the Principal Town. The Local Plan Strategy did not specify proportions of development between Malton and Norton, but to consider the best sites for development. The Transport modelling has identified a Norton focus is best- but only when the link road between Scarborough Road and Beverley Road is included.</p>
<p>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).</p> <p>An initial sweeping ecological assessment, will full survey of affected species would be undertaken during the appropriate season, and commissioned in due course.</p> <p>Regarding Trees there are no TPOs which affect the site. Any trees worthy of retention, or contribute to the amenity of the land, the vendors would be willing to work with the Council's Tree Officer</p>	<p>These matters are noted, but the access flood risk and impact on River Derwent SAC remain the primary considerations. The existing trees already contribute significantly to providing a green wedge, and the overall contribution is greater than the sum of its parts. The proposal would need to be subjected to Appropriate Assessment, as all sites in Malton and Norton being considered as option choices have been subjected to such assessment, and this site has the ability to directly link into the Derwent, with Mill Beck.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>In terms of further evaluation as a option site, there are specific issues concerning the remediation of the fish pond, impacts on the river Derwent SAC, through Appropriate Assessment which need to be considered, and so information would be required to consider this in further detail. CIL will be used pool contributions for major infrastructure improvements, but those that are necessary for the granting of planning permission would be required on-site and would be subject to a s.278 Agreement. No mention is made in respect of viability considerations with CIL and the remediation costs associated with the site. Before the LPA could consider the site further, detailed specification of the fish ponds and FRA would need to be provided. This is particularly pertinent because of the River Derwent SAC, the HRA screening assessment established that because Likely Significant Effects cannot be ruled out, an Appropriate Assessment would need to be undertaken.</p>
<p>Evolution Town Planning obo the North Cotes Farm Limited (Watts Family) and Carr Family</p> <p>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:</p> <p>Vehicular access from Welham Road between properties 143 and 147, emergency from Whitewall. Site has good access to the town.</p>	<p>The SSM has considered the sites in their various configurations, and indirectly as a single unit.</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority would need to see detailed drawings which demonstrate that the access is capable of being achieved in line with recognised standards, without unacceptably affecting the amenity of the existing residents on Welham Road who are situated adjacent to the access. The Local Planning Authority is concerned that the access is not of sufficient width. There is also a need to evaluate the strategic implications on the road network of Malton and Norton. These sites have been subjected to modelling. The site is not as accessible to the town centres of Malton and Norton as other sites, which have been consulted upon as option choices. Sites on this side of Norton would either pass along the former Bridle Way of Bazeley's Lane, which is not of sufficient width, and the crossing point with County Bridge. Sites on the west of Norton result in greater levels of congestion.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority remains of the view that development of these collection of sites would be detrimental to the landscape character within the southern part of Norton, and would harm the setting of the town. The presence of residential development to the west, in the form of Ribbon Development, and modern estate development to the north, do not in themselves provide sufficient justification for allowing further development. Despite the presence of ribbon development, the area has retained its rural character.</p>
<p>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 .</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority is keen to stress that it is the quality of the landscape character in the locality which is valued, between both Welham and Langton Roads. It is noted that the land begins to rise so the south of the site, indeed it is within the Wolds Area of High Landscape Value. As part of the Local Plan Sites Document the Local Planning Authority have identified the area as a Visually Important Undeveloped Area. The field patterns in this area are distinct, and atypical, and are greater than the sum of their parts in terms of the contribution which they make to the setting of Norton. It is the features to which the representation refers to that make this part of Norton distinctive, rural character. The presence of the properties on Welham Road are a product of their time, and their presence still allows the wider reading of the site to be undertaken.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The land is still potentially best and most versatile land. Like much of the land surrounding Malton and Norton, because 3a and 3b cannot be differentiated and 3a is still BaMVL. Therefore, in choosing sites for development there is an acknowledgement that BaMVL will be needed. Sites in Malton and Norton would be subject to Appropriate Assessment as part of the Habitats Regulations, in relation to the impact on the River Derwent SAC (Special Area of Conservation) as Likely Significant Effects could not be ruled out. These sites were not subject to the HRA, because of the poor performance through the SSM.</p>

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.

Given that there is no heritage statement, nor recently designed master plan which can articulate how the setting of Whitewall Stables can be preserved the Local Planning Authority remains unconvinced given the proximity of the assets to the site and the nature and scale of the site. The Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to preserve and enhance Listed Buildings and their setting . The Local Planning Authority is aware of the presence of properties on Welham Road, which are representative of inter-war housing, and the existence of a small number of further dwellings have been build, but it is the open quality of the fields opposite which providing setting and context to the Listed Buildings.

<p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority does not concur with the assessment that the existing, more modern dwellings have already changed the area significantly around the Listed Buildings, and as such provide the justification for the development of the site with the landscaping proposed, which acts as a screen to the buildings. The most important feature of the significance of these historic and currently in use buildings is their importance within the horse racing industry. These paddocks are to the front of the site, and that Bazeley's Lane is a former bridle way and views from Whitewall can clearly see these fields. Given that the Local Planning Authority has consulted on a number of other sites as option sites for housing land, and which do not present the same landscape and listed building sensitivities as identified on these site submissions, the public benefits do not outweigh the harm that the Local Planning Authority has identified.</p>
<p>PB Planning obo</p>	<p>Site 252:</p>

Wharfedale Homes

- 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.
 -

The material submitted to the Local Planning Authority for consideration reinforces the SSM appraisal of the site. The site performed well as an individual site. However, Nawton has already experienced a significant level of development (note development completed within the plan period), at over 30 dwellings.

<p>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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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. 	<p>The material submitted to the Local Planning Authority for consideration reinforces the SSM appraisal of the site. The site performed well as an individual site. However, Nawton has already experienced a significant level of development (note development completed within the plan period), at over 30 dwellings.</p>
<p>Nawton, with Beadlam is a Service Village in SP1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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. 	<p>The role of Nawton/Beadlam as a Service Village within the Local Plan Strategy is unequivocal. In distributing the housing requirement across the Service Village tier two matters are primary: considering what development has occurred, or is subject to permission, within the plan period, and as equitably as possible distributing the residual development requirements across the Service Village Tier, without artificially reducing sites, and acknowledging important sensitivities. The Local Planning Authority's preferred sites take into account a 20% land supply buffer in order to ensure that there is enough land allocated/committed to deliver the requirements of the Local Plan Strategy.</p>

<p>Comparing with RDC proposed housing options, the Council have only identified four potential housing allocations with the identified Service Villages.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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. 	<p>Each housing site represents a significant development for the community in which it is located. The site assessment process is multi-layer, and it is not about scoring settlements in themselves, nor is it about the scoring of individual sites. Scoring is not terminology the Local Planning Authority wish to associate with the assessment process because it confers a numeric system which has not been undertaken. The Local Planning Authority notes the response to the Slingsby Site, and its deemed excessive size. Whilst the Local Planning Authority seek to distribute the housing requirement as equitably as possible across the Service Village Tier, the number of recent permissions and completions, and the nature of the supply of sites across the service village tier means that certain villages will not be having an allocation. The site in Slingsby will not be development in its entirety due to the trees of the Balk. The Local Planning Authority has identified that it will not actively reduce sites, unless there a valid planning reasons for undertaking a reduction in site size. Furthermore, in reducing the site size the Local Planning Authority have to be mindful of the existing development at Aspen Way, and how the two schemes would relate to each other. Aligned to the work undertaken on the Site Selection Methodology, and taken on board the above considerations, it is considered that reasonable and appropriate to pursue proposed allocation at Slingsby (430/464) for c.36 units (not 73 which was an error) and seek no allocations at Nawton/Beadlam.</p>
<p>O'Neil Associates obo Thomas Crown Associates</p>	<p>Site 423: Brownfield site -semi-derelict agricultural buildings. Highly sustainable location- 5-10 minutes walk of Malton Train Station , schools, shops and local facilities</p> <p>As Brownfield site, situated within the built up area if Norton, the Local Planning Authority investigated as part of the site selection work whether the site is capable of being developed. The Local Plan Strategy does, as per national planning guidance, support the preferential use of Brownfield land, particularly where it is within a sustainable urban context, and complies with other plan policies.</p>

<p>· 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.</p>	<p>This is not correct. The stage 1 assessment identifies the site being within flood zone 3a (because it is within Flood Zone 3 and developed). It is not Flood Zone 3b, which would have meant failing stage 1. However, in stage 2, the site's high flood risk is then considered in more detail. The NPPF, concerning Development Plan Production, is clear that there is a policy presumption of allocating development to areas of least flood risk, unless it is impossible to do otherwise. The level of flood risk identified on the site is such that sites which have a higher level of flood risk than flood zone 1 fail the Sequential Test, because the Local Planning Authority has a range of sites to meet housing requirements in areas of lower flood risk, and so it is compelled to direct development to those. Even the option choice sites, where some land is in flood zone 2/3, that land must be excluded from the developable area, on the advice of the Environment Agency. This is irrespective of any technical solution to address flood risk matters for proposed/existing development (as required by an FRA).</p>
<p>·The site is capable of development, available for development and deliverable within the first 5 years of the Plan.</p>	<p>Aside from the fundamental issues of flood risk, this is a small parcel of land, of challenging configuration, and would not deliver any significant level of affordable housing, given that the level of affordable housing cannot be provided at this stage in the representations, gives weight to the Local Planning Authority's concerns. The proposed scheme is cramped, and represents a clear over-development of the site.</p>
<p>Disagree that the site has multiple access issues. Highway Authority have responded to planning application with no objection subject to conditions.</p>	<p>The SSM will be updated to reflect the commentary regarding access off Lakeside Way.</p>

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 Local Planning Authority is not compelled to allocate a Brownfield site for housing due to the level of flood risk. There are other sites which can deliver development requirements at lower levels of flood risk, irrespective of any other concern raised or any 'technical solution' which can be demonstrated. The sequential test undertaken by the site submitter has not considered all the sites which the Local Planning Authority is considering as option sites to meet identified needs. Accordingly, it fails the Sequential Test, and therefore cannot undertake the Exception Test.

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 2344m³ 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 2454m³, Site can be developed without loss of flood storage volume.

SuD's 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

See above response.

Savills obo Halifax Estates and Brewis

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

Family

<p>· 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.</p>	<p>This representation seeks the Council to consider allocating 105 ha of land for a mix of uses. This would represent a new Development Plan. The site is of a scale which would be a Strategic Site (as discounted in the production of the Local Plan Strategy), and at 105ha of developable area, would be far in excess of Plan requirements. The site will be given a new ID, and publicised as such. The Council considered the capability of parcels of the site extent of this representation coming forward, but were concerned about site-specific matters, and that other sites performed better in the SSM process, and nothing contained within these representations leads the Council to a different view.</p>
<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.</p>	<p>· The approach proposed by Savills is not correct. The Zone of Tolerance is not part of the land supply. That is the role of the 20% land supply NPPF Buffer which is factored in across the district. It is a mechanism within the Plan to positively manage completions. To actively include this in the supply would, in effect be raising the housing supply target over 55% above the plan requirements. This would be a new plan. The Zone of Tolerance operates on the basis that it is a flexible buffer which allows the delivery of an annual 25% uplift on the 200 homes per year as set out in the Local Plan Strategy, without a deduction in the following 5 years of supply. This helps to respond positively to the small-scale windfall developments the Local Planning Authority will experience above and beyond the identified allocations/commitments. The Local Planning Authority has taken into account existing permissions, in accordance with the NPPG.</p>

<p>· 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 the 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.</p>	<p>· The Local Planning Authority is working with the site submitters of the option sites to ensure that sufficient information is provided concerning deliverability and developability. The representations provided for the promotion of this site are not sufficient for the Local Planning Authority to consider the site as deliverable and developable, but since the site could only be considered as a Strategic Site, which is not in accordance with the LPS, then the Local Planning Authority do not intend to ask for further information about the developability/delivery of the site.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>· The SSM is informed by information provided to the Council about how sites could be developed. The Local Planning Authority consider that the SSM represents a transparent and robust component of site assessment. The Local Planning Authority will be supplementing the SSM with a background papers for each settlement. If there are deficiencies in considering how sites could be refined, this is a reflection of the paucity of information which accompanied the submission. The Council remain of the view that components of this site submission still have concerns: this representation proposes a strategic site, which is not what the Local Plan Sites Document is capable of delivering- based on conformity with the Local Plan Strategy.</p>
<p>(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.</p>	<p>No clear precise information is available to evaluate the impact, although due to the scale of the site, it would a Strategic Site and subject to consideration by Highways England.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>The site is low lying, with a strong intervisibility to Old Malton. Reducing the site extent, i.e. excluding the land to the north of the railway line would not be sufficient to address the harm identified. The NPPF concerning Development Plan Production is clear that there is a policy presumption of allocating development to areas of least flood risk, unless it is impossible to do otherwise. The level of flood risk identified on the sites (655a and 655b and northern part of 655c) is such that in the Development Plan production process, such sites which have a higher level of flood risk than flood zone 1 instantly fall foul of the sequential test, because the Local Planning Authority has a range of sites to meet housing requirements in areas of lower flood risk. Even the Local Planning Authority's 2 option sites, where some land is in flood zone 2/3, that land must be excluded from the developable area, on the advice of the Environment Agency. This is irrespective of any technical solution to address flood risk matters for proposed/existing development (as required by an FRA).</p>
<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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 	<p>655 site was assessed in its respective components a, b and c to allow the consideration of the site in components. Irrespective of considering the sites in their totality (with other land -184) as in this submission, those concerns remain. Given that the Local Planning Authority is not looking to deliver sites which are critical to the delivery of the spatial plan, and therefore defined Strategic Sites, there is no strategic policy approach to consider this site. As discussed above, the commentary identifies that the absence of access was in relation to site submission which is transected by railway (655 a and b), which is a very significant access constraint and not to the entire site, as clearly access to Scarborough Road is present for 655c and 655b. Site 651 has been discounted due to the level of flood risk and the site fails the sequential test. Being of flood Zone 1 site 649 is now identified as the proposed allocation at Norton.</p>

<p>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 on 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.</p>	<p>Site 184 was submitted for employment uses, and assessed on that basis, however, residential development would have further sensitivities concerning flood risk and still have sensitivities with heritage assets. See comments above regarding flood risk and intervisibility of site in relation to Old Malton and St. Mary's .</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 184d- scores negatively on the basis that commercial development could:- Significant tree loss Impact on residential amenity Not compatible size for employment Re-appraising the site a comprehensive proposal with residential uses would result in a positive score for this element 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The Local Planning Authority would need to reconsider 184d as a residential site- which is not what this submission asks because it seeks for the site to be considered within a much larger site. 184d would also be a small site in relation other sites being considered.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Part of 184e has also been considered as site 478 as a residential site - residential development was also considered to have an adverse impact on the setting of Norton Grove Stud. Which, whilst not being listed, provides an attractive setting to this part of Norton.

**Carter Jonas obo
Hovingham Estate**

Site 643: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.

The Local Plan Strategy was submitted in 2012, and adopted the following year. The sites component of the development plan is being prepared now in the context of planning permissions being granted (commitments) and completions taking place within the Plan period. It is entirely appropriate that these are reflected in the supply position, and reflected in the nature of proposed allocations to meet the requirements of the Local Plan Strategy. The eventual purpose of commitments is to become completions. The designation of Hovingham as a Service Village recognises that of the numerous settlements in the district it has key services including primary school, shop and regular bus service. The council has been mindful of the need to as equitably as possible distribute the Residual housing requirement across the Service village tier, being mindful of recent commitments/completions, the Council must also look at the characteristics of the sites submitted. For example, at the village of Staxton, a Service Village, which has not seen any development/permissions in the Plan period, no sites have been considered suitable for allocation due to various constraints and concerns around deliverability. The Council notes the sentence "parameters of The Vision and possibly achieving broader sustainability objectives such as heritage benefits/considerations". This is not the policy justification for allocation of land for housing. That is through the implementation of SP1 and SP2 , through the application of the SSM which is the actual functional workings of the Sustainability Appraisal. If housing sites come forward on the basis of "heritage benefits/considerations", this is on the basis that they are being considered as "Enabling Development" which is development coming forward under exceptional circumstances out with the approach of the Plan. Policy SP12 of the Local Plan Strategy sets out the approach to consideration of proposals.

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.

This response fails to take into account that the allocations are to meet the residual plan requirements. The Slingsby Site is for 36 dwellings (not 73 as previously described) (subject to design/trees consideration). This has been incorrectly described as being 59% of the planned growth over the whole of the plan period. The planned growth is 300 dwellings. As such it is not correct that the Slingsby site is making up 59% of the planned supply, and it is closer to c.13%. This is entirely in accordance with the Local Plan Strategy; distributing as equitably as possible, development across all the villages in the category, meaning existing permissions and completion have to be factored in. Sites are unlikely to be artificially reduced unless there are constraints which warrant such an approach.

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.

This statement fundamentally misunderstands Policy PS2 in the Local Plan Strategy, and the role of local buffer. In the Examination of the LPS, the Inspector concluded it was both the right approach to distributing development, and that the quantum of development was also appropriate. This notion of a "maximum amount of development, which cannot be breached" is incorrect. SP2 outlines scenarios where residential development can take place at the full range of settlement types which exist within Ryedale. The 300 homes to the Service villages is a floor, not a ceiling, which is to be as equitably as possible distributed across the service village tier, taking into account permissions and completions in the plan period. The operation of the local buffer allows for a 25% uplift in completions without reduction in the following years land supply position. This does not specify where this comes from, and is very likely to represent infill development in the smaller settlements. To allocate sites to all the service villages in conjunction with those already consented would be akin to doubling the level of housing to the Service Village Tier. The Local Plan Strategy is clear that development should be split across the Service Village Tier. That is precisely what the Local Planning Authority is achieving through the proposed allocations, whilst being mindful of completions, permissions and the sustainability appraisal findings. It is considered that the consideration of sites and the evaluation of those sites is compliant and consistent with national and local policy.

<p>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.</p>	<p>Disagree. The defining of Service Villages and their development strategy has been the subject of sustainability appraisal as part of the production of the Local Plan Strategy. The Local Planning Authority refreshed the SA scoping to take account of settlement-specific sustainability matters. This was published as part of the sites consultation, and a document which sought to demonstrate how the sustainability appraisal process has been imbedded into the site assessment process. The Site Selection Methodology Tables are the site-focused sustainability appraisal process. The Local Planning Authority have also produced settlement-specific background papers which clarify in specific detail the approach taken in the context of the sustainability appraisal, in conjunction with the Site Selection Methodology.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>There are no public rights of way which cross the site.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>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 garden purposes.</p>	<p>The Sites Consultation was undertaken and demonstrated to represent the point in time, and the sustainability appraisal process can only reflect that position, and be guided by evidence upon which to make judgements. The SSM will note that the gardens are subject to a garden licence. The Local Planning Authority would expect some form of equivalent provision.</p>

<p>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,</p>	<p>The site performed better as an individual site, when reduced in extent from the original (374) submission, because of the flood risk to the north, and the setting of the Worsley Arms. However, there remains some sensitivities- concerning the setting of the Worsley Arms. Given the need to factor in recent developments, there is no need to release further land. There are particular sensitivities concerning Listed Buildings.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 highways improvements to Mowbray Crescent are required (width and alignment) they could be carried out on land owned by the client.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>There is no detail to consider the nature of the impact on the setting and significance of the Worsley Arms complex. Matters such as landscape setting, access would be considered in greater detail had Hovingham not already had the recent development of Pasture Lane.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority are of the view that significant recent development has recently occurred in the settlement. A "heritage imperative" is not in itself a determinant of the implementation of the spatial strategy. Where development is sought as "Enabling Development", on the basis that it is to finance a conservation deficit (based on Historic England guidance and SP12 of the Local Plan Strategy). 'Wider obligations of the Estate' is not sufficiently precise to articulate what the conservation deficit is.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority agrees with the representation that the majority of the housing on the Pasture Lane scheme has been occupied by retired couples and individuals and couples/families on higher incomes. Housing allocations need to be reflective of meeting the broad-ranging housing requirements. It is regrettable that the proportion of affordable housing on the Pasture Lane site, could not have been increased, particularly since the land was in the Hovingham Estate's ownership. The Local Planning Authority would welcome the undertaking of a housing needs survey which would demonstrate what the indigenous needs are and how they could be met. Policy SP3 of the LPS is concerned with the provision of Exception sites, to meet identified local needs, which can be subsidised by market housing, where it is necessary for viability. Whilst it should not be inferred that site 643 is an acceptable site, the LPS is clearly supportive of the delivery of housing which meets identified local needs.</p>

<p>Site 643 is: is fully deliverable:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>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.</p> <p>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 community.</p>	<p>The deliverability matters do not outweigh the other considerations around the sites assessment: namely impact on heritage assets, and access. Also, fundamentally, the settlement's experience of recent, substantial levels of development.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>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)</p>	<p>The proximity of Development Limits is but one of many considerations. The SSM identifies its proximity to existing Development Limits.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted. The Highway Authority would assess the access.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted. The Site is designated as a Service Village due to its relatively good levels of accessibility.</p>
<p>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).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Infrastructure Capacity Site would benefit from existing utilities serving the neighbouring residential properties.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>The Environment Agency have advised that a small part of the site (the north eastern corner) remains in Flood Zone 2, and that it would, in performing the sequential test, expected to be discounted from the developable area. The information regarding other matters in noted, and will be reflected in the SSM.</p>

<p>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)</p>	<p>The site has not been discounted on 'landscape impact' . Significance of Howardian Hills AONB is not in dispute. It is a landscape designation of national significance, which is afforded great weight in the decision making process. The Local Planning Authority does not concur with the view that there would be negligible significance. The AONB boundary abuts the site, being concurrent with the Conservation Area extent, and the proposed development would change how this part of Hovingham is experienced. The current semi-rural edge provides a softening, and entirely expected transition into the open countryside from the existing development. The Local Planning Authority is aware of the discrepancy with the AONB boundary between the Inset Maps and the AONB extent map (produced 2009). The Local Planning Authority has used in the site assessment process the correct, digitised version, which corresponds with the AONB unit's map.</p>
---	--

<p>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.</p>	<p>See responses to the heritage statement below:</p>
<p>Heritage Report: Impact on designated heritage assets- Listed Buildings. • Coach House to Worsley Arms Hotel – Grade II</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lumley House, High Street – Grade II • Worsley Arms Farmhouse – Grade II • Worsley Arms Hotel – Grade II <p>These Listed Buildings are within the context of the potential residential land allocation.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

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 Local Planning Authority do consider that the complex of listed Buildings in the Worsley Arms complex are a very significant heritage asset, and their setting is important to maintain. The Local Planning Authority must, as a requirement of the s.66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) have...."special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses". This is in response to exercising planning functions. Noted whilst some of the farm buildings are of a scale which is detracting, the complex of outbuildings and parcels of land which are used as gardens are entirely to be expected on the edge of a village. The Local Planning Authority is aware that the elevations which are most sensitive in terms of demonstrating the significance of the site are the western and northern elevations, and this is recognised in the designation of the land to the north as a VIUA, which links into already established VIUAs on the garden area of the Worsley Arms. This open area affords important views of the north eastern part of the Worsley Arms, including the Coach House, which is Listed in its own right, but included for group value. This allows the depth of the property to be experienced.

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 as 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.

Based on these representations the Local Planning Authority would require clarification. In the absence of 'appropriately detailed layout plans' which also consider the scale and massing of the building in relation to the Worsley Arms, it is not possible for the Local Planning Authority to confirm acceptability of the proposal. No substantial harm is still harm. As the report states, the impact could vary significantly in terms of impact on setting and significance, depending on the layout: siting scale and massing of development. The requirements placed on the Local Planning authority are clear, that in order for the Local Planning Authority to consider making a judgement on the acceptability of development on the site, this cannot be assessed on simply the principle. But, since there is no compelling need for the site to be allocated

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 Local Planning Authority does not concur with the view that there would be negligible significance, and that because the area is excluded that it provides a legitimacy to undertake development . The statement states that there would be a slight impact. But this is not qualified by whether it is positive or negative. Based on the following sentence it is assumed that this impact is assessed as being positive. The Local Planning Authority remains unconvinced that the impact on the Conservation Area has been fully articulated. This is in no small part due to the absence of master plan of a scheme. But given that the Local Planning Authority is not making an allocation at Hovingham, there was no need to require a master plan.

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 enhancement.

The Local Planning Authority would counter such a view that due to exclusion the site is therefore a de facto site for redevelopment. The site is not within the Conservation Area but the mixture of outbuildings and gardens, with the farm buildings (whilst being modern and large) are nevertheless reasonable and accepted features of an edge of village situation, irrespective of their absence from the Conservation Area. The site is immediate adjacent to the Conservation Area, and the complex of buildings concerning the Worsley Arms. As such development has the potential to have a significant impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in respect of the setting. Although since no scheme is available to consider, the nature of the impact cannot be ascertained.

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.

Strip Field Systems are a heritage asset, and would not necessarily be defined as archaeological asset. The Local Planning Authority consider that an archaeological watching brief would be a minimum. Based on the archaeological evidence within the Vale of Pickering. The County Heritage Unit have advised for sites in the vicinity of this site: Site (32) has already been subject of a DBA, geophysical survey and trial trenching. We have recently had verbal reports that Bronze Age cremation burials have been found on site, so would advise that any further development here is subject to a programme of archaeological mitigation recording. It is noted that some groundwork have been undertaken- denoted by the historic maps, which is likely in that part of the site affected deposits.

**North York Moors
National Park
Authority**

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?

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.

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.

The Local Planning Authority cannot prevent new sites from being considered through the allocations process. The onus is however, on the site submitter to demonstrate that their site performs better than a site which the Local Planning Authority consider is the preferred site. The consideration of sites through the Site Selection Methodology has been undertaken, however, the LPA must be mindful of existing permissions which have been granted/implemented. The Care Home on Hurrell Lane was subject to permission for the development of a number of dwellings, (plus the change in occupancy of other properties to be no longer non-retirement only). The brownfield redevelopment could have occurred at any point in the plan, and the change of occupancy does not represent a new development.

This site performed reasonably well through the SSM, attaining a Group 3 status, and is less sensitive than other sites at the settlement. It is also a brownfield site. The Trees were subject to a TPO which was primarily instigated for landscaping to the former care home.

Norton Town Council	Representation on site 656 : 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.	The Local Planning Authority cannot prevent new sites from being considered through the allocations process. The onus is, however, on the site submitter to demonstrate that their site performs better than a site which the Local Planning Authority consider is the preferred site. This is challenging when sites require strategic consideration, and cumulative impacts consideration (transport/air quality) when sites have been considered on that basis. The Site Selection Methodology has been applied to this site, with the above matters borne in mind. The Local Planning Authority is aware of the infrastructural capacity concerns, however, further studies have evaluated the impact of sites on internal junctions and the resulting impact on air quality to ensure that there are no unacceptable impacts. Regarding utilities infrastructure, Strategic Infrastructure Providers have a long-standing awareness of the overall Plan requirements, and have factored this within their capital programmes. In examining sites, they are expected to at the very least not exacerbate existing issues, i.e. mitigate their own impact. This includes the matters referred to in the representation. Development proposals can also bring the opportunity to improve existing adverse situations, but it is not the within the remit of the Local Planning Authority to compel a developer to undertake such proposals, but they can be a positive by- product. Compared to current sites the site is not proposed as an allocation.
----------------------------	--	--

<p>Norton Town Council</p>	<p>Representation on site 660: 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.</p>	<p>The Local Planning Authority cannot prevent new sites from being considered through the allocations process. The onus is, however, on the site submitter to demonstrate that their site performs better than a site which the Local Planning Authority consider is the preferred site. This is challenging when sites require strategic consideration, and cumulative impacts consideration (transport/air quality) when sites have been considered on that basis. The Site Selection Methodology has been applied to this site, with the above matters borne in mind. The Local Planning Authority are of the view that this site, at 105ha of developable area, could only be considered as a Strategic Site, i.e. it is essential to the delivery of the Plan. The Local Plan Strategy, being the strategic component of the Ryedale Plan, did not propose Strategic Sites - had it done so they would have been included. The Local Planning Authority is aware of the infrastructural capacity concerns, however, further studies are evaluating the impact of sites on internal junctions and the resulting impact on air quality to ensure that there are no unacceptable impacts. Regarding utilities infrastructure, Strategic Infrastructure Providers have a long-standing awareness of the overall Plan requirements, and have factored this within their capital programmes. In examining sites, they are expected to at the very least not exacerbate existing issues, i.e. mitigate their own impact. This includes the matters referred to in the representation. Development proposals can also bring the opportunity to improve existing adverse situations, but it is not the within the remit of the Local Planning Authority to compel a developer to undertake such proposals, but they can be a positive by- product.</p>
<p>Kirkbymoorside Town Council</p>	<p>Representations on site 657 and 661: 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.</p>	<p>Noted. The Local Planning Authority cannot pursue allocation of 622, because it fails the sequential test because the land was in Flood Zone 3b. The site 657 has been granted planning permission, and as a commitment allows Kirkbymoorside to achieve an employment land supply which is plan-compliant. This does not preclude the favourable consideration of planning applications for employment land/activities, as set out in the Local Plan strategy, notably Policy SP6.</p>

<p>Sheriff Hutton Parish Council</p>	<p>Representations on site 658: 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.</p>	<p>Noted. The presence of previous planning applications would be a material consideration in assessing the site for future development purposes, but their presence in themselves does not constitute reason to discount a proposal. The site must be considered within the context of the Development Plan in its current form. Previous applications may have been refused under a different policy context. There may have been specific matters which would require further examination, such as impact on designated heritage assets, or if recent refusal was made, the reasons behind that refusal would need to be assessed as to whether they still stand.</p> <p>The access has not been assessed by the Highway Authority. The site has an undulating road, and is close to the 60mph. In order for a site to come forward, there would be an expectation that the speed limit would be reduced in order to provide a safer means of ingress/ egress.</p> <p>Matters concerning sewage treatment and surface water drainage would require further information to consider these matters. The connection of sewerage and water supply is a matter for Yorkshire Water. Surface water drainage matters would be subject to advice by the Environment Agency, and requires that surface water run off rates of the development site must not exceed run off rates for greenfield sites.</p> <p>The onus is on the site submitter to demonstrate that their site performs better through the site assessment than the site which the Local Planning Authority has identified as a preferred or option site. As such, further information has been requested in order to make that judgement.</p>
<p>Mr B Corfe</p>	<p>Site 205/387, South of Firthland Road.</p>	<p>This site is not identified as an allocation due to lack of need, and due to some site-specific sensitivities, including the presence of Strip Field Systems and complex archaeology.</p>

	<p>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>	<p>Noted. The Highways Authority are satisfied with the volume of traffic and the proposed alleviation measures</p>
	<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"> 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. 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. <p>Clearly, both of these options are far from satisfactory even with the present volume of traffic using them.</p>	<p>The Local Plan Highway modelling has identified that there will be a level of increased pressure on the Vivis Lane, which in the view of the Highways Authority is acceptable.</p>

Vehicles wishing to head West along the A170 from my estate have two options:

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.

2. Further West via Firthland Rd then Manor Drive, again through a welter of cars parked on either side of both of these roads.

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.

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.

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.

The Local Education Authority has confirmed that a new school would not be triggered by the Plan requirement of housing- this is due to current house-building and the existing housing stock, in combination with demographic projections that the number of school-age children is less than previously estimated, and that there is no demand for a new primary school at this time (or within the Plan period). The shortages in coverage for Doctor's surgeries are a result of challenges in recruitment as much as facilities. Although in the preparation of the Local Plan Strategy practices have been made aware of development requirements. New developments are not required to remedy a pre-existing deficiency. Members will, in any re-evaluation of the Reg 123 decide if CIL monies are to be spent on health infrastructure, but this will be within the context of other infrastructure requirements, and their respective priorities.

Nineteen47	<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>	<p>The site has been added into the Sustainability Appraisal under site ID 666. The site has not been necessary to bring forward in terms of the residual requirement. No confirmation has been received from either land owner that legally both site 156 and 666 will be developed together. The detailed layout of site 156 is yet to be established in any detail. The Council's own SSM evaluation accorded Group 2 status to both site 156 and to this site: this is due to the sites both being part of the VIUA for eastern Kirkbymoorside, being within the Area of High Landscape Value, and being part of a strip field system. As an incursion, site 156 was deemed to be sufficiently well integrated. There are also further site assessment considerations with site 666, including that it has yet to been subjected to bird survey in respect of Golden Plover (a HRA requirement). The sites 454/259 and 345 have not been identified as allocations.</p>
-------------------	--	---