

For Office Use Only

Ref. No.

PART B - Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation Paul Andrews

3. To which part of the document or map does this representation relate?

Please tick the document and indicate the specific policy, paragraph, table or map you are commenting upon.

Policy As appropriate

Paragraph/Table As appropriate

Policies Map Mallon and Norton Policies Map

4. Do you consider the document is:

Please tick as appropriate

- | | | | | |
|---|-----|-------------------------------------|----|-------------------------------------|
| a. Legally Compliant | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Sound | Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Complies with the Duty to Co-operate | Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Please see next page to fill in your comments

5. Please give details of why you consider the document is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the document or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please use this box to set out your comments.

'see attached Note

6. Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound, having regard to the matter you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this modification will make the document legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

See attached note

Please Note: Your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support / justify the representation and the suggested modification as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he / she identifies for Examination.

7. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the Examination?

No
I do not wish to participate at the oral part of the Examination

Yes
I wish to participate at the oral part of the

8. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the Examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

I am a district councillor representing Malton ward.

I am mayor of Malton and a member of Malton Town Council

I wish to be involved in the debate relating to future development in Malton and Water.

Please Note:

The Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the Examination.

Signature

If you are filling in this form electronically by typing your name in this box you are stating to the best of your knowledge all the above information is correct

Signature

Date

Data Protection:

Ryedale District Council is a registered data controller, with the Information Commissioner's Office, as defined by the Data Protection Act 1998. By submitting your details to the Council you are consenting to your information being used for the preparation of the Ryedale Plan Local Plan Sites Document and Policies Map. Please be aware that representations made at Publication Stage cannot remain anonymous. Your response, including your name and address will be made available to view on the website and as part of the examination in public. However, the Council will redact your email address, phone number and signature before your representations are made publically available. Ryedale District Council will need to share you details with the planning inspector appointed to examine the documents, however, the Council will not pass your information onto other third parties unless it has a legal obligation to do so (ie crime prevention). Please be aware that RDC officers may need to contact you as part of this consultation process and a Programme Officer assisting the Planning Inspector may need to contact you as part of the examination process. For further information or clarification on this matter please contact Jill Thompson on 01653 600 666 ext 327 .

**The Ryedale Plan: Local Plan Sites
Publication Stage Representation Form**

Representations of Councillor Paul Andrews.

Answers to Questions 5 and 6 of the Form

Answer to Question 5

1. As regards Malton and Norton, there should be a policy in place restricting all new development to sites which have direct access to a four way intersection with the A64. Please note “direct” does not mean “immediately adjacent to such an interchange. The reason is to ensure that traffic from all new developments can escape onto the A64 without having to drive through Malton or Norton Town Centres.
2. I support the inclusion of the Beverley Road site in the residential land allocations.
3. I object to all other land allocations for residential development within the town and parish boundaries of Malton and Norton.
4. Reasons:
 - 4.1. Policy SP10 of the Ryedale Plan requires infrastructure identified in Tables 2 and 3 which is stated to be **critical and necessary** to support the local Plan Strategy to be secured in tandem with new development.
 - 4.2. Table 2 identifies “**Critical Improvements to Physical Infrastructure**”. These include new slip roads and roundabouts to the intersection at Brambling Fields and a number of “**complementary town centre measures to ensure proper operation of Brambling Fields Improvement**”
 - 4.3. The purpose of these infrastructure works was to take HGV traffic out of Malton and Norton Town Centres, so that the existing highways infrastructure could cope with new residential development in both towns. This was (and is) particularly important because all traffic passing between Malton and Norton has to cross the railway line at the level crossing in Norton. This results in massive traffic congestion at Butchers Corner in Malton, which, together with the roads leading to Butchers Corner, has been designated as an Air Quality Management Area.
 - 4.4. The roundabouts and slip road at Brambling Fields have been built, but the specifications are inadequate to accommodate modern HGV’s. The inspector is invited to view the roundabout on the West side of the A64 and will see that the centre is heavily rutted where lorry trailers have had to ride over the curb on the central reservation. As a consequence of the inadequacy of these works, many HGV’s will not use the intersection, and those coming from the South drive through Malton and Butchers Corner to arrive at destinations in Norton (eg. the bacon factory) and beyond.

- 4.5. One of the critical “complementary” measures is the imposition of an HGV ban at the Level Crossing. However, County has shown little interest in this. The Ryedale Plan was approved in September 2013. In 2011 Ryedale had approved over 300 new homes at Broughton Rise, and after September 2013, they approved a further 50 new homes also at Broughton Rise (the allotments site), the construction of more than 200 houses on land designated as a “visually attractive undeveloped area” at the Showfield and followed this a few years later with permission for a further 80 houses adjacent to the Showfield Site.
- 4.6. (The building over the “visually attractive” Showfield, incidentally was justified on the basis of Enabling Development” to facilitate the move of the Malton Cattle Market from Malton Town Centre to a site adjacent to Eden Camp. However, the Council allowed the development to proceed without any effective guaranty that the Cattle Market would move, and to date, the houses are being built but the relocation of the Cattle Market is in doubt)
- 4.7. The numbers of houses above come from memory and are approximate – they are not numerically accurate, but I’m sure the Council’s officers will provide the precise numbers.
- 4.8. Neither of these huge new estates has direct access to a four way intersection with the A64. This means that traffic from these estates going Southwards cannot escape without driving through Malton Town Centre. This causes massive congestion. For example, on Tuesday 19th December it took my wife 35 minutes to drive the few hundred yards from Market Place, Malton to the traffic lights at the top of Newbiggin, and it looked as though the traffic queue went all the way back as far as Butchers Corner and probably at least as far as Morrisons in Castlegate.
- 4.9. However, since September 2013, NYCC has shown little interest in providing a realistic traffic order for an HGV restriction on the level crossing. They excused themselves for taking any action for several years on the grounds that they were carrying out monitoring exercises. Eventually in 2016 they recommended an “experimental” order banning HGV’s of 12.5 tonnes – which would have made hardly any difference. The County Area Committee insisted on an order banning all vehicles with a weight in excess of 7.5tons. This was approved by County in November 2016 – but subject to County considering exemptions. They expected to make a final order by Easter 2017. On December 11th 2017, I asked NYCC officers at the County Area Committee when we would have the HGV restriction order. The meeting was informed that the matter had been referred to consultants WSP and a report was expected in February 2018.
- 4.10. I firmly believe County are under pressure from businesses in regard to the making of an HGV order. I would not be surprised if they were to use the consultants (who have been criticised by a government inspector on another matter where they were acting for an authority for providing evidence and arguments at a major planning enquiry for which there was “no excuse”) to

justify watering down the agreed 7.5 ton limit so as to allow heavier vehicles to use the crossing, and to make extensive exceptions (eg for quarry vehicles) which will make the order, when (and if) it is made, virtually useless.

- 4.11. I also believe Policy SP10 of the Ryedale Plan has been used as a ploy to justify putting 50% of all new housing development and 80% of all new employment development in Malton and Norton – so that rural members could ensure rural wards would remain untouched.
- 4.12. In these circumstances it would seem to me that the plan will be unsound unless and until the roundabouts at Brambling Fields are redesigned and rebuilt, and an HGV restriction order is made for the Level Crossing which fully remedies the current situation in regard to traffic congestion to the satisfaction of the local community.
5. Further, I have an additional reason for objecting to the proposed allocation of land at Ryedale House. Ryedale has not managed its resources wisely. It broke every rule in the book when it tried to give itself planning permission for the building of a new superstore on Council owned Wentworth Street Car Park. They knew this would be challenged, but nevertheless gambled on winning and wasted their money on legal and consultancy fees, and the acquisition and refurbishment of Harrison House (£1.2M, I believe). As a consequence they would seem to have neglected the maintenance of Ryedale House and now find they can't afford to bring it back to standard. So the Council offices are being sold and the Council is seeking the allocation of the land on which the offices stand for 60 houses. This site immediately adjoins land belonging to the police authority and, next to that, the police station itself. We know the police are looking to re-locate the police station, and so it would appear that the allocation of Ryedale House may be the thin end of the wedge. The land where Ryedale House stands currently fits in with the green spaces on the other side of the road and provides a natural break between Malton and Old Malton. It should not be built on. A private developer would not be allowed to build there: so neither should Ryedale District Council.
6. I agree the building of a new estate at Beverley Road, provided the developers are required to build a spine road to connect with the industrial estate. My reasons are as follows:
 - 6.1. It would complete the housing allocation for Malton and Norton;
 - 6.2. The spine road would allow traffic going to Beverley and East Yorkshire to get to the A64 without passing through the town centre;
 - 6.3. Although the site is not immediately adjacent to a four way intersection with the A64, it does have direct access to the Brambling Fields intersection, and residential traffic will be able to escape onto the A64 without passing through either Malton or Norton Town Centres..
7. Finally, a word on the way the housing requirement for Malton and Norton has been calculated. I believe the numbers of planning permissions granted and/or existing land allocations does not take into account a for some sites where

permission was granted on appeal against a refusal decision. This includes a site for – I think - 100 (it may be more) houses on Langton Road, Norton. In my view, the plan is not sound unless all extant planning permissions and allocations are taken into account when assessing the land allocation requirements.

Answer to Question 6

- Add a policy at the appropriate place in the plan stating that all future development in Malton and Norton should be on land where there is direct access to a four way intersection with the A64;
- Revise all housing requirement figures so as to deduct all permissions granted, including permissions granted on appeal after refusal by the Planning Authority;
- Delete the land allocation at Ryedale House, and any other land allocation other than extant permissions and the Beverley Road site from the Malton/Norton allocations proposal map.

PAUL ANDREWS

19th December 2017