**NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN FOR MALTON AND NORTON 2019-2027**

**INFORMAL POLICY OPTIONS CONSULTATION – REPORT ON RESULTS**

**INTRODUCTION**

Overview

The consultation officially ran from Friday 25th January 2019, for 3 weeks until 5pm on Friday 15th February 2019.

Due, however, to problems with the door-to-door distribution of newsletter/questionnaires, the deadline was extended until 5pm on Monday 25th February, to allow for delivery to addresses not previously covered. The fact of the extension was advertised in the local press.

Overall response/breakdown

The consultation attracted 223 separate responses, with 221 made by response form (with/without supplements) and a further 2 by e-mail or letter.

Report structure

The remainder of the report looks at each policy option area in turn and is set out as follows for each policy option area:-

* Quantitative summary of results;
* Schedule of verbatim comments;
* Conclusions from results;
* Recommended actions in response to results.
* Issues for discussion prompted by consultation results (NB where such issues were identified).

**POLICY H1: MALTON HOUSING MIX**

**Q. WHAT KIND OF NEW HOMES DO YOU THINK MALTON NEEDS?**

Answered: 171 Not Answered: 53

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANSWER CATEGORY** | **ANSWER CHOICE** | **% RESPONSE** | **NUMERICAL RESPONSE** |
| Housing Type | Bungalows | 59% | 101 |
|  | Detached | 29% |  49 |
|  | Semi-detached | 48% |  83 |
|  | Terraced | 25% |  43 |
|  | Specialist Elderly Accommodation  | 48% |  83 |
| Housing Tenure | Owner-Occupier | 60% | 103 |
|  | Shared Ownership | 36% |  62 |
|  | Rented | 47% |  80 |
|  | Private Rented | 10% |  18 |
| Housing Size | One Bed | 26% |  45 |
|  | Two Bed | 71% | 121 |
|  | Three Bed | 49% |  84 |
|  | Four Bed+ | 16% |  27 |
|  |  |  |  |
| TOTALS |  |  | 899 |

**COMMENTS**

Type

All types.

Re ‘special accommodation for the elderly’ – wet rooms.

All.

Re ‘semi-detached’ – but not too close together.

Re ‘special accommodation for the elderly’ – and/or disabled.

Re ‘bungalows’ – the increasing population will be elderly one day.

Re ‘special accommodation for the elderly’ – sheltered with café, social/medical facilities.

Tenure

Mixed.

All.

Re ‘rented’ – more social housing.

Re ‘rented’ –publically owned.

Re ‘rented’ – from council.

Size

Mixed.

All.

General

RDC - As Local Planning Authority, the District Council is responsible for negotiating a mix of housing to meet local housing requirements. The District-Wide Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) provides evidence to support the type of housing required in Ryedale to address stock imbalances and projected household growth. It is important that planning decisions are evidenced based and the District Council would be keen to see how your consultation responses compare to the housing mix needs identified in the SHMA. If a specific housing need survey is not to be undertaken to support a housing mix policy in the Neighbourhood Plan, it would be helpful if any emerging Neighbourhood Plan policy could be prepared with reference to the SHMA. It is assumed that the reference to rented tenure is a reference to affordable or social rented tenures. The need for affordable rented accommodation is high in Malton and Norton, with demand exceeding supply.

A balance of all the options, in similar numbers (especially 2-3 bed houses).

If you consider equality and diversity you need a good mix of everything which allows for social inclusion.

Mix of all.

No more housing but if so mixture of all.

A mix is best.

Mixture!

More allowance for small schemes offering high quality bespoke detached properties to attract and supply wealthy homeowners 3/4/5 bed.

If absolutely necessary (!?), the least environmental effect is preferred, i.e. 2 bed bungalow, owner occupied or private rent.

Housing association houses needed.

Flats (apartments).

Affordable housing for the young.

Why would Malton be different to Norton?

Other

No Housing Development.

None! Too many houses for the existing infrastructure.

Do Malton/Norton need new homes? The infrastructure is inadequate. Any new development must give pedestrians and cyclists priority over motor vehicles.

No more houses as there’s no infrastructure to manage!!!

No more new homes – short on infrastructure.

No more houses/housing/homes. X3

None! X6

None until the surgery and school are built!!

Enough houses in Malton.

First thing that needs fixed is the railway crossing. Very dangerous for pedestrians especially the elderly and mothers pushing prams and pushchairs or with young children.

None until roads sorted out.

No more housing. Stop building everywhere!!

No more – our roads and sewerage system needs sorting out – on warm days Butcher Corner and Wheelgate smell.

I cannot comment about housing in Malton but feel thought must be given to the facilities needed to sustain more people i.e. doctors, dentists etc.

Ideally no more new homes until the town’s utilities can cope. Sewage and water treatment plants are stretched to the limit. Malton seems to have an issue with strong odours emanating from various points in the town centre. Health and safety first please.

No more housing until sewers and crossing are sorted.

None really. Development should be halted until road connectivity improved.

No more needed.

The towns can’t cope with more houses. Managed volumes – the town can’t cope at the moment.

None. Enough development at moment.

None - becoming a dormitory for York.

I really don’t think the infrastructure can cope with any more new homes. The traffic in town and on the A64 can be impossible already.

There is an immediate and pressing need to protect the environment from further urban encroachment. Specifically to promote wildlife habitat, avoid negative visual impact, likewise congestion, noise pollution. As such, I am not in favour of any option either in Malton or Norton.

No need for any more houses – too many housing estates as it is.

Before doing all this – build a new junior & infant school. Provide another doctors’ surgery and sort drains in Malton town centre. Get your priorities right.

No more housing built until the traffic and roads situation is planned and more sustainably than at present. Traffic pollution is a major threat to the town.

I think enough houses have been built.

Something should be done about the congestion and pollution in the town centre, e.g. the traffic lights at the junction, also the smell from the drains is a health hazard at all times but especially in summer.

You need to be aware that building all these houses is going to cause enormous stress on schools (especially Norton) where they cannot expand and the Derwent Surgery (I believe you had a meeting with them this week). Derwent Surgery has in excess of 21,000 patients and it is almost impossible in this area to attract doctors and nurses. York and Scarborough Hospitals are rally struggling. There is also a shortage of teachers. It’s all very well to build a surgery in the large development in Norton but it will be almost impossible to staff.

Preferred option no more housing. Too busy to get anywhere and so much litter and pollution. If any more houses, need to be occupied by people who are invested in this town and have reason to look after it.

The character of the town is being lost – wildlife is suffering – natural habitats being lost.

There are enough new homes being built. The infrastructure of the 2 towns requires improvement before more houses are built.

Malton does not need any new homes without the infrastructure to accommodate people and vehicles!

None – the infrastructure can’t take any more!

Too much development in both towns already – infrastructure cannot cope.

There should be policy to prevent extensions to create additional bedrooms, so that the supply of 2 and 3 bedroom houses is maintained.

Infrastructure will not take any more.

No more housing! Services, e.g. sewage system will not take any more. Smell of sewage in Malton during summer particularly should be addressed urgently.

In addition

**CONCLUSIONS**

* Bungalows seen as the type of new home most needed in Malton, supported by 59% of respondents (101), with 48% support (83 respondents) for ‘Specialist Accommodation for the Elderly’, suggesting meeting elderly needs is seen as particularly important.
* Semi-detached housing supported by 48% of respondents (83).
* Owner-occupation seen as the type of tenure most needed in Malton, supported by 60% of respondents (103).
* Rented (i.e. non-private rental) accommodation supported by 47% of respondents (80). This supports the RDC identified need for affordable rented accommodation in Malton (and Norton) with demand exceeding supply.
* 2-bedroom properties seen as the size of new home most needed in Malton, supported by 71% of respondents (121).
* 3-bedroom properties supported by 49% of respondents (84).
* 25 respondents (approx. 10%) cite lack of or problems with existing physical and social infrastructure of various types as a serious obstacle to new housing development.
* 6 respondents cite sewerage odours in Malton town centre as an issue.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Develop an aspirational (i.e. support, encourage etc.) Malton-specific housing mix policy reflecting the findings of the consultation and prepared with reference to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA).

In the absence of a local housing needs survey (i.e. objective local evidence), such a policy can be no more than aspirational. Such a policy would however support and provide additionality in respect of adopted Local Plan Strategy Policy SP4 (Type and Mix of New Housing).

**ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION**

Are there community actions that could be developed to help to address identified infrastructure issues?

**POLICY H2: NORTON HOUSING MIX**

**Q. WHAT KIND OF NEW HOMES DO YOU THINK NORTON NEEDS?**

Answered: 148 Not Answered: 76

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANSWER CATEGORY** | **ANSWER CHOICE** | **% RESPONSE** | **NUMERICAL RESPONSE** |
| Housing Type | Bungalows | 54% |  80 |
|  | Detached | 29% |  43 |
|  | Semi-detached | 47% |  70 |
|  | Terraced | 30% |  45 |
|  | Specialist Elderly Accommodation  | 47% |  70 |
| Housing Tenure | Owner-Occupier | 58% |  86 |
|  | Shared Ownership | 34% |  51 |
|  | Rented | 49% |  72 |
|  | Private Rented |  8% |  12 |
| Housing Size | One Bed | 26% |  38 |
|  | Two Bed | 72% | 107 |
|  | Three Bed | 53% |  79 |
|  | Four Bed+ | 15% |  23 |
|  |  |  |  |
| TOTALS |  |  | 766 |

**COMMENTS**

Type

All types.

Re ‘special accommodation for the elderly’ – wet rooms.

Re ‘detached’ – not too close together.

Flats.

Re ‘bungalows’ – but they do use more land so perhaps some low level terracing. I don’t have knowledge of housing needs.

Tenure

Mixed.

Re ‘shared ownership’ – more social housing.

Re ‘rented’ – publically owned.

Size

Mixed.

General

RDC - As Local Planning Authority, the District Council is responsible for negotiating a mix of housing to meet local housing requirements. The District-Wide Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) provides evidence to support the type of housing required in Ryedale to address stock imbalances and projected household growth. It is important that planning decisions are evidenced based and the District Council would be keen to see how your consultation responses compare to the housing mix needs identified in the SHMA. If a specific housing need survey is not to be undertaken to support a housing mix policy in the Neighbourhood Plan, it would be helpful if any emerging Neighbourhood Plan policy could be prepared with reference to the SHMA. It is assumed that the reference to rented tenure is a reference to affordable or social rented tenures. The need for affordable rented accommodation is high in Malton and Norton, with demand exceeding supply.

All.

A balance of all the above with plenty of 2-bed especially.

Mix of all.

Mixture of all.

A mix is best.

Mixture.

Do not know enough about Norton to make an informed judgement.

Not resident in Norton so I don’t know.

Why would Malton be different to Norton?

Other

None! Too many houses for the existing infrastructure.

Do Malton/Norton need new homes? The infrastructure is inadequate. Any new development must give pedestrians and cyclists priority over motor vehicles.

No more houses as there’s no infrastructure to manage!!!

No more new homes.

No more houses/housing/homes. X3

None! X7

None until the surgery and school are built.

Enough houses in Norton.

None until roads sorted out.

No more housing. Stop building everywhere!!

More affordable housing as the current supply over the last few years of development is well below targets (except Keepmoat development on Langton Road – 38% affordable).

No more - our road structure with the railway crossing cannot take any more. Since 1983 new developments in Langton Road area. Field View, The Chase, also the extension Heron Way-Heron Close. Gladmans Estate Norton Primary School.

Ideally no more new homes until the town’s utilities can cope. Sewage and water treatment plants are stretched to the limit. Malton seems to have an issue with strong odours emanating from various points in the town centre. Health and safety first please.

Further doctors’ surgeries to be supplied.

None really. Development should be halted until road connectivity improved.

No more needed.

The town is not fit for more homes until roads, schools, drains and doctors are sorted.

Before any, you must provide a road from Langton Road to the A64 bypassing Norton.

None. Enough development at moment.

None - becoming a dormitory for York.

I really don’t think the infrastructure can cope with any more new homes. The traffic in town and on the A64 can be impossible already.

There is an immediate and pressing need to protect the environment from further urban encroachment. Specifically to promote wildlife habitat, avoid negative visual impact, likewise congestion, noise pollution. As such, I am not in favour of any option either in Malton or Norton.

If absolutely necessary (!?), the least environmental effect is preferred, i.e. 2 bed bungalow, owner occupied or private rent.

None needed.

No more housing than planned.

I don’t think any more houses are needed in the next 10 years.

Too much development here already.

You need to be aware that building all these houses is going to cause enormous stress on schools (especially Norton) where they cannot expand and the Derwent Surgery (I believe you had a meeting with them this week). Derwent Surgery has in excess of 21,000 patients and it is almost impossible in this area to attract doctors and nurses. York and Scarborough Hospitals are rally struggling. There is also a shortage of teachers. It’s all very well to build a surgery in the large development in Norton but it will be almost impossible to staff.

There are enough new homes being built. The infrastructure of the 2 towns requires improvement before more houses are built.

Norton doesn’t need any new homes without the infrastructure to accommodate people and vehicles!

None – the infrastructure can’t take any more!

Too much development in both towns already – infrastructure cannot cope.

Don’t think it needs any more.

Infrastructure will not take any more.

No more housing! Services, e.g. sewage system will not take any more.

**CONCLUSIONS**

* Bungalows seen as the type of new home most needed in Norton, supported by 54% of respondents (80), with 47% support (66 respondents) for ‘Specialist Accommodation for the Elderly’, suggesting meeting elderly needs is seen as particularly important.
* Semi-detached housing supported by 47% of respondents (70).
* Owner-occupation seen as the type of tenure most needed in Norton, supported by 58% of respondents (86).
* Rented (i.e. non-private rental) accommodation supported by 49% of respondents (72). This supports the RDC identified need for affordable rented accommodation in Norton (and Malton) with demand exceeding supply.
* 2-bedroom properties seen as the size of new home most needed in Norton, supported by 72% of respondents (107).
* 3-bedroom properties supported by 53% of respondents (79).
* 19 respondents (approx. 8%) cite lack of or problems with existing physical and social infrastructure of various types as a serious obstacle to new housing development.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Develop an aspirational (i.e .support, encourage etc.) Norton-specific housing mix policy reflecting the findings of the consultation and prepared with reference to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA).

In the absence of a local housing needs survey (i.e. objective local evidence), such a policy can be no more than aspirational. Such a policy would however support and provide additionality in respect of adopted Local Plan Strategy Policy SP4 (Type and Mix of New Housing).

**ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION**

Are there community actions that could be developed to help to address identified infrastructure issues?

**POLICY M1: WENTWORTH STREET CAR PARK**

**Q. OF THE FOLLOWING POTENTIAL USES, SELECT YOUR PREFERRED USE FOR THE SITE, ORDERING YOUR PREFERENCES NUMERICALLY STARTING WITH ONE AS YOUR MOST PREFERRED OPTION**

Answered: 221 Not Answered: 2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANSWER CHOICES/ PREFERENCES** | 1(9) | 2(8) | 3(7) | 4(6) | 5(5) | 6(4) | 7(3) | 8(2) | 9(1) | TOTAL SCORE | YES | NO |
| Remain Same | 495 | 128 |  77 | 24 | 15 |  4 |  3 |  0 | 0 | 746 | 3 |  0 |
| Hotel/Car Park | 144 | 232 | 154 | 60 | 30 | 16 | 18 |  6 | 1 | 661 | 1 | 15 |
| Residential |  72 | 136 | 105 | 72 | 25 | 24 | 33 |  8 | 3 | 463 | 1 | 20 |
| Care Home |  45 | 144 | 112 | 90 | 75 | 44 | 15 |  4 | 1 | 530 | 1 | 17 |
| Retail |  81 | 216 |  56 | 54 | 90 | 40 | 21 |  0 | 1 | 559 | 1 | 20 |
| Leisure Centre |  63 | 112 |  98 | 84 | 50 | 72 | 21 | 10 | 0 | 484 | 2 | 19 |
| Business Park |  9 |  32 |  21 | 42 | 40 | 60 | 63 | 16 | 1 | 284 | 0 | 19 |
| Mixed Use | 135 |  40 |  49 | 30 | 10 |  0 |  0 | 10 | 1 | 275 | 1 | 13 |
| Other |  36 |  16 |  21 |  6 |  5 |  0 |  3 |  0 | 3 |  90 | 1 |  9 |

Notes

1. TOTAL SCORE – obtained by multiplying the number in brackets for each preference by the number of ‘votes’ for each preference.

2. YES/NO – where a response clearly indicates a definite ‘yes’ or ‘no’ for an option instead of a numerical preference.

**COMMENTS**

Remain as Car Park (with improvements)

Free 2 hour stay.

If Market Place pedestrianized.

Improvements to design and aesthetics, including some green elements such as small trees/bushes etc. Vitally important to keep maximum amount of town centre parking to support local businesses and the new food/café culture of Malton. Immoral to even think of developing this car park as it was donated to the council as a permanent car park to benefit the residents and businesses of the town.

It is a community resource as a car park lacking in other towns in the area.

This is a central car park. Bring the price down, more people will us it and free up Norton St Nicholas St Car Park for Norton people.

This car park is essential. A major study was undertaken in Cumbria and car users were asked to feedback their activity when entering Keswick and Kendal. The general conclusion was that people only shop within 50 metres of their parked cars. Applying this to Malton would suggest that the car park is needed. More people would subscribe to this if the daily charge were reduced to an affordable level. Better to be full on a reduced rate than being only 25% full on a higher rate. Improvements should include a modern block of public conveniences.

What kind of improvements?

Make it free parking for up to 3 hours then charges could apply. This would help draw people into our town.

Not enough parking spaces now.

Make less bleak, add planted areas.

If Market Place parking and Wentworth Street Car Park are built on, where are people going to park.

Need for car park space particularly if Market Place is pedestrianised – partially or otherwise. Market towns I know have central parking facilities!

The top parking area for subsidised passes for people working in Malton so they are not causing congestion by parking on the streets.

Better access and signage.

Upper level could be developed.

Drainage!!

Please leave the car park. It is needed for public use.

Free blue badge spaces.

Improvements needed.

Allow residents of Wentworth Street to use this, with permits and access, due to increasing difficulty of parking on Wentworth Street itself.

Is an absolute must to preserve parking in the town centre for visitors and local business. Immoral use of a car park that was donated to the council as a permanent car park.

Wentworth Street Car Park is unattractive/ugly and recycling area should be in a fenced-off compound from view.

We need more not less parking areas! Better sign posts to Wentworth Street Car Park. Free 2 hours parking there. Cheaper long stay parking.

To make provisions for the rifle club.

Please give a thought to Malton Rifle Club (has been there since the late 1890s).

Hotel and Car Park

Public car park.

Budget hotel. Car park for residents to use shops.

Travelodge placed in the risen up right hand corner.

Surely this is a commercial venture.

Not needed.

Do we need.

No demand for any more hotels in the town.

For young families. Premier Inn or Travelodge type?

Residential

No houses.

Not needed at this site.

Can’t cope with more.

No more houses!

Enough new housing already.

No more housing. We need green spaces.

No more housing sites.

Care Home

Don’t seem to be a paying proposition.

With lots of facilities for all levels – from relatively fit to care.

Retail

There are empty premises now.

Fill the current shops.

High end supermarket.

I would recommend that councillors contact their counterparts in Beccles (Suffolk) where an in-town supermarket has boosted footfall and improved the situation for small businesses in the market town.

Leisure Centre

To complement – e.g. a swimming pool?

Already have facilities.

Leisure facilities/swing park.

But why not improve what we have already got.

You need to be providing a new swimming pool ready to replace the clapped out Derwent Pool.

Business Park

Possible – small area.

No – we already have 2 business parks and access is poor.

Don’t need.

Mixed Use Development

Roller skating rink and car park.

A fuel discounted outlet.

Leisure centre and retail. X2

Retail and car parking. X2

Some car parking.

Care home and car park.

Car park and special accommodation for elderly.X2

Youth centre.

Hotel and leisure.

Hotel/leisure centre – with enough car park area.

Or as previous plans that was rejected with a Tesco supermarket and petrol station.

Homes and business.

Bowling etc.

Retail and hotel.

Houses and parking. X3

Retail with increased spaces.

Business park/car park.

Offices/shopping.

Car park. Food street. Market.

Affordable hotel.

Supermarket and petrol station.

Housing and retail.

Sheltered housing upper part, supermarket the rest – 3 hours free parking. A supermarket on Wentworth Street could provide the answer. I for one walk to do my shopping (reducing traffic and pollution). Some maisonettes on upper car park for older residents may free up some bigger properties for larger families.

Other

Bungalows for the elderly with on site warden.

Elderly and disabled.

Supermarket and car park.

Retail with free parking. Must continue as a car park as not enough parking in Malton. Possibly with a small high market supermarket – Waitrose/Booths.

Small b&b type hotel and car park, e.g. Premier Inn.

I think we need an open space for cars and other activities, particularly if the Market Place is to be pedestrianised.

Care home and parking.X2

Mental health facility. Well-being.

Council housing.

Part residential part car park.

Petrol station.

A compact cycle parking facility made secure by ‘pay for entry doors’.

Supermarket – Aldi – Tesco.

Landscaped park with playground and toilets.

Apartments for the elderly.

Residential and car park – with something like Mickle Hill on smaller scale. It is handy for the town but not too noisy!

Maybe a new primary school.

Marks & Spencer’s retail food shop.

Remain as car park with link to pedestrianisation of town – Market Place.

Car park, small residential and low (?) retail.

Fitness park for adults and wildlife centre - why not use the space to encourage purposeful leisure i.e. outdoor adult fitness park. This may encourage young adults to use their time to benefit themselves physically and mentally.

All (*NB except for ‘remain the same’*) the same and not required!

General

RDC - As landowner, the District Council has no proposals for the significant redevelopment of the car park. The car park is included in the current car parking strategy work which has been commissioned by the Council. Notwithstanding this, the car park is underused and there may be some potential for some additional land uses around the fringes of the site and/or the upper deck which would not compromise its primary use as a car park. Within this context, the existing development plan would support in principle some of the uses listed in the consultation material, subject to development management considerations.

So if you take away Wentworth Street parking and pedestrianize the Market Place where do people park!!! The shops need customers and they need parking. Why does this desperate need to build more and more houses seem to overtake the need for another surgery, another school. Plain common sense seems to be badly lacking. Taking away more and more parking takes customers away from local shops. Ridiculous!!!

Perhaps it might be better to consider planning as and when a business proposition is made.

What about the cattle market?

Plus supermarket and petrol station Welham Road which was rejected. Think growth of Norton. Don’t stick in the mud. This town is getting old. Needs new life and to keep younger population here instead of all us older people.

Please build out of town near Eden Camp or somewhere like.

Any idea of building in the car park is bound to cause more problems – a car parking disaster – the area is prone to flooding – who could possibly think of this!

Whose idea was it to cut off access to pasture Lane and redirect traffic from a main road out of Malton onto a new housing development? Ridiculous! The other access road to this car park is a very tight corner!!!

Depends on RDC’s decision on Ryedale House.

Cutting trees down, in cemetery – these reduce the pollution in the town. Also provide habitat for owls, birds. A lot of fires lit – causing smoke fumes. Also the new development ‘Copperfields’ has caused a lot of odour pollution – raw sewerage being moved – this is awful. Also traffic build up on Shawfield Lane.

Retail in Cattle Market as per original plan.

Despite Fitzwilliam Estate’s objections, the Helmsley side of town desperately needs a supermarket. All the houses being built and still we are all forced down into Castlegate for supermarket shopping. The traffic problems say it all!!! The promise of a supermarket on cattle market didn’t materialise and doesn’t seem likely.

**CONCLUSIONS**

* ‘Remain the same as a car park with improvements’ is the most preferred potential use, registering the highest score (746) and the highest number of indicated first preferences, by a significant margin, i.e. 55 – 39 more than the next highest.
* ‘Hotel with car park’ is the most preferred alternative potential use, registering a score of 661, but with only 16 indicated first preferences. This option also attracted 15 definite ‘no’ comments.
* ‘Retail’ emerged as the next most favoured alternative potential use, with a score of 559 and 9 indicated first preferences. This option also attracted 20 definite ‘no’ comments.
* 10 comments were made regarding suggested car park improvements.
* 8 comments were made regarding the management of car parking, i.e. in relation to hours, charging, concessions etc.
* 1 comment was made regarding future use of the cattle market site.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Consider the development of a policy protecting all/part of the site in its current public car parking use.

Consider including a further aspirational policy element, encouraging/supporting development for hotel with public car parking on the upper deck, within the context of adopted Local Plan Strategy Policy SP7 (Town Centres and Retailing) and the identified ‘Northern Arc’.

Include reference to car park improvements within the policy, drawing on consultation suggestions.

Input comments regarding car parking management to current RDC car parking strategy work.

**POLICY M2: PEDESTRIANISATION OF MALTON MARKET PLACE**

**Q. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING OPTIONS WOULD YOU PREFER, ORDERING YOUR PREFERENCES NUMERICALLY STARTING WITH ONE AS YOUR MOST PREFERRED OPTION**

Answered: 221 Not Answered: 2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANSWER CHOICES/ PREFERENCES** | 1(6) | 2(5) | 3(4) | 4(3) | 5(2) | 6(1) | TOTAL SCORE | YES | NO |
| Remain as is | 708 | 120 |  48 | 36 | 10 | 1 | 879 | 10 |  1 |
| Permanent pedestrianisation |  96 |  60 |  48 | 36 | 70 | 4 | 314 |  0 | 21 |
| Pedestrianised certain times  | 228 | 165 | 108 | 51 |  6 | 0 | 558 |  5 | 11 |
| Social & Leisure/Fixed Facilities |  90 | 230 | 148 | 54 |  6 | 1 | 529 |  6 | 11 |
| More Blue Badges |  78 | 130 |  80 | 66 | 46 | 3 | 403 |  7 | 13 |
| Other |  36 |  25 |  8 |  3 |  4 | 3 |  66 |  3 |  8 |

Notes

1. TOTAL SCORE – obtained by multiplying the number in brackets for each preference by the number of ‘votes’ for each preference.

2. YES/NO – where a response clearly indicates a definite ‘yes’ or ‘no’ for an option instead of a numerical preference.

**COMMENTS**

Remain As Is

Just leave as it is.

Keep the town alive! A busy town with cars is a thriving town.

Really important to keep local shops accessible with good parking. If you are carrying food shopping, e.g. from greengrocers you need car nearby!

So handy for local shopping especially disabled.

Market should remain as is but maintaining flexibility when hosting festivals et al. The economy of the town needs this space to be available, especially to those who have disabilities.

For parking local and visitors.

Make some parking 3 hours so people can attend shows at the Milton Rooms, with probably a concession badge to display given out when purchasing tickets.

Why change – the town needs improvements but need parking and current shops filling.

No parking in Market Place would sound death knell for shops and cinema etc.

As some extra feedback regarding the pedestrianisation of the market place I have speaking with a local from Harrogate who is business orientated. She said that the pedestrianisation that took place in Harrogate had a significant effect on local businesses in the area due to the extra traffic problems (a one way system was introduced around the area) and problems with parking close to the businesses. This resulted in a lot of the smaller businesses, especially the independent ones, suffering financially and closing. I agree with this outlook. The cars may not look pretty but they bring the public close to the shops and cafes, etc. in the market place. Just look at the positive impact that making the parking free had on the market place. If is made difficult for cars and the public to access the market place then I feel this will have a knock on effect of less people and therefore less income for the businesses in the area, especially during the quieter times and bad weather.

With the only post office in town in the Market Place, how could anyone consider making into a pedestrian area. How could disabled people etc. use it? Another really bad idea. Who thinks these ideas up!

Parking is the lifeblood of our holiday and residents’ town, providing convenience and attracting people from outside of Malton who will find it easy to find parking that is convenient, plentiful and available at all times. The other options are liable to increase anti-social behaviour.

Blue badge spaces remain vacant while drivers go round and round looking for a space.

Unless parking (free) is provided nearby, it is not feasible to remove cars from the equation.

Blue badge spaces should be without time restrictions and free.

Short term parking – half an hour.

There is so much history in the town.

Would cause more parking issues for current Malton residents if this was changed.

Not all of us are young and fit. We NEED parking near post office and Market Place shops.

Pedestrianised would cause shop closures.

Not enough parking places already. Pedestrianisation or similar would take even more people away from Market Place area.

Parking in the Market Place encourages visitors. If it was pedestrian only, it would be empty!

Permanent Pedestrianisation

This would create extra traffic chaos in the town.

And where would visitors park with no Wentworth Street car park.

No good for shopping – carrying is impossible for many.

Pedestrianised Certain Times

In conjunction with ‘Social & Leisure Activities/Fixed Facilities’.

Only on festival days.

Already is at food festivals.

Certain time of year only. X3

Already done for specific times in year.

Car parking needs to be considered elsewhere in town if pedestrianised. With parking elsewhere, Market Place would be ideal area to pedestrianize.

Social & Leisure Activities/Fixed Facilities

In conjunction with ‘Pedestrianised Certain Times’.

No – do this as required but do not lose parking spaces for this.

Not needed.

Already done for specific times in year.

On top side of car park.

No parking on the top end of the market place. Convert it into a plaza.

Increased Blue Badge Spaces

Are there any?

Quite a lot already.

And then reduce normal parking.

Other

Pedestrianised but with disabled parking.

Pedestrianised with 15 minute pick up area and blue badge parking.

Move the Saturday market.

The central area of any market town is a place for ‘special events’. We need, from time to time, to be able to create a ‘buzz’ and therefore we need this space for the same.

Do not lose the atmosphere.

Pedestrianised during the day with parking at night. The area by the toilets made for disabled parking.

Partly pedestrianised.

Small parts could be pedestrianised but it is VERY necessary for parking for evening events – cinema/Milton Rooms, restaurants etc. The church is used during the day at all times and needs access and parking for funerals, weddings etc.

Pedestrianisation with link to Wentworth St Car Park.

Half of Market Place as parking with maximum 1 hour and policed. Other half pedestrianised with limited hours delivery for businesses.

Does ‘Market Place’ include Milton Rooms area and cinema entrance area?

Mixture of everything suggested.

Small trees in big planters would soften edges.

Better lighting/environment.

More seating.X2

Need mother and child parking spaces – there are none. Very difficult if you have children getting them out of cars. Spaces very tight.

Add some greenery.

Enforce parking on double yellows (including blue badges).

Information board directing to new improved Wentworth St Car Park!!

Could we have a bandstand.

Part pedestrianize Milton Rooms area and outside St Michael’s Church.

General

RDC - The pedestrianisation of the Market Place would alter traffic distribution in the central road network and North Yorkshire County Council as Highway Authority should be closely consulted on this matter if any of the proposals are to be considered further. The County Council will be undertaking highway modelling of the local network in the coming months. If, following the consultation, the Town Councils are keen to promote the pedestrianisation of the market place in the Neighbourhood Plan, it is suggested that this should be brought to the attention of NYCC in order that the implications for the movement/displacement of traffic can be assessed as part of this modelling. The proposal is also likely to impact upon car parking and will have implications for the car parking strategy that the District Council is currently undertaking.

Concern over amount of parking if both Wentworth St and Market Place lost to alternative.

Serious consideration should be given to a town centre one-way scheme – as adopted successfully in other small towns.

Norton – if they follow through with Beverley Rd plans, the estate needs a surgery, bank, petrol station in the mix of things. Each house needs parking for at least 2 cars.

I couldn’t place these in order as they may run together.

There is not enough parking space in centre of town. Many elderly visitors have difficulties in walking distances. We need to do all we can to encourage visitors and provide adequate parking. Failing that a park and ride might be worth considering.

Increase blue badge spaces in town not Market Place.

An improved Norton Bus Station – appalling. Sheltered, better seating, display timetables etc. Could link with railway station.

I’m really not sure but do not get rid of too much parking or no one will pop in hardly.

Tackle the problem of traffic flow through the town and face the real problems.

If there is less/no parking in the Market Place, then double the spaces at Wentworth – retail with basement parking. Give 2 hours free parking as in Market Place.

Move livestock market to create more space/opportunities.

Cattle market into car park. Or shuttle bus service from Wentworth Car Park if pedestrianised.

Parking relocated to farmers’ cattle market site asap.

To make informed decisions, we need clarification on 1) RDC move to WSCP; 2) Cattle market move and future of current plot.

The cattle market area would make an ideal location for pedestrianisation with a large central area of open space for use of public and new location for improved food market etc – a multi-use ‘market place’ with new business units/residential flats above surrounding.

The best place for the market and installation of quality uniform marquees in a long term plan would be in the cattle market area when this relocates. This area when developed could have a large pedestrianised area in the centre far more suitable as part of a long term plan for the town centre.

**CONCLUSIONS**

* ‘Remain as is’ is the preferred option, registering by far the highest score (923) and, again by far, the highest number of indicated first preferences – i.e. 118 – 80 more than the next highest (NB against 1 definite ‘no’ vote).
* ‘Pedestrianisation at certain times’ is the preferred alternative option, registering a score of 558 (with 38 indicated first preferences against 11 definite ‘no’ votes), closely followed by ‘social and leisure activities with fixed structures’, with a score of 529 (15 indicated first preferences against 11 definite ‘no’ votes).
* The potentially ‘stand-alone’ option of ‘increased blue badge spaces’ registered a score of 403 with 13 indicated first preferences, and 13 definite ‘no’ votes.
* 8 comments were made regarding suggested Market Place improvements.
* 3 comments were made regarding the management of car parking, i.e. in relation to hours, charging, concessions etc.
* 6 comments were made regarding possible uses of the livestock market site once made available.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Consider the development of a policy protecting all/part of the Market Place in its current public car parking use.

Include reference to car park improvements within any policy, drawing on consultation suggestions.

Input comments regarding car parking management to current RDC car parking strategy work.