

AMOTHERBY PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk to the Council
Miss S Bath
Tel: (07855) 761210
E-mail: clerk@anotherby-pc.gov.uk

Glenmore
Amotherby
MALTON
YO17 6TG

Planning Department
Ryedale House
MALTON
YO17 7HH

4th January 2022

Application 21/01530/MFUL
Land At OS Field 8052 Meadowfield Amotherby Malton North Yorkshire

Erection of 58no. dwellings comprising 22no. 2 bedroom, 31no. 3 bedroom and 5no. 4 bedroom dwellings, including public open space, landscaping, kiss and drop facility and associated infrastructure (total site area 2.68ha)

Dear Sir or Madam

In response to the consultation regarding the above development Amotherby Parish Council **OBJECTS** to the application.

Before stating the reasons for objecting to the proposal it should be noted that the objection does not relate to the principle of developing the site. It is acknowledged that the site in question has been allocated for residential development in the Ryedale Local Plan but it is worth noting how the current situation has arisen.

Ryedale District Council will be aware of the continued interest the Parish Council has had in development in Amotherby, dating back to the initial stages of the Local Plan. The Parish Council questioned the proposal to join Amotherby with Swinton to form a Service Village given that we are 2 separate communities less than 3 miles from Malton where development could have been allocated close to facilities such as shops and services. Nevertheless, Amotherby and Swinton were amalgamated for planning purposes and residential development in the 2 villages was anticipated. The amount of housing expected was based on the housing figures in the Local Plan and the distribution of development throughout the 10 Service Villages. The Local Plan stated the housing figure for the service villages as 300 and that there should be an even spread throughout the 10. Thus, the Parish Council anticipated that approximately 30 dwellings would be developed in Swinton and Amotherby and as we are separate communities an equitable split would result in 15 dwellings in each village.

However, Ryedale District Council decided that Swinton had had sufficient development and the whole of the allocation should be in Amotherby. The Parish Council contested this approach without success and following a Public Inquiry, in which the Parish Council participated, Kings Field (the current application site) was allocated for residential development. The allocation was adopted by the District Council on the basis of an indicative yield of 40 dwellings.

The Parish Council has had to accept the allocation and were comforted to some extent by the adoption in the Local Plan of Policy SD10 which sets out the development principles of the site. Amotherby Parish Council **objects** to the application on the basis that the proposed development does not adhere to the requirements of Policy SD10 of the Ryedale Local Plan and other local and national policies.

Attached as Appendix 1 are the detailed reasons for the Parish Council objections with specific reference to the criteria in Ryedale Local Plan Policy SD10.

Prior to the submission of the current application the developer's agent undertook a consultation exercise with, amongst others, Amotherby Parish Council. The Parish Council's response to that consultation is appended in Appendix 2 together with a further email to the consultant.

At this time, following concerns raised by the Parish Council regarding the proposed scheme, the Parish were advised by the Head of Planning that further engagement between officers and the Parish Council would be forthcoming – this has not occurred.

No amendments to the scheme were forthcoming and in essence the application is as originally proposed in the consultation scheme.

It should be noted that the submitted Design and Access Statement includes a section on responses. The responses clearly indicate support from officers of the Council with some minor amendments attributed to their concerns at the consultation stage.

The Statement states:-

“ the planners appeared enthusiastic towards the new proposal. However they did have concerns regarding the below.

- The density appears to be higher than originally anticipated for this site*
- Break up the amount of front plot parking*
- The planners would like to see the introduction of bungalows*
- The close proximity of the proposed houses to Malton Road is of concern due to noise.*

The Statement goes on to state :-

All the above concerns have been addressed in the revised layout submitted for this application. Since the pre-application, the development has been revised as follows

- Number of units reduced*
- Landscaping has been added to the front of properties to help reduce the impact of parking*
- Additional public open space has been introduced to the south due to the noise impact from Malton Road.*

The Statement gives the impression that the applicants are responsive to comments made at the pre-application stage and in particular the changes at the southern end of the site resulting in a reduced number of units. It should be noted that the buffer zone at the southern boundary was an issue flagged up by the Planning Inspector in her Report on the Sites Document and the following is stated:-

07.Due to the depth of the site a substantial buffer can be created to reduce the potential of noise from the busy B1257 road. Development principles also seek to ensure the retention of the hedge along the main road which would help to reduce the visibility of the development when viewed from the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

It is not clear whether a substantial buffer has been provided but the reduction in the number of units and the additional public open space would appear the result of technical issues associated with noise and not any real desire to reduce the number of dwellings closer to what the Planning Authority

intended. The resultant unused area is then termed “additional public open space” but is actually due to a constraint on development in that part of the site.

It should be noted that none of the Parish Council’s concerns have been referred to in the Statement, or addressed, although the report gives the impression that all consultees are happy with the revised proposal. This is clearly not the case.

The Statement also gives the impression of a high level of community involvement - again this is not the case. Proper community involvement would have meant engagement at an early stage and not when a virtually complete scheme had been evolved. The Parish Council were consulted on a scheme which was stated was not for substantial change and was left with an opportunity to only influence peripheral issues.

The Design and Access Statement’s commentary on the District Council’s involvement is disturbing given that apparently only three areas of concern were flagged up through the pre-application consultation. These are claimed to be addressed, resulting in a scheme that Officers favour in advance of a formal submission. The Parish Council hope that this is not the case.

Summary

The Parish Council acknowledge the allocation of the application site for residential purposes. If the proposal was designed to meet the requirements set out in Central Government Guidance and Local Plan Policy, with reference to Policy SD10 of the Sites Document the Parish Council may have been able to offer support. This is clearly not the case leading to **objection** to the proposal.

The attached report outlines the Parish Council’s objections to the proposed development and are summarised as:-

* The development criteria stated in Policy SD10 and other Policies of your Ryedale Local Plan have not been met.

*When compared to the existing village of Amotherby the development is excessive in terms of size, scale, and mix of dwellings, with a resultant adverse impact on its character and social cohesion of the village. The site is somewhat detached from the main part of the village with poor connectivity which adds to this problem.

*The submitted Design and Access Statement is inaccurate and in parts irrelevant resulting in a scheme of generic house types and a layout that appears as a housing estate “bolted on to” the west side of Amotherby village. The scheme does not reflect the character and appearance of Amotherby.

* The Public Right of Way which crosses the site has not been retained as required by Policy SD10.

*A proper sustainable drainage scheme has not been provided.

*The issue of noise from the B1257 has not necessarily been resolved. A hedge does not stop noise and a clear steer from Environmental Health is required.

*The so called “Kiss and Drop” facility does not appear to have been designed with any proper analysis of the problem that requires its provision.

*The sustainability of the site has always been questionable even at the indicative level of 40 dwellings in a location with minimal facilities. This issue is compounded by increasing the number of dwellings to 58 all of which will be affordable. Families will have to rely on a poor level of public transport or the car to access any reasonable level of services in Malton, both of which appear unsatisfactory given the reason for designating Amotherby a Service Village in the first place.

* The issue of the need for this form and size, and sustainability of the development is in question.

The Parish Council have requested information on this issue from the District Council and reserve the right to comment further.

Yours sincerely

Sara Bath
Clerk to Amotherby Parish Council

Appendix 1

Amotherby Parish Council response/objection in detail

Ryedale Local Plan Sites Document - Policy SD10 – Housing Allocation - Land to the south of Amotherby Primary School, Amotherby:

Development Principles - Detailed proposals for the development of the site shall include:-

- an indicative yield of 40 dwellings
- access from the B1257
- retention of Public Right of Way through the site
- pedestrian and cycle only link to Meadowfield
- land to be provided for a kiss and drop facility for Amotherby Primary School, public open space and children's play area within the northern quarter of the site
- retention of hedge along boundary with the B1257
- well-designed streets and spaces
- landscaping belt to the western site boundary
- scale of buildings to be limited to one and two storey heights
- sustainable drainage system to be integrated into design
- capability for electric vehicle charging for each property with a dedicated car parking space within its curtilage
- lighting scheme to minimise glare, reduce energy usage, and protect amenity
- appropriate archaeological evaluation and mitigation as detailed in Appendix 1
- as a Safeguarded Site, the feasibility and viability of the extraction/utilisation of the minerals resource will be demonstrated

1. An indicative yield of 40 dwellings.

The proposed development of 58 dwellings is far beyond the indicative yield of 40. This increase to 58 dwellings should also be viewed in the context of where the community expectations were in the course of the Local Plan Process, other relevant policies in the Local Plan, the sheer size of the development in relation to the existing village and the mono-mix of tenure.

Whilst it is accepted that the site in question is allocated for residential purposes in the Ryedale Local Plan there are several policy issues that need to be considered in respect of the number and mix of dwellings and tenure proposed.

The Parish Council **object** to the number of dwellings proposed and the tenure proposed.

Going back to the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy the stated aspirations for Service Villages, page 27, is “Limited Small Scale Housing Growth”.

At para 4.18 of the Strategy Document a clear steer on housing development sizes and their relationship to existing “places” is given and states:-

4.18 It is important that new housing sites are appropriate to the character and scale of existing places in terms of their size. The Plan provides a broad steer as to the size/scale of new sites in different locations to help guide the allocation of housing land. It supports the identification of small, medium and large sites at different locations. As an indicative guide for the scale of sites in the context of Ryedale, large housing sites are generally sites of 100 dwellings or more, medium sized sites are those which accommodate generally, between 30 –100 homes and small sites, less than 30 dwellings.....

The proposed level of development in Service Villages is clearly stated in Policy SP2 and states:-

*SP2 Delivery and Distribution of new housing
Service Villages 300 (10%)*

Limited small-scale sites in or adjacent to current Development Limits.

Sites to be distributed as far as possible, amongst all villages in the category.

In addition to the requirement for limited small-scale sites to be developed in Service Villages the overall level of provision of dwellings in such villages is stated to be 300 and these should be distributed amongst all the villages in this category.

It is clear that the proposed development exceeds what is stated as “small” in para 4.18 and when the issue of scale is put into the equation with a 48% increase in the number of properties in the village it is clear that the proposed housing is not appropriate, or Policy compliant.

It should be noted that the Government class development over 10 dwellings as major and states in the NPPF

Major development: For housing, development where 10 or more homes will be provided, or the site has an area of 0.5 hectares or more.

The Parish Council also **object** to the type and mix of the proposed housing. It should be noted that the scheme is submitted by Yorkshire Housing and is for 100% affordable/social housing.

The Local Plan at 4.46 states:- *Type and Mix of New Housing*

4.46 The provision of an appropriate mix and choice of new housing is central to the objective of creating sustainable and balanced communities.

Policy SP4 states:- *Type and mix of new housing*

Increased housing choice and high quality housing will be provided through:

- *New housing development*
- *The re-use of empty properties*
- *Improvements and adaptations to existing homes*

New housing sites in Ryedale will provide increased housing choice and contribute to the provision of a balanced housing stock.

The introduction of 58 units of social housing into the village which has a mix of social and market housing creates a wholly unacceptable imbalance in the social structure of the settlement. The proposal clearly does not provide housing choice or a balanced housing stock and thereby does not accord with Policy SP4.

In addition to Local Plan policy considerations Central Government through the NPPF gives a clear steer on the issues of balanced communities and states at section 8:-

8. Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives)

a).....

b) a social objective - to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe places, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and

c).....

The size, scale and mono tenure/landlord nature of the proposed development with no market housing does not foster the above ideal or comply with Local Plan Policy. On the contrary there is a real danger that the proposal as it currently stands will lead, rightly or wrongly, to an enclave of social housing detached from the village and not part of it. This is partially as a result of the characteristics of the site chosen by the District Council which has poor connectivity with the village.

2. Access from the B1257

This has been provided and we await the County Councils view on the proposed access point.

3. Retention of Public Right of Way through the site

This has clearly not been achieved. Whilst the applicants may argue that a right of way (PRoW) will exist through the site via a diversion the Policy SD10 clearly requires the retention of the only PRoW on the site. The proposed diversion takes pedestrians onto footpaths adjacent to roads bringing about pedestrian vehicular conflict and takes away from the locality a car free link across the site. Based on the need to retain the PRoW it should and could have formed part of a scheme with this facility as an integral part. In reality it has been moved for the convenience of the developers.

The Parish Council have requested further information on the County Councils position on this matter.

4. Pedestrian and cycle only link to Meadowfield

This has been provided.

5. Land to be provided for a kiss and drop facility for Amotherby Primary School, public open space and children's play area within the northern quarter of the site

The Public Open Space and Children's Play Area are provided.

However, the so called "Kiss and Drop Facility" appears to be small, poorly designed and does not take cognisance of the actual issues surrounding the problem of taking children to and from Amotherby Primary School. The terms "kiss and drop" was coined in the Local Plan. In real terms many children attending the school are not kissed and dropped off. In the morning parents/guardians park their vehicle close to the school and children are walked to the school gate. In the afternoon parents/guardians again park as close as possible to the school and then proceed on foot to the school gate to pick up their child. The notion that children are kissed and dropped off indicates a total lack of understanding of what the impact of the school drop-off and pick-up process means for the village.

On street parking for parents is at a premium and at times claimed for long periods of time bringing about extreme traffic congestion due to a conflict with school traffic and through traffic. Conflict also arises between parents / guardians and homeowners as a result of blocked drives and poor inappropriate parking. This may seem to the Council as something that is repeated in numerous locations throughout the country and should be put up with, however, this facility was seen by the Council through the Local Plan process as important enough to warrant a specific policy requirement in the Ryedale Local Plan. There is no indication of how this facility will work, whether it is suitable for the number of vehicles required, how parents/guardians will be encouraged to use it and what the benefit to the community will be. There is a possibility that the current parking problem will end up being split between the existing community and residents on the new estate.

It is apparent from the applicant's submission that, notwithstanding their discussions with the school, there is a lack of understanding of the problem, resulting in statements in the Design and Access Statement referring to the school drop off/pick up impact on Meadowfield - there are only 3 dwellings on Meadowfield. The school drop off/pick up impacts on far more than just these 3 dwellings and affects in particular, Cherry Tree Walk, Main Street, High Street, and also Church Street.

6. Retention of hedge along boundary with the B1257

The hedge is shown to be retained. Although reference is made in the Inspectors Report into the Sites Document to the southern boundary of the site and states:-

07. Due to the depth of the site a substantial buffer can be created to reduce the potential of noise from the busy B1257 road. Development principles also seek to ensure the retention of the hedge along the main road which would help to reduce the visibility of the development when viewed from the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

It is questionable as to whether this has been achieved notwithstanding the amended scheme.

7. Well-designed streets and spaces

In order to satisfy this development principle, the application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement. However, this Statement does little to reflect the character and appearance of the village of Amotherby and how the real character should be reflected in any development of the site in question. It should be noted the D&A Statement is dated 1 July 2021. This is well after the original pre-submission consultation on virtually the same scheme that occurred in March 2021. This leaves doubt as to whether the Statement formed part of the original design concept or has been completed post

design. In addition, the revised National Planning Policy Statement was published on 21 July 2021. No reference is made to this document or specifically to the amended sections on Achieving Well Designed Spaces, Section 12.

There are a number of inaccuracies and irrelevances in the D&A Statement which not only reflect on the outcome resulting from the Statement but cast doubt over its overall accuracy.

The site is described as a vacant field, when it is actually a hay meadow with a Public Footpath running through it. Whilst it is accepted the site is allocated for residential development it should be noted as to what the village and community is losing to facilitate this development and the expectation the community have with regard to a high standard of development to compensate for this loss. It is considered that this has not been achieved.

At 2.3 reference is made to a lack of amenity space in Amotherby. Whilst this is correct the notion that the closest playground is an 8 minute drive away is incorrect and is in fact in Swinton our partner village. Furthermore, it is stated that Brickyard Lakes Country Park is amenity space - this is clearly not so and is irrelevant in terms of this submission. The D&A Statement also claims that "Due to the lack of amenity space close by the proposal will be looking to introduce large areas of public open space including a new play area". This is not the result of any analysis or enhancement given to the community but a Local Plan requirement.

At section 3.0 Design Process it is claimed that the Local Plan Development Principles have been "accounted for". It is not clear what "accounted for" means but it is clear that the development principles have not been satisfied.

In addition, in 3.1 it is claimed that "The proposal reflects the existing scale form and materiality of the neighbouring buildings". This is clearly not the case as houses and gardens are much smaller than in the existing village, and house styles and materials do not reflect existing village properties.

And at section 4.00 of the D&A Statement it is stated "The proposal takes into account all the principles of the Ryedale District Local Plan".

Again, this is clearly not the case:-

- No reference is made to Policy SP16 Design of the Local Plan.
- No reference is made to Ryedale District Councils Supplementary Planning Guidance in the form of the Rural Design Guides.
- No reference is made to the revised NPPF Section 12. Achieving well-designed places.

The Policy of Ryedale District Council through the Local Plan and The Government through the revised NPPF point to a scheme which complements the existing built form of the village and achieves a design and layout which is locally distinctive.

What has been submitted is the equivalent of a 1970s housing estate "bolted on" to the edge of Amotherby village. No cognisance has been taken of the historic flow of the village which is generally linear with grass verges and front garden walls. The house types have not been derived from local distinctiveness but are off the peg, generic and have been used in various locations in the country. The village is made up of a mix of detached houses, villa style semi-detached properties and terraced cottages. This character is not reflected in the proposed scheme.

The proposed materials again are not locally distinctive, apart from selected brick. The village is comprised of a mix of natural stone, render and brick under clay pantile roofs - this mix is not reflected in the scheme.

The issue of the use of "off the peg" generic house types is important. The developers through their Design and Access Statement claim they have analysed the character of the village and through that analysis derived house designs that reflect that character. As seen above it is clear that there is poor analysis and a poor outcome. The house types can be seen on many mass housing sites throughout the country. One example is a development off Spinney Road, Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire. The affordable housing element of the scheme is being dealt with by Riverside, a registered social housing provider. They are currently promoting affordable housing on the site which are virtually identical to those proposed in Amotherby. Wimpey market them as "The Gosford". A link to Riverside is <https://www.riversidehomeownership.org.uk/development/melton-manor> where a mock-up of the property is depicted.

In addition, the Riverside website also has a page which refers to the project team associated with the provision of affordable dwellings at this site which includes Michael Dyson Associates Ltd, the author of the Design and Access Statement and architects for the developers. See link [Spinney Road, Melton Mowbray | Riverside](#)

It is clear the house types have not been derived from an analysis of the character of Amotherby and is “anywhere” generic development.

The layout of the housing does not respect the need to retain the Public Footpath which runs through the site which could have provided an interesting element of the development whilst retaining an historic feature of the locality. The diverted, non-policy compliant footpath appears as a convenient aid to the applicants’ aspirations for developing the site and is a poor substitute for what the Policy intends.

It is worth pointing out the requirements of the Local Plan and NPPF in terms of design:-

Ryedale Local Plan

SP16 Design Development proposals will be expected to create high quality durable places that are accessible, well integrated with their surroundings and which:

- Reinforce local distinctiveness
- Provide a well-connected public realm which is accessible and usable by all, safe and easily navigated
- Protect amenity and promote well-being

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 12. Achieving well-designed places

130. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;*
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;*
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);*
- d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;*
- e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks;*
- and f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users⁴⁹; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.*

The above Policy requirements have not been met and we are left with “anywhere development” using off the peg design that does not reflect the character and appearance of the village.

8. Landscaping belt to the western site boundary

This feature is shown to be provided. Although given its width its ability to screen the site from the West is limited.

9 Scale of buildings to be limited to one and two storey heights

This criterion has been met.

10. Sustainable drainage system to be integrated into design

This has not been provided. Whilst the scheme claims to be a Sustainable Drainage System it relies on a holding tank, pipes and pumps to achieve a run off rate comparable with the existing agricultural
21/01530/MFUL – PC response

drainage capacity of the field. The run off is discharged into the existing surface water system in Amotherby. Yorkshire Water and North Yorkshire County Council Highways are fully aware of surface water problems in Main Street, Amotherby, particularly as a result of heavy rainfall and agricultural run-off. Nowhere in the application is there any reference to this problem and how an increase in flows from this development will impact on the existing system and consequentially residents of Main Street.

At 4.3 in the submitted Suds Management Plan it states:-

“Due to the minimal amount of green open available space onsite it is deemed a suitable solution...”. The requirement for a sustainable drainage system should be seen as an integral part of the proposal, as required by Policy SD10, and not an apparent afterthought following the formulation of a housing layout. The provision of SuDs on this site should be a constraint on development and in part drive the proposal.

To be clear the following information provided by the Local Government Association explains what a sustainable drainage system should be. What has been submitted does not reach these expectations.

Sustainable drainage

Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) are designed to manage stormwater locally (as close its source as possible), to mimic natural drainage and encourage its infiltration, attenuation and passive treatment. *SuDS are designed to both manage the flood and pollution risks resulting from urban runoff and to contribute wherever possible to environmental enhancement and place making. With this in mind, the multi-functionality and multiple benefits of SuDS should always be considered.*

Key Principles

SuDS essentially operate through infiltration where possible and attenuation combined with slow conveyance. Many SuDS solutions employ a combination of infiltration and attenuation. Situations where infiltration is not an option, for example because of the soil type or contamination, tend to favour attenuation type SuDS.

Good SuDS design should follow the SuDS philosophy, which calls for the inclusion of a number of key principles:

- 1. A management train – using a number of SuDS components in series and characterising areas into land use and drainage type*
- 2. Source control – managing runoff as close as possible to where it falls as rain*
- 3. Managing water on the surface – wherever possible, runoff should be managed on the surface*
- 4. Early and effective engagement – consider the use of SuDS at the earliest stages of site selection and design.*

Good practice with attenuation and slow conveyance type SuDS is to use ‘soft engineered’ surface features rather than underground storage and to align the conveyance train with exceedence flood routing.

When SuDS are used in new developments with highways or retrofitted in existing developed areas where there is also highway drainage, the highway drainage arrangements will generally be a key theme which shapes the form of the SuDS. This is because highway run-off often forms a high percentage of the total run-off from developed areas and is also the surface water element that contains the highest level of pollutants.

Benefits of SuDS

Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) mimic natural drainage processes to reduce the effect on the quality and quantity of run-off from developments and provide amenity and biodiversity benefits. When specifying SuDS, early consideration of potential benefits and opportunities will help deliver the best results.

The Parish Council expects that a proper SuDs scheme is incorporated into the scheme as required by Policy SD10 and cannot see why this cannot be achieved.

11. Capability for electric vehicle charging for each property with a dedicated car parking space within its curtilage

This is now a national requirement

21/01530/MFUL – PC response

12. Lighting scheme to minimise glare, reduce energy usage, and protect amenity

Scheme awaited

13. Appropriate archaeological evaluation and mitigation as detailed in Appendix 1

Defer to responsible authority

14. As a Safeguarded Site, the feasibility and viability of the extraction/utilisation of the minerals resource will be demonstrated

Defer to responsible authority.

Appendix 2

Parish Council letter and email responses to Applicants Agent regarding pre-application consultation

AMOTHERBY PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk to the Council
Miss S Bath
Tel: (07855) 761210
E-mail: clerk@anotherby-pc.gov.uk

Glenmore,
Amotherby,
MALTON
YO17 6TG

Mr P Butler
PO Box778
York
YO1 0LT

Tuesday 2 March

Dear Paul

In response to your email dated 9 February 2021 and the Zoom meeting between yourself, a representative of Yorkshire Housing, and the Chairman and Vice Chairman of Amotherby Parish Council held on 19 February 2021 the Parish Council would state the following.

Firstly, the Parish Council would have to state our disappointment at the diligence of the community consultation. This was pointed out at the Zoom meeting. Several residents have complained that they have not received any communication. Whilst the Parish Council offered to assist you in alerting residents of your client's proposals it is concerning that we have had to resort to such measures so that all residents may be properly consulted. In addition, it is noted that deliveries of the pamphlet to residents were included with a batch of junk mail. Not everyone accepts junk mail and others may have disposed of it, including your pamphlet, without realising its importance.

It is disappointing/disturbing that such an important communication can be treated essentially as junk mail and is a poor starting point from which to engage with the Community.

The Parish Council are continuing to discuss the situation with residents and further views may be forthcoming prior to your consultation end date of the 7 March 2021.

The Parish Council understand that the pre application process we are currently going through will form part of your intended planning application as adherence to the Local Plan Statement of Community Involvement. The Parish Council would state that the Community

has not been “involved” in the formation of this scheme. The Community’s involvement is as a consultee on a scheme that already has a high degree of certainty from your client’s point of view and any contrary opinion is not likely to result in any changes, as confirmed by comments in our Zoom meeting. This appears to be a continuation of the “tick box planning” which this community has had to suffer from the outset of the development of the Ryedale Local Plan.

You may not be interested in the background to Amotherby’s involvement with the Local Plan process but it does put into context the position of the Parish Council and the Community. At the outset of the Ryedale Local Plan Amotherby was linked to Swinton to form a spurious Service Village less than 3 miles from Malton. Again a few boxes were joined together and ticked to form a Community that the District Council could “hang its hat on” to prove designation.

Whilst the concerns of Amotherby Parish Council were not accepted by Ryedale District Council the Parish Council accepted that we would have to take our share of development and we were reassured that the development would be limited to 30 dwellings. Given that we had 2 villages jointly designated for development it was anticipated that it would be shared between Amotherby and Swinton, 15 in each settlement. Alas no. The District Council decided that Swinton had had enough recent development and all the allocation would be placed in Amotherby.

This was again changed at the Sites Document stage and as you know we now have an allocation with an indicative yield of 40 dwellings. A far cry from the anticipated 15. We now have a proposal for 65 affordable dwellings.

Since allocation of Kings Field, which is to a large extent intended to bring about some certainty to the development process in Ryedale, the Community have accepted that the site is likely to be developed.

In line with paras 39 and 40 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Ryedale Local Plan Statement of Community Involvement it was hoped that the Community would be involved, at an early stage, in the development of any proposals for the site in question. This has not happened, and we remain just consultees with no involvement. It appears as another example of ticking the required box to satisfy the requirements of a planning application.

However, based on the concept of “community involvement” Amotherby Parish Council would support the development of Kings Field on the following basis and ask that the developers negotiate with the Planning Authority and the landowners to achieve a scheme that adheres more closely to the expectations of the Community and delivers Ryedale District Councils adopted Local Plan Sites Document, Policy SD10.

1. the development is limited to no more than 40 dwellings
2. 35% affordable
3. a mix of dwelling sizes, design and tenure, including market housing that reflect the character and make up of the village
4. a layout that respects the character of the village and the retention, and not rerouting, of the historic right of way which crosses the site
5. a larger area of open space with facilities that would bring to together the new and old elements of the village/community
6. a scheme that reflects the proximity of the site to the Howardian Hills AONB
7. an access to the school that works and understands the way children are taken to and picked up from school without moving an existing traffic and parking problem from the centre of the village to the proposed development.

Whilst the Parish Council retain a positive position regarding being involved in the development of the site the consultation by Yorkshire Housing has to be addressed.

The Parish Council are of the opinion that the current scheme fails to meet many of the fundamental requirements set down in the Local Plan Sites Document which are clearly stated. See below:-

Policy SD10 – Housing Allocation- Land to the south of Amotherby Primary School, Amotherby:

Development Principles Detailed proposals for the development of the site shall include:

- An indicative yield of 40 dwellings
- Access from the B1257
- Retention of Public Right of Way through the site
- Pedestrian and cycle only link to Meadowfield
- Land to be provided for a kiss and drop facility for Amotherby Primary School ; public open space and children's play area within the northern quarter of the site
- Retention of hedge along boundary with the B1257
- Well designed streets and spaces
- Landscaping belt to the western site boundary
- Scale of buildings to be limited to one and two storey heights
- Sustainable drainage system to be integrated into design
- Capability for electric vehicle charging for each property with a dedicated car parking space within its curtilage
- Lighting scheme to minimise glare, reduce energy usage, and protect amenity
- Appropriate archaeological evaluation and mitigation as detailed in Appendix 1
- As a Safeguarded Site, the feasibility and viability of the extraction/utilisation of the minerals resource will be demonstrated

In conclusion - the proposed scheme has no regard for the Community of Amotherby and :-

- * would increase the size of the village by half as much again
- * have the appearance of a suburban housing estate bolted onto the existing village and thus has no regard for the existing character and appearance of the settlement
- * has a mix of dwellings which again is in contrast to the existing mix in the village in terms of size, type, and tenure
- * disregards the Ryedale Local Plan requirement to retain the Public Right of Way running through the site.
- * disregards its impact on the Howardian Hills AONB
- * provides for an insufficient landscape belt on the west boundary
- * does not provide a workable alternative access to the school
- * whilst only marginally sustainable at the time of designation (jointly with Swinton) as a Service Village the Community has since lost its “shop” and has a much reduced bus service. The proposal to develop a 65 unit development of mainly small affordable/social dwellings in a location with limited facilities appears wholly misguided. On the basis that the occupants of the proposed dwellings are not in a financial position to purchase a property and may not own their own transport they will have to somehow reach services 3 miles away.
- * the development goes beyond meeting local affordable housing needs.
- * whilst 65 units of affordable housing may appear appealing to the District Council in their attempts to hasten the supply of such housing Amotherby is not the place for such a large scheme of this nature. It should be provided where occupants have ready access to services, such as locations in Malton/Norton.
- * contradicts the Ryedale Local Plan at para 3.30 regarding the District Council’s Service Village settlement strategy which states :-
This Strategy aims to ensure that development is shared across settlements identified as Service Villages and not focussed in relatively few settlements.

The Parish Council would have no alternative if the consultation scheme is submitted as a planning application other than to object, on the basis of, but not exclusively, the concerns raised above.

However, if the developers wish to engage with the Parish Council with a view to achieving a scheme that meets the requirements of Policy SD10 of the Ryedale Local Plan we are open to further discussion.

Yours sincerely

Miss S Bath
Clerk to the Council

Email to Paul Butler 5th March 2021

I refer to your email dated 3 March 2021 concerning the above.

The Parish Council wish to state that they are quite happy to continue a dialogue with yourself and your client.

However, it was made clear at the Zoom meeting on 19 February that your client would be unable to change the scheme fundamentally and in essence the “formulation of (y)our development proposals” is therefore complete. The Parish Council position is clearly stated in our letter, particularly with reference to Policy SD10 of the Ryedale Local Plan Sites Document. You have stated that, in your opinion, your client’s scheme, with particular reference to housing numbers, mix, type, and tenure, is based on Local and National Policy requirements and cannot be amended.

Whilst the Parish Council listened to your answers to our questions it was apparent that the scheme was not for fundamental amendment and we are left discussing relatively minor elements.

If this is still the case it confirms the Parish Council’s position of consultees and not participants. If we were to be considered participants, the Community would have been brought in at a much earlier stage.

The Parish Council are quite happy to continue to meet with you and discuss the proposal (as stated in the last sentence of our letter of 2 March 2021) but the Parish Council position remains as that stated in the letter. We do not however wish to be combatants regarding this issue and hope an acceptable way forward can be found. The Parish Council looks forward to you contacting us with a view to a further meeting.

With best wishes

Sara
Clerk to the Council