

Kirkbymoorside Town Council

Information for meeting on Monday 21 December 2020

11. Planning

e. Proposed development of Sylatech and associated land at West Lund Lane

II. To note correspondence received in response to the consultation

Kirkbymoorside
YO62 6AJ
12 December 2020

Councillor Nick Holroyd
Chairman and Mayor, Kirkbymoorside Town Council

Dear Cllr Holroyd

I am in receipt of a public consultation document from DPP planning regarding the expansion of Sylatech at Kirkbymoorside. I was somewhat surprised to see that the proposal includes 67 dwellings as part of the development, being at odds with the Ryedale plan which highlights the land being considered is for expansion of existing industry only. While I accept that the formal planning application is still to be submitted, I wanted to air my opposition at this early stage.

I feel it is rather underhand, and much like politicians 'burying bad news' to put out a public consultation document in the run up to Christmas when people's minds are on something else. To expect replies by the 2nd January, after just three weeks at this busy time is unreasonable especially when due to Covid it is not possible to hold a public meeting. I think the end of January would have been a fairer date.

The Ryedale plan for Kirkbymoorside identifies the land to the east of West Lund Lane as expansion of existing industry – i.e. Sylatech. The proposal being put forward goes against that agreement in that it is a hybrid development including housing. We already have 200 new houses being built on the west side of the town, and a further site for 45 dwellings is currently being considered off Swineherd Lane. I would like to know how many of these 200 houses are being purchased by current residents or those that work in Kirkbymoorside.

Kirkbymoorside is a small market town with limited employment opportunities, so any increase in population will result in more pollution and congestion due to commuting to places of work. The town of Kirkbymoorside does not need a further 67 dwellings without first having the infrastructure to support this type of expansion.

There is just one doctor's surgery, one dentist, one chemist, one primary school. The nearest secondary school, Ryedale, is bursting at the seams. The road network cannot cope with the additional traffic, both commercial and residential, and outdated services, especially sewerage, will not cope with an ever increasing population, and housing developments of these magnitudes will undoubtedly spoil our small market town.

More specifically on the actual plans, creating entrances from West Lund Lane will severely increase the level of traffic in what beyond the old railway bridge is a single track, quiet rural lane. This is used by many town residents, and not just in the immediate area, for their mental health and well-being by taking daily walks, children can safely ride bikes and dogs are exercised off lead. During the first lockdown it became a lifeline for many as their daily exercise. Adding 67 dwellings will increase the number of houses accessed down West Lund Lane by 150%. I don't feel that the lane is suitable for this additional level of traffic. Assuming there will now be additional street lighting on the

proposed housing development, there will be additional light pollution in an area that is largely dark sky.

Finally, there are grave concerns over the proposed phase 3 expansions, which will turn this area effectively into another industrial estate. Sylatech have not indicated what type of subsidiary businesses they will be, but there is likely to be an increase in air and land pollution together with noise. The only access to these units looks to be via West Lund Lane resulting in yet more traffic, possibly including HGVs.

The two buildings being proposed close to West Lund Lane will be an eyesore on the landscape, especially for the dwellings of Ardoch and Field View, with a negative impact on house values. The current value of our properties, invested in during our working life, are meant to provide for a comfortable standard of living in retirement after downsizing, or provide the ability to choose later life care if or when required. This may well be put at jeopardy, and is already causing anxiety and sleepless nights with worry.

Overall I would reluctantly accept the initial expansion of Sylatech (with access from the A170) but am totally against the housing development and proposed phase 3 for the reasons given. I would ask that you lend your support to the opposition of this proposal.

Yours sincerely,

A large black rectangular redaction box covers the signature. A small, thin vertical line extends downwards from the bottom left corner of the redaction box.

Subject: Proposed Development at West Lund Lane

Date: Tue, 15 Dec 2020 11:22:35 +0000.

I understand that there is a town council meeting next week and the proposed development at West Lund Lane is on the agenda.

I don't know if it is too early to give my views and/or if this is the right forum but that's never held me back in the past.

Firstly may i say that I am very pro the development of Sylatech but combining it with further unwanted residential development completely loses my support. May I therefore separate the issues between the commercial and the residential.(albeit I recognise that Sylatech will want the residential part to help finance the whole proposal and therefore they might not consider them separately).

Commercial Issues.

West Lund Lane is not a commercial road, it has a bottle neck at the bridge which i doubt is strong enough to take the HGV vehicles that would be needed for this development. Whist I have no objection to the expansion I believe that it should be limited to the current (or improved) access and that at worst an emergency exit onto West Lund Lane. My only other comment is that Phase 3 is somewhat open and that limits especially to noise/environmental issues should be made if the proposal went through.

Residential issues

This would be the Fourth residential proposal after the massive (in proportion to Kirkbymoorside currently) development starting in Westfields, the long vacant, neglected and unsightly development at Wainds field, the Swineherd Lane proposal and now this one. I am now going to sound like a broken record but the objections are the same as before only now with the Westfield development going ahead they are even more acute. All these additional houses will need services like School's, Doctors and Dentist's. which are already at capacity. Where are the Jobs for these new people? The transport links to other towns are limited whilst the roads in the immediate area are continually being "patched up" instead of repaired which with the inevitable extra traffic will necessitate even more roadworks and disruption. Work on these factors should have taken place before the Westfields development. Surely before any more residential development we should see movement in these areas.

I ask that the current proposal is rejected until at the very least the infrastructure issues are addressed or that we work with Sylatech on the commercial side of this proposal.

[REDACTED]