

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
Introduction	RDC Independent Group - The background (pp7-9) needs to be updated to take in the matters referred to in the first two sections above (i.e. it needs strengthening and clarifying to address some of the key issues affecting both towns in regard to housing, employment, highways (especially HGV traffic) and retail (<i>NB particularly the likely rebalancing of housing and employment in Malton and Norton in the new Local Plan now in preparation</i>). During the course of the preparation of the plan, there have been changes of circumstances and so in some respects the plan needs updating.)	DISAGREE – the background as set out in P7-9 is a factual account of the plan preparation process, together with a section on the plan’s structure. The updating suggested would be entirely inappropriate within these pages. It is possible that the comment is quoting page numbers in error and is in fact referencing either P5 (Foreword) or P10-11 (Malton & Norton – Yesterday & Today). Appropriate updating in either location would be acceptable, however the updating suggested is considered speculative and premature given the very early stages of the new Local Plan and the absence of any published plan documentation in the public domain.	NO ACTION
Malton & Norton – Yesterday & Today	RDC - It is the intention that the plan progresses to the stage at which it becomes part of the development plan for the area. In this respect, it is helpful if, consequently the development plan is aligned as a whole. The penultimate paragraph of Chapter two makes reference to recent ‘rapid growth, weak development planning and a lack of traffic management presenting a threat to Malton and Norton’s heritage’. The Neighbourhood Plan should include evidence and further explanation to support this assertion. In the District Councils view, the statement does not bear scrutiny and is unduly negative and unhelpful in the context of a shared aspiration to include the Neighbourhood Plan as part of the development plan.	AGREE – the paragraph would benefit from evidence and explanation to support the statement or amendment in the interests of alignment with the Local Plan. Experience elsewhere indicates that examiners are likely to recommend deletion of unduly negative or critical statements in respect of local planning authorities and/or their plans.	ACTION – amend paragraph so it does not read as a statement of fact or suggest any criticism of RDC/NYCC.

	<p>FME - It is suggested that the following additional paragraph be included in the section titled 'Malton and Norton – Yesterday & Today' on page 11 to follow the existing text relating to FME: "In 2011 the Malton Amenity Community Interest Company (CIC) was established to provide free limited-time parking in the town centre, organise events such as food festivals and promote the town more widely. The CIC initially established the brand We Love Malton and has more recently adopted Visit Malton as its trading name. A range of events is now delivered by the CIC including the annual Malton Food Lovers Festival, monthly food markets including the Harvest Food Festival and a Christmas Market, a weekly stall market, the Marathon du Malton and in 2019 the first music festival in the grounds of The Talbot. A number of other organisations also arrange events in the Market Place".</p> <p>Yorkshire Wildlife Trust (YWT) - River Derwent Special Area of Conservation (also a Site of Special Scientific Interest) is given particular focus within the plan and we feel it's inclusion within Section 2 of the plan (Yesterday and Today) could be expanded to include 'the river and its importance for nature'.</p>	<p>AGREE – this is a reasonable suggestion which would provide useful additional information.</p> <p>AGREE – it is considered that a short section on the river as suggested would be a useful addition to the chapter.</p>	<p>ACTION – add paragraph as suggested.</p> <p>ACTION – add section on the river as suggested.</p>
Vision	<p>CPRENY - The vision presents as a commentary rather than as a clear 'vision' of the town in 2027 but CPRENY acknowledge the essence of what is aspired to. The paragraphs under the 'vision' heading currently read more as a textual justification typically found under planning policies than as clear vision for the towns, although elements are there throughout the paragraphs. It is considered, however, that the wording of the paragraph beginning 'the River Derwent' should be reworded to remove negative connotations, albeit CPRENY understand the reasoning behind this.</p>	<p>DISAGREE – it is considered that the vision reads very largely as a vision, painting a picture of how the community wishes the towns to be by 2027 – NP visions written in this style invariably find favour with examiners. It is also considered that the paragraph on the River Derwent is a fair and accurate reflection of how the community views the river, balancing its pros (its ecological richness well to the fore here) with its challenges and that it requires no rewording.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Fitzwilliam Malton Estate (FME) - Firstly, FME wish to place on record that they are supportive of the general vision and objectives of the plan, taken as a whole.</p> <p>FME - FME generally support the proposed vision and objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan but would suggest that the importance of agriculture as an industry to Malton and Norton should be recognised alongside local food and horse racing.</p> <p>RDC Independent Group - Page 12 para 4: delete “new development” – the conservation areas owe part of their character to the development surrounding them. There should be no need for “new” development except in the Livestock Market area after the Livestock Market has moved.</p> <p>The vision should be seen in the context of a wider area.</p> <p>Disagree with route of new river crossing</p> <p>In principle, yes</p> <p>It must also include creating an environment for new business and economic growth, not just relying on heritage and culture as will decline.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>AGREE – a reference to the importance of the towns’ agricultural hinterland and importance would be useful.</p> <p>NOTED – new development is inevitable within the towns’ 3 conservation areas and their status does not preclude it. It is however recognised that the phrase ‘new development’ could give an inaccurate impression of its scale and that improved wording could be found.</p> <p>NOTED – it is unclear what is intended here, i.e. what wider area is meant and what exactly that context then is. The vision can only relate to the area which the plan covers.</p> <p>NOTED – the vision does not refer to any river crossing route.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that the vision already talks positively about development of the horse racing, food and tourism sectors (paras 3 &</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add agriculture reference as suggested.</p> <p>ACTION – reword the paragraph in order to better reflect the likely scale of any new development in the conservation areas.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>There is no mention of climate change which, together with nature and biodiversity loss is the single most pressing issue of our time. The Paris Agreement needs to be taken on board.</p>	<p>4) and about employment growth and opportunity (final para).</p> <p>NOTED – the vision, indeed the whole plan, reflects the issues and concerns thus far raised by the community – climate change and biodiversity have not been foremost amongst them up to this point. While acknowledging the crucial importance of the Paris Agreement, it should also be noted that the NP is essentially a planning document which must be written within the context of national planning policy and the Local Plan. As such it is limited in terms of what it can currently say on climate change matters and must not duplicate what is already said elsewhere, in policy terms, on biodiversity. NPs are additionally limited by not being able to include policies/standards/requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings, including on the sustainability of new homes. That said, these issues are raised by a number of respondents and it is considered that they should be further investigated to determine whether and if so how the plan could more effectively address them and reflect growing concerns.</p>	<p>ACTION – investigate the feasibility of addressing the issues raised within the plan and amend plan if/as considered feasible/necessary. Following investigation, agreed to amend introduction to 'Environment' section.</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>On the whole I agree - but the comment I have referred to at the end of this answer shows a complete misunderstanding of flood risk, we shouldn't be expecting a natural feature like a river to flood less - its us who has build too close meaning that when it does flood it is an inconvenience - this comment shows a complete lack of understanding of natural processes. Instead it should be framed around working with the flood risk in the town to ensure no further development is built in areas at risk, and opportunities taken to claim back land to give the river space to flood in areas we are less concerned about, such as parks, gardens etc. Lets not see the river as 'evil' if we are wanting to enhance it for peoples enjoyment. This is the comment I am referring to 'The town councils' vision is of a Derwent that floods less (or not at all)'</p> <p>Town centre congestion and parking violations are a concern</p> <p>Commercial development of the Towns appear to be limited to local food, horse racing and tourism.acing,</p> <p>It looks great and wide reaching</p>	<p>NOTED – it is considered that the plan and its policies have a very good understanding of flood risk and are written within this context. The plan’s SEA report assesses this aspect of the policies and concurs. That said, it is accepted that the wording referred to in para 5 of the vision is loose and suggests a lack of understanding. It is agreed that this wording should be revised.</p> <p>NOTED – town centre congestion concerns are reflected in the vision’s statement regarding new crossings and improved Malton-Norton road links. Parking violations are not sufficiently strategic to warrant mention in the vision and are not considered sufficient an issue to address elsewhere in the plan.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the final para of the vision also talks about employment growth and opportunity more generally. Policy EM1 additionally references retail. It must also be remembered that the NP needs to be read within the context of the Local Plan employment policies and should not duplicate those.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>ACTION – revise the wording quoted.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>Generally yes</p> <p>This plan is a great start - but I feel like it could be a bit more forward thinking in places, a bit more ambitious. Developers need to contribute more either financially or in kind. I think Beverley would be a good case study town to aspire to - it has links with horse racing, it has a beautiful greenspace as well as a historical centre and market place which attracts a wide variety of shops and restaurants. Change will take time - but I think we need to start by being clear with our vision and ambitious with how we will get there, whilst putting the environment at the core.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that the NP vision is sufficiently ambitious for its 2027 time horizon. It is felt that the environment – both natural and built – are well to the fore in the plan and that the role of developer contributions is well-reflected in many of its policies.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Objectives	<p>FME - Firstly, FME wish to place on record that they are supportive of the general vision and objectives of the plan, taken as a whole.</p> <p>FME - FME generally support the proposed vision and objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan but would suggest that the importance of agriculture as an industry to Malton and Norton should be recognised alongside local food and horse racing.</p> <p>YWT - We strongly support that the objective regarding the river is not just to protect but also to improve the local environment and particularly the ecological quality of the river corridor. We also support improving access to the river for the community.</p> <p>Bullet 7 - Development needs careful consideration</p> <p>They are sufficiently broad brush as to be hard to disagree with.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – while it is considered appropriate to recognise the role of agriculture in the vision (see ‘Vision’ section), it is felt that this would not be appropriate for the objectives, given that the NP is silent on agriculture within its policies and community actions.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – any redevelopment of vacant plots would beset within the context of all relevant NP policies and those of the Local Plan.</p> <p>NOTED – objectives by their very nature tend to be broad brush – the</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Good objectives</p> <p>I would like to see the plan support more growth in retail space, mixed housing developments and new employment sites.</p> <p>Yes #2 should include air quality related to over capacity sewer issues.</p> <p>Yes agree with them all. I would like to see additionally -1) creates town environment and services that attract new business and expansion and 2) proactively encourages and facilitates net zero carbon towns</p> <p>I agree mostly with the Vision Statement and Objectives. But 'To build upon the economic strengths of the towns and address deficiencies in the economy' needs the addition of 'within planetary boundaries'.</p>	<p>detail is provided through follow-on policies and community actions.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – NP Policy EM1 specifically supports new retail development. Policy H1 specifically supports a mix of housing to meet local needs. The NP deliberately avoids site allocation, leaving it instead to the Local Plan, the LPA being better placed to carry out the required site filtering and assessment.</p> <p>NOTED – this is considered too specific to reference in an objective. Any air quality issues are covered by the generic air quality reference.</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that the existing objectives already sufficiently encompass the issues raised under 1). It is considered that the objective of a net zero carbon town, while laudable, is strategic in nature and beyond the policies/ actions of a NP to deliver, written as it must be within the context of existing national planning policies and Local Plan strategic policies.</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that such an addition is too vague to be interpreted in any meaningful way.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>Agree with many but not enough support for new retail space and attracting larger employers. Housing provision shouldn't just be for locals.</p> <p>I'm not sure whether it's the appropriate place to do it - but I wondered if you could go further on improving connectivity/reducing congestion - around a commitment to more cycle ways/one way systems/ and creation of public rights of way? Also I wondered if there is anything you can do here to tie developers in to contributing to the improved community facilities - or whether this is to be done solely through the CIL? Could there also be an objective around no development in flood plain, or perhaps taking opportunities to remove derelict buildings for example from floodplain and then creating new pocket parks that could flood in their place?</p>	<p>NOTED – Policy EM1 specifically supports new retail development within the context of the wider objective. The housing objective encourages the meeting of local needs and Policy H1 reflects this, but neither preclude (as they cannot) the meeting of wider needs as provided for in the Local Plan of which the NP will ultimately form part.</p> <p>NOTED – there are 3 separate issues here:-</p> <p>1) Re connectivity etc. – objectives are necessarily generic by their nature – it is the plan's policies and community actions which already address the detailed matters raised.</p> <p>2) Re developer contributions – the plan's policies variously address the issue of provision of facilities and other green and social infrastructure via development.</p> <p>3) Re the flood plain – flood plain development must be assessed as a matter of course in accordance with both national and Local Plan policy the NP cannot add to or be in conflict with this. Where flood risk is an issue in relation to any of the NP policies e.g. its 2 riverside corridor policies RC1 & 2), this has already been assessed in the separate SEA report accompanying the plan and its policies adjusted and caveated accordingly.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	-----------------------------------

	<p>fully agree</p> <p>Agree with them all but some are much higher priority than others.</p> <p>Agree with all</p> <p>Agreeable objectives, particularly tackle town congestion. "Air quality" does not seem to be a priority issue in this rural environment. Articulated HGV's are not welcome in the town centre and I have witnessed some incredulous incidents with articulated lorries trying to negotiate the town and with HGV's and large vans parking on pavements and blocking roads.</p> <p>1) Objectives 1 and 4 in conflict. In the 1970s there were efforts to open the river to pleasure craft as far as Malton. Lost opportunity to develop tourism. 2) On 7 include relocation of inappropriately sited industrial units like Bright Steels, the Cattle Market and Taylor Brown.</p> <p>I agree with the stated objectives.</p> <p>They adequately represent the breadth of our community needs.</p> <p>It looks great and wide reaching</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – accepted that this may be the case. The quantity and weight of policies flowing from the objectives reflects this to some extent.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the NP's policies and community action seek to address these issues as far as they are able within the context set for them by national and local Plan policies.</p> <p>1) DISAGREE – it is considered that there is no conflict between 1 & 4 – policies RC1 & 2 clearly set out how the 2 can be reconciled. 2) DISAGREE – there is no evidence that the specified units are inappropriately located. Even if they were, the NP has no powers through either its planning policies or community actions to bring about such relocations.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>I agree broadly with the 11 objectives and will comment in more detail later</p> <p>Excellent</p> <p>i agree with a lot of the objectives but don't want the plan to restrict the growth of the community.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the physical growth of the towns/community is largely determined by the adopted Local Plan. The NP policies seek to shape that growth in a way beneficial to the community.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
4.1 Transport & Movement - General	<p>YWT - We support the push for sustainable transport including walking cycling.</p> <p>RDC Independent Group – <i>P1-3 of representation: various Highways issues flowing from the Jacobs Strategic Transport Assessment referenced on P16 of NP.</i></p> <p>We are appalled that the only contact we've had has been a single leaflet through the letterbox (which we had missed completely) when it turns out that the "plan" contemplates building a major road across our own land, and our own quiet residential garden. That's pretty shameful.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – as none of the highways issues raised are related to any NP policies, actions or other text/maps, there is no response to make.</p> <p>NOTED – all addresses within the 2 parishes were contacted in exactly the same way – a major undertaking in itself given the circumstances of Covid – with a 'leaflet' setting out a summary of the NP and clear links to where the full plan could be viewed. Given the size of the full plan/map, it was totally impractical to distribute full details to all addresses. It is unclear from the comment exactly which location is affected by the plan, however all contemplated highway improvements detailed in policies are couched in terms of seeking to safeguard broad swathes</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	Improved infrastructure, including new roads and junctions are very important to protect our town centres.	of land within which improvements could potentially take place, from other development which could prevent such improvements. The policies in no way constitute hard and fast proposals for development on any land. NOTED	NO ACTION
Policy TM1	<p>Crossley Grand Children’s Trust - perhaps could be more ambitious in its steering of wording for importance and relevance.</p> <p>NYCC - The existing Whitewall Quarry access is onto Welham Road and therefore is relevant (together with site allocations MJP12 and MJP13) with respect to Neighbourhood Plan Policy TM1-7. <i>(NB The Minerals & Waste Joint Plan (MWJP) site MJP12 is Land at Whitewall Quarry - to be an allocation with respect of Policy M09 Meeting crushed rock requirements. MJP13 is Whitewall Quarry Near Norton - to be an allocation with respect of Policy W05: Meeting waste management capacity requirements – Construction, Demolition, and excavation waste (including hazardous CD&E waste).</i></p> <p>NYCC - There is a waste safeguarded site (the Malton/Norton HWRC) that is adjacent to the proposed route of TM1-1 which would be a consideration if this route were proposed to be developed. The relevant policies are Policy S03: Waste management facility</p>	<p>NOTED – it is unclear how much more ambitious and in what way(s) it is felt the policy could be. As such, it is not possible to consider any meaningful amendments. It should be noted that the wording of NP policies is constrained in terms of what it can require of new developments.</p> <p>NOTED – Policy TM1 as it relates to location TM1-7 is not considered to be in any way incompatible with either the existing quarry access or the identified site allocations – the respondent makes no objection to the policy.</p> <p>NOTED - Policy TM1 as it relates to location TM1-1 is not considered to be in any way incompatible with either the safeguarded site or the identified policies – the respondent</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>safeguarding and Policy S06: Consideration of applications in Consultation Areas.</p> <p>RDC Independent Group - Policy TM1 – page 15 – Please add the words <i>“and provided such development accords with the other policies in this plan”</i> at the end of the sentence: “The acceptability of such development is subject to there being no adverse effects on the integrity of the River Derwent Special Area of Conservation”. If these additional words are not added, it will be possible to construe the policy as allowing a development miles away, if the developer promises money for cycle tracks etc.</p> <p>Yes - in support of additional railway line crossings</p> <p>Emphatically!</p> <p>Yes but we must ensure open spaces in Norton and Malton continue to be upheld</p> <p>1) My only concern with TM1 is it seems to focus around what is already there - its not anything ground breaking, the other TM policies don't seem to cover new cycleways or footways either - unless I have misunderstood?? 2) There are so many opportunities for new cycleways/footways for example... Welham Road would benefit from a cycle way to join it in with the Menethorpe road, so people could do a loop back round to where the new cycle way is on the A64. Also an orbital loop in town would be amazing - so many cross town journeys are made by car but could so easily be done by bike or by foot. And we are not encouraging future generations to cycle because it simply is not safe - cycleways would really help. 3) Is there an option to create any more PROWs? Its been great to see so many people walking in the</p>	<p>makes no objection to the policy. Any implications would be addressed should a planning application come forward.</p> <p>AGREE – some such wording would strengthen the policy.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the plan’s Environment policies are designed to give protection to many open spaces in the plan area.</p> <p>1) DISAGREE – para 2 of the policy encourages additions to the network, while para 4 expects qualifying development to contribute to new provision. The policies covers all aspects of cycle ways and footways so there is no ned for other policies to duplicate. 2) NOTED – it is considered that existing NP policies are sufficiently encouraging of any new cycleway proposals that might come forward. The suggested loop lies 40% outside</p>	<p>ACTION – amend wording to reflect the concern raised – final wording subject to further consideration.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION 3) ACTION – add new community action as indicated.</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>lockdown but there are not many connecting PROWs around the town?</p> <p>support extra derwent crossing to ease level crossing condestion</p> <p>Area - disagreement - The primary objective, where the potential demand exists, to re-establish rail routes with a view to decreasing traffic. Alternative uses should be seen as a second best.</p> <p>Cycling is very important to many in Malton and Norton.</p> <p>Couldn't find Neighbourhood Plan Proposals Map to understand TM1-1 to 7 need</p>	<p>of the Neighbourhood Area so could not be promoted through the plan. 3) NOTED – the policy sets out some such options, but must as a planning policy, link those to new development requiring planning permission. There is however merit in adding a new community action re seeking to establish new PROW independent of new development.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it is assumed that this comment relates specifically to TM1-1. As such, there is no reason why parallel rail and footpath/cycle routes could not be compatible should the prospect of a reinstated rail route be a possibility. However no such prospect appears to exist at the present time.</p> <p>AGREE</p> <p>NOTED – summary document P1/para 2 clearly references link to full plan which includes map.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy TM2	Crossley Grand Children’s Trust - perhaps could be more ambitious in its steering of wording for importance and relevance.	NOTED – it is unclear how much more ambitious and in what way(s) it is felt the policy could be. As such, it is not possible to consider any meaningful amendments. It should be noted that the wording of NP policies is constrained in terms of	NO ACTION

	<p>TM2-3 opposed to this. As could use the land replacing existing buildings could rejuvenate the area and be a real focal for Norton eg an Innovation hub. Yes to keep the green area by the river.</p> <p>i would like to see some development on the land at Woolgrowers however I feel this would need massive investment in infrastructure and can only see this happening if we have a slip road from the A 64</p> <p>Agreement subject to there being no possibility of reinstating the railway at Orchard Fields</p> <p>Vital that pedestrian and cycle routes over the river and to some extent the railway, are increased and enhanced in order that connectivity between the towns is maintained.</p> <p>Disagree with route of new river crossing</p>	<p>what it can require of new developments.</p> <p>DISAGREE – it is considered that the land take on the Norton side of the river would be small and the benefit of a new crossing would far outweigh any new development here.</p> <p>NOTED – this is a large site – a new crossing would not necessarily preclude new associated development.</p> <p>NOTED – no such prospect exists at the present time.</p> <p>AGREE</p> <p>NOTED – 3 potential crossings are identified in the policy – it is unclear to which one(s) the comment relates.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<p>Policies TM3-5 – Supporting Text</p>	<p>RDC Independent Group - Additionally, para 5 of p.16 should be revised to read: <i>“As such, Neighbourhood Plan policy aims to encourage traffic that does not need to pass through the towns out onto the A 64 bypass. Ideally, to do this, the plan aspires to selected A 64 junction improvements, in order to increase capacity at Broughton Road and York Road, by creating four-way junctions instead of two-way slip roads. However, in reality, it is recognised that it is unlikely that funding will be available for such projects within the foreseeable future, and so all new development which accords with this plan in all other respects (other than brown land development) will be directed to areas which have direct access to the A64,”</i></p>	<p>NOTED – the content of all but the last 3 lines of the suggested text, commencing “and so all...”, is already covered by the existing text. In order to have any practical import, those last 3 lines would need to be embodied in NP planning policy (NB such a policy could not be applied to development sites already allocated in the adopted Local Plan as this would be contrary to NP basic</p>	<p>ACTION – draft new policy as suggested for further consideration.</p>

	<p>RDC Independent Group - The narrative on the section on Highway Improvements (pp16 and 17) should be expanded to take into account the notes on highways set out above. I would suggest the following text is inserted at the beginning of this section: <i>“Highways was considered by Ryedale during the preparation of the Ryedale Plan. Jacobs produced a report in 2010 called a “Strategic Transport Assessment.” This was challenged at the Local Plans examination, and has since been overtaken by events.</i></p> <p><i>The Jacobs assessment recommended Option 4(a), which stated that Malton/Norton could take 2165 new homes without unacceptable impact on the local highways network. This projected increase meant an expansion of the settlement by almost one third. This was subject to some recommended mitigation measures and highways improvements, of which only a few have been completed. In 2011, permission was granted for a large estate at Broughton Manor. This was after the Report and before the adoption of the Ryedale Plan.</i></p>	<p>conditions). It is considered that this could be achieved via a ‘Development on Unallocated Sites’ policy (‘TM6’) – an approach which has met favour with examiners when included in other NPs. Such a policy would however need to be carefully worded so as not to be interpreted as a ‘green light’ for new unallocated development. The scale of development covered also needs to be considered together with the scope for encouraging sustainable transport to discourage town centre trips by car. The supporting text to the policy would need amending accordingly (see Policies TM3-5 Supporting Text below).</p> <p>DISAGREE – on being ‘made’ (i.e. adopted), the NP becomes part of the Development Plan for the area, alongside the adopted Local Plan. As such, it is important that the 2 plans are aligned. The adopted Local Plan is predicated on the Jacobs report which was accepted at Local Plan inquiry. The insertion of the suggested text would cast the report in a negative light at odds with the Local Plan. Experience elsewhere indicates that examiners are likely to recommend deletion of unduly negative or critical statements in respect of local planning authorities and/or their plans. The suggested</p>	<p>ACTION – in the event of a new Policy ‘TM6’ being added to the plan, amend supporting text as indicated.</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p><i>The Ryedale Plan was adopted in September 2013. It has a retrospective start date for development of 1st April 2012. It prescribes 1500 new houses for Malton/Norton during the plan period, and in Table 2 of Policy SP10 prescribes “critical improvements to physical infrastructure” required to enable new development to take place. These were the conversion of an existing three way road intersection at Brambling Fields into a four way intersection and related measures including an HGV ban over the Level Crossing. The conversion of the intersection was completed before the plan was adopted. The HGV ban was not imposed until 5 years after the adoption of the plan, and the result has been to move some traffic issues to High field Road, whilst leaving other serious issues at Butchers Corner and the Level Crossing unresolved; few (if any) of the other “critical” improvements have been carried out, and some of them have been dismissed as unworkable.</i></p> <p><i>Since the adoption of the Ryedale Plan, some seven hundred or so new houses have been built in Malton and Norton. This includes the development of the Visually Important Open Area known as the “Show Ground” at Pasture Lane, Malton.”</i></p>	<p>text asserts that the report has been overtaken by events and explains the thinking behind it, but presents no evidence. Whatever the merits of the suggested text, it is considered that it add nothing in terms of an understanding or explanation of Policies TM3-5 which follow. That said, if a new ‘TM6’ policy is agreed (see immediately above), the supporting text to Policies TM3, 4, 5 and new Policy TM6 will need amending to include a justification for TM6 – this would allow pertinent material (excluding text in conflict with the Local Plan) from the suggested text to be incorporated.</p>	
<p>Policy TM3</p>	<p>Crossley Grand Children’s Trust - perhaps could be more ambitious in its steering of wording for importance and relevance.</p> <p>FME – 1) FME own land to the south of York Road and where the suggested route of the new road crossing is shown (TM3-1). It is intended that this land will be promoted as an extension to the adjacent industrial estate for employment uses as part of the forthcoming Ryedale Local Plan. FME have no issue in principle with</p>	<p>NOTED – it is unclear how much more ambitious and in what way(s) it is felt the policy could be. As such, it is not possible to consider any meaningful amendments. It should be noted that the wording of NP policies is constrained in terms of what it can require of new developments.</p> <p>1) NOTED 2) NOTED – it is considered that some clarification would be beneficial, in terms of both purpose (i.e. to relieve the County Level</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) ACTION – add text and possibly graphic to provide clarification indicated.</p>

	<p>the proposed crossing and would be happy to ensure that the delivery of any future link is not prejudiced by the development of their land to the south of York Road. 2) In terms of the TM3-2, it is difficult to understand how there could be a new crossing of the river and railway which would benefit from policy TM3-2 to the South of Norton road. If there is something specific in mind it would be helpful to clarify that in the supporting text.</p> <p>NYCC - We note that the Plan seeks to safeguard land for a future vehicular crossing of the river (Policy TN3), although the crossing itself does not form part of the proposals. Due to the protected status of the River Derwent, any such crossing would require comprehensive ecological assessment under the Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2017.</p> <p>NYCC - There is a site allocation proposed in Policy M15: Continuity of supply of building stone located to the north of York Road on the western side of Malton, at Brows Quarry (MJP63) and its location can be viewed on the Interactive Policies Map. MJP63 is within the Green Infrastructure Space near to the York Road 'gateway' locations identified within Policy E5 of the Neighbourhood Plan, and the Vehicular River/Railway Crossing TM3-1 Land North-East of York Road Industrial Estate.</p> <p>1) Indicated route of TM3 (also) interferes with potential for river enhancement along south side of river (more could be made of the existing footpath along the south side, with significant potential for enhancement which could be naturally sympathetic to the environment and nature, yet offering significant opportunity for pleasure along the river side to residents and tourists) and also SSSI on the banks. 2) Negative impact on local conservational value of historical houses on York Road which are an existing heritage asset of Malton - a series of buildings in local stone built from 1840 onwards – part of the history of Malton and visual from main rail route into Malton.</p>	<p>Crossing bottleneck) and envisaged logistics (i.e. rail crossing only, bridge/level crossing, connections to highway network).</p> <p>NOTED – this is accepted.</p> <p>NOTED - Policy TM3 as it relates to location TM3-1 is not considered to be in any way incompatible with either the policy or the site allocation – the respondent makes no objection to the policy. Any implications would be addressed should a planning application come forward.</p> <p>1) NOTED – the policy seeks to prevent development which would preclude the creation of a new crossing rather than itself proposing a crossing. Any development of a crossing would present opportunities for riverside enhancement – proposals would have to be subject to there being no adverse effects on the integrity of the River Derwent Special Area of Conservation/SSSI.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>Not sure about creating more road space as it tends to fill up with cars</p> <p>Although nycc is the major stake holder regarding roads I feel we need to look at slip roads off the road to Hovingham on to the A64 to get the HGVs out of town. I would also like the same eg for a slip road to be built just past Broughton Mannor to the left to join the A64 so traffic did not need to come through town from the estate to get on to the A64</p> <p>Disagree with route of new river crossing</p>	<p>2) NOTED – while the buildings identified are not listed and fall outside the conservation area, they may well have potential interest as non-designated heritage assets. Any impact upon these buildings and their settings would be taken full account of should any proposals come forward.</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that the benefits for Malton & Norton centres of creating a new river/rail crossing and resultant new road would far outweigh any such objection.</p> <p>NOTED – this is already addressed in Policy TM4.</p> <p>NOTED – 3 potential crossings are identified in the policy – it is unclear to which one(s) the comment relates.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy TM4	<p>RDC – 1) Traffic and transport matters have a high profile in the document and the District Council understands the desire for road infrastructure improvements that will help to alleviate traffic congestion in the central road network. Whilst some of the improvements referred to will help to alleviate road congestion, they are not required to support planned growth at the towns to 2027. The adopted development plan and the evidence base supporting the plan is clear on the strategic transport improvements that are</p>	<p>1) AGREE – supporting text should clarify the matter raised in the comment in highlighted text.</p> <p>2) AGREE – some evidence/ justification would be beneficial to underpin the specified improvement aspired to.</p>	<p>1) ACTION – amend text as indicated.</p> <p>2) ACTION – amend text to provide evidence/justification in line with comment.</p>

	<p>necessary to support planned growth. To avoid any confusion or ambiguity, this should be made clearer in the supporting text.</p> <p>2) Furthermore, a number of the improvements referred to have not previously been evidenced as being highway improvements which would reduce congestion. An A64/Castle Howard road junction (TM4-2) and a Castle Howard Road/Broughton Road link road (TM4-5) are examples. Without evidence that these further improvements would result in network improvements these should not be referred to in the plan, even in an aspirational sense.</p> <p>Crossley Grand Children’s Trust - perhaps could be more ambitious in its steering of wording for importance and relevance.</p> <p>FME own a significant amount of land on the western edge of Malton including where TM4 - 4 and TM4 – 5 are shown indicatively on the draft Neighbourhood Plan Proposals Map. The Estate will be promoting these areas of land for residential development of an appropriate scale as part of the forthcoming Ryedale Local Plan subject to further detailed masterplanning. The allocation of land for residential development on the western side of Malton would not prejudice the delivery of such routes coming forward and in fact would enable the delivery of a link between Middlecave Road, Castle Howard Road and York Road as part of the development(s). The ability to deliver such links which are already aspirations of the neighbourhood plan make the land to the west of Malton the most appropriate location for future housing development in the forthcoming Ryedale Local Plan and FME would welcome the opportunity to work with all parties to develop a masterplan that would benefit Malton.</p>	<p>NOTED – it is unclear how much more ambitious and in what way(s) it is felt the policy could be. As such, it is not possible to consider any meaningful amendments. It should be noted that the wording of NP policies is constrained in terms of what it can require of new developments.</p> <p>NOTED – although with no commitment or otherwise to the idea of residential development in the locations identified.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	-----------------------------------

	<p>Habton PC - To prevent unnecessary traffic in Habton, there should be a 4 way intersection in Broughton Road.</p> <p>Habton PC - Public transport links to the Town and the rural villages should be improved to improve connectivity between the villages that use the town's services.</p> <p>NYCC - There is a site allocation proposed in Policy M15: Continuity of supply of building stone located to the north of York Road on the western side of Malton, at Brows Quarry (MJP63) and its location can be viewed on the Interactive Policies Map. MJP63 is within the Green Infrastructure Space near to the York Road 'gateway' locations identified within Policy E5 of the Neighbourhood Plan, and also the Highway Improvement Scheme TM4-4 Southern (Norton) By-pass referred to in Policy TM4 of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>NYCC - NYCC is presently undertaking feasibility work to look at movements throughout Malton and Norton which will identify any reductions in trips through the towns that could be made. The outcomes of this work are not yet known at the time of writing.</p> <p>NYCC - Traffic management- NYCC is presently looking at options for the removal of speed humps on Pasture Lane One Way System. NYCC is proposing to implement a 6 month experimental order which will see a one way system on Norton Road in 2021.</p>	<p>NOTED – this is already indicated in the supporting text – P16/para 5.</p> <p>AGREE – a community action to this effect should be added to the plan.</p> <p>NOTED – in light of this and other comments, it is considered that the policy should be amended so that it still reflects the Southern By-pass aspiration (TM4-4) between the current start and end points, but that no indicative line should be shown on the Proposals Map. Further, in line with this, similar amendments will be made in respect of TM4-2 & TM4-5. In respect of TM4-3 (Scarborough Road-Beverley road Link Road), as this is already provided for in adopted Local Plan policy, the Proposals Map will show an indicative line consistent with that already proposed.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP could be updated to take account of the outcomes should they be available at the time of updating, relative to NP submission timetable.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add new community action as indicated.</p> <p>ACTION – amend plan policy, supporting text and Proposals Map as indicated/necessary.</p> <p>ACTION – update NP with outcomes if possible prior to submission.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>YWT - Malton bypass cuttings LWS which is designated on the basis of old established neutral and calcareous grassland could potentially be affected by Highways Improvement Schemes under Policy TM4.</p> <p>RDC Independent Group - It should be clear from the above (<i>i.e. previously made comments</i>) that the current level of development as recommended in the Ryedale plan is unsustainable in terms of congestion and pollution. The Neighbourhood Plan recognises this in calling for the improvement of the intersections onto the A 64 at Broughton Road and York Road. Unfortunately, it is well known that neither County nor Ryedale has sufficient funds available to implement either of these schemes.</p> <p>RDC Independent Group - The Neighbourhood Plan is also right to have the policy aim of encouraging traffic that does not need to pass through the towns out onto the A 64 bypass. However, it should be made clear that this should be achieved in regard to all new development – regardless as to whether or not the above two intersections are converted into four way intersections.</p> <p>The link road TM4-5 looks completely unnecessary. There really isn't a problem about traffic getting from Castle Howard Road to Broughton Road and this new road slices across the school playing field. Really cannot see how this could be justified. Then there's a really awkward-looking connection to the proposed road from Castle Howard Road to Norton. It's as though RDC wants to build a ring road round north Malton. There already is one, right alongside!</p> <p>I believe that resisting developments at as many as 5 locations in order to allow space for new or widened roads (including A64 junctions) is</p>	<p>NOTED – any potential impacts could be addressed at detailed proposals stage should schemes come forward.</p> <p>NOTED – this is acknowledged on P16/para 8.</p> <p>NOTED - it is considered that this could be achieved via a 'Development on Unallocated Sites' policy (NB not in respect of already allocated sites as this would be contrary to NP basic conditions) – an approach which has met favour with examiners when included in other NPs. The supporting text to the policy would need amending accordingly (see Policies TM3-5 Supporting Text above).</p> <p>NOTED – as a matter of fact, this is not an RDC aspiration. RDC in its comments has made it clear that without evidence of need, TM4-5 should be removed from the NP.</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that this is proportionate given the aim of taking</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – draft new policy as suggested for further consideration.</p> <p>ACTION – amend text to provide evidence/justification.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>giving undue space to accommodating vehicles, when we should be aiming for fewer vehicles.</p> <p>Any improvements should have cycleways incorporated within them, even if there are no cycleways to connect at present then we can slowly bit by bit increase our web of cycle routes.</p> <p>The proposed route for a southern bypass is awful. It appears to come very close to many houses whose occupants will be affected by the noise, it cuts through areas of natural beauty which are used and appreciated by many people, it comes close to the groundwater source protection zone around the reservoir close to Langton Road, it is close to a at least 2 racing stables as far as I can see. The environmental impact would be awful, I cannot agree with this in any way. It also surely conflicts completely with E1-6, E2 & HR12.</p> <p>Route far too close to residential area for no possible good reason. Leaving York Road it could run close to the industrial estate which would be far more appropriate. Instead it is shown as running right outside our neighbour's house then slicing across the bottom of our garden. We don't pay council tax to have our interests so willfully trampled on. The road line then proceeds in a really awkward dog-leg round the golf club. It really looks uncomfortably as though one of the planning team is a member of the golf club and that avoiding its entire site is the one overriding factor behind the whole route from York Road round to the Norton road system. Outrageous.</p> <p>Route should touch commercial curtailage, rather than domestic curtailage as indicated route – could be moved to the industrialised zone to wrap around the industrial estate away from proximity of housing and residents. This would lighten the impact on pollution - air</p>	<p>traffic out of Malton & Norton centres in order to address the serious congestion and pollution problems. The final number of locations for the submission plan is still to be determined.</p> <p>NOTED – this is covered by Policy TM1. Details would be addressed should highway scheme proposals come forward.</p> <p>NOTED – in light of this and other comments, it is considered that the policy should be amended so that it still reflects the Southern By-pass aspiration between the current start and end points, but that no indicative line should be shown on the Proposals Map.</p> <p>NOTED – in light of this and other comments, it is considered that the policy should be amended so that it still reflects the Southern By-pass aspiration between the current start and end points, but that no indicative line should be shown on the Proposals Map.</p> <p>NOTED – in light of this and other comments, it is considered that the policy should be amended so that it still reflects the Southern By-pass</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – amend plan policy and Proposals Map as indicated.</p> <p>ACTION – amend plan policy and Proposals Map as indicated.</p> <p>ACTION – amend plan policy and Proposals Map as indicated.</p>
--	--	--	--

	and noise. Significant light pollution of all ring roads could be damaging.	aspiration between the current start and end points, but that no indicative line should be shown on the Proposals Map.	
Policy TM5	<p>RDC - Policy TM5 would benefit from being clearer in respect of the revised road priorities sought in order to avoid ambiguity. In order to assist the implementation of this policy and to allow the application of the development plan as a whole. In the absence of evidence that all of the measures are appropriate, the policy would benefit by being tempered with a statement to ensure that they are supported if it can be evidenced that they are appropriate in terms of highway safety, air quality and congestion.</p> <p>NYCC - NYCC is to go out to consultation on options for a package of level crossing improvements later this month (<i>NB March 2021</i>).</p> <p>RDC Independent Group – (<i>Re the AQMA</i>) This is included in the conservation area, but is in a shocking state. We set out below some comments we have received from a local resident of the Castlegate area. <i>“From first glance the one thing that stands out and you allude to it, is that having twice as many trains is going to create extra queuing traffic. This should never have been allowed within an existing AQMA. What is actually being proposed to mitigate this?”</i></p> <p>traffic lights are essential at the level crossing.</p> <p>Far too little information about this (can't even see TM5 on the map), but it sounds like a very good idea and a high priority spend. A lot of the problem with traffic flow over the bridge and railway line is due to the pitifully poor junctions with side roads immediately beyond both sides of the railway line. How can the Council think of the enormous</p>	<p>NOTED – policy wording would benefit from suggested ‘tempering statement’. Ditto clarification on revised road priorities, but this to take account of March 2021 NYCC consultations on options for level crossing improvements.</p> <p>NOTED - the NP could be updated to take account of the outcome of the consultation should it be available at the time of updating, relative to NP submission timetable.</p> <p>NOTED – Policy TM5 seeks to address the issues at the County Bridge Level Crossing in so far as NP planning policy allows. NYCC is to go out to consultation on options for a package of level crossing improvements later this month (<i>NB March 2021</i>).</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – TM5 is not shown on the map as the policy itself clearly identifies the policy’s focus, i.e. County Bridge Level Crossing. Inexpensive adjustments to the</p>	<p>ACTION – amend policy wording as suggested re tempering statement. Amendment re revised road priorities contingent on NYCC consultation outcome.</p> <p>ACTION – update NP with outcomes if possible prior to submission.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>cost of a new link road over the river when the existing road is so very poorly served, in ways which could be put right at a small fraction of the cost?</p> <p>Yes - as long as it support the relief/bypass road to Industrial Estate</p> <p>Some short term measures will be put in place during 2021 however I feel Castlegate is the neglected part of town and this should be considered more in the plan</p> <p>I feel like this goes someway to improving things, I'm unclear what 'revised priorities' is inferring - one way system??</p> <p>The current road layout is chaotic and does not reflect traffic flows. In the short term the layout should revert to priority being given to traffic entering/leaving Church St.</p> <p>The sooner the better</p> <p>Prevent any further development in that area which would increase traffic volumes. Like shops and filling stations. traffic</p>	<p>existing roads will not address the fundamental blockages of the railway line/river whereas a new crossing point will.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – Castlegate already figures quite significantly within the NP in various ways. Without more detail as to how it should be further considered, it is not possible to respond meaningfully to this comment.</p> <p>NOTED – clarification on revised road priorities to take account of March 2021 NYCC consultations on options for level crossing improvements.</p> <p>NOTED – clarification on revised road priorities to take account of March 2021 NYCC consultations on options for level crossing improvements.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it is not within the NP's power/gift to impose this type of blanket ban. It is considered, however, that this intent could be achieved via a 'Development on Unallocated Sites' policy ('TM6') – an approach which has met favour with examiners when included in other NPs. Such a policy would however</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION - Amendment re revised road priorities contingent on NYCC consultation outcome.</p> <p>ACTION - Amendment re revised road priorities contingent on NYCC consultation outcome.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – draft new policy as suggested for further consideration.</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>It would seem that simply preventing vehicles turning right out of Church street towards the bridge and instead forcing them to turn left and implementing a small roundabout outside of Lidl would resolve a significant number of the current issues?</p> <p>Only parts of this policy. I would prefer traffic lights with a pedestrian phase included and a refuge for pedestrians.</p>	<p>need to be carefully worded so as not to be interpreted as a 'green light' for new unallocated development. The scale of development covered also needs to be considered together with the scope for encouraging sustainable transport to discourage town centre trips by car. The supporting text to the policy would need amending accordingly (see Policies TM3-5 Supporting Text above).</p> <p>NOTED – clarification on revised road priorities to take account of March 2021 NYCC consultations on options for level crossing improvements.</p> <p>DISAGREE – it is considered that all suggested measures have a potential part to play.</p>	<p>ACTION - Amendment re revised road priorities contingent on NYCC consultation outcome.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy TM6 – supporting text	RDC - The reference to the Ryedale Local Plan Sites Document on Page 17 should refer to it being adopted rather than submitted.	AGREE – Local Plan reference needs to be updated.	ACTION – update reference as indicated.
Policy TM6	<p>There's no explanation of what this means.</p> <p>absolutely</p> <p>Needs to take account of the Paris Agreement on climate change</p>	<p>DISAGREE – the supporting text to the policy (P17-18 of NP) explains the policy.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it is unclear how the policy should specifically take account of the Paris Agreement. As such it is not possible to respond meaningfully to the comment.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Any significant planning application brings traffic management issues at various locations around the town, therefore all possible situations need to be taken into account, not just in the immediate vicinity</p> <p>In principal yes, as long as money is not wasted on external reports if it can be done in house</p>	<p>NOTED – the policy wording allows both for local and wider traffic management implications.</p> <p>NOTED – the plans specified in the policy would be the developer’s responsibility to produce/pay for.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
4.2 The River Corridor - General	<p>RDC - The plan places significant emphasis on improving and maximising opportunities associated with the river. The proposed policies make it clear that the aspirations are subject to there being no adverse effects on the integrity of the River Derwent SAC and subject to flood risk. This is appropriate and will assist the implementation of this policy. The District Council is aware that a Habitat Regulation Assessment has been prepared to support the plan and that the application of the assessment has informed the plan as it is now drafted.</p> <p>YWT - The Yorkshire Derwent Catchment Partnership (YDCP) is one of over 100 catchment partnerships who follow the Catchment Based Approach. This initiative was launched by Defra in 2012 to encourage and facilitate collaborative working at a river catchment scale to help to protect our water environment. Our Catchment Based Approach partnership has been fully established since 2016. Our partnership is made up of environmental NGOs, local authorities, government agencies, landowner representatives and farmer representative bodies and is hosted by us at Yorkshire Wildlife Trust. We work together to deliver a wide range of projects across the catchment to meet our vision and our key aims. The vision of the Yorkshire Derwent Catchment Partnership is for a thriving river with a catchment abundant in wildlife, providing a better quality environment for people to live, work and visit. This is a vision which we hope the Neighbourhood Plan will share.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the town councils are happy to reflect this vision within the NP.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add wording indicating support for YDCP and its vision.</p>

Policy RC1	Local Council Award Scheme Foundation - I am working on a new town tour with Margaret Mackinder, to cover the history of the road, river and railway in relation to Malton trade. We thought it a good idea to have an answer ready for any possible question on the use of the river today, which I think we will simply express like this: /The river corridor between Malton and Norton has the possibility for enhancement (picnic areas, seating, footpath, cycleway, bridleway, refreshment facilities) but it is constrained, not only by flood risk but particularly because of its designation as a Special Area of Conservation./	NOTED	NO ACTION
	CPRENY - CPRENY welcomes and supports the initiative of the Councils to promote the River Derwent in the creation of opportunities for visual, environmental and access improvements to the benefit of the community whilst preserving conservation designations. This approach will aid the regeneration of this area whilst promoting the principles found in the NPPF in terms of improving biodiversity and making a more effective use of land. This is also in general conformity with the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy which seeks to improve the built fabric of the towns by the redevelopment of the underused river corridor subject to appropriate flood risk mitigation and ensuring that elsewhere 'downstream' does not become liable to flooding as a result of development.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	FME - It is difficult to establish from the draft proposals map where this relates to. As such, FME would ask for further clarification as they own land between the River and Norton Road, and it is not clear whether the land is affected by the proposed designation.	NOTED – it is considered that the proposals map, (aided by the County Bridge/Norton Road inset in respect of land between the river and Norton Road), make the extent of the area covered by RC1 sufficiently clear, particularly when magnified online. The town councils would however be happy to provide further clarification.	ACTION – provide further clarification to FME re the area in question.
	But what about the river running out of Malton to the west? It's very popular with walkers on the Norton side, teeming with wildlife and a	NOTED – the entirety of the river corridor west of the area covered by	NO ACTION

	<p>huge environmental asset. Oh, hold on, you don't want anyone to care about its destruction by a new link road.</p> <p>This is not extensive enough. Lockdowns and Covid has shown us how much green space is needed</p>	<p>Policy RC1 is covered by NP Policy E4 (Green Infrastructure). Policies TM3 & TM4, in respect of potential new river crossing and link road would, should actual proposals come forward, affect only a limited stretch of the river and be subject to adopted Local Plan Strategy Policy SP14 in respect of adverse effects on the River Derwent SAC. Any such proposals would be expected to include opportunities for associated river corridor enhancement, both for biodiversity and access.</p> <p>NOTED – it is not clear from the comment in what way the policy is not extensive enough, i.e. in terms of area of river corridor covered, type of provision covered? As such it is not possible to respond in any meaningful way. It should be noted that the entirety of the river corridor both east and west of the area covered by Policy RC1 is covered by NP Policy E4 (Green Infrastructure) as well as Policy E1-1 and E2 east of the town centres. The NP's Environment policies (E1-6) address green space more widely. It should also be noted that the NP was finalised for consultation purposes before the full extent of Covid impacts could've been known.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	------------------

	<p>Yes - provision of a new cycle route on north bank from Watergate (<i>NB Water Lane</i>) CP (<i>NB Car Park</i>) to York Road Industrial Estate to avoid York Road.</p> <p>The riverside corridor is certainly worthy of protection for wildlife and appropriate leisure use. Sites prone to flooding, I believe, should not be developed. Flooded properties cause too much anxiety, disruption and expense.</p> <p>I would like to see more inclusive walks and cycle paths along the river corridor</p> <p>1) As well as enhancements - could you also include something along the lines of taking opportunities to 'remove' inappropriate development from floodplain as opportunities arise? There are many developments that are at a high flood risk, and if opportunities are taken over time to change the use of them in to more flood compatible uses then the impact flood risk has upon the town will become less and less - it might not help this generation or the next one - but it shows we are thinking about the long term direction of this town - and instead of flood risk been as you put it the 'thorn in our sides' we show we have adapted and can live with water - especially with the impacts of climate change getting worse. 2) I also think something around education on flood risk and the river - because clearly if almost 200 people think its worth developing property within floodplain then obviously people do not understand! 3) The council</p>	<p>NOTED – a cycle route already exists along York Road for much of the route suggested. A north bank river route is unlikely to be feasible at the Malton end due to private property interests. Such a route is also likely to be deemed to have adverse effects on the River Derwent Special Area of Conservation and to not therefore be acceptable.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy specifically states that any development is subject to the satisfaction of flood risk requirements, including sequential testing, as directed by the Environment Agency.</p> <p>NOTED – Policy TM1 would cover any proposal for walks/paths along the river.</p> <p>1) NOTED – it is considered that this is already, and more appropriately, covered by the more generic policies and aspirations of the adopted Local Plan. 2) NOTED – the issue of education cannot be addressed within NP planning policy but a community action can be added. 3) DISAGREE – it is not the function of the NP to needlessly duplicate what is already set out in the NPPF. Where NP policies specifically support development in areas of flood risk,</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) ACTION – add a new community action re river/flood risk education. 3) NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>should be clear within this plan that they do not think it is appropriate to develop floodplain areas in line with the NPPF</p> <p>Please mend public footpath signs.</p> <p>This is a significantly under-utilised resource in Malton/Norton.</p>	<p>the flood risk requirement is clearly set out, in line with NPPF.</p> <p>NOTED – this is not a NP planning policy issue but a community action could be added covering assessment of public footpath signs and action to repair where necessary.</p> <p>AGREE – hence it being addressed in the NP.</p>	<p>ACTION – add new community action as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy RC2	<p>FME - FME support the regeneration of land north and south of county bridge. 1) As with draft policy RC1, it would be helpful if a more detailed inset map could be provided for the area affected by the proposed in order to identify the land clearly. 2) FME would also support the extension of the proposed designation to include land to the east (south of Sheepfoot Hill) which is also predominantly in the ownership of the Estate. 3) However, FME would question why policy RC2 seems to be restrict potential residential uses in this location. The draft policy states: “No residential or other vulnerable use (in terms of flood risk) coming forward on this land and subject to development meeting the sequential test and where applicable the exceptions test in line with national policy”. It is noted that the majority of the area is located within Flood Zone 3 but with the benefit of flood defences as are large parts of the centre of Malton, it is considered that the policy should not rule out residential development entirely given the sustainable brownfield nature of the site where the sequential and exceptions tests could be readily passed. The way the policy is currently worded is therefore not consistent with NPPF.</p>	<p>1) NOTED - it is considered that the proposals map, (aided by the County Bridge/Norton Road inset in respect of land between the river and Norton Road), make the extent of the area covered by RC1 sufficiently clear, particularly when magnified online. The town councils would however be happy to provide further clarification.</p> <p>2) NOTED – it is considered that the site should be extended to include the land specified and that a map showing new intended boundary should be requested.</p> <p>3) NOTED – the exclusion of residential uses on the site is as stipulated by the HRA report. The flooding restriction relating to residential or other vulnerable uses was inserted into the policy as recommended by the SEA report. Both reports were required following the screening in of the policy.</p>	<p>1) ACTION – provide further clarification to FME re the area in question.</p> <p>2) ACTION – amend site boundary in line with map to be requested from FME.</p> <p>3) NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Good idea</p> <p>The proximity to the river and indefinite need to maintain flood defences for reddevelopments would suggest that a softer landscaping approach to this area would be more appropriate. This would also align with RC1</p> <p>These sites are clearly at high flood risk, so the type of development that is going to be acceptable here is quite restricted. I'm not sure on ownership etc - but are there options for land swaps in town, so that the council could take ownership of this area and open up as a riverside park area/ community space? Or could the CIL be used to specifically fund a park in this location?</p> <p>Please mend public footpath signs</p> <p>Include a link to the Neighbourhood Proposals Map.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE – it is considered that this land is currently under-utilised with potential for productive development – this would not preclude measures to enhance the riverside environment and provide access.</p> <p>NOTED - it is considered that this land is currently under-utilised with potential for productive development. Policy RC1 identifies significant stretches of the river to the west and east for recreational purposes. The owners have indicated support for the policy.</p> <p>NOTED – this is not a NP planning policy issue but a community action could be added covering assessment of public footpath signs and action to repair where necessary.</p> <p>NOTED – it is unclear exactly to what the comment relates, i.e. a link from where to the map? If the policy itself is being referred to, then no such link is necessary as the map is freely available to view on the website.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add new community action as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<p>4.3 The Environment - General</p>	<p>CPRENY - It is considered, however, that the NP could be made stronger by the inclusion of a requirement for the provision of appropriate Sustainable Drainage Systems and native species planting within landscaping schemes along the river corridor. Similarly, a proposal that all new developments include the retention</p>	<p>NOTED – all biodiversity measures suggested are already covered in the adopted Development Plan (Local Plan Strategy Policy SP14), which this NP will become part of on 'adoption'.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>of existing hedgerows and incorporate significant tree planting on site or throughout an enhancement area would have been welcomed. This would not only aid climate change mitigation and improve biodiversity across new developments but also within existing centres in need of enhancement. CPRE campaign for the retention and expansion of greenspaces both nationally and locally, recognising their intrinsic roles providing both amenity value for residents and visitors to the countryside alongside facilitating wildlife habitats.</p> <p>CPRENY - National Planning Policy is clear, however, that proposals should demonstrate a measurable net gain in biodiversity (paragraph 175d) and the forthcoming Environment Bill is expected to set out a requirement for all proposals to achieve a net gain of 10% in biodiversity, which is already being rolled out as good practice across the country. It is considered that the draft policies and supporting text within the NP could be made stronger by reference to the need to deliver a net gain for biodiversity which could have pre-empted this requirement and ensured conformity with the NPPF as well as highlighting the implicit role the environment must play in the fight against the detrimental impacts of climate change in line with paragraph 149 of the NPPF.</p> <p>NYCC - these policies encourage development of Green Infrastructure and the multi-functional benefits attached to it and are supported.</p> <p>NYCC - We would recommend that policies in the Plan are more clearly linked to strategic policies set out in the NPPF for conserving and enhancing natural environment including landscapes and green infrastructure; enabling and supporting healthy lifestyles; maintaining and enhancing networks of habitat and natural capital; reducing risks from climate change; improving air quality; reducing flood risk. There is a useful definition of Green Infrastructure in the NPPF.</p>	<p>SUDs are similarly covered in SP17. It is not the role of NPs to duplicate existing Local Plan policy provisions.</p> <p>NOTED – the net gain requirement is already covered in the adopted Development Plan (Local Plan Strategy Policy SP14), which this NP will become part of on ‘adoption’. It is not the role of NPs to duplicate existing Local Plan policy provisions.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE – the supporting text of policies already makes good reference to the NPPF. The Basic Conditions Statement which will accompany the submission plan will include full detail, as required, on how the plan’s policies have regard to national planning policies.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>YWT - We would like to see a greater focus on Local Wildlife Sites in the plan. Specifically, we would like to see the protected wildlife sites, including SINC or LWS included on the proposals map. We note that Lady Spring Wood LWS is mentioned within the plan and assessed to be designated as Local Green Space. However, a number of other SINC sites are not given consideration within the plan e.g Broughton Lane, Bazeley's Lane.</p> <p>YWT - Opportunities to implement buffer zones around Local Wildlife Sites to minimise the impacts of development should be explored through the plan.</p> <p>YWT – re Biodiversity Net gain - Even in areas allocated for development, nature can benefit. In accordance with NPPF para 175d, proposals should demonstrate a 'measurable' net gain in biodiversity. The emerging Environment Bill which is expected to put a requirement for all proposals to achieve a 10% net gain in biodiversity; whilst not yet formally released, this level is already being implemented as good practice across the country. We would therefore welcome the inclusion of a commitment to development requiring net gain as part of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>YWT - Yorkshire Wildlife Trust would also recommend inclusion of details of the 'Building with Nature' initiative within the Neighbourhood Plan. Building with Nature is a framework that enables developers to integrate high-quality multifunctional green</p>	<p>NOTED – this is considered to be a reasonable suggestion. The NP should reference SINC/LWS sites where relevant to policies and be shown for information on the Proposals Map.</p> <p>NOTED – in general terms, this is considered unnecessary given that adopted Local Plan Strategy Policy SP14 already protects LWS from developments which would result in significant harm – this would encompass developments outside of the actual sites. It is not the role of NPs to duplicate existing Local Plan policy provisions. That said, where NP policies have potential impacts on LWS, the possibility of buffer zones could be considered.</p> <p>NOTED – the net gain requirement is already covered in the adopted Development Plan (Local Plan Strategy Policy SP14), which this NP will become part of on 'adoption'. It is not the role of NPs to duplicate existing Local Plan policy provisions.</p> <p>NOTED – while clearly a laudable initiative, it is not considered appropriate to promote to</p>	<p>ACTION – incorporate Local Wildlife Sites into the plan as suggested.</p> <p>ACTION – consider LWS buffer zones where NP policies have potential impacts. NB no changes following consideration.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>infrastructure to create places in which people and nature can flourish. Building with Nature sets out standards to provide a benchmark to be used in addition to the Biodiversity Net Gain metric, in order to provide a qualitative assessment of a proposed development site. The Building with Nature (BwN) key themes are:</p> <p>Core – Distinguishing green infrastructure from a more conventional approach to provision of open and green space. • Wildlife – to protect and enhance wildlife, creating networks where nature can thrive, and supporting the creation of development which more effectively delivers a net gain for wildlife. • Water – a commitment to improving water quality, on site and in the wider area: reducing the risk of flooding and managing water naturally for maximum benefit. • Wellbeing – to deliver health and wellbeing benefits through the green features on site, making sure they can be easily accessed by people close to where they live.</p> <p>YWT - Any planting should ensure the right trees (or other planting) in the right place. Unless there is good evidence to suggest otherwise, this usually means locally native trees of local provenance and in keeping with the surrounding natural habitat.</p> <p>YWT - Development can incorporate measures for wildlife simply in the following ways: bird and bat boxes, using native plants in landscaping schemes, using climbing plants on walls, adding green roofs to buildings, using Sustainable Urban Drainage Schemes (SUDS), inclusion of ponds.</p> <p>RDC Independent Group – 1) <i>(NB suggested new policy)</i> E7 All new development in Malton/Norton will be expected to provide electric vehicle charging infrastructure in any parking spaces (including</p>	<p>developers a set of voluntary, non-statutory standards in NP policy.</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that this is already covered in the adopted Development Plan (Local Plan Strategy Policy SP14), which this NP will become part of on ‘adoption’. It is not the role of NPs to duplicate existing Local Plan policy provisions.</p> <p>NOTED – all biodiversity measures suggested are already covered in the adopted Development Plan (Local Plan Strategy Policy SP14), which this NP will become part of on ‘adoption’. SUDs are similarly covered in SP17. It is not the role of NPs to duplicate existing Local Plan policy provisions.</p> <p>1) NOTED – Local Plans and NPs are increasingly including policies in relation to electric vehicle charging</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) ACTION – develop electric vehicle charging infrastructure policy as suggested.</p>
--	---	--	--

	domestic garages) 2) and other low emission measures such as the provision of green infrastructure.	<p>infrastructure in parking spaces. It is considered that a suitably worded policy could be developed for inclusion, but within the Transport & Movement rather than Environment section.</p> <p>2) NOTED - It is felt that the provision of green infrastructure is already well covered in the adopted Development Plan (Local Plan Strategy Policy SP14), which this NP will become part of on 'adoption'. It is not the role of NPs to duplicate existing Local Plan policy provisions. NP Policy E4 also already addresses new provision in relation to the existing network.</p>	2) NO ACTION
Policy E1	<p>RDC - The Plan seeks to designate a number of areas of land as local greenspace. The District Council considers that the Neighbourhood Plan is the most appropriate way in which to designate these sites which are considered to be of significant value to local communities.</p> <p>CPRENY - The NP seeks to allocate 8 sites as 'Local Green Spaces'. CPRENY fully support all of these potential allocations through draft policy E1 and the emphasis on enhancement including to biodiversity to these spaces via draft policy E2. The attention afforded to the need to protect and preserve existing green spaces and create new spaces within the plan is commendable and the whole section supported.</p> <p>Crossley Grand Children's Trust - perhaps could be more ambitious in its steering of wording for importance and relevance.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it is unclear how much more ambitious and in what way(s) it is felt the policy could be. As such, it is not possible to consider any meaningful amendments. It should be noted that the wording of NP</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>FME - FME own the land identified as E1-4 Norton Road Riverside which is currently a picnic area. The land is also identified in the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy as open space under policy SP11. However, draft policy E1 introduces a very special circumstances test for the redevelopment of such sites, this is inconsistent with policy SP11 of the Ryedale Local Plan which provides a series of criteria which the redevelopment of such sites would need to meet. As such, it is considered that draft E1 is not in general conformity with the strategic policies in the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy and should be amended accordingly.</p> <p>At the discussion on the Local Plan please consider adding High Malton as a Green Space. The housing development was turned down there in order to protect the setting of the AONB from "significant and demonstrable harm", and the "natural beauty and intrinsic character" of this attractive approach to Malton. Castle Howard Rd has tree preservation orders on many of its lovely trees and it would be fitting if a green space further up the road complimented that. Further up there is the riding Gallops which again would benefit from having a green space rather than trucks thundering down past it.</p>	<p>policies is constrained in terms of what it can require of new developments.</p> <p>NOTED – it is acknowledged that there is a potential conflict here, which hinges on the interpretation of ‘general conformity’. On the one hand it could be argued that as both policies seek to protect open space, there is general conformity. On the other hand, the circumstances in which development would be permitted differ between the 2 policies. It is considered on balance that the proposed LGS designation should remain and that an examiner should determine the conformity or otherwise. It should be noted that RDC have not objected to the proposed designation.</p> <p>NOTED – the site’s landscape significance was acknowledged in the assessment of the site for LGS designation – see NP Appendix 1. This was however outweighed by its failure to meet other qualifying criteria. In view, however, of clear evidence as to the value which the local community place upon the site (see comments below in this section), it is considered that the site should be reassessed for designation.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – reassess site against qualifying criteria and propose for designation if found to qualify. NB found to be ineligible as ‘extensive tract of land’ – ref national planning policy and guidance.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>I am writing to support Cllr. Paul Andrews concerns regarding the Malton and Norton Neighbourhood Plan. In particular, the inclusion of "High Malton" as part of that plan. I would also like to associate myself with the WEST MALTON RESIDENTS' GROUP, who went to great lengths to resist the development of this site. I fully agree with their concerns about the pollution, traffic congestion, and the visual harm that this development would cause. I urge you to campaign for the removal of High Malton from the Plan.</p> <p>I was concerned to read in this weeks Gazette that the High Malton site has not been given Green Space status in the draft Malton and Norton Neighbourhood Plan. I would be grateful if this matter could be reviewed as its incredibly important and special site to me and my family.</p> <p>Like the authors of the letter from West Malton Residents Group (Gazette & Herald 17 March) my wife and I were surprised to read that the 'High Malton' proposed site on Castle Howard road was not considered "special" in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. There were several hundred signatories to the petition against this development at the time on environmental grounds (proximity to AONB) and on safety grounds (increased traffic congestion). It may well be that this and similar future development proposals go ahead due to sheer population pressure but the supporting arguments should at least be based on honesty and fact.</p>	<p>NOTED – the comment seems to misunderstand the status (or lack of status) of the High Malton site within the NP. It is not included for any kind of development and therefore cannot be removed.</p> <p>NOTED - in view of clear evidence as to the value which the local community place upon the site, it is considered that the site should be reassessed for designation.</p> <p>NOTED - the site's landscape significance in relation to the AONB was acknowledged in the assessment of the site for LGS designation – see NP Appendix 1. This was however outweighed by its failure to meet other qualifying criteria. It should be noted that prevention of development and any associated safety concerns pertaining to development are not qualifying criteria for LGS designation. In view, however, of clear evidence as to the value which the local community place upon the site, it is considered that the site should be reassessed for designation.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – reassess site against qualifying criteria and propose for designation if found to qualify. NB found to be ineligible as 'extensive tract of land' – ref national planning policy and guidance.</p> <p>ACTION – reassess site against qualifying criteria and propose for designation if found to qualify. NB found to be ineligible as 'extensive tract of land' – ref national planning policy and guidance.</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>We are writing to express our concern that the High Malton site, west of Malton, has not been given Green Space status in the draft Malton and Norton Neighbourhood Plan and to request that this is reconsidered, and the site protected from development, without delay and as a matter of high priority. Such a significant development would adversely affect air pollution, associated volume of traffic, local infrastructure and the local character of the site, appreciated by so many residents, not least during the Covid-19 pandemic when the beneficial effects of outside rural exercise on mental health and general wellbeing have been highlighted. The approach to a recognised AONB, with wonderful open views, should be preserved for current and future generations of local residents, not destroyed.</p> <p>We are writing with regards to a particular part of this plan which greatly concerns us. Section E1.10 High Malton - has not been designated as a Local Green Space. The comments within the Summary Assessment /Basis for Recommendations that - " it demonstrates no particular significance to that community " and " It is not demonstrably special to the local community" are at best ill judged and at worst ignorant of and insulting to the local community. And the comment in the Wildlife Richness category simply stating - "No ". shows a real lack of knowledge of this area. This area is currently highly productive farmland and has been for many years. It contains a number of trees and hedgerows which provide valuable habitats for a range of wildlife. It is situated at the western approach to Malton and provides a natural , rural setting to the town and so makes for a very pleasant , harmonious and appropriate entrance and welcome to our rural market town and "food capital" .</p>	<p>NOTED - the site's landscape significance in relation to the AONB was acknowledged in the assessment of the site for LGS designation – see NP Appendix 1. This was however outweighed by its failure to meet other qualifying criteria, including its recreational value (NB only the site's bordering public footpaths are officially available for exercise not the site itself). It should be noted that prevention of development and any associated pollution or other concerns pertaining to development are not qualifying criteria for LGS designation. In view, however, of clear evidence as to the value which the local community place upon the site, it is considered that the site should be reassessed for designation.</p> <p>NOTED - the site's landscape significance in relation to the AONB was acknowledged in the assessment of the site for LGS designation – see NP Appendix 1. This was however outweighed by its failure to meet other qualifying criteria, including its recreational value (NB only the site's bordering public footpaths are officially available for public access not the site itself) and wildlife value (NB neither the site or any of its constituent habitats are recognised as demonstrably special for wildlife). In view, however, of clear evidence</p>	<p>ACTION – reassess site against qualifying criteria and propose for designation if found to qualify. NB found to be ineligible as 'extensive tract of land' – ref national planning policy and guidance.</p> <p>ACTION – reassess site against qualifying criteria and propose for designation if found to qualify. NB found to be ineligible as 'extensive tract of land' – ref national planning policy and guidance.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>It is also the setting for the Howardian Hills AONB and therefore very visually important that this setting is maintained - indeed in late 2015 a planning application for a 500 homes and mixed use development on this site was unanimously rejected because of the severe harm development would do to this natural area and the setting for the AONB - and it is noteworthy that not only was there a large number of local objections to this application, but when the planning committee refused permission, the applicant did not appeal! This area has always been regularly used by the local community for walking, dog walking and cycling in particular. During the last year because of lockdowns this area has become increasingly popular and hugely beneficial to the wider local community for outdoor recreation/exercise with easy access to the wider network of footpaths of the Howardian Hills AONB and to be able to enjoy the rural aspect of this area, to enjoy exercise, to enjoy the outside "classroom" for children, and to enjoy watching the wildlife - which includes hares, buzzards, owls, bats, deer and a wide variety of birdlife. It can surely be seen just how important this area is to the local community and therefore just how important it is to designate this area as a Local Green Space. We would encourage this designation to happen as soon as possible.</p> <p>I would like to state my support of the letter by the West Malton Residents Group that appeared in the Gazette regarding High Malton. There is massive local area opposition to this plan, which would turn one of the few peaceful and semi-rural areas of Malton into more urban sprawl. Having seen the level of objection to the plans when they were submitted I am quite amazed that it has not been protected from development in the current plans and that local objections have not been recognized. The area to the north and south of Castle Howard Road and at the end of Middlecave Road is only small, but it is greatly loved and highly used by hundreds of local residents, and I really do hope it is protected for future generations' benefit. This is a peaceful area that has public footpaths and roads accessible for walking and cycling, and for allotment-holding. Residents obtain health and wellbeing benefits from this direct access to the area. This has always been the case, but particularly in the last</p>	<p>as to the value which the local community place upon the site and indications of its wildlife value, it is considered that the site should be reassessed for designation.</p> <p>NOTED - the site's landscape significance in relation to the AONB was acknowledged in the assessment of the site for LGS designation – see NP Appendix 1. This was however outweighed by its failure to meet other qualifying criteria, including its recreational value (NB only the site's bordering public footpaths are officially available for public access not the site itself) and wildlife value (NB neither the site or any of its constituent habitats are recognised as demonstrably special for wildlife). It should be noted that the NP in no</p>	<p>ACTION – reassess site against qualifying criteria and propose for designation if found to qualify. NB found to be ineligible as 'extensive tract of land' – ref national planning policy and guidance.</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>12 months. It is also an area containing a wealth of wildlife, including foxes and barn owls, in addition to garden birds, rooks, migrating birds, rabbits and other small mammals. I have personally seen all these animals in this area. I walk in this area every day, and can confirm it is well used and loved. As it is mostly level access it is regularly used by young families, and elderly and infirm people, who are able to gain particular benefit from this safe and accessible area without getting into a car to drive there. Malton has no parkland of its own, and this particular area is the nearest we have to it. The trees and wide verges of Castle Howard Road allow people of all ages, from young families (with children on bikes and buggies, or walking) to quite elderly residents to access the countryside safely and easily. They also provide a great deal of amenity through just looking beautiful. The stunning views across to the Wolds, on one side, and the North York Moors, on the other from Castle Howard Road are awe-inspiring and beautiful, creating a dramatic approach and exit for the town. The hay meadows/paddocks at the top of Middlecave Road are quite unusual in the immediate area, being the only large area of grassland. It provides habitat for barn owls and small mammals, and looks very attractive with its large trees and hedge borders. It would be a great disservice to future generations if this area of accessible countryside were lost to the residents of Malton, for the benefit of a small number of people with vested interests.</p> <p>We would like to comment on the Malton & Norton Neighbourhood Plan in relation to the High Malton site. This site DOES have a great significance to the residential community. This has been particularly noticeable during the pandemic. This area has provided a space to walk, run and cycle for all the people of Malton and immediate area, away from the traffic, pollution and noise of the town. It is particularly busy at weekends with family groups enjoying the countryside. Indeed the benefits to physical and mental health must be enormous. We therefore consider that it is essential that the area known as High Malton should be designated as a local green space. We understood from the consultation of 2014/15 that this would be kept as a place of natural beauty and gateway to the AONB of the</p>	<p>way promotes the development of High Malton. In view, however, of clear evidence as to the value which the local community place upon the site and indications of its wildlife value, it is considered that the site should be reassessed for designation.</p> <p>NOTED - the site's landscape significance in relation to the AONB was acknowledged in the assessment of the site for LGS designation – see NP Appendix 1. This was however outweighed by its failure to meet other qualifying criteria, including its recreational value (NB only the site's bordering public footpaths are officially available for public access not the site itself). It should be noted that the NP in no way promotes the</p>	<p>ACTION – reassess site against qualifying criteria and propose for designation if found to qualify. NB found to be ineligible as 'extensive tract of land' – ref national planning policy and guidance.</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>Howardian Hills. As far as we know High Malton area was not included in the Ryedale Plan for housing development which ultimately received Government approval. We do not understand why this position should be altered.</p> <p>We would like to comment on the Malton and Norton Neighbourhood Plan in relation to the High Malton site. This site DOES have a great significance to the residential community. This area has provided a space to walk, run, and cycle for all the people of Malton and immediate area, away from the traffic, pollution and noise of the town. It is particularly popular at weekends when family groups enjoy the countryside. The benefit to Physical and Mental Health being invaluable. We therefore consider that it is essential that the area known as High Malton should be designated as a local green space. We understood from the consultation of 2014/15 that this would be kept as a place of natural beauty and a gateway to the AONB of the Howardian hills. As far as we know High Malton was not included in the Ryedale Plan for housing development which ultimately received Government approval. We do not know why this position should have been altered.</p> <p>West Malton Residents Group - The comments in the Neighbourhood Plan concerning the High Malton site in the Consultation Document are not correct: the site DOES demonstrate particular significance to the residential community beyond the visual amenity: the traffic and noise of any residential development would significantly impact on these walking routes in the setting of, and into, the Howardian Hills AONB. It is also demonstrably special to the local community, as evidenced by the huge petition to protect it in the High Malton Housing Application of 2014-2015 (over 500 signatures) and over 100 individual objectors to development on the site, many of whom cited</p>	<p>development of High Malton. In view, however, of clear evidence as to the value which the local community place upon the site, it is considered that the site should be reassessed for designation.</p> <p>NOTED - the site's landscape significance in relation to the AONB was acknowledged in the assessment of the site for LGS designation – see NP Appendix 1. This was however outweighed by its failure to meet other qualifying criteria, including its recreational value (NB only the site's bordering public footpaths are officially available for public access not the site itself). It should be noted that the NP in no way promotes the development of High Malton. In view, however, of clear evidence as to the value which the local community place upon the site, it is considered that the site should be reassessed for designation.</p> <p>NOTED - the site's landscape significance in relation to the AONB and local residents was acknowledged in the assessment of the site for LGS designation – see NP Appendix 1. This was however outweighed by its failure to meet other qualifying criteria including recreational value (NB only the site's bordering public footpaths are</p>	<p>ACTION – reassess site against qualifying criteria and propose for designation if found to qualify. NB found to be ineligible as 'extensive tract of land' – ref national planning policy and guidance.</p> <p>ACTION – reassess site against qualifying criteria and propose for designation if found to qualify. NB found to be ineligible as 'extensive tract of land' – ref national planning policy and guidance.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>its importance to enjoying the walk along the boundary. There was also significant objections from West Malton Residents Group at the time, with a significant number of signatories to it. The local character of the area is what attracts so many walkers, and this section needs amending too.</p> <p>We would like the High Malton site to be designated a Green Space for the following reasons:</p> <p>1 Development of this site would result in harm to the setting and enjoyment of the Howardian Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. As such it would fundamentally conflict with the requirement in national planning policy that “great weight” should be given to the conservation of this landscape.</p> <p>Development on this site would significantly reduce the gap between the edge of the built-up area of Malton and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This would harm the setting of this designated landscape and impact upon the enjoyment of those using the public footpath network along its eastern edge.</p> <p>2 The loss of this area of farmland and its subsequent development would have an adverse effect upon the landscape setting of Malton and the approach to the town from the west.</p> <p>A large urban extension on this site would radically change the rural setting of Malton.</p> <p>The upgrading of Castle Howard Road which would be required as a result of development (including new roundabout, street-lighting, kerbing etc) would result in significant change in the approach to the town from the open countryside to the west, totally destroying the rural character of this route.</p> <p>There is no guarantee that a new roundabout on Castle Howard Road would not also require the removal of a large number of trees further harming the approach to and setting of the town.</p> <p>the site in its current form makes a vital contribution to the landscape setting of the town: the impact of the loss of this area would be huge, and its subsequent development would irrevocably damage the</p>	<p>officially available for public access (not the site itself). It should be noted that prevention of development and any knock-on implications such as traffic generation are not qualifying criteria for LGS designation. It should also be noted that the NP in no way promotes the development of High Malton. In view, however, of clear evidence as to the value which the local community place upon the site, it is considered that the site should be reassessed for designation.</p>	
--	--	---	--

	<p>character of the approaches to Malton from the east along Castle Howard Road.</p> <p>the creation of a new roundabout on Castle Howard Road would urbanise the area of what is, to the west of its junction with Castle Howard Drive, a gently curving rural road, changing its rural character.</p> <p>–the landscape character of the town would suffer an acceptable degree of harm due to the impact of development on the landscape setting of this part of Malton</p> <p>In addition to the harm which development of this site would be likely to cause to the enjoyment of those using the AONB, any proposed new development along the Middlecave Road frontage would radically alter the character of the Bridleway at the western end of Middlecave Road and result in harm to the enjoyment experienced by those currently using this route to access the public footpath network to the west of the A64.</p> <p>The area is extremely popular with walkers from Malton, being the most popular route to the countryside and the Howardian Hills AONB from Malton, becoming even more popular during lockdown. Since the new estates at Broughton Manor and Showfield Lane have been built, it has seen a significant increase in people walking in the area as it is easily accessible from footpaths from Outgang Lane to Broughton Woods and the AONB "Plantation" walk to form circular walks with the Middlecave Road and/or Castle Howard Road back to Malton completing the circuit. Many people in West Malton walk a circular route from Middlecave Road to Castle Howard Road and vice versa via the AONB along the northern and southern boundary of the High Malton and close to the western boundary where the High Malton site forms the setting for the AONB with the edge of Malton barely visible in the distance. There are also open views from the AONB to the Wolds which would be interrupted by development of this site.</p> <p>The amenity value of this site to Malton as a whole is huge, being well-walked and viewed, the green space around the footpaths on the southern and northern edge greatly enhance their amenity value which would be lost in any development that would require access that would</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>destroy the character of these popular footpaths. This area is also the only significantly large area of green space in West Malton.</p> <p>In summary: the High Malton site needs to be designated a Green Space to protect the setting of the AONB from significant and demonstrable harm, and to protect the natural beauty and intrinsic character of this attractive approach to Malton. These two specific reasons were also used to reject the last housing application on this land in 2015 by Ryedale District Council, and are still true today.</p> <p>RDC Independent Group - The second site is known locally as the “High Malton” site and is situated on the Northern side of Malton and to the East of Castle Howard Road. It has direct views across to the Howardian Hills. The landscape is so formed that the cutting with the A64, which passes through it, is hidden from view.</p> <p>There was an application for 500 new houses on this land. The proposal included no direct access to the A 64, with the result that all traffic would have had to use either Middlecave Road or Castle Howard Road and, if travelling North on the A64, would have had to pass through Malton Town Centre. The application was highly controversial and a public hall had to be hired to include all the public interested in the matter when it came forward for decision in October 2015. My recollection is that neither Malton TC nor Norton TC objected in spite of the high level of public concern. The application was refused on the ground of the unacceptable impact of the proposed development of the site on the setting of the AONB. There was no appeal.</p> <p>It is therefore profoundly disappointing to see this area of land excluded from being designated as a Local Green Space (Page 68). The reasons given are strongly disputed.</p> <p>In my view, this land not only satisfies all the requirements of the Neighbourhood Plan’s Local Green Space policy, but also comes within the Gateways Policy (E5 – p.25) and this should be made clear.</p>	<p>NOTED - the site’s landscape significance in relation to the AONB and local residents was acknowledged in the assessment of the site for LGS designation – see NP Appendix 1. This was however outweighed by its failure to meet other qualifying criteria. It should be noted that prevention of development and any knock-on implications such as traffic generation are not qualifying criteria for LGS designation. It should also be noted that the test for designation is not satisfying the requirements of the policy, but rather meeting the qualifying LGS criteria as laid down in the NPPF, which it was adjudged as not doing. It should further be noted that the NP in no way promotes the development of High Malton. In view, however, of clear evidence as to the value which the local community place upon the site, it is considered that the site should be reassessed for designation.</p>	<p>ACTION – reassess site against qualifying criteria and propose for designation if found to qualify. NB found to be ineligible as ‘extensive tract of land’ – ref national planning policy and guidance.</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>RDC Independent Group - Policy E1 (page 23) should be amended by the addition of “<i>E1-9 Land at High Malton</i>”. Incidentally I have checked with Ryedale. This is a matter of local discretion and there is no planning reason to prevent this land being included, and the high level of public concern in regard to the 2015 refusal should be respected.</p> <p>This is very limited. There is a missed opportunity by not including land to the immediate south of the River Derwent stretching towards Huttons Ambo. This is beautiful walk, full of nature and could be used much more as open green space, much needed, for residents of both Norton and Malton.</p> <p>i would like to see a footbridge over the river, between Ladyspring Wood and Norton.</p> <p>Yes - creation of an extensive Public Park between Orchard Fields and Jack Berry House combining exposure of Roman evidence, Cafe, parking, play area, picnic facilities, shrub and planting beds. Linking a walking route from Orchard Fields to Old Malton. Then a new pedestrian/cycle bridge just north of Old Malton car park back to the Norton side to create a circular path.</p>	<p>NOTED – see immediately above.</p> <p>NOTED – all sites put forward for designation were duly assessed and those adjudged to sufficiently meet the qualifying criteria were proposed for designation. The site in question was not put forward until now. Although no map is supplied delineating the land in question, the description suggests that this is a large tract of land which would normally exclude it from LGS designation. That said, it is considered that the land proposed should be formally assessed against the criteria.</p> <p>NOTED – this is already covered in Policy TM1-1.</p> <p>NOTED – while considered desirable, this is not considered feasible as much of the land specified is in private ownership. A significant area of this land is however already in recreational use and this plan proposes to designate Local Green Spaces at ‘Lady Spring Wood and</p>	<p>ACTION – reassess site against qualifying criteria and propose for designation if found to qualify. NB found to be ineligible as ‘extensive tract of land’ – ref national planning policy and guidance.</p> <p>ACTION – assess site against qualifying criteria and propose for designation if found to qualify. NB found to be ineligible as ‘extensive tract of land’ – ref national planning policy and guidance.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p>Would like to see Plantation also protected</p> <p>More green spaces</p> <p>The Mill Beck corridor (E1-8) needs extending - this is a 'corridor' along its entire length at present, by only protecting part of it with the designated status it, it will be at risk of becoming developed and therefore not acting as a corridor, and meaning the wildlife that travels along it at present will no doubt reduce or disappear. In addition, a designation along its length will also link in with flood risk, ensuring this area is not developed will allow the land to function naturally and absorb rainfall, which will contribute to the status quo of flooding in the town.</p> <p>vital to restrict loss to building.</p> <p>public access to Norton Grove/Scarborough Road needs to be improved as does access to Mill Beck corridor.</p>	<p>river Walk to Old Malton, Castle Garden and Orchard Fields.</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that the land proposed should be formally assessed against the criteria.</p> <p>NOTED – this aspiration is covered by NP Policy E3.</p> <p>NOTED – it is unclear how/in which direction(s) the site should be extended – the wider 'corridor' is already within Green Infrastructure and a Visually Important Undeveloped Area in the adopted Local Plan. As such, it is hard to respond in any more meaningful way.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – Norton Grove/Scarborough Road access is considered to be fine as it is. Mill Beck Corridor access is subject to imminent improvement as a condition of a recent residential planning permission.</p>	<p>ACTION – assess site against qualifying criteria and propose for designation if found to qualify. NB found to qualify.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy E2	Crossley Grand Children's Trust - perhaps could be more ambitious in its steering of wording for importance and relevance.	NOTED – it is unclear how much more ambitious and in what way(s) it is felt the policy could be. As such, it is not possible to consider any meaningful amendments. It should be noted that the wording of NP	NO ACTION

	<p>This is too limited. There is a missed opportunity to include more green space in this. Lockdown and Covid has reemphasised an increased need for this for wellbeing and recreation.</p> <p>"appropriate enhancement" needs some qualification</p> <p>more green spaces</p> <p>In essence I agree, but any increase in biodiversity should be focussed solely on native species.</p> <p>it seems too open to interpretation.</p>	<p>policies is constrained in terms of what it can require of new developments.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy embraces all protected green space in the parish. NP Policy E4 additionally expects enhancement of all identified green infrastructure (GI) in the parish to accompany any GI-related development, thus covering huge swathes of other green space.</p> <p>NOTED – the intent is enhancement appropriate to the qualities/functions of the individual green space in question – it is acknowledged that could be made clearer in the policy wording.</p> <p>NOTED – this aspiration is covered by NP Policy E3.</p> <p>NOTED – by the definition of biodiversity, this would be the case.</p> <p>NOTED - it is acknowledged that the policy wording would benefit from greater clarity.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – amend policy wording to clarify the meaning of 'appropriate'.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – amend policy wording to clarify the meaning of 'appropriate'.</p>
Policy E3	Crossley Grand Children’s Trust - perhaps could be more ambitious in its steering of wording for importance and relevance.	NOTED – it is unclear how much more ambitious and in what way(s) it is felt the policy could be. As such, it is not possible to consider any meaningful amendments. It should be noted that the wording of NP	NO ACTION

	<p>YWT - We are pleased to see a focus on new green space.</p> <p>RDC Independent Group - Rephrase as follows: <i>“Proposals for new residential development will be expected to include the provision of equipped children’s play areas and public open space , in order to provide individual and interesting places for recreation”</i></p> <p>particularly the provision of equipment which would cater to a range of ages.</p> <p>Would like the green space as part of any development to be more imaginative than play area eg for older people, nature too</p> <p>play areas should also incorporate facilities for children with a variety of disabilities.</p>	<p>policies is constrained in terms of what it can require of new developments.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – while the rewording is generally considered to be acceptable/a slight improvement, an expectation of the provision of equipped children’s play areas in respect of all residential development would not be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan, as Local Plan Strategy Policy SP11 states only that such provision will be sought and then only on sites of 50 dwellings or more – as such the policy would not meet basic conditions. As a result the policy must remain as a supportive policy only in respect of play areas.</p> <p>NOTED – this is already specified in the supporting text – P23/para 3.</p> <p>NOTED – this is implicit in the phrase ‘public open space’ within the policy, but could be expanded on in the supporting text.</p> <p>NOTED – this could be included in the supporting text.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – amend policy in line with the suggestion while retaining its supportive intent.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – amend supporting text to reflect comment made.</p> <p>ACTION – amend supporting text to reflect comment made.</p>
Policy E4	North Cotes Farm Ltd - These representations have been made on behalf of North Cotes Farm Limited who farm the land edged red and	DISAGREE – the reasons for the identification of the land in question	NO ACTION

	<p>green on the plan included with this letter. The land is located off Welham Road in Norton. The land is 12.3 hectares in size and is well located in respect of the existing built-up area of Norton. Directly to the north of the land are the cul-de-sacs of Hunters Way and Leat Close which contain 2-storey homes in relatively dense linear layouts. Immediately to the west are predominately 2-storey detached homes along Welham Road. To the south is a boundary with the road known as Whitewall. There is a line of homes along the southern edge of this road. The land is divided into fields which are used for grazing. The edges of the fields contain hedges and trees, inside the field boundaries there are no features except for a wood in the north east corner. We object to the classification of the land as Green Infrastructure. It is not clear why our client's land is included in the Green Infrastructure area. At present, the Site makes little contribution to the settlement viewed either from publicly accessible viewpoints within the settlement or from approach roads or paths. There are no outstanding views. The main view into the Site from Whitewall is already marred by suburban development and domestic clutter of the rear gardens of properties along Welham Road. There have been no heritage assessments produced to suggest that the Site contributes to the setting of the listed buildings Whitewall House and Whitewall Cottages which are to the south of the site. The connection between the listed buildings and the Site is severed by Whitewall. There are no public views across the Site or from within the Site which link to the listed buildings. The horse racing industry, paddocks and stables are a common feature in the surrounding countryside and the overall landscape character would not be changed by the loss of fields on the Site. Modern development immediately east of Whitewall has affected the setting of the listed buildings. In the wider landscape, the Site is generally well contained to the north by the urban edge of Norton, to the west by existing housing along Welham Road and to the south by the rising wooded slopes of Scott's Hill. The Site does not provide a public vista/viewpoint into the surrounding countryside. The Site comprises 3 fields which are used for grazing and there are no distinctive landscape features that contribute to the character of the space. The rural character of Bazeley's Lane (hedgerows, woodland on</p>	<p>as green infrastructure is made clear in NP Appendix 2 – The Mill Beck Corridor. Significant in the reasoning is the land's designation as Visually Important Undeveloped Area in the adopted Local Plan. It is considered that both the policy and the inclusion of this land under the policy do meet the basic conditions and no clear evidence as to why they do not/ which basic condition(s) are not met is advanced in the comments made.</p>	
--	---	---	--

	<p>Scott's Hill and individual hedgerow trees) lies further east from the Site. Views from Whitewall across the Site towards Malton and Norton are mostly screened by built development and vegetation, due the flat, low lying topography. Only part of the mature trees along Mill Beck can be viewed from Whitewall across the Site. Vantage points to Malton and Norton are from higher ground to the south and the Site does not contribute to these views. This policy to include the Site as Green Infrastructure does not satisfy the basic conditions required for a Neighbourhood Plan to be made. It is an appropriate strategy based on proportionate evidence and therefore does not accord with National Policy. Our clients land should be removed from the Green Infrastructure policy.</p> <p>YWT - opportunities to create corridors between sites should be explored through the plan. Corridors can include hedgerows, areas of scrub, drains, wildflower margins and unmown grass strips.</p> <p>YWT - We are pleased to see a strong focus on the network which is already in place. We support the approach to define in detail, in map form, the area and boundaries of the already identified 'green infrastructure network' within the Neighbourhood Area and welcome the inclusion of a Community Action to 'work with partners to develop a 'Green Infrastructure Strategy', including action plan, in order to coordinate the aspirations, actions, activity and investment of relevant agencies and the local community'. It is essential that the Neighbourhood Plan and the Green Infrastructure Strategy do not operate in isolation, but work collaboratively with neighbouring Plans</p>	<p>NOTED – such opportunities are already encompassed within the policy's requirement for GI-related development to extend the existing identified network. The more general sort of provision suggested in the comment is already well covered by adopted Local Plan Strategy Policy SP15 (Green Infrastructure Networks). It is not the role of NPs to duplicate Local Plan policy provisions.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	-----------------------------------

	<p>to maintain connectivity of habitats across the landscape, beyond the Plan or Planning Authority boundaries.</p> <p>YWT - Creating corridors of tree planting to increase amenity should be extended to include other appropriate habitats.</p> <p>It's all good. But the "Derwent Corridor" has been defined to exclude the stretch of river which you happen to feel like putting a road over. Which makes your posturing about protecting green spaces look like empty guff. It's that which we disagree with.</p> <p>Not wide enough</p> <p>Yes - work with Sustrans to create this network and position Malton & Norton well for cycle tourism and accommodation.</p>	<p>NOTED – such opportunities are already encompassed within the policy’s requirement for GI-related development to extend the existing identified network. The more general sort of provision suggested in the comment is already well covered by adopted Local Plan Strategy Policy SP15 (Green Infrastructure Networks). It is not the role of NPs to duplicate Local Plan policy provisions.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the boundaries of the corridor are based on those identified over 10 years ago in the Natural England/NYCC/RDC Yorkshire & Humber Green Infrastructure Mapping Project as stated in the policy’s supporting text. The NP Proposals Map shows clearly that the stretch of river in question falls within the defined corridor not outside as asserted.</p> <p>NOTED – the vagueness of the comment makes it impossible to respond in any meaningful way.</p> <p>NOTED – as a matter of fact, the green network already exists. However, Sustrans are clearly a key partner in terms of working on the</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>There may be opportunities for green business development and especially community energy schemes so strongly opposed to limitations here - ok if exceptions for these could be built into policy</p> <p>Recent reports on the state of nature show that we cannot backslide on conservation efforts</p> <p>I find this one a little hard to fully understand - i think its saying that 'green infrastructure' will be allowed in these areas? Again its worth reiterating my comments to policy E1 - please see my answer to this in relation to Mill Beck. In addition - has any thought been given to blue/green corridors - so ensuring we take into account our water environment too?</p> <p>important to enhance access</p> <p>In essence I agree, but any viable proposal for the re-establishment of the Drifffield-Thirsk railway should be supported.</p>	<p>associated cycle network, particularly relevant to NP Policy TM1.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy is sufficiently flexibly worded so as not to preclude appropriate development, which may well include the types of development highlighted.</p> <p>NOTED – hence this and other environmental policies in the plan.</p> <p>NOTED – no, the policy is identifying an existing green open space network, protecting it and supporting opportunities to enhance and extend it. The role of watercourses/bodies is implicit in the generally accepted definition of 'green infrastructure'. That said, recent Local Plans are now adopting the term 'green & blue infrastructure' in recognition of that role. The section/policy headings could usefully be amended in line with this trend.</p> <p>NOTED – this is implicit in the policy's reference to enhancement.</p> <p>NOTED - the policy is sufficiently flexibly worded so as not to preclude appropriate development, which may well include the type of development highlighted.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – amend policy/ section headings to read 'Green & Blue Infrastructure'.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>There seems to huge untapped potential here.</p> <p>see comments re access to Mill Beck above, this should also apply to Priorpot Beck corridor and the Driffield/Thirsk disused railway line.</p>	<p>NOTED – the vagueness of the comment makes it impossible to respond in any meaningful way.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy E5	<p>RDC - It is not clear how the Town Councils expect Policy E5 to be implemented or what the policy is seeking to achieve. Given the position of Malton and Norton in the landscape, distanced views of surrounding landscape character types are achieved from many vantage points. Is the policy aimed at protecting the setting of these landscapes or to protect views of them? If it is the latter then in order to provide clarity and assist implementation, the Neighbourhood Plan should make it clear which views it considers to be of importance and support this with evidence and further justification.</p> <p>FME - FME would question whether this policy is necessary given that the considerations it outlines would form the basis of any assessment of a site allocation or planning application.</p> <p>NYCC - There is a site allocation proposed in Policy M15: Continuity of supply of building stone located to the north of York Road on the western side of Malton, at Brows Quarry (MJP63) and its location can be viewed on the Interactive Policies Map. MJP63 is within the Green Infrastructure Space near to the York Road 'gateway' locations identified within Policy E5 of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>NYCC - The MWJP sites MJP12 (<i>Land at Whitewall Quarry - to be an allocation with respect of Policy M09 Meeting crushed rock requirements</i>) and MJP13 (<i>Whitewall Quarry Near Norton - to be an</i></p>	<p>NOTED – the intention is to protect views. It is accepted that the policy would be strengthened and its implementation facilitated by the clear identification and evidencing of key views.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy is considered necessary but would be strengthened by the clear identification and evidencing of key views which could then be taken account of in any development proposals.</p> <p>NOTED – Policy E5 is not considered to be in any way incompatible with either the existing quarry access or the identified site allocation – the respondent makes no objection to the policy. Any detailed implications would be considered at the time of any planning application.</p> <p>NOTED – Policy E5 is not considered to be in any way incompatible with the identified site allocations – the</p>	<p>ACTION – identify and map key views and support with reference to photographic and descriptive evidence.</p> <p>ACTION – identify and map key views and support with reference to photographic and descriptive evidence.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p><i>allocation with respect of Policy W05: Meeting waste management capacity requirements – Construction, Demolition, and excavation waste (including hazardous CD&E waste))</i> are located just to the south of the ‘gateway’ on Welham Road proposed in Policy E5 of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>RDC Independent Group - In my view, this land (NB High Malton) not only satisfies all the requirements of the Neighbourhood Plan’s Local Green Space policy, but also comes within the Gateways Policy (E5 – p.25) and this should be made clear.</p> <p>RDC Independent Group - Delete the word “<i>main</i>”. The copy I have of the Proposals Plan is too small for me. I need to see which are the routes referred to, but in my view, all highway routes out of Malton/Norton which face either the AONB or the Yorkshire Wolds should be subject to this policy.</p> <p>I agree. But do you? Building a six storey high bridge over the railway line to carry a new link road over the river will utterly destroy one of the key landscape views which Malton enjoys (including the main scenic view from the Talbot).</p>	<p>respondent makes no objection to the policy. Any detailed implications would be considered at the time of any planning application.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP Proposals Map makes it clear that there are 2 gateway locations relevant to the High Malton site. This should be highlighted in the reassessment of the site for LGS designation purposes.</p> <p>DISAGREE – as the 9 gateway route locations all relate to ‘main’ routes into/out of the towns, it is not considered reasonable to delete the word ‘main’ as suggested. The online map can be enlarged in order to view all locations adequately.</p> <p>DISAGREE – there is a balance to be struck between the value of a view and the benefits of relieving serious congestion and pollution in the 2 town centres. Should a proposal come forward for a new river/rail crossing and associated road, the impact on views would be addressed as part of any assessment and mitigation measures put in place to try to compensate for any loss of view.</p>	<p>ACTION – include proximity of 2 gateway locations in LGS reassessment.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>Not wide enough - this should include more visuals en route into Malton</p> <p>Visual consideration but not preventative</p> <p>No development should be allowed at gateways into the two towns.</p>	<p>NOTED – without the detail of which additional routes/locations should be encompassed by the policy, it is impossible to respond in any meaningful way.</p> <p>NOTED – the weight placed by the planning system nationally on the importance of views does not allow NP policy to impose a ban on development which affects views in the identified locations. Individual views would be assessed on their merits should any planning application come forward. To aid in this, the policy is to be strengthened by the clear identification and evidencing of key views which could then be taken account of in any development proposals.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – identify and map key views and support with reference to photographic and descriptive evidence.</p>
Policy E6 – supporting text	RDC - The Plan would benefit from reference to recent evidence and trends in air quality in the AQMA. The District Council will forward further information relating to this issue.	AGREE – this information would strengthen the underpinning of the policy.	ACTION – incorporate the information to be provided by RDC into the supporting text.
Policy E6	<p>NYCC - All the (<i>Highways</i>) proposals being progressed in the towns seek to mitigate the air quality issues around Butcher Corner. NYCC will continue to work proactively to reduce vehicle trips and stationary traffic in the Air Quality Management Zone.</p> <p>RDC Independent Group – (<i>Re the AQMA</i>) This is included in the conservation area, but is in a shocking state. We set out below some comments we have received from a local resident of the Castlegate area.</p> <p><i>“From first glance the one thing that stands out and you allude to it, is that having twice as many trains is going to create extra queuing</i></p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – Policy TM5 seeks to address the issues at the County Bridge Level Crossing in so far as NP planning policy allows. NYCC is to go out to consultation on options for a package</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p><i>traffic. This should never have been allowed within an existing AQMA. What is actually being proposed to mitigate this?"</i></p> <p>RDC Independent Group - Reword this as follows: <i>"Proposals for new development in or around Malton/Norton will be required to demonstrate that mechanisms are in place to prevent any potential adverse impacts on the Malton AQMA and to provide improvements in air quality there.</i></p> <p>Yes - needs to include the sewer affects on air quality.</p> <p>I dont think Castlegate is given enough help to omit or do different things to increase better air quality. Also The Hgv ban works in some respects over Covid no checks have taken place we need to work hard the come to a sensible solution to get traffic out of town and if traffic is in town we need to mitigate emissions</p> <p>Any development should be required to not have an impact on air quality, but should also show that it would not impact on air quality in other locations. not allow for air quality to be</p>	<p>of level crossing improvements later this month (NB March 2021).</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that the suggested rewording in respect of ‘preventing’ potential adverse effects, while desirable, would not be in general conformity with strategic policy SP17 of the adopted Local Plan Strategy and would therefore not meet the basic conditions tests for NPs. Similarly, the suggested requirement for development to provide improvements in air quality. The reference to electric vehicle charging and green infrastructure as examples of mitigating measures is considered to be a useful element of the policy.</p> <p>NOTED – existing problems emanating from the sewage system cannot be addressed via this or any other planning policy as this is not a planning matter.</p> <p>NOTED – Policy E6 and community actions should work to address this.</p> <p>NOTED – it is not possible for the NP policy to require this – to do so would contravene one of the basic conditions tests for NPs.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>Depends on what this would involve and how it is intended to achieve this. Environmentalist solutions that litter the landscape with huge windmills or solar panel farms makes us cautious.</p> <p>1) Prevent development in these areas likely to cause an increase in traffic volumes. 2) Include particulate monitoring as well as NOx.</p> <p>Although compared to other towns of this size EV charging infrastructure is good it can still be improved and should be available to all drivers using a contactless card.</p>	<p>NOTED – such measures within the town centre AQMA are highly unlikely.</p> <p>1) NOTED – in light of this and other comments, it is considered that this can be addressed for a new ‘Development on Unallocated Sites’ policy (TM6) in the Transport & Movement’ chapter.</p> <p>2) NOTED – the monitoring of particulates to be clarified via RDC.</p> <p>NOTED – planning policy cannot stipulate payment methods.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) ACTION – draft new policy as suggested for further consideration.</p> <p>2) ACTION – particulate monitoring in the AQMA to be clarified by RDC. NB Advised by RDC that not done/necessary.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policies CF1 & CF2 – supporting text	RDC - The plan refers to community facilities that are lacking in Malton and Norton but is unclear about what these are.	NOTED – this relates to those facilities listed in para 4 (P28) and subsequently covered by the plan’s CF policies – this could perhaps be clarified.	ACTION – clarify 1 st para in line with comment.
Policy CF1	<p>RDC - The proposed improvements to existing facilities are clear.</p> <p>Yes to developing facilities but NO to car parking as aim is to reduce traffic numbers</p> <p>People can mostly walk or cycle to the swimming pool, at least if they live in Malton or Norton. Providing additional car-parking would merely encourage more car journeys</p> <p>Support subject to appropriate archaeological mitigation of any development involving ground disturbance</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – policy makes it clear this would be based on a consideration of need rather than a requirement.</p> <p>NOTED – policy makes it clear this would be based on a consideration of need rather than a requirement.</p> <p>NOTED – this consideration is covered by NP Policy HD11.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	Definitely and enforce general parking restrictions in the area of Norton swimming pool.	NOTED – there is no perceived parking/enforcement issue here.	NO ACTION
Policy CF2	<p>RDC - The proposed improvements to existing facilities are clear.</p> <p>1) Yes - needs a swimming pool, even if only small. 2) Needs a public footpath from Middlecave Road through the Malton School grounds, to allow residents to access without a significant route down Middlecave and back up Broughton Roads, that would enable walking as opposed to driving.</p> <p>Can't comment as don't know what might be in the pipeline. I would not support additional car parking for reasons given in</p> <p>Add proviso for link to A64.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>1) NOTED 2) AGREE – the suggested footpath route is considered desirable to improve leisure centre accessibility.</p> <p>NOTED – car parking is not an element in this policy.</p> <p>DISAGREE – this is not considered to be a reasonable requirement to place on this scale of development. The road improvement aspiration for the A64/Broughton Road junction is addressed in Policy TM4.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>1) NO ACTION 2) ACTION – add suggested route to Policy TM1 and to list of community actions.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy CF3	<p>RDC - The plan includes an aspiration for a new doctor's surgery to serve the Towns. Whilst it is appreciated that the proposed policy is aspirational and serves to provide policy support in the event of proposals for a new surgery, the plan should avoid raising expectations in the local community. It is considered that the extent to which a new surgery is required or realistic should be discussed with the existing surgery and CCG and the position reflected in the plan.</p> <p>Also I would like to make it known that the river is the boundary and the surgery ie medical center is in Norton not Malton.</p>	<p>NOTED – taking account of the recent Derwent Surgery expansion plans, it is agreed that the surgery/CCG be contacted in order to ascertain their current and likely future capacity, in order to gauge the likely need/realism for a new medical centre. Findings to inform any policy amendment.</p> <p>NOTED – the river boundary issue is not considered relevant in this context. The need for a new centre in Norton/at all is being reviewed in</p>	<p>ACTION – clerk to contact surgery/CCG. Policy to be amended if/as necessary.</p> <p>ACTION – Policy to be amended if/as necessary informed by consultation findings.</p>

	<p>Derwent Surgery is already accessible to the community, has car parking and is on several bus routes.</p> <p>Potentially as a second health centre as opposed to one large one</p> <p>Walk in centre too?? Improving provision at Malton Hospital to serve the growing population rather than having to travel out to urgent care, or to give birth</p> <p>More housing development needs more infrastructure.</p> <p>Should definitely be in Norton.</p>	<p>consultation with Derwent Surgery/ CCG.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE – Malton Hospital already has a walk-in centre and urgent care provision. Maternity is adequately covered in York.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED - the need for a new centre in Norton/at all is being reviewed in consultation with Derwent Surgery/ CCG.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – Policy to be amended if/as necessary informed by consultation findings.</p>
Policy TC1	<p>As for the malton museum they had which I believe is in store, A Wharram Piercy display that was made by a company called Scenic Route , And by the look of things it looks like Fitzwilliam shut the museum down in the market place for financial gain not tourism,</p> <p>Culture and arts venues need to work together to give the best possible cultural experience.</p> <p>Not at the limitation of business development and other visitor attractions</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – existing community action to be extended to include this coordination role for the town councils.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy is even-handed in supporting any/all museums/facilities in their extension or new build plans. Business development matters are not relevant to planning policy.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – extend community action as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Not in the form expressed. I support further development of the Museum provision in Malton/Norton, but would oppose proposals to develop separate Roman or Horse-Racing Museums given that operating more facilities would be more costly, require more volunteers and/or paid staff than a single facility. Better to seek a single location, incorporating adequate storage facilities for the Museum Archives, covering all aspects of the areas history and archaeology.</p> <p>Lacking in Malton.</p> <p>Each development would have different concerns so it is impossible to give blanket agreement</p> <p>Extension of existing rather than new.</p> <p>Woodhams Stone Collection - As a Trustee of both the Woodhams Stone Collection and Malton Museum I can see the advantages of 'grouping together' the museums and the racing history of the area under one roof. Volunteer resources are inevitable limited and shared facilities would reduce the resources required for reception and day to day running like cleaning and servicing. Pooled resources of both day-to-day management and volunteers are far more likely to bring about more cost-effective long-term management and most importantly sustainability. However, the Woodhams Stone Collection is a very different Museum to most. The collection comprises a vast social history assemblage of objects and paper ephemera from the last two centuries. We are currently housed in Norton-on-Derwent with a shop front property on Commercial Street and a Victorian warehouse to the rear. It is our hope that we can secure grant funding to refurbish the warehouse and bring it into use to house the collection and provide space for researchers. We had only just opened our display area in the shop area a few days before lockdown, however those who managed to get to see it were very enthusiastic. We have a popular Facebook site with nearly 4000 members who post their own pictures as well as</p>	<p>NOTED – the policy is deliberately worded to be flexible enough to support whatever development options are favoured by the towns' museums.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the policy is deliberately worded to be flexible enough to support whatever development options are favoured by the towns' museums.</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that the existing policy as worded encompasses the museum's aspirations.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>those from the collection and this generates much public engagement, evoking memories and engaging the communities of Malton & Norton in telling their stories. The situation of the shop and the warehouse are well placed for footfall, local businesses are supportive of having an attraction in Norton as there is a perceived bias towards Malton. The newly named 'Malton and Norton Heritage Centre' which houses the Woodhams Stone Collection could be seen to put Norton on the map as a visitor attraction. To launch in Community History Month (May) we are in the process of establishing a heritage trail around the shops in the two towns looking at their past uses in that will help raise the profile of the wealth of 'everyday history' that surrounds us. We would be happy to collaborate with future discussions about the direction of the museum offer in the area.</p> <p>Malton Museum - The Trustees of Malton Museum welcome the renewed effort to refine, improve and implement the provisions of the draft Neighbourhood Plan (NP), and on this basis wish to offer the following on the document as circulated.</p> <p>General Points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Malton Museum welcomes the acknowledgement of Malton and Norton's nationally important cultural heritage from prehistoric and Roman times and from more recent centuries, and we would urge that the final document recognise this more fully, not only in terms of the sites and landscapes preserved beneath and around the towns, but also in terms of the collections of artefacts cared for and exhibited by Malton Museum. • We would be glad to see further emphasis on the value already placed on the cultural heritage by both communities, as represented by their enthusiastic response to the outreach work already carried out by Malton Museum on a voluntary basis for local schools and for the wider community. • We would be glad to see the further development of these initiatives included as an objective of the NP, for the benefit 	<p>NOTED – it is not clear how/in what way it is envisaged the plan should recognise the towns' history/heritage more fully. As such, it is difficult to respond in a meaningful way. (NB it is intended that the plan says more about the towns' listed buildings and scheduled ancient monuments in the community actions section – see below)</p> <p>NOTED – while the initiatives are considered laudable, such an</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	-----------------------------------

	<p>of young and old in terms of skills development and volunteering opportunities, and more broadly to enhance wellbeing in the local communities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We would be glad to see greater emphasis on the way in which Malton and Norton’s cultural heritage can support the economic welfare of the towns, by adding value to the visitor experience through the provision of exhibitions and events. • We believe that more emphasis should be placed on the nationally important and extensive collections of prehistoric and Roman artefacts currently curated by Malton Museum, and that the NP should recognise the urgent need to re-house these collections in more secure and environmentally stable accommodation, so as to preserve them for future generations and to ensure they can continue to be housed locally. <p>Areas of concern: Currently the Malton Museum Collections covers the whole span of both prehistory and historical periods and is complimented by the social history collections held by the Woodhams Stone Collection. The NP raises the possibility of developing separate Roman and Horse Racing Museums which would cover two important topics of the history of the area. While we recognise that this suggestion derives, at least in part, from consultation with the local community we believe that it raises a number of issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greatly increased costs of obtaining, maintaining and staffing two facilities • Volunteer resources are inevitable limited and shared facilities would reduce the resources required for reception and day to day running like cleaning and servicing. • Pooled resources of both day-to-day management and volunteers are far more likely to bring about more cost-effective long-term management and most importantly sustainability. 	<p>objective is not considered to be appropriate in what is essentially a land use planning document.</p> <p>NOTED – while exhibitions/events are considered valuable, their greater emphasis is not considered to be appropriate in what is essentially a land use planning document.</p> <p>NOTED – the existing policy as worded would support such re-housing.</p> <p>NOTED – the existing policy as worded would support whatever development solution(s) the various interest consider most appropriate. The supporting text reference to exploring opportunities for a specifically Roman-themed museum should be amended to ‘exploring all opportunities for appropriately housing Roman artefacts and to support all efforts to find the most sustainable solution to providing museum facilities in the towns’.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – amend supporting text as indicated.</p>
--	---	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It might be better to engage with the racing community and see if there is potential for developing a museum which caters not only for Roman and Racing interests, but also the wider history of the area (as Malton Museum does at present) under one roof and/or as a single entity. • Obtaining/keeping Accreditation with Arts Council England (ACE), a status that is essential for obtaining most 'Museum sector' grants/support, would be easier for a single institution rather than a series of smaller, probably inadequately resourced, bodies. <p>What might such a building accommodate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Such a building might house permanent exhibition space for key material covering all areas of interest • Space for special exhibitions • Space for collections storage, including environmentally stable/controlled storage (would be required for ACE accreditation given the nature of the Collection) • Space for Researchers • Necessary service facilities, including office space • Perhaps a small café area. • Perhaps office space for Racing Welfare who are the current guardians of what racing history and memorabilia has been collected together so far. <p>This could also result in a modern more sustainable building that takes in all the new low energy performance requirement, resulting in lower running costs.</p> <p>Location: Proximity to the Orchard Field area would be good for both Racing and Romans. It is near Jack Berry House which has in recent years become an important hub for the local Racing Community and wider racing</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>interests, and for a while in the late 19th Century there was also a racecourse somewhere on Orchard Field. Malton Museum obviously has a strong connection with the Roman fort through the collection. Obviously, as Orchard Field is a Scheduled Ancient Monument development on the site would be a non-starter.</p> <p>A location close to Orchard Field has other benefits in that it would be close to the town and, in terms of access, its proximity to the bypass is an obvious benefit.</p> <p>To this end we wonder of it would be useful to talk to the Racing community and see if there is any potential for developing a museum which caters for both interests under one roof. The Museum has made good connections with the Racing community over the last year or so which we intend to re-kindle this year. There are already trainers who are interested in finding museum space for racing materials in the longer term.</p> <p>Another possible location would be premises in the town centre, although identifying premises could be an issue. It needs to be recognised that any development of a Museum (or Museums) would be heavily reliant on grant funding, probably from (amongst others) the National Lottery Heritage Lottery Fund who would expect (insist on!) a long-term lease, if the Museum were not going to own the building.</p>		
Policy TC2	<p>FME - FME is wholly supportive of finding ways in which visitors can be attracted to the town but financial realities need to be considered. In the current financial climate securing funding for such projects will be challenging unless they are commercially viable. FME consider that policy TC2 should be reworded as it is not a function of the Neighbourhood Plan to 'require' developers to submit any specific documents as this is the remit the local authority when considering any development proposals. As such, FME would suggest the policy wording is amended as follows: "Such development will be supported providing: • Any such development demonstrates a full understanding of any known or potential archaeological remains, and; • The application is accompanied by a heritage statement assessing the significance of remains, the impact of proposals and mitigation</p>	<p>DISAGREE – once made, i.e. 'adopted', the NP will form part of the statutory development plan for the area. As such, NPs have the same status as Local Plans and it is as much a function of a NP as of a Local Plan to require something through its policies if such requirements meet the basic conditions. Given that Orchard Fields is a scheduled ancient monument, a heritage statement is considered to be a reasonable requirement. RDC have raised no</p>	NO ACTION

	<p>measures and; • Prior to commencement of work on site, agreement is reached as to appropriate actions”</p> <p>the Roman fort in Orchard Fields as I believe that about 20yrs ago this was muted and a company called PLB Designs was asked to do some work on this and set up an office in the maltings never to be heard of again untill now.</p> <p>Orchard Fields is a Scheduled Ancient Monument so would not be suitable for any development. Derventio is an outdated name for the Roman Fort it is generally accepted to be Delgovicia.</p> <p>Yes - see answer to TC1. Development needs to be more extensive than just Orchard Fields.</p> <p>like to see this developed as visitor attraction</p> <p>Visitor facilities implies car parking - which would be inappropriate in this location (and it plentiful elsewhere in the two towns - the plan should encourage physical mobility)</p>	<p>objection to and made no comment on this policy.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – hence the requirement in paragraph 2 of the policy for a heritage statement. Historic England have no objection to and made no comment on this policy. It would of course be fully involved in any proposals. The out-of-date name needs to be updated in in the text.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>DISAGREE – this is not necessarily the case and the policy makes no reference to car parking (NB as NP policies elsewhere do when it is considered important). Any proposals would be subject to the submission of a heritage statement. Historic England have no objection to and made no comment on this policy. It would of course be fully involved in any proposals.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – update name in supporting text.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>As well as protecting the archaeology, any development should be respectful of the existing trees and the natural beauty and biodiversity of this site.</p> <p>However, I think this also needs to go further and request the provision of proper footway across the site - this is a lovely walk yet its difficult to access for those with limited mobility as well as pushchairs</p> <p>Even if this just entails improved signage</p> <p>Yes BUT it would have to be a very well designed solution that didn't overly restrict local access to the site in any negative way.</p> <p>I cannot support a visitor centre here, but far more explanation by way of boards etc should be erected and more made of Orchard Fields in any enhanced museum provision in the town itself.</p> <p>Yes - visitor facilities needed at Orchard Fields - see comments about a Public Park between Orchard Fields and Jack Berry House.</p> <p>Malton Museum - We recognise the support shown in the initial public consultation for better visitor facilities at the Roman Fort site in Orchard Field, and for museum collections and displays relating to the horse racing community. We ask that an NP objective should be for</p>	<p>NOTED – these considerations are already covered by policies in the adopted Development Plan (Local Plan Strategy Policies SP13, 14, 16), which this NP will become part of on ‘adoption’. It is not the role of NPs to duplicate existing Local Plan policy provisions.</p> <p>NOTED – there is no perceived access issue here that needs addressing.</p> <p>NOTED – signage for the site is already covered under community actions</p> <p>NOTED – hence the use of the word ‘sympathetic’ in the policy. Any development would also be subject to the NP’s heritage & design policies, notably HD1, 2, 4 & 5.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy makes no mention of a visitor centre. The types of measures envisaged are listed in the community actions section.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – an objective of this nature would be inappropriate for what is essentially a land use planning document. It is considered that these matters should be reflected in either</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – reflect the joint working aspiration in the plan as indicated.</p>
--	--	---	---

	the local Councils and Malton Museum to work together to achieve feasible outcomes for these aspirations.	policy supporting text or under community actions as most appropriate.	
Policy TC3	<p>A new hotel would not be in keeping with the towns, both of which have a wide selection of visitor accommodation.</p> <p>Depends very much on location.</p> <p>I prefer a Hotel, and amenities such as Petrol Station at Eden Camp, A64 Pickering Road junction.</p> <p>Close to the A64 - putting it in the town will only lead to more congestion. Plus more people are likely to visit a hotel with parking out of town, than have to arrive without a car just to stay in town.</p> <p>Development should be within the towns - an out of town hotel could operate as a self-contained island and bring minimal benefit to the towns proper.</p> <p>Preferably in town to support the shops</p>	<p>DISAGREE – results from both this and past consultations show good community support for a new hotel.</p> <p>NOTED – general locations are specified in the policy, while Policy TC4 specifically supports a development at Wentworth Street.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy’s ‘along the A64’ specification would support such a preference, subject of course to other NP and Local Plan policies being met.</p> <p>NOTED – this is an assertion which may or may not be true but is not backed up by evidence. The size of hotel envisaged is unlikely to impact greatly on congestion levels.</p> <p>NOTED – this may or may not be so – the policy is worded flexibly in order to allow for either possibility. Policy TC4 specifically supports a town centre option.</p> <p>NOTED - the policy is worded flexibly in order to allow for either possibility. Policy TC4 specifically supports a town centre option.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>I believe that it would be better to support the existing hotels and regenerate existing buildings (green man for example) before considering new provision.</p> <p>in principle, yes, but without more details it is impossible to say</p> <p>As long as it of the 'budget/chain' type, we already have expensive hotels, cheaper pubs and expensive B and B's.</p> <p>a budget hotel is needed to encourage both short and longer stay visitors.</p>	<p>NOTED – results from both this and past consultations show good community support for a new hotel. Policy in no way precludes new hotel development within an existing building as suggested.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy offers in principle support only in respect of certain general locations. The acceptability of any development would be subject to detailed proposals.</p> <p>NOTED – planning policy cannot express this type of preference.</p> <p>NOTED – planning policy cannot express this type of preference.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy TC4	<p>see 22</p> <p>A hotel there? Nice views of the cemetery perhaps. Would only work as part of a major upgrading of that whole area - which doesn't seem to be on the cards.</p> <p>This site would be suitable for a new supermarket. Such town centre investment has acted as a magnet in other market towns, supporting smaller retail businesses (eg see Beccles in Suffolk). This would also serve the growing Copperfields and associated developments</p> <p>I would only want a hotel on the top of the car not the main area</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the idea of a hotel in this location was well supported in the 2019 NP consultation. NP Policy M1 supports the overall improvement of the car park environment.</p> <p>DISAGREE – a hotel on this site was well-supported in this consultation. It also received greater support than a supermarket in the 2019 NP consultation.</p> <p>NOTED – policy specifies the car park's upper deck.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Wrong place - get a hotel on the edge of town</p> <p>Depends if it is likely to cause further town centre congestion considering the location.</p> <p>Need car parking space to support food festivals etc</p> <p>again, probably yes but more detail would be needed</p> <p>see comments to TC3.</p>	<p>NOTED – a hotel in this location is well-supported in community consultations. NP Policy TC3 would however also support A64 locations.</p> <p>NOTED – it is unlikely that the size of hotel envisaged would impact significantly on town centre congestion.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy specifies a hotel with public car parking capacity. Policies M1 & M2 safeguard parking capacity on the remainder of the Wentworth Street site and Malton Market Place.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy offers in principle support only. The acceptability of any development would be subject to detailed proposals.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy HRI1	<p>You don't help horse racing at all by putting a potential millstone round the neck of any stables which for whatever reason finds that it cannot continue. You'll just regulate the industry into finding it harder to borrow on the security of the land - because if it had to foreclose the lender might be unable to sell, or might be forced to sell to the only buyer willing to commit to horse racing. I can only see downsides from such a policy. What are the upsides? Surely people can always seek planning permission to convert local agricultural land for horse racing anyway?</p> <p>Protection measures may have adverse effect on the industry.</p>	<p>NOTED – the policy does include built-in 'tests' that would allow re-development away from horse racing/riding stables if met. The perceived upside is the safeguarding of a local industry that is seen as key to the local economy and tourism development. It is acknowledged that new development of agricultural land for horse racing is possible but considered that protection of existing specialist infrastructure is preferable</p>	<p>ACTION – undertake a bespoke targeted consultation with local stables and other local industry reps. NB policy wording amended as a result.</p>

	<p>We need to make more of our race horse significance</p> <p>But keep in good repair.</p>	<p>to new development from scratch. That said, if these are local industry views, they need to be taken seriously. It is considered necessary to carry out a targeted consultation with local stables and industry reps before proceeding to submission with this policy.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – not a planning policy issue. There is no perceived issue here.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy HRI2	<p>RDC - It is unclear how the policy HR12 is to be implemented. The policy requires further clarity regarding its intent.</p> <p>NYCC - The Proposed Policy HRI2: Horse Racing Zones and Development is noted and the importance of the horse racing industry to tourism in the area is acknowledged, however if development is to be undertaken on land within the Neighbourhood Area, then the MWJP emerging policies will also need to be taken into account (with weight appropriate to the progress of the MWJP, currently at examination).</p> <p>Any objections to developments/ initiatives must be evidenced so not simply spurious objections</p> <p>can integrity of zones withstand pressure from building and traffic?</p>	<p>NOTED – the policy would benefit from clarification.</p> <p>NOTED – Policy HRI2 is not considered to be incompatible with emerging MWJP policies as all specified issues of safety would be addressed as a matter of course should detailed minerals/waste development proposals come forward on land within the identified zones – the respondent makes no objection to the policy.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy would benefit from clarification which would aid in this regard.</p> <p>NOTED – this will only be known once the policy has been applied in practice.</p>	<p>ACTION – clarify policy in line with suggestion.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – clarify policy in line with suggestion.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	Link to plan?	NOTED – the NP Proposals Map is available to view on both town council and RDC websites, as referenced in the NP summary document.	NO ACTION
Policy HRI3	<p>NYCC - The existing Whitewall Quarry access is onto Welham Road and therefore is relevant (together with site allocations MJP12 and MJP13) with respect to Neighbourhood Plan Policy HRI13 'Improved Accessibility to the Horse Racing Industry' in terms of HRI13-7 (the National Cycle Route 166).</p> <p>Great idea to utilise the vast expanses of land the horse racing industry needs - small paths round the edges to create PROWs will improve connectivity across the towns</p> <p>strongly agree with keeping routes open to horses but many already forced to resort to 'bussing' due to exponential vehicle growth, much illegal. Please note no longer a bridle way although it should be. Also note historical correct spelling - Bazley's Laney</p> <p>Link to plan?</p>	<p>NOTED – Policy HRI3 is not considered to be incompatible with emerging allocations – the respondent makes no objection to the policy.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it is unclear which route is no longer a bridleway (Whitewall/ Bazeley's Lane?). This needs to be checked. Ditto correct spelling.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP Proposals Map is available to view on both town council and RDC websites, as referenced in the NP summary document.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – check status of specified route and spelling of 'Bazeley's' and amend if/as necessary.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy HRI4	<p>A separate horse racing museum may not be advisable, it would be better to share facilities with other museums in the area to increase sustainability. See below.</p> <p>Yes - as long as it considers the needs, or combines with Malton Museum - maybe in a new venue at/near Orchard Fields.</p> <p>Providing it doesn't detract from existing museum provision</p>	<p>NOTED – the policy wording is sufficiently flexible to allow for the development of a museum in concert with other museum facilities.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy wording is sufficiently flexible to allow for the development of a museum in concert with other museum facilities.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>I would prefer a larger (than that currently existing in the Subscription Rooms) museum which could incorporate a permanent horse racing display</p> <p>Museum facilities should be concentrated on a single site to reduce overheads and maximise the benefits of volunteer input. Any facility should include temporary exhibition space to allow different aspects of the reserve collections to be exhibited. Adequate resourcing would be essential.</p> <p>Malton Museum - We recognise the support shown in the initial public consultation for better visitor facilities at the Roman Fort site in Orchard Field, and for museum collections and displays relating to the horse racing community. We ask that an NP objective should be for the local Councils and Malton Museum to work together to achieve feasible outcomes for these aspirations.</p>	<p>NOTED – the policy wording is sufficiently flexible to allow for the development of a museum in concert with other museum facilities.</p> <p>NOTED - the policy wording is sufficiently flexible to allow for any solutions appropriate to the interests concerned.</p> <p>NOTED – an objective of this nature would be inappropriate for what is essentially a land use planning document. It is considered that these matters should be reflected in either policy supporting text or under community actions as most appropriate.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – reflect the joint working aspiration in the plan as indicated.</p>
4.7 Heritage & Design - General	<p>Historic England – we note that the Neighbourhood Plan incorporates Heritage and Heritage Asset policies. These policies should be worded in a way which will help to protect these sites and their settings, to address Heritage at Risk and ensure that any change is managed appropriately.</p> <p>Historic England – we would suggest that a schedule of, and policies relating to, Local Non-Designated Heritage Assets are drawn up, utilising the guidance set out in Historic England Advice Note 7.</p>	<p>NOTED – it is considered that the plan’s policies in respect of the 3 conservation areas are worded appropriately. Heritage at Risk Register includes the Grade II* listed ‘Screen Wall NW of Malton Lodge’ – the policy implications of this need to be investigated.</p> <p>NOTED – this is already addressed via a community action. Given the advanced nature of the NP and the amount of new work that would be involved in assessing candidate sites and compiling a schedule as</p>	<p>ACTION – investigate policy implications as indicated and amend policies if/as necessary.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>YWT - Any planting should ensure the right trees (or other planting) in the right place. Unless there is good evidence to suggest otherwise, this usually means locally native trees of local provenance and in keeping with the surrounding natural habitat.</p> <p>RDC Independent Group - We set out below some comments we have received from a local resident of the Castlegate area. <i>"I continue to be angered by the ongoing degradation to the fabric of areas of our towns. Some streets have been subject to virtual abandonment. In the case of Castlegate, RDC has granted planning permission for HMOs here because landlords had no interest in investing in properties that flood. RDC even managed (badly) their own HMO here until they realised it was not fit for purpose. So we have been left with poor quality housing stock that people with limited resources have to accept as homes. The landlords will not invest. Either this area is a conservation area or it's not. Fitzwilliam estate and other landlords and shopkeepers have stated responsibilities what they have to do to maintain properties within a conservation area. Otherwise we continue in this farcical situation where I have to inform RDC of any work I do on my property, whilst other properties are allowed to slide into dereliction. I do genuinely fear it may be too late for Castlegate, but let it be a warning to what lies ahead for other areas of the town. There is a distinct "them and us" feeling creeping in. Local people must have agency in their lives and environment. We are not asking for special treatment here, just a level playing field.</i></p>	<p>suggested, together with existing Local Plan policy (Local Plan Strategy Policy SP12) protecting non-designated heritage assets, it is considered that this is not feasible or necessary for inclusion in the NP.</p> <p>NOTED - it is considered that this is already covered in the adopted Development Plan (Local Plan Strategy Policy SP14), which this NP will become part of on 'adoption'. It is not the role of NPs to duplicate existing Local Plan policy provisions.</p> <p>NOTED – NP conservation area policies HD1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 10 variously address the degradation and dereliction issues highlighted. They are supported by a list of community actions.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	-----------------------------------

	<p><i>This street that was once the proud industrial centre for brewing and other smaller industry for Malton and Norton with some amazing period architecture, has sadly been ignored. We can't even get heritage street lighting and paving in a conservation area. A community cut in half by a busy road, whilst in the background, sparkly new magpie developments throw up hundreds of houses in a year or two, creating further pollution as everyone comes to shop at Morrison's."</i></p>		
Policy HD1	<p>FME - FME are concerned that the draft policy is very prescriptive and does not allow for more alternative innovative design approaches or variety. Whilst it is acknowledged that planning policies setting out broad design principles are appropriate, the level of detail proposed in draft policy HD1 goes beyond what is considered necessary and would limit the decision makers ability to consider each site and proposal on its 'own merits'. It is therefore considered that the draft policy as currently worded is not in generally conformity with NPPF and, in particular, paragraph 127 which states: "Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments: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)" Moreover, FME would welcome provision within the policy (or a separate policy) to support the reuse of upper floors in the town centre. Innovative design solutions may enable new uses and greater vibrancy within the town centre.</p> <p>new carbon neutral materials are already available and we should encourage these, also solar panels on roofs etc. We might have opportunity for green new builds so mustn't limit</p>	<p>DISAGREE – given that the policy is couched in terms of developments 'having regard to' rather than 'being required to adhere to' it's provisions, it is considered that it is not 'very prescriptive' but rather offers sufficient flexibility for bespoke site solutions to be arrived at, guided by the stated principles. As such, it is considered that the policy 'has regard to national policy' (NB it is not required to be in general conformity with NPPF as asserted) and meets the basic conditions. Discussion with RDC indicates that there is no perceived planning issue surrounding the reuse of upper floors in the town centre.</p> <p>NOTED – solar panel installation is often permitted development (i.e. no planning application needed so no planning policy assessment). Rather the problem lies with insensitive installation within conservation areas, hence the Article 4 provision under community actions. More</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – investigate the feasibility of addressing the issues raised within the plan and amend plan if/as considered feasible/necessary. Following investigation, introduction to</p>

	<p>We need to recognise to promote high spec conservation areas this costs money and this can be very expensive for owner !However in Norton on Commercial street the conservation area is completely at odds with the overall concept some shop frontages just let the town down and the town needs to be promoting a much higher standard of shop fronts</p> <p>Perhaps worth checking how some of this may link in to flood risk requirements for those sites at flood risk - just in case the requirements are at odds with each other</p>	<p>generally, NPs are limited by not being able to include policies/ standards/requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings, including on the sustainability of new homes. NP Policy HD2 however does seek maximisation of opportunities for energy/resource conservation through construction. All that that said, these issues are raised on a few occasions, and it is considered that they should be further investigated to determine whether and if so how the plan could more effectively address them and reflect growing concerns.</p> <p>NOTED – acknowledged, but conservation areas are prized statutory heritage assets to which development must be sensitive – it should be noted that the policy promotes good principles but does not require them. Specific provision is made re the Norton on Derwent Conservation Area (NP Policies HD1, 6 & 7) and shop fronts (Policy HD3).</p> <p>NOTED – the plan and its policies have been thoroughly checked re flood risk via a SEA (Strategic Environment Assessment) Screening report available on the town council websites.</p>	<p>'Environment' section amended.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>This should not be at the expense of homes/businesses being able to implement eco-friendly technology in the form of upgrading to double glazing or considering solar panels.</p> <p>Allowance should be made for the provision of solar panels in locations where they are only visible from neighbouring properties and not from the public highway. There needs to be a balance between preserving the features of the historical environment and a more sustainable energy policy.</p>	<p>NOTED - solar panel and double glazing installation are often permitted development (i.e. no planning application needed so no planning policy assessment). Rather the problem lies with insensitive installation within conservation areas, hence the Article 4 provision under community actions. NP Policy HD2 however does seek maximisation of opportunities for energy/resource conservation through construction and no NP conservation area policies prohibit such technology.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy HD2	<p>Crossley Grand Children's Trust - perhaps could be more ambitious in its steering of wording for importance and relevance.</p> <p>New housing estates need to have greater distinctiveness - get away from the bog standard boxes piled on top of one another</p> <p>This should not be at the expense of homes/businesses being able to implement eco-friendly technology in the form of upgrading to double glazing or considering solar panels.</p>	<p>NOTED – it is unclear how much more ambitious and in what way(s) it is felt the policy could be. As such, it is not possible to consider any meaningful amendments. It should be noted that the wording of NP policies is constrained in terms of what it can require of new developments.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy is designed to achieve this.</p> <p>NOTED - solar panel and double glazing installation are often permitted development (i.e. no planning application needed so no planning policy assessment). Rather the problem lies with insensitive installation within conservation</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	But see comments on HD1.	<p>areas, hence the Article 4 provision under community actions. NP Policy HD2 however does seek maximisation of opportunities for energy/resource conservation through construction and no NP conservation area policies prohibit such technology.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	NO ACTION
Policy HD3	new carbon neutral materials are already available and we should encourage these, also solar panels on roofs etc. We might have opportunity for green new builds so mustn't limit	<p>NOTED – solar panel installation is often permitted development (i.e. no planning application needed so no planning policy assessment). Rather the problem lies with insensitive installation within conservation areas, hence the Article 4 provision under community actions. More generally, NPs are limited by not being able to include policies/standards/requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings, including on the sustainability of new homes. NP Policy HD2 however does seek maximisation of opportunities for energy/resource conservation through construction. All that said, these issues are raised on a few occasions, and it is considered that they should be further investigated to determine whether and if so how the plan could more effectively address them and reflect growing concerns.</p>	<p>ACTION – investigate the feasibility of addressing the issues raised within the plan and amend plan if/as considered feasible/necessary. Following investigation, introduction to 'Environment' section amended.</p>

	<p>Maintaining the historic flavour of the buildings and architecture.</p> <p>This should not be at the expense of homes/businesses being able to implement eco-friendly technology in the form of upgrading to double glazing or considering solar panels.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED - solar panel and double glazing installation are often permitted development (i.e. no planning application needed so no planning policy assessment). Rather the problem lies with insensitive installation within conservation areas, hence the Article 4 provision under community actions. NP Policy HD2 however does seek maximisation of opportunities for energy/resource conservation through construction and no NP conservation area policies prohibit such technology.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy HD4	<p>Consider removing structures in Area 3 and landscaping this area instead (to improve flood resilience, amenity value and river access)</p> <p>Include redevelopment of the Cattle Market.</p>	<p>NOTED – NP Policy RC1 provides for recreational enhancement of significant stretches of the riverside. It is considered that a balance needs to be struck between this and encouraging new/productive uses of riverside sites/buildings.</p> <p>NOTED – this is already addressed in both RDC’s adopted Local Plan Strategy (Policy SP7) and Local Plan Sites Document (Policy SD14). It is not the function of NPs to duplicate policies in the Development of which it will form part once made.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	This should not be at the expense of homes/businesses being able to implement eco-friendly technology in the form of upgrading to double glazing or considering solar panels.	NOTED - solar panel and double glazing installation are often permitted development (i.e. no planning application needed so no planning policy assessment). Rather the problem lies with insensitive installation within conservation areas, hence the Article 4 provision under community actions. NP Policy HD2 however does seek maximisation of opportunities for energy/resource conservation through construction and no NP conservation area policies prohibit such technology.	NO ACTION
Policy HD5	This should not be at the expense of homes/businesses being able to implement eco-friendly technology in the form of upgrading to double glazing or considering solar panels.	NOTED - solar panel and double glazing installation are often permitted development (i.e. no planning application needed so no planning policy assessment). Rather the problem lies with insensitive installation within conservation areas, hence the Article 4 provision under community actions. NP Policy HD2 however does seek maximisation of opportunities for energy/resource conservation through construction and no NP conservation area policies prohibit such technology.	NO ACTION
Policy HD6	What about the area of land near Lakeside and the snickets that has been up for development before - could this be turned in to community greenspace, pocket park or community orchard?	NOTED – on the assumption that the comment relates to land adjacent Lakeside Way, this land is already	NO ACTION

	<p>This should not be at the expense of homes/businesses being able to implement eco-friendly technology in the form of upgrading to double glazing or considering solar panels.</p>	<p>proposed for designation as Local Green Space in this plan (Policy E1).</p> <p>NOTED - solar panel and double glazing installation are often permitted development (i.e. no planning application needed so no planning policy assessment). Rather the problem lies with insensitive installation within conservation areas, hence the Article 4 provision under community actions. NP Policy HD2 however does seek maximisation of opportunities for energy/resource conservation through construction and no NP conservation area policies prohibit such technology.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
<p>Policy HD7</p>	<p>This should not be at the expense of homes/businesses being able to implement eco-friendly technology in the form of upgrading to double glazing or considering solar panels.</p>	<p>NOTED - solar panel and double glazing installation are often permitted development (i.e. no planning application needed so no planning policy assessment). Rather the problem lies with insensitive installation within conservation areas, hence the Article 4 provision under community actions. NP Policy HD2 however does seek maximisation of opportunities for energy/resource conservation through construction and no NP conservation area policies prohibit such technology.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

Policy HD8	This should not be at the expense of homes/businesses being able to implement eco-friendly technology in the form of upgrading to double glazing or considering solar panels.	NOTED - solar panel and double glazing installation are often permitted development (i.e. no planning application needed so no planning policy assessment). Rather the problem lies with insensitive installation within conservation areas, hence the Article 4 provision under community actions. NP Policy HD2 however does seek maximisation of opportunities for energy/resource conservation through construction and no NP conservation area policies prohibit such technology.	NO ACTION
Policy HD9	This should not be at the expense of homes/businesses being able to implement eco-friendly technology in the form of upgrading to double glazing or considering solar panels.	NOTED - solar panel and double glazing installation are often permitted development (i.e. no planning application needed so no planning policy assessment). Rather the problem lies with insensitive installation within conservation areas, hence the Article 4 provision under community actions. NP Policy HD2 however does seek maximisation of opportunities for energy/resource conservation through construction and no NP conservation area policies prohibit such technology.	NO ACTION
Policy HD10	Crossley Grand Children’s Trust - perhaps could be more ambitious in its steering of wording for importance and relevance.	NOTED – it is unclear how much more ambitious and in what way(s) it is felt the policy could be. As such, it is not possible to consider any	NO ACTION

	<p>Again - open up to modern eco-friendly, carbon neutral materials</p> <p>This should not be at the expense of homes/businesses being able to implement eco-friendly technology in the form of upgrading to double glazing or considering solar panels.</p>	<p>meaningful amendments. It should be noted that the wording of NP policies is constrained in terms of what it can require of new developments.</p> <p>NOTED – NPs are limited by not being able to include policies/standards/requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings, including on the sustainability of new homes. All that said, these issues are raised on a few occasions, and it is considered that they should be further investigated to determine whether and if so how the plan could more effectively address them and reflect growing concerns.</p> <p>NOTED - solar panel and double glazing installation are often permitted development (i.e. no planning application needed so no planning policy assessment). Rather the problem lies with insensitive installation within conservation areas, hence the Article 4 provision under community actions. NP Policy HD2 however does seek maximisation of opportunities for energy/resource conservation through construction and no NP conservation area policies prohibit such technology.</p>	<p>ACTION – investigate the feasibility of addressing the issues raised within the plan and amend plan if/as considered feasible/necessary. Following investigation, introduction to 'Environment' section amended.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	--

	see earlier comments re solar panels, other small renewable energy facilities should be viewed favourably.	NOTED	NO ACTION
Policy HD11	<p>FME - As outlined in relation to draft policy TC2, it is considered a matter for the Local Planning Authority to determine the level of information that would need to support any planning application. Moreover, the suggested requirements for the policy are overly onerous as there may be circumstances where archaeology is of low significance/value and therefore does not need to be excavated or fully recorded. There are also instances where following a geophysical survey the significance of any likely archaeology is low and any field excavation can be controlled by condition and undertaken after the development has been approved. As such, FME would question the need for draft policy HD11 as these matters are already dealt with as part any planning application.</p> <p>NYCC - The plan is very aspirational with regards to the historic environment rather than taking the most usual approach of just preserving what is there. This is extremely good to see and we support the principles of re-establishing a museum and providing visitor facilities and interpretation at the Roman fort at Orchard Fields. Draft policy HD11: The phrase 'Where physical preservation is not possible...' could be strengthened to 'Where physical preservation is not required...'</p> <p>An archaeological investigation clause should be included on any new developments as there is likely to be some impact on this archaeologically rich area.</p>	<p>DISAGREE – once made, i.e. 'adopted', the NP will form part of the statutory development plan for the area. As such, NPs have the same status as Local Plans and it is as much a function of a NP as of a Local Plan to require something through its policies if such requirements meet the basic conditions. Given the extent and importance of archaeological remains in the area (ref NP Appendix 3), the policy's expectation is considered to be a reasonable requirement. RDC have raised no objection to and made no comment on this policy. NYCC have supported it, indeed suggested wording that would strengthen it.</p> <p>AGREE – the suggestion re strengthening the wording of the policy is considered to be feasible and warranted.</p> <p>NOTED – this is effectively what the policy already includes.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – strengthen policy wording as suggested.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>The public's interest in archaeology has been growing in recent years as evidenced by popularity of tv programmes connected with it. It's our heritage.</p> <p>This should not be at the expense of homes/businesses being able to implement eco-friendly technology in the form of upgrading to double glazing or considering solar panels.</p> <p>it seems lacking</p> <p>If possible some remains may be able to be incorporated into new buildings, especially those with public access, eg a hotel.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the relevance of the comment to this policy is unclear.</p> <p>NOTED – it is not clear how/in what way the policy is thought to be lacking. As such, it is not possible to respond in any meaningful way.</p> <p>NOTED – this is covered by the 'physical preservation' element of the policy.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
<p>4.8 Housing – General & supporting text to H1</p>	<p>RDC Independent Group - The Current Ryedale Local Plan has its foundation on the concept that new development in Ryedale should be concentrated in the five market towns. 50% of all new housing (<i>and 90% of all new employment development</i>) is to be in Malton and Norton. This concept was largely the result of Nimbyism in the country areas which resisted development within villages, resulting in an adamant refusal to look at enlarging village envelopes, which have remained unchanged for almost 30 years. It is now recognised by the District Council that this unbalanced concept is unsustainable and has damaged Malton and Norton, and the District Council has commenced a review of the Ryedale Plan, which includes looking at the housing distribution policies of that plan. The Neighbourhood Plan therefore provides an opportunity to inform and influence the revision of the Ryedale Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan should be updated accordingly.</p> <p>RDC Independent Group - The Neighbourhood Plan is therefore right not to make any recommendations regarding site allocations for housing. However, this does not go far enough. In my view, there</p>	<p>NOTED – the NP will be examined against the adopted Local Plan at the time of examination, not against the new emerging plan – it is highly unlikely that this will be adopted before the examination. As such, the policies of the NP have to be written in the context of and be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted Local Plan. The updating suggested is speculative and premature, given the very early stages of the new Local Plan and absence of any published plan documentation in the public domain.</p> <p>DISAGREE – such a policy statement (NB it would have to be policy to carry any weight) would not be in</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>should be a clear statement that no new development (apart from Beverley Road – see below) should be permitted until there are a four way intersections at Broughton Road and York Road, whether land is allocated or not.</p> <p>RDC Independent Group:- Beverley Road site in Norton. This is anticipated to include 600 or so new houses. This is land which has been allocated by the Ryedale Plan and is therefore available for development. The intention is that the developer will be required to extend the spine road through the adjacent industrial estate to the Beverley Road. This is to enable traffic coming from the direction of Beverley to access the A64 at Brambling Fields without having to drive through Norton Town Centre. The development of the site will therefore achieve substantial planning gain at no cost to the public. Development on this site will have direct access onto the A64 without residential traffic having to drive across the Level Crossing and through Malton/Norton town centres in order to access the A64 to North or South. Ryedale’s Planning Department have been requested to provide detailed information in regard to the number of dwellings which have been built since 25th October 2010 (the date of the Jacobs report), and the anticipated number which can be built on land which has been made available, by permissions, appeal decisions and existing land allocations. It is clear, on the basis of figures provided by Ryedale that the development of the Beverley Road site will complete the allocation of houses required for Malton and Norton by the Ryedale Plan. It is understood that this has been under discussion with a developer for many years, but no planning application has been submitted. It is important that this site is retained, and that no other site in Malton and Norton is brought forward either as a substitute for it or as an additional allocation.</p>	<p>general conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted Local Plan (Local Plan Strategy SP2 and sites allocated in accordance with that policy) and as such would not meet basic conditions.</p> <p>NOTED – the NP is silent on this site and on housing allocations generally.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	------------------

	<p>RDC Independent Group - Section 4.8 on p.45 is not strong enough. As mentioned above, my understanding is that land has already been allocated by the Ryedale Plan for all of the 2,000 houses which Jacobs reckoned the towns could take without unacceptable harm. Of the houses to be built on these sites, all but 600 or so have already either got planning permission or have been built. The remaining 600 are scheduled for the Beverley Road site which has been allocated, but not yet received planning permission.</p> <p>Our concerns about the flawed nature of the Jacobs Strategy document have already been stated. It has also been overtaken by events – ie the intention to run more trains.</p> <p>However, if the view is still taken that the Jacobs document should still be regarded as credible in any way, one has to respect its conclusion which was that 2,165 new dwellings was the number of new houses which could be built with an acceptable impact on the local highways network, subject to mitigation measures and some highways improvements, some of which have not been carried out. <u>It follows that the Report acknowledges that more than 2165 houses could have an unacceptable impact on the local highways network. So Malton and Norton have already reached their limit and this should be clearly set out in this document.</u></p> <p>Please therefore rewrite the third para. as follows: <i>“The Ryedale Sites Allocation Local Plan has allocated sites to fully accommodate the requirements of the Ryedale Plan, and with the exception of the Beverley Road site, all of these sites have either been developed or have planning permission. The Jacobs Strategic Transport Assessment of 2010 concluded that 2165 new dwellings could be accommodated without having an unacceptable impact on the local highways network. Since 2010, this number has been accommodated by planning permissions or development – again with the exception of the Beverley Road site.</i></p> <p><i>The Beverley Road site is expected to provide positive planning gain in terms of a spine road between the adjacent industrial estate and the Beverley Road, thus enabling traffic from Beverley to have direct access</i></p>	<p>DISAGREE – it is considered that this adds nothing material to the NP, the 2nd suggested paragraph particularly so.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	------------------

	<p><i>to the A 64 at Brambling Fields. without passing through Norton Town Centre.”</i></p> <p>RDC Independent Group – <i>(NB re new suggested policies)</i> insert the following policy as H1 on page 45 at the end of the section headed: “Introduction”:</p> <p>1) H1: “No further land should be considered for allocation for residential development in Malton/Norton until and unless the York Road intersection with the A64 is made four-way and a new four-way intersection with the A64 is built at Broughton Road, and other substantial highways improvements are made, which are ancillary to these and also those which complete the recommendations of the Jacobs Strategic Transport Assessment 2010, and any subsequent recommendations arising out of the increased use of the railway”.</p> <p>2) H2: The development of the allocated Beverley Road site will be expected to provide a new spine road to connect the Beverley Road with the main spine road of the adjoining industrial estate so as to provide direct access to the A64 at Brambling Fields for traffic from the Beverley Road”</p> <p>3) So, please also renumber Policy H1 on page 46 as H3.</p>	<p>1) DISAGREE/NOTED – such a ‘ban’ on residential allocations would not meet the basic conditions test in respect of NPs having regard to national planning policy – it would be contrary to various provisions of section 5 “Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes”. It is considered, however, that the intent of this suggested policy (i.e. to direct any unallocated development to areas with direct A64 access and out of the town centres) could be achieved via a ‘Development on Unallocated Sites’ policy – an approach which has met favour with examiners when included in other NPs. Such a policy would however need to be carefully worded so as not to be interpreted as a ‘green light’ for new unallocated development. The scale of development covered also needs to be considered together with the scope for encouraging sustainable transport to discourage town centre trips by car. The supporting text to the policy would need amending accordingly (see Policies TM3-5 Supporting Text above).</p> <p>2) DISAGREE – this is already addressed in RDC’s adopted Local Plan Sites Document (Policy SD3). It is not the function of NPs to duplicate</p>	<p>1) ACTION – draft new policy as suggested for further consideration.</p> <p>2) NO ACTION</p> <p>3) NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>policies in the Development Plan of which it will itself become a part on being made.</p> <p>3) DISAGREE – if policy suggestion in 1) above is accepted, there would be no new policy in this section.</p>	
Policy H1 – supporting text	RDC - the plan itself would benefit from the inclusion of reference to key pieces of evidence to support policy proposals. For example, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment includes information that will help to support the Plan’s housing policy.	NOTED – it is considered that the plan would benefit from the inclusion of such references.	ACTION – include references as suggested.
Policy H1	<p>RDC - It is ambitious to expect sites of 10 dwellings to reflect the mix outlined. Whilst the District Council does not dispute the intent of the policy, it would benefit from some revision to its wording to assist implementation.</p> <p>Crossley Grand Children’s Trust - perhaps could be more ambitious in its steering of wording for importance and relevance.</p> <p>FME - FME are concerned by the limited evidence base which seems to support draft policy H1 and the lack of any professional assessment of housing needs. Indeed, it is considered that such matters are better dealt within the Ryedale Local Plan which will be informed by an appropriate evidence base including an up-to-date Strategic Housing Market Assessment.</p>	<p>AGREE – it is suggested that the substitution of the wording ‘which provides a housing mix with the following particular emphases’ with ‘which contributes to the provision of the following housing mix’ would reflect the intent of the comment.</p> <p>NOTED – it is unclear how much more ambitious and in what way(s) it is felt the policy could be. As such, it is not possible to consider any meaningful amendments. It should be noted that the wording of NP policies is constrained in terms of what it can require of new developments.</p> <p>DISAGREE – it is acknowledged that the evidence base does not include a professionally conducted local housing needs assessment. However, it fully reflects a community consultation involving over 300 local</p>	<p>ACTION – amend the policy wording as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Additional volume of traffic needs to be considered impact</p> <p>Affordable housing should be part of any planned development and enforced so that builders cannot wriggle out of this responsibility.</p> <p>Seems unduly prescriptive. We need adequate starter homes in the mix. Apart from that, why not let developers go with what they think will sell? Why would the planners think they know better? And why would I want to insist on homes having mostly two bedrooms (and, it seems, never four bedrooms)?</p> <p>Mix should be determined for individual applications depending on the site and the local housing needs at the time.</p>	<p>people, the findings of which reflect those of RDC’s Strategic Housing Market Assessment (NB as pointed out by RDC in its comments – supporting text is to be amended to make this point). RDC have not objected to the policy. Further, experience shows that NP examiners find such policies in line with basic conditions, particularly as they are couched in terms of support for a particular mix rather than requiring that mix.</p> <p>DISAGREE – this is not relevant to a policy which is not proposing any new housing or allocating any new housing sites.</p> <p>NOTED – provision for and requirements in respect of affordable housing are already included in RDC’s adopted Local Plan Strategy (Policy SP3). It is not the function of NPs to duplicate such provision.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the policy is not prescriptive – it is couched in terms of supporting a specified mix rather than requiring it and then only on small sites. The mix specified fully reflects the findings from a community survey of over 300 local households as clearly stated in supporting text.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>I would like to see a large mixed housing development to the west of Malton with contributions from the developers towards a new link road onto the A64, i.e. from Broughton Road,</p> <p>Would like to see the west side of Malton developed for housing and contributions made by developers towards a new junction onto the A64.</p> <p>Bungalows are an appalling use of land as a resource. Much more consideration as to proximity of target populations to facilities and / or use of alternatives to private cars should be given. Car parking on pavements in Copperfields is already a blight</p> <p>Need to take account of an ageing population and their needs</p> <p>But should add after elderly, people with a range of disabilities</p>	<p>NOTED – the town councils do not see the NP as an appropriate vehicle for housing allocation. This is seen as an RDC function and any suggestions for new sites should be directed to RDC to consider as part of its Local Plan review work.</p> <p>NOTED – bungalows were very popular in the community survey of over 300 local people on which the policy is based, with over 50% support. The NPs transport & movement policies emphasise walking and cycle use. Housing site allocation is seen as an RDC planning function. There is no perceived parking/enforcement issue in Copperfields.</p> <p>NOTED – this is one of the things the policy specifically seeks to address.</p> <p>NOTED – policy is based on community survey findings which did not indicate this particular priority. Disabled needs are however already addressed in adopted RDC Local Plan Strategy Policy SP4.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
4.9 Employment - General	<p>RDC Independent Group - The Current Ryedale Local Plan has its foundation on the concept that new development in Ryedale should be concentrated in the five market towns. <i>(50% of all new housing and)</i> 90% of all new employment development is to be in Malton and Norton. Updating is (also) required in regard to employment development. The Ryedale Plan prescribes 80% of new employment</p>	<p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>development at Malton/Norton. (I think this was increased to 90% before adoption of the plan). However, the Council has only a few weeks ago approved a major extension of the Thornton Road Industrial Estate at Pickering and resolved to invest over £2M of the Council's own money in developing it.</p> <p>RDC Independent Group – <i>various employment issues raised relating to the Eden Road site, the Livestock Market and the Thornton Road Industrial Estate, Pickering, concluding that “as there appears to be so little demand for new industrial land in the local area, there should be no expectation of the allocation of more land in Malton/Norton for employment purposes and no consideration for this should be given until there is clear evidence of demand – evidenced by real enquiries and not by wishful thinking, fancy statistical projections or hypothetical opinions in Consultants’ reports.”</i></p> <p>RDC Independent Group - It is not understood why the Neighbourhood Plan does not clearly support retail development within the existing Cattle Market Area, particularly as there is an extant planning permission for this.</p>	<p>NOTED – the NP includes no employment allocations and alludes to no such allocations.</p> <p>NOTED – the retail development of this site/area is already specifically covered by an allocation (SD14) in the adopted Development Plan (i.e. RDC’s adopted Local Plan Sites Document). It is not the function of NPs to duplicate policies in a plan which it will itself form part of on being made. Also, as stated, there is already an extant planning permission. As such any new policy would be redundant/after the fact.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy EM1 – supporting text	RDC Independent Group - Page 47 – Employment – Am I right in thinking that the “Manor Farm Business Park” is the one at Eden Road?	NOTED –the correct name of the business park in question is Eden Business Park. Text should be amended accordingly.	ACTION – amend text as indicated.

	<p>RDC Independent Group - Page 47. Please bring the “introduction” up to date by inserting the following after the para: “ The employment section addresses the vision’s desirewith the principal town’s status. The words which should be added are: “As regards the allocation of new land for employment, this is covered by Policy SP6 of the Ryedale Plan. Malton/Norton were expected to take 80% of all new employment development. Land has accordingly been allocated and given planning permission at Eden Road, and the greater part of this site remains undeveloped. The view is taken that there is no need to allocate further land for employment purposes in this plan”.</p> <p>Please add the following words at the bottom of the narrative on p.48: “It is expected that the Livestock Market in Malton Town centre will move to a site at the Eden Road Business Park shortly, as Ryedale has ring fenced £1.5M to enable the move to take place, subject to submission of plans, including a business plan. This will make the present Livestock Area available for retail use.”</p> <p>RDC Independent Group - Please add new policy EM2 on p.48: “The Livestock Market area in Malton shall be allocated for retail purposes”.</p>	<p>NOTED – it is considered appropriate to add the majority of the suggested wording or similar, after the bullet point list of existing employment sites (P47) as this would provide useful factual information. The last suggested sentence is however, as stated, ‘a view’ not based on any presented evidence/professional assessment. It is not for the NP, which will become part of the Development Plan, to assert that there is no need for a reviewed Local Plan to allocate further employment land – this would be contrary to NPPF section 6 and basic conditions. As such, it is not considered appropriate to include this sentence.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the retail development of the livestock market is already specifically covered by an allocation (SD14) in the adopted Development Plan (i.e. RDC’s adopted Local Plan Sites Document). It is not the function of NPs to duplicate policies in a plan which it will itself form part of on being made. Without a new policy the suggested preamble is of no material value within the NP.</p>	<p>ACTION – add suggested wording or similar as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy EM1	<p>FME - FME support the draft policy EM1 and do not have any comments to make on the policy itself. They would however request that a number of minor tweaks to the supporting text are made for clarity. On page 48, it is requested that changes to the final paragraph before Policy EM1 as follows (changes underlined): First sentence:</p>	<p>AGREE – it is considered that such clarifications would be beneficial.</p>	<p>ACTION – amend text as suggested.</p>

	<p>“With reference to the food industry, in 2011 the Fitzwilliam Malton Estate set about looking for opportunities” Third sentence: “Consequently Visit Malton developed the Malton Food Lovers Festival, an annual event that is used</p> <p>Until roads are improved for additional traffic from extra housing</p> <p>We need to attract employers that pay higher wages and this means not restricting land for employment sites.</p> <p>Yes - greater tourism accommodation support. Unlike Pickering there are virtually no B&B's or short rental accomdation. There are some AirBnB developments, but not enough to support opportunity. One particular area of opportunity is overnight or short term cycle tourism that often prefer group accommodation and secure storage.</p> <p>Future industries should not be excluded. Increasing artisan producers alongside food are evident. Green industries are set to exponentially grow and our towns are well placed to take advantage - include green industries in the list</p>	<p>DISAGREE – it is not considered appropriate to add such a caveat to a policy which merely supports particular types of development in general terms – which may or may not impact on existing roads.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy does not restrict land for employment site.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – although there is no particular Local Plan evidence highlighting green industries as a potential growth sector, neither are they excluded. Reference is however made in the Local Plan Strategy to renewable energy and new economic uses for the wider countryside. It is considered that specific support/ encouragement for green industries would be in keeping with general ‘green’ concerns highlighted in the consultation. It is also considered that the word ‘particularly’ should be</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – amend policy wording as indicated.</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>Anything to do with local food whether providing or selling it is to be preferred to non-local which incurs transport emissions including CO2. Local shop owners are more likely to remain even in difficult trading times than a national chain and be more supportive of the community eg arrange deliveries for customers and other help in Covid timese</p> <p>Larger employers in both retail and office space should be encouraged.</p> <p>If in the right places</p> <p>Too specific all suitable employment should be encouraged.</p> <p>To enhance the Food Capital status we need more variety of restaurants and other food outlets.</p>	<p>inserted into the policy, thereby not excluding other unspecified sectors.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the policy already covers retail. There is no particular Local Plan evidence highlighting offices as a potential growth sector. As a generic sector not particularly characteristic to the towns, it is not considered necessary to specifically highlight it within the policy. Final policy wording will not specifically exclude support from uses other than those specified.</p> <p>NOTED – other employment uses are already covered by the RDC adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy encourages and supports both the food industry and retail sectors.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy M1	<p>FME - FME is fully supportive of policy M1 to retain Wentworth Street Car Park for this purpose.</p> <p>Wentworth Street car park is almost never packed. Suggests that some flexibility on this is possible.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – NP Policy TC4 if implemented will result in some loss of car parking capacity.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Wentworth Street is an ideal site for a much needed budget hotel and possible retail space,</p> <p>Yes - either at Wentworth CP or on a new site over the railway opposite Malton Train Station, as facility for overnight Motorhome parking. We are lagging behind Helmsley and Pickering in lacking these important tourism facilities.</p> <p>As indicated previously, consideration should be given to use of this site for retail. Alternatively, it could be retained if the Market Place car park was closed</p> <p>Wentworth St car park is very large and i'm not aware of insufficient parking spaces. Environmental improvements if this means more trees and planting - yes</p> <p>Would like to see a hotel and retail space on parts of Wentworth Street car park.</p> <p>Car parking and more particularly delivery/courier van parking is a blight in Malton with these vehicles parking wherever they like, usually on the pavement, crossing zig-zags, double yellow lines etc.</p>	<p>NOTED – a hotel is proposed under NP Policy TC4. Retail emerged as a less popular option in this location during public consultation.</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that provision for overnight motorhome parking at Wentworth St Car Park would support local tourism and that a new community action could be added to this effect, subject to discussion with RDC re current parking regulations and Helmsley/ Pickering provision.</p> <p>NOTED – retail was less popular than a hotel in public consultation. The policy retains most of the site in car parking use.</p> <p>NOTED – NP Policy TC4 if implemented will result in some loss of car parking capacity. Trees/ planting would be covered under the environmental improvement umbrella.</p> <p>NOTED – a hotel is proposed under NP Policy TC4. Retail emerged as a less popular option in this location during public consultation.</p> <p>NOTED – the addressing of such issues is not within the NDP’s policy remit.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – discussion with RDC as indicated prior to final decision re a new community action. Following discussion, deemed not feasible.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>Is this in conflict with suggestions to build a hotel on the site. The hotel will want reserved parking for its residents and any functions it promotes.</p>	<p>NOTED – there is no conflict as only the upper deck of the car park is identified for a hotel development, including public use of associated car parking area.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
<p>Policy M2</p>	<p>FME - FME is supportive of draft policy M2 albeit that there should be some flexibility over the location of any compensatory parking as opportunities arise to deliver improvements in the town centre.</p> <p>I would like to see pedestrianisation of part of the Market Place. This should link in with a redeveloped livestock market site.</p> <p>There may be opportunities to transform the market place and alternative car parking space can be created nearby eg cattle market</p> <p>Yes - change CP in front of the church to a public space with a permanent Band Stand and use of Malton in Bloom planters.</p> <p>Car parking in this area is a blight. The plan should encourage walking and discourage private car use within such a small town</p> <p>Too much traffic and need more pedestrian space.</p> <p>Enhancement of the streetscene is required to get away from it being just a car park - the work of In Bloom is a big help</p> <p>Car parking at Malton Market Place is excellent, accessible car parking is vital for the town to prosper, I used to live near Wetherby which has excellent parking facilities in town and it is very popular and successful.</p>	<p>NOTED – policy wording allows for the suggested flexibility.</p> <p>DISAGREE – a community survey responded to by over 200 people clearly indicated a preference for continued car parking over any pedestrianisation.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the policy does not provide for this. Continued car parking reflects community expressed wishes.</p> <p>DISAGREE – a community survey responded to by over 200 people clearly indicated a preference for continued car parking over any pedestrianisation.</p> <p>NOTED – the policy provides for environmental improvement.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>No map</p> <p>The market square should be pedestrianised and vehicular access only allowed for market stall holders, if air quality is to be improved then the circling of the square by drivers looking for a parking space should be stopped.</p>	<p>NOTED – the NP Proposals Map is available on both town council websites and in both offices, as clearly referenced from the NP summary leaflet.</p> <p>DISAGREE – a community survey responded to by over 200 people clearly indicated a preference for continued car parking over any pedestrianisation.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Policy N1	<p>If residential space needed, don't preclude this but can insist on flood resilient development</p> <p>I agree with not supporting residential and other uses vulnerable to flooding.</p> <p>I own the land at the back of Commercial Street and I notice on the plan it should be car parking. The authors of the plan cannot expect a resident to provide carp space at a cost to the land owner? I feel regeneration of this area should be developed I fell the authors should take in to account that the ATS land has planning permission on this land now and a lawful commencement has actually started I also feel it should be noted that if this build in not forthcoming the land should be supported for retail as we need more retail on Commercial Street</p> <p>has i have stated before, as the property owner of the land in N1 i would like it to be used for shops I.E, a small Precinct or something similar or maybe light industry possabily housing but with a name of commercil street i think it says it all, Plus if you arnt prepared to fund this development which is what you have said then why are you dictating what it should be used for</p>	<p>DISAGREE – preclusion of residential is in line with recommendation of Strategic Environmental Assessment report.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the policy states that the land should be regenerated, including car parking, not exclusively for car parking. Uses such as retail and light industry, less vulnerable in flood risk terms, would be acceptable in this location and could be included in the policy. In line with the recommendation of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) report, residential use is excluded for flood risk reasons (NB site is Flood Zone 3) and the planning permission cited does not apply to site N1. That said, there may be scope to soften the policy approach to residential</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – amend policy to support retail and light industrial uses. Investigate scope for softening policy approach to residential development and amend if/as feasible. Following investigation, no amendment as would be clearly contrary to HRA and SEA.</p>

	<p>Rear access to commercial properties is vital and necessary.</p> <p>No map</p> <p>as long as there are green spaces and possibly a small children's play area.</p>	<p>use, subject to further consideration of the SEA & HRA reports and discussion with RDC.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – the NP Proposals Map is available on both town council websites and in both offices, as clearly referenced from the NP summary leaflet.</p> <p>DISAGREE – not considered appropriate in this location.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Community Actions	<p>FME - On page 52, FME suggest that the list of matters to be addressed would benefit from the addition of: 1) • Coach parking • Overnight parking for motorhomes with provision of utilities. 2) In addition, FME suggest that there should be reference within this section of the Neighbourhood Plan to finding solutions to the viability of the Milton Rooms, a much underused resource.</p>	<p>1) NOTED – it is considered that provision for coaches/overnight motorhome parking would support local tourism and that a new community action could be added to this effect, subject to discussion with RDC re current parking regulations at Wentworth St and Helmsley/ Pickering provision.</p> <p>2) NOTED – now under new management and with the benefit of new RDC funding and possibly more to come, it is considered that solutions are already being found. That said, the town councils are keen to see the facility's future secured. A new supportive community action will be added as suggested.</p>	<p>1) ACTION – discussion with RDC as indicated prior to final decision re a new community action. Following discussion, deemed not feasible.</p> <p>2) ACTION – add new community action re working to secure future viable use for the Milton Rooms.</p>

	<p>Habton PC - Ryton Rigg Road should have an HGV ban (with the exception for local farm vehicles and local deliveries), as it is not suitable for larger vehicles trying to access the Eden Camp development.</p> <p>Habton PC - To prevent unnecessary traffic in Habton, there should be a 4 way intersection in Broughton Road.</p> <p>Habton PC - Public transport links to the Town and the rural villages should be improved to improve connectivity between the villages that use the town's services.</p> <p>Historic England – The Malton and Norton on Derwent Plan area contains 2 Grade 1, 14 Grade II* and 243 Grade II Listed Buildings, 1 of which, the Grade II* listed 'Screen Wall North West of Malton Lodge' is on the heritage at Risk Register 2020. It is also home to 4 Scheduled Monuments.....It will also contain many Local Non-Designated Heritage Assets.</p> <p>Historic England – if you have not already done so, we would recommend that you speak to the staffs at the North Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service who look after the North Yorkshire Historic Environment Record/Sites and Monuments Record. They should be able to provide details of not only any designated heritage assets but also locally important buildings, archaeological remains and landscapes. Some Historic Environment Records may also be available on-line via the Heritage Gateway. It may also be useful to involve local voluntary groups such as the local Civic Society or local historic groups in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>NYCC - The proposal to create a local list of non-designated heritage assets is supported.</p>	<p>NOTED – suggestion to be passed on to the Highways Authority (NYCC) for its consideration.</p> <p>NOTED – this is already indicated in the supporting text – P16/para 5. It is considered that lobbying for such provision could also be usefully added to community actions.</p> <p>AGREE – a community action to this effect should be added to the plan.</p> <p>NOTED – this information could usefully be added as a preamble to the action on non-designated heritage assets (P56).</p> <p>NOTED – this is helpful advice in respect of the community action on non-designated heritage assets and could usefully be added to the text (P56). The Historic Environment Record has already been approached to provide the information in Appendix 3.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>ACTION – refer suggestion on to NYCC.</p> <p>ACTION – add new lobbying action to community actions as indicated.</p> <p>ACTION – add new community action as indicated.</p> <p>ACTION – add information as presented by HE.</p> <p>ACTION – add information as supplied by HE.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>NYCC - Not sure whether this merits inclusion but any public transport measures to improve connectivity between Malton and Norton and/or more sustainable movements between Malton and Norton would require substantial funding.</p> <p>YWT - Quarrying of local stone is mentioned as a possible mechanism to source stone to match the existing built infrastructure. Restored quarries, if designed and managed appropriately, offer great potential for habitat restoration. YWT has been involved with a number of quarry restorations and manages a number of reserves which were originally or are still part of quarry sites and would be pleased to offer advice if this idea is pursued.</p> <p>RDC Independent Group – (<i>Re the AQMA</i>) This is included in the conservation area, but is in a shocking state. We set out below some comments we have received from a local resident of the Castlegate area. <i>“Equally concerning after years of trying to get the HGV ban over the level crossing it is being ignored and not enforced. No signage near the bridges or at Butcher corner and no enforcement.”</i></p> <p>RDC Independent Group – We set out below some comments we have received from a local resident of the Castlegate area. <i>“A part of the plan should be to incorporate a scheduled and audited cleaning programme for the historic buildings whose fabric is being eroded by pollution. I would contend that the pollution is well documented and as a result of inaction the buildings are getting coated in NO2 and harmful carbon deposits. It is now the responsibility in my opinion for those who are not being effective in improving air quality within the AQMA to take some responsibility. Using low pressure high heat listed building approved washers to remove the</i></p>	<p>NOTED – as the plan currently contains no reference to public transport measures, this is not currently considered to be relevant. Should the submission version plan include any such measures, the comment will be considered for inclusion.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>AGREE – action re signage issue and HGV ban enforcement to be added as community actions.</p> <p>AGREE – Malton TC already beginning to address this issue. Grant scheme to support cleaning a possibility to be considered. New community action to be added reflecting the suggestion.</p>	<p>ACTION – consider reflecting funding information should public transport measures feature in submission version plan. NB considered but not included.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add new community actions as indicated.</p> <p>ACTION – add new community action as indicated.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p><i>dangerous carbon from the buildings. You only have to look at the roofs. The street sides are filthy and the other pitches are clean.”</i></p> <p>Keep public regularly informed of progress and chances to consult.</p> <p>They don't include anything specific about York Road. True, it's not of great scenic value but it is the most important gateway into Malton and surely it deserves better than piecemeal light industrial development, road-building etc. without any over-arching policy objectives to preserve its character and quality? Especially so as it's also a major pedestrian route, mostly for people working on the York Road Industrial estate, who have poor pavement facilities, no cycle facilities worth the name and very poor policing of road traffic speed limits.</p> <p>RDC has a commitment to over 5,000 sq metres of retail space to 2027. I would like to see the neighbourhood plan encourage the council to bring this to fruition, i.e. livestock market site, Wentworth Street CP.</p> <p>No</p>	<p>NOTED – town councils responses to consultation to be posted on their websites once finalised, together with next steps. Next opportunity for consultation will be at Regulation 16 stage – this will be organised by RDC.</p> <p>NOTED – the plan includes a ‘Gateway’ location on York Road (Policy E5). York Road also forms the northern boundary to an area of ‘Green Infrastructure’ (Policy E4) and is therefore subject to its provisions regarding enhancement. That said, it is agreed that the pedestrian and cycleway connections to the estate are poor, and while noting an existing programme for pavement renewal, it is considered that new community actions in respect of addressing unpaved sections and pedestrian /cycle separation would be beneficial. Speeding is not however perceived to be a particular problem.</p> <p>NOTED – there is already a clear Local Plan policy in respect of the livestock market to which the NDP cannot usefully add anything.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>ACTION – update websites with consultation responses and next steps at appropriate times.</p> <p>ACTION – add new community actions as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>Good suggestions. Missing is specific support for carbon neutral new housing developments; preferential support for green based business or developments and for community energy initiatives. Would also like to see more initiatives for youth provision - places to go eg developing the 2 sports centres.</p> <p>Removing solar panels from permitted developments in the conservation areas would be a retrograde step. While it may be important to retain the essential character of historic areas, lack of 21st century infrastructure is inexcusable. The lack of double (or triple) glazing in historic buildings would be considered a joke in some other parts of N Europe</p> <p>No</p> <p>The Neighbourhood plan shouldn't restrict the future growth of Malton and Norton.</p> <p>Orchard Fields - include a path across the site to improve access to all.</p> <p>Heritage trail (<i>NB under Horse Racing Industry</i>) - how about a 5k running/walking route - things like this will really appeal to the younger people and those who have moved in to the town, and will improve the health of those who live here.</p>	<p>NOTED – NP Policies CF1 and CF2 specifically address the 2 sports centres. Specific support for green-based businesses is to be added to Policy EM1. A new community action re lobbying/support for more youth provision to be added, while noting that new proposals/plans are currently being considered by the TCs. The feasibility of support for carbon neutral new housing and community energy initiatives in the plan to be investigated further.</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that the comment highlights the need for a wider review of the community action re Article 4 Direction as it is stated – this to cover the accuracy of the bullet point list (i.e. what is/isn't permitted development) and the relevance of each entry relative to each of the 3 conservation areas.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – not considered that it does.</p> <p>NOTED – there is no perceived access issue here that needs addressing.</p> <p>NOTED – this is covered in general terms by the provisions of Policy TM1. As no route is suggested in the comment, it is not possible to be</p>	<p>ACTION – amend Policy EM1 and add new community action as indicated. Further investigations to be undertaken as indicated and plan amended if/as considered feasible/necessary. Following investigations, amendment made to introduction to 'Environment' section.</p> <p>ACTION – review community action as indicated in liaison with RDC. Following review, action amended to 'exploring scope for' a more nuanced approach, appropriate to individual uses in individual conservation areas, reflective of their character and issues.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	--	---

	Public Realm - how about the incorporation of Sustainable Urban Drainage into some of the improvements - then they have a dual functions.	more specific within the policy or to consider adding a new community action.	
	Can the CIL be used towards improving medical provision?	NOTED – SUDS are already covered in the adopted Development Plan (Local Plan Strategy Policy SP17), which this NP will become part of on ‘adoption’. It is not the role of NPs to duplicate existing Local Plan policy provisions.	NO ACTION
	What about cyclepaths as well as cycle parking?	NOTED – the scale of CIL funding likely to be available to the TCs would not be sufficient to address medical provision.	NO ACTION
	Please improve the public walk signs, they look very tatty now.	NOTED – NP Policy TM1 addresses both cycle paths and covered parking facilities. In addition, cycle racks within car parks are specifically addressed as a community action.	NO ACTION
	Generally approve	NOTED – a community action could be added covering assessment of public footpath signs and action to repair where necessary.	ACTION – add new community action as indicated.
	The towns suffer from a poor road link between them. Recent flooding events show again how easily this breaks and vehicle movements are greatly affected.	NOTED	NO ACTION
	I agree that parking charges would have a negative effect on the towns prosperity but street furniture to prevent illegal and inconsiderate	NOTED – this is addressed in policies in the NP’s Transport & Movement section.	NO ACTION
		NOTED – it is considered that further street furniture would add to already	NO ACTION

	<p>parking along with support from the local police or parking enforcement would be worthy of consideration.</p> <p>I agree with a permanent ban of HGV's and its enforcement.</p> <p>I like, agree and support the content of the proposed Community actions.</p> <p>no</p> <p>Policy to limit further development of Whitewall Quarry after planning permission expires in 2023?</p> <p>I am in favour of improvements to Castle Gardens and Orchard Fields.</p> <p>I am strongly opposed to the removal of permitted development rights in particular where this causes a negative impact on peoples homes. For example preventing roof lights and upgrading doors and windows to improve sound proofing and energy efficiency. In my opinion there are a significant number of properties that are deteriorating rapidly simply because of the existing planning restrictions.</p> <p>I am very much in favour of supporting Malton in Bloom, they have been making significant positive improvements throughout the town.</p> <p>Nil</p> <p>I do not agree with the Direction 4 comments, buildings cannot be left in aspic, sensitively done some changes will enhance a conservation area, also see my earlier comments re solar panels.</p>	<p>excessive amounts of 'furniture clutter'.</p> <p>AGREE – action re HGV ban enforcement to be added as community action.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – minerals planning policy is an excluded matter for NPs.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that the comment highlights the need for a wider review of the community action re Article 4 Direction as it is stated – this to cover the accuracy of the bullet point list (i.e. what is/isn't permitted development) and the relevance of each entry relative to each of the 3 conservation areas.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that the comment highlights the need for a wider review of the community action re Article 4 Direction as it is</p>	<p>ACTION – add new community action as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – review community action as indicated in liaison with RDC. Following review, action amended to 'exploring scope for' a more nuanced approach, appropriate to individual uses in individual conservation areas, reflective of their character and issues.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – review community action as indicated in liaison with RDC. Following review, action amended to 'exploring</p>
--	---	--	---

	I would very much support the ideas re Castle Garden, a much underused and publicised facility and Orchard Fields.	<p>stated – this to cover the accuracy of the bullet point list (i.e. what is/isn't permitted development) and the relevance of each entry relative to each of the 3 conservation areas.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>scope for' a more nuanced approach, appropriate to individual uses in individual conservation areas, reflective of their character and issues.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Monitoring, Review & Implementation	<p>RDC - the implementation section requires some revision to ensure clarity around infrastructure delivery in order to avoid expectations being raised within the local communities. This is expanded upon in more detail below.</p> <p>RDC - The implementation section (also) includes references to Ryedale CIL being used to fund these wider strategic highway improvements. This will raise expectations in the local community that these improvements can or will be delivered. The use of CIL is aligned to the infrastructure required to support planned growth. Its use to fund further strategic transport improvements will be considered if this is required to support further growth in the longer term beyond 2027. In the meantime, the references to the use of CIL to fund improvements which are not required in the current plan period should not be included in the plan.</p> <p>RDC - The inclusion of the list of projects/ areas that the Town Councils will prioritise CIL expenditure is welcomed and is consistent with national advice in relation to the content of neighbourhood plans. The plan also includes a list of infrastructure types/projects which the Town Councils would like the District Council to address with CIL receipts. The Ryedale Plan makes it clear what types of infrastructure are required to support planned growth for the plan period. A necessary improvement is the provision of a new primary school for Norton and this should be included on this list. The Plan should also make it clear that the extent to which projects that are not required to support planned growth to 2027 are funded by CIL will be dependent</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>AGREE – it is agreed that misleading text should be amended or deleted if necessary.</p> <p>AGREE - it is agreed that misleading text should be amended or deleted if necessary.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – amend or delete text in line with comment.</p> <p>ACTION – amend or delete text in line with comment.</p>

	<p>on future growth strategies and choices beyond the plan period. In addition , the plan should make it clear that the Ryedale CIL is required to support infrastructure improvements across the whole of Ryedale and that the money does need to be prioritised as it is a limited source of funding and will not be sufficient to deliver all required or desired infrastructure improvements. Clarity on these matters will avoid expectations being raised over the deliverability of infrastructure – especially strategic highway improvements. As outlined above, the Project Delivery Plan should not include infrastructure projects that are not are required to support planned growth over the plan period. The District Council will be happy to discuss the necessary revisions to this list and the evidence base which supports such a list.</p> <p>NYCC - Section 6 concerns deliver and Community Infrastructure Levy. Areas with an adopted neighbourhood plan receive 25% of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions generated within their areas. In times of increasing pressure on the County Council’s own budgets, the use of CIL received by the Parish to deliver identified improvements and projects would be supported. It would therefore be helpful for the plan to set out how the Parish council proposes to use the Developer Contributions received to support the objectives of the Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p>	<p>NOTED – it is considered premature for the town councils to set this out at this stage. Neither is this a requirement of NPs.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
<p>Appendix 1 – LGS Assessments</p>	<p>RDC Independent Group - requires revision so as to include High Malton as a local green space.</p> <p>Malton Museum - Matters of Fact to be corrected in the final document p64 (NB E1.2): Yes - this land has a 2 000 year history, starting with the Roman Fort of Derventio <i>Delgovicia</i>¹ around AD 71, through to a Norman Castle and Elizabethan House. The site still holds a great deal of interest for archaeologists and has been listed by English Heritage Historic England² as a Scheduled Ancient Monument. The first excavations began in the 1930s by Philip Corder and John Kirk, commemorated by</p>	<p>DISAGREE – any revision as to the LGS status of High Malton rests on the outcome of the proposed reassessment.</p> <p>AGREE – incorrect text needs to be amended.</p>	<p>ACTION – dependent on outcome of reassessment.</p> <p>ACTION – amend incorrect text as indicated.</p>

	<p>a standing stone and plaque in adjacent Orchard Fields Field, and many of the finds can still be found in the Malton Dickens Museum on Chancery Lane³. Since then, it has played host to other on-going⁴ investigations, including Channel 4's Time Team, as well as The Defence Archaeology Group's <i>Project Nightingale</i>. Archaeologists from the University of York are currently mapping have surveyed⁵ the site using Geophysics. Further information at:- http://www.maltoncastlegarden.org.uk/history</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Roman name for Malton/Norton is now generally considered to be <i>Delgovicia</i> (see P Wilson 'Derventio, Delgovicia and Praetorio: Some Roman-period Place-names of Eastern Yorkshire Revisited', <i>Britannia</i> 48 (2017), 305-308 doi:10.1017/S0068113X17000058) 2. Historic England is the body responsible for Scheduled Monuments 3. Orchard Field is correct 4. In the past Malton Museum stored material at Dickens House but had to move out when the building was required for the Dickens Museum – they now store all material themselves 5. There is currently no active fieldwork in Orchard Field 6. Geophysical Survey is not current 		
Habitat Regulations Assessment	<p>RDC - The Habitat Regulation Assessment would benefit from an addendum to update the document in the light of revisions to emerging policy that were identified as part of the assessment.</p> <p>NYCC - Although some of the urban section of the River Derwent is not designated, the river upstream and downstream is a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), a habitat of European OFFICIAL importance for nature conservation. Because of this designation, any plan or project likely to affect the ecology of the river needs to be assessed under the Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2017; this is known as a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). We have reviewed the HRA produced by Fleming Ecology on behalf of the Town Councils. While</p>	<p>NOTED – this will be carried out once the submission plan is finalised.</p> <p>NOTED – the HRA has been 'signed-off' by RDC - the competent authority in this case. Natural England have been involved as a statutory consultee in the development of the HRA and in respect of the NP. They have raised no objection to or made any comment on the HRA</p>	<p>ACTION – amend HRA once submission plan finalised.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>we do have some minor queries, the HRA is rigorous and comprehensive and we broadly agree with its conclusions. The HRA is a complex procedural document and it is important that its findings are considered fully and inform the Neighbourhood Development Plan. The key section is Section 4. In essence, the HRA concludes that the Plan policies are compatible with the conservation of the River Derwent SAC but changes to wording were needed for Policies RC1 (to remove references to fishing pegs and boat moorings), RC2 (to exclude residential development) and N1 (again to exclude residential development). We note that the Pre-submission Draft of the Plan appears to have adopted the recommendations of the HRA. Apart from some minor issues of clarity and wording, our main concern would be that the HRA provides little information on the status of SAC features in the vicinity of Malton and Nortonon-Derwent. The features for which the river is designated do not occur throughout the river and it would have been useful to summarise which are relevant to this section. For example, Sea Lamprey only enters the river in very small numbers and is unlikely to be a relevant consideration but River Lamprey is known to occur at least as far upstream as Rye Mouth, while Bullhead occurs mainly in riffles such as below County Bridge. We have some concerns regarding the assessment of the original Policy RC1 in the HRA. However, subsequent changes to the wording of the policy mean these are no longer important.</p>	<p>accompanying the NP. As such, it is considered that there is no need to revise the document in line with the comment. The HRA will be revised to reflect the final submission version of the NP.</p>	
NP Proposals Map	<p>NYCC - The Proposals Map accompanying the plan includes Non-Neighbourhood Plan designations such as Conservation Area boundaries and the Malton Air Quality Management Area boundary. It may be prudent to include designated nature conservation sites as these impose significant constraints on land use. These include the River Derwent Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) at Lady Spring Wood and Malton Bypass Cutting. Details of SINCs, including GIS files of their boundaries, can be obtained from North & East Yorkshire Ecological Data Centre.</p>	<p>NOTED – this is considered to be a reasonable suggestion. The NP should reference SAC, SSSI and SINC/LWS sites where relevant to policies and be shown for information on the Proposals Map.</p>	<p>ACTION – incorporate Local Wildlife Sites into the plan as suggested and show all referenced sites on Proposals Map.</p>

General – Layout/Presentation	FME - It would be helpful for referencing text if, in the submission version, all paragraphs were numbered.	AGREE – it is considered that this would aid referencing.	ACTION – add paragraph numbering to submission plan version.
General – Climate Change	<p>CPRENY - It is considered that the Steering Group could strengthen the NP through incorporating mitigation measures for climate change throughout the document, for example, within design policies requiring the generation of on-site energy production and zero-carbon dwellings and for proposed new built development to incorporate suitable electric car charging points as standard to future proof the plan.</p> <p>CPRENY - Many NPs and Local Plans now incorporate plan policies dedicated to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and the requirement to combat climate change. It is felt that such a policy is missing from the plan. The inclusion of such a policy would ensure all types of future developments regardless of location (including horse racing, hotel provision, those within conservation areas, river corridor enhancements and new employment/residential developments) play their part to protect residents, the countryside and biodiversity from the harmful effects of climate change.</p>	NOTED - NPs are limited by not being able to include policies/standards/ requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings, including on the sustainability of new homes. Moreover, it would be contrary to basic conditions (NPPF) to place requirements on development as suggested. It should be noted that NP policies do already address these matters where considered most relevant and in appropriate terms, i.e. Policy HD2 and E6. Electric vehicle charging is also referenced in community actions under ‘car parking strategy’. All that said, these issues are raised on a few occasions, begging the question re whether the NP should be saying something more about them.	ACTION – investigate the feasibility of addressing the issues raised within the plan and amend plan if/as considered feasible/necessary. Following investigation, introduction to ‘Environment’ section amended.
General – Minerals & Waste	NYCC - The ‘Neighbourhood Area’ shown on the Neighbourhood Plan Proposals Map includes land outside the current built up areas of this locality. The whole area is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area/Mineral Consultation Area within the emerging Minerals and Waste Joint Plan (MWJP) being produced by North Yorkshire County Council, City of York Council and North York Moors National Park Authority. The relevant policies in this case are Policy S02: 5 Developments proposed within Minerals Safeguarding Areas and Policy S06: Consideration of applications in Consultation Areas.	NOTED – the NP’s policies are considered to be compatible with the proposed MWJP designation and the respondent raises no specific objections to any NP policies.	NO ACTION

General – Flood Risk Management	NYCC - NYCC continues to work with Risk Management Authorities to manage the flood risk in Malton and Norton. NYCC is presently leading on the delivery of a scheme which makes pumping operations more robust and provide property level resilience to those buildings at highest risk. NYCC is working to look at other options that may be developed to further reduce the risk in the towns. NYCC looks forward to working with the town councils on this work as it progresses.	NOTED	NO ACTION
General – New Town & Strategic Road Improvements	<p>Cllr S Thackery - Recommendations to resolve flooding issues, reduce traffic volume and congestion in Malton and Norton, and also improve air quality and overall quality of life for both residents and visitors.</p> <p>Important: my recommendations assume the permanent implementation and enforcement of the HGV restriction over Norton level crossing.</p> <p>'Objectives':</p> <p><i>1. To protect and improve the local environment [and particularly the ecological quality of the river corridor].</i></p> <p>In brief, I propose the following:</p> <p>The development of a new town / large village On a new island in the middle of a new lake (In the vicinity of Brambling Fields). The construction of slip roads on/off the A64 at the B1257 Broughton Road. The construction of a new roundabout on/off the A64 at Musley Bank.</p> <p>Proposal explained:</p> <p>The new lake (name tbc) would be both a recreational destination and reservoir and be created in the vicinity of Howe Bridge, Espersykes and Brambling Fields, on natural flood plain. The new lake would receive, and temporarily store, water from the River Derwent in times of heavy rainfall.</p>	NOTED – the recommendations are strategic in nature and contrary to the adopted development plan. They also relate substantially to land outside the Neighbourhood Area. As such, they cannot be entertained within the NP, being contrary to basic conditions.	NO ACTION

	<p>The scheme is an adaptation and expansion of the successful ‘Slowing The Flow’ project in Pickering, and the newly approved Environment Agency River Foss Flood Alleviation Scheme, which will be <u>built on farmland in Ryedale</u> (between Sheriff Hutton and Strensall) <u>to protect houses in York</u> from flooding by the River Foss. This scheme was recently approved by the Ryedale District Council Planning Committee.</p> <p>The new ‘Lake Ryedale’ (aka reservoir and settlement) will provide safe temporary storage of water and a mechanism with which to regulate its flow through the towns of Malton and Norton. This scheme is specifically designed to rid the towns of the disruptive and ultimately unworkable flood defence strategy currently being employed. This scheme will utilise the natural environment of the River Derwent flood plain to alleviate the increasingly damaging effects of flooding caused by climate change.</p> <p>The new town/village will be the ‘go-to’ and sought-after location for Ryedale’s first new all-carbon-neutral homes, and connect to the existing towns by tram, dual-carriageway cycle path and, in the summer months, by river taxi to Norton and Malton bus and railway stations. The island will connect to the A64 via a new Bridge (the ‘Briar’?) at Brambling Fields. Yet again, this idea is simply an adaptation and reworking of an already proven and successful idea, based on the example of the island of IJburg, Amsterdam, which is a new and colourful town built on a newly constructed island. The drainage system in IJburg works because it is new.</p> <p><i>2. To cut congestion and improve air quality.</i> <i>3. To improve connectivity between Malton and Norton [and vice versa].</i> <i>4. To improve access to the river for the community.</i></p> <p>The creation of the new (self-generating, all-electric) town with its direct connection to the A64, coupled with the proper implementation of the HGV restriction over Norton level crossing and restriction on</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>further development within the existing towns, would cut (reduce) traffic congestion and improve air quality. However, the removal of HGV traffic from the towns will result in the biggest improvement to the built environment and air quality, and thereby the biggest improvement to the quality of life of residents and visitors alike.</p> <p>The fulfilment of Objectives 2 and 3 depend on the construction of slip roads on/off the A64 at the B1257 Broughton Road, and construction of a new roundabout at Musley Bank.</p>		
General	<p>RDC - As a general observation, it is considered that the draft plan is very light touch in its references to the evidence which underpins its proposals. Whilst it is accepted that the evidence base will be collated to support the plan through examination, the plan itself would benefit from the inclusion of reference to key pieces of evidence to support policy proposals.</p> <p>RDC - The North-East Yorkshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Environment Agency Flood maps will assist the implementation of proposals in areas of the towns at risk of flooding. Reference to evidence would also help to support some of the statements included in parts of the supporting text, which without a 'root' in evidence could be regarded as assertions rather than statements. The Local Planning Authority would be happy to discuss how the evidence base used to support the Ryedale Plan can be used to explicitly support the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>RDC - National guidance makes it clear that plans and policies should be drafted to be clear and unambiguous. Many of the policies in the document act to provide general policy support for specific matters or are aspirational in their intent. On the whole they are drafted clearly and (with limited exceptions) are not ambiguous. However, as many of the policies are supportive and aspirational in nature, the plan should take every opportunity to make this clear in order to ensure that expectations are not raised.</p>	<p>NOTED – specific examples of this are raised in more detailed RDC comments and are responded to positively above.</p> <p>NOTED – more detailed guidance on this from RDC would be appreciated.</p> <p>NOTED - specific examples of this are raised in more detailed RDC comments and are responded to positively above. Generally, it is considered that policies are sufficiently clear in their intent – experience indicates that NP examiners express no concerns</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – seek detailed guidance from RDC on the matter raised. While acknowledging in light of guidance received that more detailed evidence references would improve the plan, it was agreed that such changes were not critical to the plan, so no changes made.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>Crossley Grand Children’s Trust - The trust whole heartedly supports and indeed look forward to the neighbourhood plan implementation. It will be advantageous to have a clear complementary strategy in place, running at a home-grown level, along with the local plan. The neighbourhood plan is strong in its aspiration and set out in a way which is useful to understand for users and development harmonisation with good aims and policy approach.</p> <p>Crossley Grand Children’s Trust - The emphasis is strong around the fundamental ideals of the town councils, protection of the river corridor, the food and farm heritage, horseracing, heritage (buildings and archaeology), the railway, and most importantly, green spaces and the traffic connection improvements.</p> <p>Crossley Grand Children’s Trust - The pandemic and the future shift towards home working, has made it clear that access to good quality environment, the outdoors footpaths bridleways and green spaces and the reduction of traffic and pollution and the avoidance of concentration of congestion should be a high priority. The importance of this is the link to good transport routes and the opportunities to link areas and relieve pressure and traffic through the town centre, which we all know cannot be over stated and the chance to provide what Malton and Norton has needed for some time and delivered through the successful development of other available areas within the town boundaries.</p> <p>Crossley Grand Children’s Trust - Finally land swap options to create the facilities required in better locations should be embellished to get viable uses in better locations encouraged and for possibilities to be explored through discussion with the town councils and Ryedale forward planning and pre-application consultation.</p>	<p>regarding these sorts of policies and any expectations they might raise.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – it is unclear how this relates to anything specific within the NP’s policies/community actions. As such, it is not possible to respond in any meaningful way.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>FME - It is (however) considered that the plan could go further in acknowledging and developing policies to support the vibrancy of the town, which has a high proportion of independent owner managed businesses, and its many facilities.</p> <p>FME - Whist it is regrettable that the plan has been so long in the making with implications both as to its current accuracy and its duration, FME welcome that it is now progressing with a draft Neighbourhood Plan out for consultation.</p> <p>FME - Indeed, FME would support the plan period being extended subject to factual information being updated and the comments made in these representations.</p> <p>FME - FME would very much welcome being involved in the development of the Plan and would be happy to assist the Neighbourhood Plan group wherever possible. If it is considered beneficial, we would be happy to arrange a meeting to discuss these representations and how FME may assist going forward at a time of the group's convenience.</p> <p>NYCC - The council supports and welcomes the preparation of the neighbourhood plan and considers this as one way that communities in North Yorkshire can have greater collective control of their own</p>	<p>NOTED – it is unclear in exactly what ways/in what respects the plan could go further to achieve what is suggested, other than the specific instances identified in more detailed comments which are responded to above.</p> <p>NOTED – the reasons for the plan's long gestation are adequately explained in chapter 1. Its duration is determined by the time horizon of the adopted Local Plan. With the exception of detailed amendments proposed in the above, the plan is considered to be sufficiently accurate.</p> <p>DISAGREE – the plan's time horizon is determined by the adopted Local Plan. There is scope for future NP revision to reflect the time horizon of the emerging new Local Plan. The imperative now is to move the plan to 'adoption' asap.</p> <p>NOTED - The immediate imperative now is to amend the plan to reflect the changes agreed in this document and to move swiftly to submission. Thereafter to support RDC in moving the plan to 'adoption' asap.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>well-being, as promoted by the Council’s Stronger Community Programme.</p> <p>Seeing as there is very little in this for Norton why should we be putting finances into Malton especially when they wont put finances into the skate park or is it as we have had allways been told we are the poor relations but have to help Malton everytime, because by what i have heard the neighbourhood plan the cost is horrendous.norton.tc</p> <p>RDC Independent Group - We welcome the plan, but feel it needs strengthening and clarifying to address some of the key issues affecting both towns in regard to housing, employment, highways (especially HGV traffic) and retail. During the course of the preparation of the plan, there have been changes of circumstances and so in some respects the plan needs updating.</p> <p>RDC Independent Group - In February 2021, the Secretary of State commenced a consultation on the reorganisation of local government in North Yorkshire with two options, either for a unitary county or an East/West split. It is important that Malton and Norton have a robust neighbourhood Plan in place before Ryedale District Council is merged in a new authority.</p> <p>It would have been much easier to fill this form in if the questions had been after each section, instead of having to go back and forwards between tabs, it took twice as long as it need have done.</p>	<p>DISAGREE – 30 of the 40 NP policies, not to mention its community actions, have clear implications for Norton, while 18 of the 30 specifically include proposals directly affecting Norton. The NP work has been significantly supported by outside grant aid.</p> <p>NOTED - specific issues raised by RDC Independent Group are responded to above.</p> <p>NOTED – the current intention is for the town councils to submit the plan to RDC in September 2021. It is anticipated that it could then take a further 12 months before the plan is ‘made’, but the exact post-submission timescale is in the gift of RDC not the town councils.</p> <p>NOTED – the fact that this is the only complaint received suggests that the questionnaire was largely well-received.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	---