

# AMOTHERBY PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk to the Council:-  
Mrs Sammie Brambles  
Tel: Malton (01653) 695745  
E-mail: clerk@anotherby-pc.gov.uk

'CARPENTERS CROFT'  
AMOTHERBY, MALTON  
NORTH YORKSHIRE, YO17 6TG

14<sup>th</sup> July 2017

Development Management Team  
Ryedale House  
Old Malton Road  
Malton  
YO17 7HH

**Application 17/00645/MOUT - Land East of Manor Farm, Amotherby**

**Residential development of 20no.semi detached dwellings and formation of vehicular access (site area 0.79ha) -approval sought for access and landscaping**

Dear Sir/ Madam

The PC considered this application at our meeting on Mon 10<sup>th</sup> July. We are concerned with the lack of progress with the Local Plan and therefore find it difficult to give an informed view.

That said, although this site is outside the current development limits of the village it was one of the sites (Site 635) that was recognised by residents at the Public Meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> December 2014 as having potential for development and received less resistance to development than other potential sites, having the advantage of access direct from the B1257.

We refer you back to the Parish Council's comments on pgs.3 &4, statistics from the Parish Plan revision on pg.5 re. house sizes required, and Residents comments from the Public Meeting on pgs.11, 12 & 14 of the "Amotherby Parish Council Submission to Ryedale District Council on LDF Sites in Amotherby, December 2014" and in addition to "Response from Amotherby Parish Council, Dec 2015 on Sites Consultation—Local Plan Sites Document and SSM", particularly comments on this site on pgs.6 &7. These documents should be within your records.

Yours faithfully

Sammie Brambles  
Parish Clerk on behalf of Amotherby Parish Council

AMOTHERBY PARISH COUNCIL  
SUBMISSION TO  
RYEDALE DISTRICT COUNCIL  
ON LDF SITES IN AMOTHERBY  
DECEMBER 2014

Contents

Page 2-4

Parish Council submission and comments on sites

Page 5-8

Appendix 1—Parish Plan questionnaire results & comments

Page 9-10

Appendix 2—Minutes of Public Meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> December

Page 11-15

Appendix 3—Residents comments on Sites from Public Meeting

Amotherby PC submission to RDC LDF team on site selection in Amotherby

A questionnaire for the purpose of updating the Parish Plan was sent out in October 2014 and the results pertaining to housing and future development in Amotherby are attached as Appendix 1.

A Public Meeting was held on 1<sup>st</sup> December, all houses in the Parish having received an invitation to attend. Residents were told how far the site selection process had progressed so far and invited to give their views on the sites verbally or in writing, or to send email comments by the following night. These would be taken into consideration in the PCs discussions to formulate the PC comments to RDC.

The general feeling of the meeting was that the residents of Amotherby are still concerned that they have been joined with Swinton to form an artificial community capable of being designated a service village. The community would prefer no major development over and above the local need or a small development and suggest the much more sustainable location of Malton, only 3 miles away, should be capable of accommodating 30 more dwellings.

Having said that, if Amotherby is to accommodate a larger housing scheme/development, then it is only fair that the allocation is split between Amotherby & Swinton. This issue was brought up at the Public Meeting when through a show of hands it was agreed that the community would only accept up to 15 dwellings, the remainder going to Swinton. While this may appear divisive this is a result of the invidious position the District Council have put us in.

The Minutes of the meeting, including verbal comments, are attached as Appendix 2.

Written & email comments received are attached as Appendix 3.

At the Parish Council meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> Dec Cllr.Mrs Skilbeck & the Clerk declared interests in one of the sites and left the room, taking no part in the discussion or decisions of the Parish Council.

The Parish Council has the following comments to make on the sites (in numerical order):-

Site 8 – Station Farm field

1. The submitted site plan appears to indicate the existing Station Farm house & outbuildings would be demolished. This house dates to about 1860 and is a very important part of the character and street-scene of the village.
2. The site is very close to BATA mill, from which there is considerable noise from 6am to 10pm and sometimes continuing until midnight or later. Houses in Church Street can hear this clearly and complaints would be very likely if developed.
3. The whole site is too large and if all used would extend the village too far east.
4. There are problems with running sand in some parts, if not all, of this field. A deep hole appeared overnight when the foundations for Cornwell House were being dug, which resulted in the house having to be built on a concrete raft. This sand area continues across the road & caused houses where the entrance to Meadowfield now is to collapse when the drainage when put into the village in the 1950s.
5. Potential access to the site is narrow (unless Station Farm demolished) and would be in close proximity to Meadowfield, potentially creating great traffic problems at peak journey times.
6. There was a proposal in 1989 to develop this field (application 3/5/62/OA), which in Nov.1989 was held in abeyance. After discussions between RDC, the Parish Council and the then owner it was eventually withdrawn, we believe in Oct 1993.
7. There may be important archaeology on the site. A resident remembers seeing a photo showing crop marks indicating a large building (possibly Roman villa). See also Google Earth.
8. The development of this site would extend the linear form of the village to the east. This would be contrary to its character and have an adverse impact of the setting of the listed church to the south.
9. Public comments expressed total opposition to development on this site.

#### Site 61 - Bentleys Garage

1. Site is an old quarry and has been used as a dumping ground for many years, potential of soil pollution.
2. Overshadowed on the south boundary by tall trees, steep slope and Westlers factory.
3. Noise problems
4. Application for housing development turned down in 2003 (03/00390/OUT) & 2006(06/00960/OUT). When taken to Appeal (APP/Y2736/A/06/2027637/NWF) dismissed by Inspector.
5. Development of this site would not add to congestion in the Main Street.
6. Given public comments it may be time to revisit the potential development of this site.

#### Site 148 – field south of the school (King’s field)

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.

#### Site 181 - opposite BATA oil & gas depot

1. Far too close to oil & gas depot for safety.
2. No support from the Public Meeting.
3. Noise problems.

#### Site 371 - Westlers factory

1. Existing working factory.
2. Public comments expressed opposition.

#### Site 381/612 - Pump House

1. Could accommodate 1 house without detriment as there are existing buildings here.

#### Site 635 – field west of Eastfield, east of Manor Farm

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.

#### Site 636 - opposite Lime Kiln Farm

1. Would join Swinton and Amotherby together.
2. Within AONB boundary.

### Conclusions

The adopted Local Plan Strategy states :-

(para 3.34) that development should be “used to meet the specific housing needs of local communities”.

(SP1 pg.30) sites should :-

- avoid adverse impacts of interests of acknowledged importance
- be accommodated without detriment to the character of the settlement and its setting.

(pg 53)—service villages—sites should be distributed as far as possible, amongst all villages in the category

A large number of houses would be too large a percentage increase in the village size to be assimilated in one go. More than 15 would be greater than a 10% increase.

Previous developments have been below 15:- Eastfield 14, Meadowfield/Cherry Tree Walk 10 and Seven Wells 12.

We therefore expect :-

- that development should incorporate houses to meet local need.
- that sites chosen should fit in well with the existing village.
- that Amotherby should have to have a maximum of 15 houses allocated and that Swinton should expect some additional development.
- that development will not add to traffic problems in the village

Appendix 1

Amotherby Parish Plan revision 2014—questionnaire results regarding housing and development.

During the first week of October a questionnaire was distributed to households in Amotherby parish for the purpose of updating the parish Plan produced in 2009.

The parish includes a total of 153 houses of which only 123 are situated in the village itself. High Street/Main Street and roads off these contain 78 and the remaining 45 lie along the B1257. The rest are in three outlying areas—Hildenley and part of Easthorpe (14), isolated farms and dwellings north of the village towards the River Derwent (7) and 9 adjoining Appleton-le-Street.

As we thought that residents of the outlying areas may have different opinions to those that live in the village itself the results have been analysed three ways :- village, outliers and whole parish.

The statistics regarding housing and future development are given in the table below.

<u>Distribution and return information</u>	Village	Outliers	Whole Parish
Number of dwellings	123	30	153
Number of houses empty :- for sale/to let/under repair	5	1	6
holiday cottages/homes	3	1	4
Number where resident declined to take	4	3	7
Number of questionnaires distributed	111	25	136
Number of questionnaires returned completed	93	17	110
Percentage return	83.8%	68%	80.9%

Statistics from questions re. housing

Number of responses & percentages of these

		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Q24 Would any member of your household directly benefit from the availability of local affordable housing, now or within the next 5 years?	Yes	18	20.5	2	13.3	20	19.4
	No	70	79.5	13	86.7	83	80.6
Q25 Would you be in favour of a small development of affordable homes for local people within the parish if there was a proven need?	Yes	67	76.1	9	60.0	76	73.8
	No	21	23.9	6	40.0	27	26.2
Q26 Would you be interested in the local authority undertaking a Housing Needs survey in Amotherby?	Yes	46	55.4	5	33.3	51	52.0
	No	37	44.6	10	66.7	47	48.0
Q31 How many new houses would be acceptable to you? Please tick one box	None	16	19.0	6	42.9	22	22.5
	1 – 5	17	20.2	2	14.3	19	19.4
	6 – 10	22	26.2	4	28.6	26	26.5
	11 – 15	10	11.9	1	7.1	11	11.2
	over 15	19	22.6	1	7.1	20	20.4
Q32 Should any development be phased over several years?	Yes	53	73.6	6	46.2	59	69.4
	No	19	26.4	7	53.8	26	30.6
Q33 If we have to have houses built what size should they be? If a mixture please tick all that you would agree with.	2 bed starter	62	32.6	6	27.3	68	32.1
	3 bedrooms	59	31.1	7	31.8	66	31.1
	4 bedrooms	22	11.6	5	22.7	27	12.7
	Bigger	5	2.6	1	4.5	6	2.8
	Bungalows	42	22.1	3	13.6	45	21.2

Conclusion

Majority of residents

- want fewer than 10 houses, although support for more
- want 2/3 bedroom properties & bungalows, not large houses
- want houses for local people, for which there appears some need

COMMENTS RE. HOUSING & DEVELOPMENT FROM PARISH QUESTIONNAIRE, OCT 2014.

FROM VILLAGE RESIDENTS

31. No. of houses

- Not sure, it would depend on where development was.
- Don't believe the village could support more—insufficient infrastructure.

33. Size of houses—other

- Pensioners bungalows

34. Extra comments on housing & future developments in the parish.

- Services in Malton area need to match increase in housing.
- Full consultation with those potentially affected is essential before any development is approved.
- Keep it to a minimum.
- It depends on where the buildings are to be placed. Providing common sense is used the more housing the better.
- Farmland (greenbelt) should not be used for development. Limit to infill sites only.
- Should grow slowly, houses in keeping with rest of village. Large development of town houses will spoil the village. People live in a village because they like village life. Building hundreds of houses between Swinton & Amotherby would make a small town & we would want to move. Transport is too poor, no work opportunities, no infrastructure, school too small, add more commuting traffic spoils villages.
- My major concerns would be extra traffic through the village & the capabilities of the sewer system & electrical infrastructure to cope with new development.
- I think the village would be spoilt & with all the proposed development in Malton & Norton is it really required?
- Not too many houses.
- Ensure any future houses are built on sites that stay within the present village boundary. No greenfield sites needed.
- If future housing is allowed a park/play area for the village should be part of the deal.
- Local sewage system is overloaded now & has been for the past 30+ years, this has in the past stopped further development. Sewage system damaged & has been for past 10-20 yrs & has never been repaired.
- We would be in favour of a small development but would be concerned about anything large due to the school becoming too full, impact of extra traffic, possibility of spoiling walks & the pretty views.
- More housing should have adequate % age of affordable houses for local people, but prior to that provision all roads should be upgraded to accommodate any additional traffic.
- Don't want Amotherby to become a town.
- Concerns for extra housing is where these new houses would be located. Also road safety & access could be a potential issue.
- When negotiating with housing development companies what can they offer the village? ie. cricket/football field.
- All development should be on brownfield sites.
- We are an unserved, congested village with traffic & parking problems. Limited employment opportunities. Amotherby cannot fruitfully support more population.
- Only on brownfields.
- Any new housing has to have regard to access onto the highway such as Main St., to avoid congestion.

- Most of the houses in Amotherby have had added extensions resulting in larger & more expensive properties. There is very little room for infill anywhere. Where is there a site that would be suitable for a small development, apart from King's field?
- Drainage unless massively updated would not cope with more houses. The school does not have the capacity to accommodate more families and it would increase traffic.
- I think only affordable starter houses for local people should be built!!!
- We feel that Amotherby & Swinton are full enough already & would be spoiled by any further development.
- I have no objection to 20-30 houses more in villages (both). It would be good for local business & may bring new opportunities. As long as the schools can service extra children/traffic.
- A SMALL development at Bentley's Garage site would be good—but houses with gardens & space to enjoy, not all crammed together.
- School & too much traffic now, also parking in the street.
- Would appreciate details of aforementioned protests. Housing is a countrywide issue requiring everyone to become involved—at the same time a community being able to maintain its integrity is paramount but does not require instant dismissal of future housing projects!
- Retirement bungalows.
- Ensure that the local infrastructure can support additional housing—safer junctions—more bus services- “village shops”.
- Need a range of housing, plus a careful strategy around affordable housing. In effect not to create an estate of purely affordable housing but to pepper-pot around mainstream development.
- Remove the Ryedale Council planning department & replace by people with common sense.

#### 71. What do you not want changed.

- Wouldn't want the village getting too big.
- Do not want to become too big.
- Keep the village small, don't over-develop.
- Village doubling in size—moved from Malton because we didn't like looking onto hundreds of houses.
- The streetview.
- Green fields to disappear.
- No more than 2 new houses every 3 years.
- Size of the village.
- Housing
- It's size.
- Why build more houses when there are many for sale some of which have been on the market for a long time.
- No further housing developments.
- Not to lose the sense of identity & become a large area, made up of residents who do not wish to be involved or mix and have no interest in the village life.
- Rural identity of the village & clean environment (no litter, grass cut, flowers along pathways etc).
- No more housing development as we don't feel the village infrastructure can cope with it.
- Anything that would spoil the views or environment.
- Don't want a massive increase in general housing.
- A small strictly for pensioners development.
- We shouldn't lose the fact that Amotherby is a quiet & tranquil village so therefore should resist large scale, purely affordable housing projects.



FROM OUTLYING RESIDENTS

34. Extra comments on housing & future developments in the parish.

- Should be made affordable for local people who already live & work in the area.
- More focus on housing in Malton rather than supermarkets. More residents in Malton would support local retail so that they have a chance of surviving more than 12 months. Demand for housing, increased residents need an economy, local economy.
- 1. With more houses come more cars. Amotherby needs to sort out the existing considerable congestion before we have more building in the village. 2. Can the school take more children?—probably not.

71. What do you not want changed.

- Village life, the community.
- The number of houses—let's keep our village as a pleasant place & not build it up so much that it is not a village anymore. And let us not squash houses in, like Swinton.

## Appendix 2

### Minutes of the Public Meeting on LDF Sites held on 1<sup>st</sup> Dec 2014 at 7-30pm

#### Present

Parish Councillors:- Cllr. N.Ballard, Cllr. P.Simpson, Cllr. J Edsall, Cllr. D Skilbeck

Members of the Public:- 39 residents of Amotherby Parish were present, list attached

#### Apologies

Simon Allen, Andrea Ward

#### Declarations of interest

The Clerk and Cllr. D Skilbeck declared pecuniary interests in Site 148 and withdrew from the Parish Council table to sit in the audience. (Neither made any comments during the meeting).

Mrs Borrett (retired Clerk) undertook to take notes.

Cllr. Ballard explained that Cllr. Simpson would briefly explain the reason for the meeting, and we would then ask for residents views and opinions. There would then be a time for those who had not already looked at the sites (displayed around the hall) to do so and make comments in writing, to be deposited in the box provided. Comments could also be emailed to the Clerk or direct to RDC (email addresses were on the table next to the comments box).

Cllr. Simpson then explained that a review of the Local Plan had already been going on for several years, some may be aware of this but others not, which was why this meeting was being held. RDC had decided that most new housing (a Government requirement) should be built in the 4 Market Towns, but that 10% (300) should go into 10 "Service Villages". Amotherby and Swinton had jointly been designated as one of the service villages. Amotherby PC had objected about this, both to RDC and the Inspector who held the Public Enquiry into the Local Plan, but our objections had been overruled. We therefore had to accept that some development in the village was inevitable, probably 30 dwellings between the two villages. The PC need residents views on the various potential sites which had been put forward for consideration for development. RDC had already carried out a preliminary weighting of the sites using the Site Selection Methodology and had explained this to the PC. Most sites were rated fairly poorly but 3 had scored much better. Views on all the sites were requested, but particularly on the 3 which looked to be the front runners.

A vigorous discussion then ensued. Comments & questions are listed below (not necessarily in order) and answers were given when possible.

- Are they (RDC) bothered about the village already being jam-packed with traffic?
- If a site was large enough to accommodate more than 15 houses would this be acceptable?
- What type of dwellings would be provided? Up to the developers?
- A. Mixed housing types required by RDC.
- Number of houses most acceptable? Does the PC themselves vote for 15?
- A. RDC have to build more houses, this has forced the situation on the PC.
- Developers would not be interested in very small sites and small numbers.
- Traffic & congestion bad enough now, development will make worse & spoil the neighbourhood.
- A. Land still has to be allocated, so which site is the most acceptable. The District Council will make the final decision on which site is allocated.
- Large size family houses bring children, far too much for the school and present traffic.
- Have make a car park for school.
- At present there would seem no need for extra building, given developments in Malton.
- If field above school used could make a car park.

- Size of site should be commensurate with number of houses required.
- Fabric of road (in village) & speed of traffic already a problem.
- Would houses be built over a period or in one development?
- Building on a site on main road more of a necessity than into the village.
- What time scale for development?
- A. Plan covers period up to 2027.
- Will we end up with more than 15 houses?
- A. There is that possibility.
- If a large site is chosen can PC state number of houses limit or will this create extra income for developer?
- Can we get some contribution (to the village) from developers?
- There is an obvious problem with traffic, is there a site where 30 houses could go with a second access point to reduce traffic on Main Street?
- Do the residents want development at all?
- A. 19% of village residents said they wanted no development at all in Parish Plan questionnaire replies.
- Not all sites have good access potential.
- Access to King's field (site 148) from top road (B1257) seems to be best option.
- If looking to keep traffic out of the village could we have one house on each site? Does there have to be 15 houses on one particular site?
- A. Not acceptable to RDC.
- Have we gone over the question of if we need a development, yes or no?
- A. PP questionnaire results indicate that a small development of homes for local people would be acceptable.
- What issues are taken into consideration by RDC? If Amotherby says we want no development will Swinton get 30?
- A. There is a possibility of getting far more than 15 houses on larger sites if the PC cannot stipulate which site is preferable. We have to decide whether we would accept 15, splitting the allocation with Swinton. If we say no to any development we may end up with all 30.
- If houses build on main road site 635 can we get a reduction on speed limit on B1257?
- A. Need to make comments on sites as presented, not on what hoped for gains may be possible.
- Can there be a vote on the number of houses residents will accept?

Proposed:- allocation should be split with 50/50 with Swinton (without commitment to any particular number). Amotherby should receive an allocation of no more than 15 new houses.

A vote was taken by show of hands. 28 voted for the proposal, none against.

- How many houses were there already in the village?
- A. The actual village, High St./Main St. and along the B1257 includes 123 dwellings, some empty .
- How many houses had been built in the past?
- A. Previous developments, Eastfields 14, Meadowfield/ Cherry Tree Walk 10, Seven Wells 12. There had also been a number built on infill sites and quite a lot of houses had been extended.

Cllr. Ballard then thanked everyone for coming and invited those present to put any comments they had on the sites in writing and leave them in the box provided. All comments would be read by Parish Councillors and taken into consideration when they debated further at next Monday's PC meeting.

Meeting drew to a close at 9pm.

### Appendix 3

#### Residents comments on Amotherby Sites from the Public Meeting 1<sup>st</sup> Dec 2014

These comments were received in writing at the meeting or by email.

#### General points

- Amotherby is a linear village so development should be in keeping with the historic character of the village, not creating large estates behind housing currently in existence.
- Not in favour of any further development which will exacerbate traffic problems on Main Street.
- Sites should be on the main road or down towards BATA.
- Look to gain lower traffic flows through the village.
- Put up 30 houses & ensure you get additional access to reduce traffic flows through the village. This will benefit the village & give the council (RDC) what they want. The important bit is to choose the correct site that gives an additional roadway access.
- Anything built adjacent to BATA does run a risk of noise which would not be suitable to property development & would restrict a good local employer.
- We want none. Large 5 in parish plan wanting larger developments would be landowners who will benefit financially! Do not increase traffic in village. Drains already at breaking point. School parking problem.
- There are big housing estates being built already, do we really need any more housing in Amotherby, taking into account access to the school with further children attending putting pressure on class sizes, congestion into Malton & pressure on amenities in Malton such as the doctors.
- Obviously new housing is needed and it makes sense to spread it amongst the villages but it should be in keeping with the village and some should be affordable housing.
- My understanding is that the planning regulations change next April at which point plans submitted for new housing developments which have no means of being supplied by natural (mains) gas can no longer be built with LPG or oil as their heat source. This will mean that they will have to be built with a renewable energy like air source or ground source heat pumps or something like a biomass boiler, all of which will add an incredible amount to the build cost and in turn the selling cost of any houses.
- We recognise that there is a potential need for increased availability of housing in Amotherby and Swinton by 2027. We would favour an incremental and organic approach to growing the local housing stock through the use of infill development of brownfield sites. We feel strongly that if development is to take place, the responsibility should be shared equally between Swinton and Amotherby.  
If a single site development is the preferred option, we would favour a site on the B1257 (i.e. site 148, 635 or 636) which could be accessed from the main Helmsley to Malton road. We do not favour any development whatsoever that requires access from and into Main Street and/or High Street. Amotherby already has very serious traffic problems owing to both very heavy school traffic and the general volume of traffic passing through the village, including BATA lorries. Anything that would exacerbate this situation further would be extremely detrimental to the village. There are many occasions when the village is completely log jammed with traffic and we feel it is only a matter of time before a serious accident will occur.
- Following tonight's meeting we would say that the 2 sites we would most strongly support are nos, 61 and 636 as they both have access from the 1257 and seem to be the right size for up to 15 dwellings. Given that is the maximum development the village is prepared to accept, it would be a mistake to support a site big enough to take more than 15 as we could end up with much 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.

- We feel it is important, when considering any development, that due regard is given to the nature and character of the two villages. It strikes us having seen the various sites proposed, particularly in Amotherby, that many of them are large and these would invite considerably more development than the 30 dwellings indicated. Development of sites of anything more than an acre or so would completely alter the feel of the village and we think these would be inappropriate, especially so with large-scale developments being currently constructed a few miles away at Broughton Rise in Malton and those contemplated by the FitzWilliam Estate on their High Malton site.

Whilst those sites 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 which is very popular and attracts pupils from a wide area because of its reputation. This brings problems of its own in terms of traffic. 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 – we live opposite the Meadowfield junction and getting in and out of our house at those times is difficult and sometimes, dangerous. Access to the school for buses and for parents to drop and collect children is difficult and unsafe and any suggestion of developing sites for housing which need access from the main street should be resisted as completely inappropriate for these reasons.

Having said this, if a single larger site were to be thought more appropriate in order to attract a developer, then we would think No 148 the most appropriate. This would offer potential to give access directly to the school from the main Malton Road and thereby relieve the main village road of its congestion problems and make it much safer for children and parents to access the school.

School not at capacity at present so with all the new houses in Malton & limited/ no capacity there children are likely to come to Amotherby, adding to the traffic problems. Catchment area children have priority over those from outside, so by building in Amotherby the school can potentially be filled with local children who will walk rather than drive. Isn’t it better to keep school for local children by providing local houses?

#### Site 8—Station Farm field

##### For

- ----

##### Against

- No, because it is right in the village.
- This site is too large. Little or no access to the site. Would require access through the village & force traffic out via a one-way around the development.
- Totally unsuitable, would lead to more traffic in village & stretch services.
- Access would have to come onto Main Street through Amotherby. Again congestion issue with traffic already going through the village & from existing residents.
- We strongly object to this site—access issues into village,--traffic issues into village, heavy now,--drainage.
- Not in favour due to adding to traffic/congestion problems in the village.

- 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 & the traffic is already unacceptable.
- 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.

#### Site 61—Bentley’s Garage

##### For

- Would seem the logical option to me as it would tidy up the entrance to the village & is a direct access from the main road, plus cars will not be travelling through the centre of the village.
- OK
- Should be reconsidered for development. Access available off main road & prevents further decay of site. This site mirrors Eastfield so within the village this is appropriate use. Westlers doesn’t wrap around the site. Sound alleviation measures can be put in place to minimise disruption.
- Would get rid of eyesore of garage forecourt. On main road.
- In favour due to access to main road B1257.
- Bentley’s garage needs to be developed. Access ok, out of village.
- Good, it would be nice to see the whole garage/site removed & something tidy built.
- OK.

##### Against

- -----

#### Site 148—King’s field

##### 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 very large scale development to make it viable (cost of all services).
- Could exacerbate surface flooding problems in Main St & building here would destroy any chance of solving school parking problems. Not a good idea to have an access onto B1257 just within 40mph limit where visibility not good.

Site 181—opposite BATA

For

- ----

Against

- Not appropriate opposite BATA with all the lorries & BATA traffic, would cause congestion. Already traffic is speeding up at the Queen's Head, going more than 30 mph. Is it a good place to put more housing opposite gas & oil depot?
- Definitely not. It's opposite BATA.
- Unclear if this development is feasible due to proximity of BATA & oil depot opposite. This may restrict the potential for this site.
- Far too close to BATA fuel depot.
- Opposite fuel depot, not suitable.
- No—not opposite fuel depot.
- Not in favour as impact on traffic, village congestion etc.

Site 371—Westlers

For

- OK

Against

- Too large to accommodate 15 no. houses required.
- Site too large-would lead to more dwellings in future, but is that a negative as keeps development ? (last words unreadable)
- Not in favour—too large a site.
- Far too large.
- Could be ok but room for far too many houses & more than we want.
- Not so good. Strong possibility of very large scale development to make it viable (cost of services, but not as expensive as site 148).

Site 381/612—Pump House

For

- Site fine but would allow limited no. of dwellings.
- Not bad.
- OK, but 1 or 2 houses?

Against

- Definitely not.
- This site is not suitable for development, too small for this no. of houses.
- Too small.

Site 635—next to Eastfield

For

- Positive view as not in village & access straight onto main road.
- Better option-access onto main road so no disturbance to village traffic & no congestion problems, especially with school traffic in village at beginning & end of school day.
- Favourable dependent on access directly on to B1257.
- Ideal site, access good.
- Good/best.
- OK. Access & public utilities can be phased.

Against

- No, not good access onto road.
- Very large, too much potential.

Site 636—opposite Lime Kiln farm

For

- Positive view as not in village & access straight onto main road.
- Better option-again access straight onto main road, not causing congestion with more traffic through Amotherby Main Street.
- Too large as site but access onto B1257 is in it's favour.
- Suitable access & out of village.
- Good position.
- OK. Easy access to main sewage/public utilities.

Against

- Definitely not, will spoil the character of the road & village as this is a wide open field.
- This is unacceptable as Swinton & Amotherby would be “physically” linked with completion of development here.
- Too large an area—could be over built.
- Too large.



## Response from Amotherby Parish Council, Dec 2015 on “Sites Consultation –Local Plan Sites Document and SSM

Four questions are posed in the Sites Consultation Document (pg 56) and in the Sites Consultation Service Villages summary (pg 6):-

1. **What are your views on the Council's preferred sites?**
2. **Do you have any views on how we have selected these sites?**
3. **Do you think there are better sites for housing development in these locations, and why?**
4. **Are there any further sites listed below we should be considering for allocation?**

Please find below Amotherby Parish Council's responses to these questions. We have limited our replies to sites in Amotherby and Swinton.

### 1. **What are your views on the Council's preferred sites?**

- In our role as representatives of residents of Amotherby the Parish Council OBJECT STRONGLY to the selection of Site 8- (land east of properties on Main Street and north of St Helen's) as a preferred development site for the following reasons.
- Amotherby Parish Council last year undertook a Public Consultation meeting which resulted in a comprehensive "Submission to RDC" in Dec 2014, to which we refer you back, and from which extracts are included below (*in italics*). The views expressed in this are still the views of the Parish Council.
- This was the one site residents overwhelmingly did **not** want developed.
- Development here will add considerably to traffic problems in the village, which already suffers excessively being a through route to Pickering, Kirbymoorside and other villages, with heavy vehicles associated with BATA and huge problems with school traffic.
- The Highway Authority do not appear to have taken into account the issue of the impact the school has on traffic flows and highway safety in Amotherby and the simple fact that any development accessing off Main Street will add to those problems and will be affected by them. Sometimes the street is gridlocked. There is a detrimental impact resulting which manifests itself in damaged grass verges, vehicles speeding to exit the area as soon as possible, excessive fumes and noise, notwithstanding the ongoing efforts of the Parish Council to achieve mitigation. Adding to this situation is unacceptable especially when other sites are available.
- We have some doubts about access to this site being satisfactorily achievable. We believe that part of the logical potential access between 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.
- In Questions 6, 10, & 12 reference is made to a submitted scheme. If "the submitted scheme" is a material factor in the assessment of the sites it should form part of the consultation and be freely available to consultees. As it stands the Parish Council are of the opinion that the "submitted scheme" should not carry any weight and should not predetermine or influence officers recommendations.
- In Question 8 it is stated "in terms of the character of this site, its rural, pastoral qualities would be lost through development; harming the character of the settlement".
- This site will affect the setting of the Grade 2 Listed church, churchyard and cemetery. (Qs 10 & 12)
- Although the existing Station Farm House is not listed it perhaps should be. It dates back to around 1860 and is a typical traditional farmhouse of that period. Any threat to the building or its immediate surroundings is unacceptable. There is a strong likelihood of important archaeological remains in the field. (Q13)
- The overall rating for "D Culture and Heritage" is "double minus/red", reflecting the concerns over the effect on the setting of the Church, existing house and possible archaeological remains.
- The geology of the site is double minus/red and there is a potential serious risk to the public water supply—should this site therefore even be considered for development? (Q25)

Please also see extracts from our "Submission to RDC" below.

PC comments Site 8 – Station Farm field,(pg 2)

1. The submitted site plan appears to indicate the existing Station Farm house & outbuildings would be demolished. This house dates to about 1860 and is a very important part of the character and street-scene of the village.
2. The site is very close to BATA mill, from which there is considerable noise from 6am to 10pm and sometimes continuing until midnight or later. Houses in Church Street can hear this clearly and complaints would be very likely if developed.
3. The whole site is too large and if all used would extend the village too far east.
4. There are problems with running sand in some parts, if not all, of this field. A deep hole appeared overnight when the foundations for Cornwell House were being dug, which resulted in the house having to be built on a concrete raft. This sand area continues across the road & caused houses where the entrance to Meadowfield now is to collapse when the drainage when put into the village in the 1950s.
5. Potential access to the site is narrow (unless Station Farm demolished) and would be in close proximity to Meadowfield, potentially creating great traffic problems at peak journey times.
6. There was a proposal in 1989 to develop this field (application 3/5/62/OA), which in Nov.1989 was held in abeyance. After discussions between RDC, the Parish Council and the then owner it was eventually withdrawn, we believe in Oct 1993.
7. There may be important archaeology on the site. A resident remembers seeing a photo showing crop marks indicating a large building (possibly Roman villa). See also Google Earth.
8. The development of this site would extend the linear form of the village to the east. This would be contrary to its character and have an adverse impact of the setting of the listed church to the south.
9. Public comments expressed total opposition to development on this site.

Our Conclusions (pg 4) stated

We therefore expect :-

- that development should incorporate houses to meet local need.
- that sites chosen should fit in well with the existing village.
- that Amotherby should have to have a maximum of 15 houses allocated and that Swinton should expect some additional development.
- that development will not add to traffic problems in the village

We refer you also to:-

Appendix 2—Minutes of the Public Meeting on LDF Sites held on 1<sup>st</sup> Dec 2014 at 7-30pm

Appendix 3--Residents comments on Amotherby Sites from the Public Meeting 1<sup>st</sup> Dec 2014

Site 8—Station Farm field, (pgs 12/13)

**For:-**

- no comments in favour

**Against:-**

- No, because it is right in the village.
- This site is too large. Little or no access to the site. Would require access through the village & force traffic out via a one-way around the development.
- Totally unsuitable, would lead to more traffic in village & stretch services.
- Access would have to come onto Main Street through Amotherby. Again congestion issue with traffic already going through the village & from existing residents.
- We strongly object to this site—access issues into village,--traffic issues into village, heavy now,--drainage.
- Not in favour due to adding to traffic/congestion problems in the village.
- 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 & the traffic is already unacceptable.
- 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, firstly on how Site 8 has been selected:-

The "Sites Consultation Summary—Service Villages" states on pg 3 that there is a "figure to plan for" of 116 houses, including a 20% buffer of 60.

- There are six Group 4 sites in other villages which will more than provide this number. (Ampleforth 21, Nawton 20, Rillington 27, Sherburn 4 + 8, Slingsby 73 = 153, plus a Group 3 site at Sheriff Hutton 15 =168).
- Since there are no Group 4 sites in Amotherby/Swinton we feel that the inclusion of site 8 (Group 3) is purely an attempt to include another village in the distribution of development.
- We find it difficult to understand why site 8 has been preferred as sites 148 (Amotherby) and 341 (Swinton) are also Group 3 sites with, in theory, equal potential. See (Amotherby and Swinton Site Assessment Table).
- Given the very close proximity of Amotherby/Swinton to Malton/Norton the very small number of houses required would be far better built there, where facilities and sustainability are much greater.
- All three sites in Amotherby (8, 148 & 635) are classed as posing a serious threat to the public water supply. Why then are they even being considered?

Secondly, we wish to point out inconsistencies and errors in the Amotherby and Swinton section of the Full Site Selection Methodology document.

- Comparing the Group 3 sites (8, 148 and 341) and sites 635 and 538 (group 2) we find that the number of dark green, light green, pink and red sections, the +'s and -'s, in stages 2 and 3 are very similar:-

Site		8	No.+/-	148	No.+/-	635	No.+/-	341	No.+/-	538	No.+/-
Dk.green	++	15	47 +	13	45 +	12	45 +	13	50 +	14	42 +
Light green	+	17		19		21		24		14	
Pink	-	9	17 -	6	16 -	4	14 -	6	10 -	8	22
Red	--	4		5		5		2		7	
+ minus - total			30		29		31		40		20

Indeed on a purely mathematical basis and **assuming no errors** in classifying the colours/+-'s & -'s of sections, sites 635 and 341 perform better than sites 8 and 148!

**However**, going through the SSM questions individually the following errors and critiques have been found:-

- Q1A --from site 635 to the local shop takes an average walker only 9 minutes.  
--from site 635 to the Primary School takes 8.5 minutes.
- Q3 –site 148. It is stated that there are no footpaths along the frontage of the site. This is **incorrect**, there is a footpath which extends all the way to Appleton-le-Street.  
–site 538. This site **does** have access onto a public highway and the section should not therefore be marked "double minus/red". See also our comments on this site in answer to your question 3.
- Q5 –site 148. No information on green infrastructure but this could be provided. The section should in our view be marked as + light green, as are other sites under consideration.
- Q8 ( or should it be 9?) –site 148. Although adjacent to the AONB the site slopes down from the B1257 and much of the site is hidden by the hedge along the road. As there are no footpaths on the AONB in close proximity it would not adversely affect the setting of the AONB and the section should be marked as + light green, not – pink.
- Q25 –sites 8, 148 and 635 in Amotherby are all marked "double minus/red" with a "potential serious risk to the public water supply"—should any of these sites be considered for development when there are sites in Swinton where no such threat exists?
- Q27 –site 8. It is stated that there is no evidence of land instability, but this is **incorrect**. There is historical evidence of running sand in this area and buildings, where the entrance to Meadowfield now is, collapsing. While Jubilee House and Cornwell House, adjacent to Station Farm, were being built in 2001 subsidence within the foundation area occurred overnight. This resulted in Cornwell House having to be extensively piled, with the piles going down at least 15 metres before hitting a solid base. This must surely be a strongly negative indicator for this site.
- Q29 –site 8. This site is close to the BATA mill, which works from 6am to 10pm, and on some occasions during the year to midnight or after. Whilst the noise from the mill is not excessive in decibel levels (most of the time) there is a continual rumbling noise, which can be annoying. Noise mitigation measures can be applied to houses but not to gardens and so this is likely to cause nuisance and

- affect the amenity of proposed occupants. There are likely to be complaints to BATA which could impact on their business.
- "I Overall rating for Amenity" –site 8. is lower than for other sites (148 & 635).
  - Q46 –site 8. Whilst Highways consider access onto Amotherby Lane(Main Street) acceptable the residents of the village do not. All traffic from this site will have to go through the village, and as job opportunities in Amotherby are limited most occupiers of houses here will have to travel away for work.
    - site 538. This site **does** have access onto a public highway and the section should not therefore be marked "double minus/red". See also our comments on this site in answer to your question 3.
  - Q48 –site 148. The existence of a PROW on the site should not count against it, indeed it may be a positive benefit by dividing the site into logical areas of use.
  - Q50 –all sites (8, 148,635 & 341). It is stated that "We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer." This is **incorrect**, the lower parts of Swinton quite frequently suffer from sewage welling up into the street and some homes, usually in periods of heavy rain as the drainage system in both Amotherby and Swinton is of a combined nature. The sewers do not have the capacity to cope with more houses.
  - Q52 – site 8 is marked "++ dark green" but it will have an adverse impact on the setting and surroundings of the Church (a community facility), it should be "– pink".
    - site 148 is marked "+ light green", but the possibility of a school car park should be a positive advantage, it should be "++ dark green" at least.
  - "M Overall rating for Community Facilities, utilities and infrastructure":-
    - site 148 is marked "– pink" but in our view the footpath across the site and the potential for a school car park are positive advantages which should lead it to be marked "++ dark green".
    - site 538 is marked "double minus/red" but owing to the error in Q46 this is **wrong**.

**In conclusion, we think the SSM is seriously flawed in certain respects and that basing the selection of site 8 on this is completely wrong.**

### 3. Do you think there are better sites for housing development in these locations, and why?

Please see below, after general points from our "Submission to RDC" of 2014 (*in italics*), the Parish Council's current comments and extracts from the "Submission to RDC" of 2014 (*in italics*), site by site.

#### Residents comments -- General points (pg11/12)

- | Amotherby is a linear village so development should be in keeping with the historic character of the village, not creating large estates behind housing currently in existence.
- | Not in favour of any further development which will exacerbate traffic problems on Main Street.
- Sites should be on the main road or down towards BATA.
- | Look to gain lower traffic flows through the village.
- | Put up 30 houses & ensure you get additional access to reduce traffic flows through the village. This will benefit the village & give the council (RDC) what they want. The important bit is to choose the correct site that gives an additional roadway access.
- Anything built adjacent to BATA does run a risk of noise which would not be suitable to property development & would restrict a good local employer.
- We want none. Large 5 in parish plan wanting larger developments would be landowners who will benefit financially! Do not increase traffic in village. Drains already at breaking point. School parking problem.
- There are big housing estates being built already, do we really need any more housing in Amotherby, taking into account access to the school with further children attending putting pressure on class sizes, congestion into Malton & pressure on amenities in Malton such as the doctors.
- | Obviously new housing is needed and it makes sense to spread it amongst the villages but it should be in keeping with the village and some should be affordable housing.
- | My understanding is that the planning regulations change next April at which point plans submitted for new housing developments which have no means of being supplied by natural (mains) gas can no longer be built with LPG or oil as their heat source. This will mean that they will have to be built with a renewable energy like air source or ground source heat pumps or something like a biomass boiler, all of which will add an incredible amount to the build cost and in turn the selling cost of any houses.
- | We recognise that there is a potential need for increased availability of housing in Amotherby and Swinton by 2027. We would favour an incremental and organic approach to growing the local housing stock through the use of infill development of brownfield sites. We feel strongly that if development is to take place, the responsibility should be shared equally between Swinton and Amotherby. If a single site development is the preferred option, we would favour

a site on the B1257 (ie.site 148, 635 or 636) which could be accessed from the main Helmsley to Malton road. We do not favour any development whatsoever that requires access from and into Main Street and/or High Street. Amotherby already has very serious traffic problems owing to both very heavy school traffic and the general volume of traffic passing through the village, including BATA lorries. Anything that would exacerbate this situation further would be extremely detrimental to the village. There are many occasions when the village is completely log jammed with traffic and we feel it is only a matter of time before a serious accident will occur.

| Following tonight's meeting we would say that the 2 sites we would most strongly support are nos, 61 and 636 as they both have access from the 1257 and seem to be the right size for up to 15 dwellings. Given that is the maximum development the village is prepared to accept, it would be a mistake to support a site big enough to take more than 15 as we could end up with much 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.

□ We feel it is important, when considering any development, that due regard is given to the nature and character of the two villages. It strikes us having seen the various sites proposed, particularly in Amotherby, that many of them are large and these would invite considerably more development than the 30 dwellings indicated. Development of sites of anything more than an acre or so would completely alter the feel of the village and we think these would be inappropriate, especially so with large-scale developments being currently constructed a few miles away at Broughton Rise in Malton and those contemplated by the FitzWilliam Estate on their High Malton site. Whilst those sites 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 which is very popular and attracts pupils from a wide area because of its reputation. This brings problems of its own in terms of traffic. 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 – we live opposite the Meadowfield junction and getting in and out of our house at those times is difficult and sometimes, dangerous. Access to the school for buses and for parents to drop and collect children is difficult and unsafe and any suggestion of developing sites for housing which need access from the main street should be resisted as completely inappropriate for these reasons. Having said this, if a single larger site were to be thought more appropriate in order to attract a developer, then we would think No 148 the most appropriate. This would offer potential to give access directly to the school from the main Malton Road and thereby relieve the main village road of its congestion problems and make it much safer for children and parents to access the school. School not at capacity at present so with all the new houses in Malton & limited/ no capacity there children are likely to come to Amotherby, adding to the traffic problems. Catchment area children have priority over those from outside, so by building in Amotherby the school can potentially be filled with local children who will walk rather than drive. *Isn't it better to keep school for local children by providing local houses?*

### **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.

Residents comments Site 148—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 very large scale development to make it viable (cost of all services).
- | Could exacerbate surface flooding problems in Main St & building here would destroy any chance of solving school parking problems. Not a good idea to have an access onto B1257 just within 40mph limit where visibility not good.

**Site 635**

Current comments from PC

- 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? Houses were built over a Roman road in Malton after archaeological investigation in about 1990 (Castle Howard Road/Fitzwilliam Drive).

Extracts from our "Submission to RDC"

PC comments Site 635 – field west of Eastfield, east of Manor Farm (pg3)

1. Roman road crosses this field towards the southern boundary. Its line can be seen on the ground by the remains of a ridge and ditches.
2. Access direct onto the B1257 is potentially good, but this currently has a 40mph limit which is often exceeded. The pavement here is narrow and right beside this fast stretch of road.
3. The site is relatively close to Westlers (Malton Foods) with its associated noise problems.
4. Development of this site would not add to congestion in the Main Street.

Residents comments Site 635—next to Eastfield, (pg 14)

**For:-**

- | Positive view as not in village & access straight onto main road.
- | Better option-access onto main road so no disturbance to village traffic & no congestion problems, especially with school traffic in village at beginning & end of school day.
- | Favourable dependent on access directly on to B1257.

- | Ideal site, access good.
- Good/best.
- | OK. Access & public utilities can be phased.

**Against:-**

- | No, not good access onto road.
- | Very large, too much potential.

**Site 341** in Swinton

There are no previous PC or residents comments on this site as our Public Meeting in 2014 looked only at sites within Amotherby.

Current comments from PC

- Continues the form of the village.
- Adjacent to site allocated in last local plan which has since been developed as Meadowfields with no apparent amenity issues.
- Noise from the scrap yard is probably about equal to that at site 8, but is not continuous and lasts for a shorter period. The yard is open 8am to 5pm although may be operative from about 7-30am to 6pm. Noise mitigation measures can be applied to houses and gardens will be quiet in the evenings.
- No adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone identified by the Environment Agency.

**Site 538** in Swinton

There are no previous PC or residents comments on this site as our Public Meeting in 2014 looked only at sites within Amotherby.

Current comments from PC

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.

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.

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 ie low landscape impact (+/light green) and not "-/pink" as assessed.

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.

**4. Are there any further sites listed below we should be considering for allocation?**

Yes, all those below, especially the group 4 sites.

- Ampleforth site 160 (group 4)
- Hovingham site 643 (group 3)
- Nawton Beadlam site 173/252 (group 4)
- Rillington site 175 (group 3)
- Sherburn sites 283 & 264 (group 4)
- Staxton & Willerby sites 177 & 217 (group 3)
- Thornton le Dale site 109(group 3)