

SITE COMMENTED UPON	COMMENT MADE	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
Transport Sites TM4	<p>I disagree with the principle of authorising new development.</p> <p>I totally disagree with the principle that long-needed improvements can only be made if funded by new development, which will inevitably add to the change in character of the town from market town to an urbanised sprawl. Government policies at this moment in time may require this, but Government policies can change and I feel that it is wrong to commit both towns to future development which could prejudice future plans. An exception to this is the Beverley Road site which will come with a spine road which everybody wants. The Neighbourhood Plan has to be consistent with the Ryedale Plan. The Ryedale Plan authorises 1800 new houses. These new proposed site allocations should not be used to give RDC the opportunity to increase the number of houses beyond the number stated in the district plan.</p>	<p>NOTED – it is considered that the policy could better achieve its aim of promoting new pedestrian and cycle river/railway crossings by safeguarding the sites in question against development which would prejudice the delivery of such crossings, rather than supporting development which could enable the delivery of such crossings. NB the policy as consulted on does not embody any new proposed site allocations for housing or any other form of development. The development, on the specified sites only, supported by the policy was caveated on an accompanying Local Plan allocation and/or acceptability relative to the biodiversity provisions of Local Plan Strategy SP14 in respect of statutorily protected international wildlife sites (i.e. the Derwent SAC).</p>	<p>ACTION – reword policy in order to safeguard sites in question against prejudicial/sterilising development regarding pedestrian/cycle river/railway crossings, removing reference to on-site 'enabling' development.</p>
Transport Sites Site TM4.1 – Dismantled Railway Line North East of Orchard Fields	<p>Strongly support the need for safeguarding of these sites to maintain potential access corridors.</p> <p>RDC - The District Council does not have a legal interest in this site.</p> <p>New cycle and pedestrian crossings are badly needed, but in the past have faltered due to Northern Rail. Note – cycle routes must connect with other routes around and in/out of Malton/Norton, which should be expanded.</p>	<p>NOTED – support welcomed.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED – connections/improvements already identified in draft NP Policy TM2. Connections/routes could be</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – review connections/routes as indicated.</p>

	<p>Strongly support a new pedestrian & cycle river/railway crossing. This would ideally connect with a system of cycle routes throughout the town. Need not be special cycle path in all places – quieter roads would suffice – but this needs thinking about and planning. Provision necessary at danger points, e.g. junctions and some right turns.</p>	<p>reviewed to ensure network is robust and comprehensive.</p> <p>NOTED – connections/improvements already identified in draft NP Policy TM2. Connections/routes could be reviewed to ensure network is robust and comprehensive.</p>	<p>ACTION – review connections/routes as indicated.</p>
<p>Transport Sites Site TM4.2 – Land at Wool Growers/Rear of Lidl to Railway Station</p>	<p>Strongly support the need for safeguarding of these sites to maintain potential access corridors.</p>	<p>NOTED – support welcomed.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>
<p>Transport Sites Site TM4.3 – County Bridge-Rear of Railway Club and Signal Box</p>	<p>Strongly support the need for safeguarding of these sites to maintain potential access corridors.</p> <p>New cycle and pedestrian crossings are badly needed, but in the past have faltered due to Northern Rail. Note – cycle routes must connect with other routes around and in/out of Malton/Norton, which should be expanded.</p>	<p>NOTED – support welcomed.</p> <p>NOTED – connections/improvements already identified in draft NP Policy TM2. Connections/routes could be reviewed to ensure network is robust and comprehensive.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – review connections/routes as indicated.</p>
<p>Transport Sites TM6</p>	<p>Issues around County Bridge/rail crossing are longstanding and difficult and likely to get worse with increased traffic and rail services. Time for some ‘radical’ and new thinking between council/highways/Network Rail and the community.</p> <p>I disagree with the principle of authorising new development.</p> <p>I totally disagree with the principle that long-needed improvements can only be made if funded by new development, which will inevitably add to the change in</p>	<p>NOTED – this is being addressed by NYCC and Network Rail modelling studies/work. The issue will also be addressed by other NP policy interventions in the full draft plan to be consulted on in late 2019.</p> <p>NOTED – it is considered that the policy could better achieve its aim of promoting new vehicular cycle river/railway crossings by safeguarding the sites in question against development which would prejudice</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – reword policy in order to safeguard sites in question against prejudicial/sterilising development regarding vehicular river/railway crossings, removing reference to on-site ‘enabling’ development.</p>

	<p>character of the town from market town to an urbanised sprawl. Government policies at this moment in time may require this, but Government policies can change and I feel that it is wrong to commit both towns to future development which could prejudice future plans. An exception to this is the Beverley Road site which will come with a spine road which everybody wants. The Neighbourhood Plan has to be consistent with the Ryedale Plan. The Ryedale Plan authorises 1800 new houses. These new proposed site allocations should not be used to give RDC the opportunity to increase the number of houses beyond the number stated in the district plan.</p>	<p>the delivery of such crossings, rather than supporting development which could enable the delivery of such crossings. NB the policy as consulted on does not embody any new proposed site allocations for housing or any other form of development. The development, on the specified sites only, supported by the policy was caveated on an accompanying Local Plan allocation and/or acceptability relative to the biodiversity provisions of Local Plan Strategy SP14 in respect of statutorily protected international wildlife sites (i.e. the Derwent SAC).</p>	
<p>Transport Sites Site TM6.1 – Land North East of York Road Industrial Estate</p>	<p>Strongly support the need for safeguarding of these sites to maintain potential access corridors. However, the site plans for TM-6 6.1 and 6.2 are not at all clear to understand and are confusingly marked. They need to be amended to be clearer.</p>	<p>NOTED – support welcomed. Acknowledged that clarity of sites as shown on plans could be improved.</p>	<p>ACTION – clarity of site mapping to be addressed in Pre-Submission NP Proposals Map.</p>
<p>Transport Sites Site TM6.2 – Land to the South of Norton Road</p>	<p>Strongly support the need for safeguarding of these sites to maintain potential access corridors. However, the site plans for TM-6 6.1 and 6.2 are not at all clear to understand and are confusingly marked. They need to be amended to be clearer.</p>	<p>NOTED – support welcomed. Acknowledged that clarity of sites as shown on plans could be improved.</p>	<p>ACTION – clarity of site mapping to be addressed in Pre-Submission NP Proposals Map.</p>
<p>Transport Sites TM7</p>	<p>I disagree with the principle of authorising new development.</p> <p>I totally disagree with the principle that long-needed improvements can only be made if funded by new development, which will inevitably add to the change in character of the town from market town to an urbanised sprawl. Government policies at this moment in time may</p>	<p>NOTED – it is considered that the policy could better achieve its aim of promoting A64 junction improvements by safeguarding the sites in question against development which would prejudice the delivery of such improvements, rather than encouraging development which could enable the</p>	<p>ACTION – reword policy in order to safeguard sites in question against prejudicial/sterilising development regarding A64 junction improvements, removing reference to on-site ‘enabling’ development.</p>

	require this, but Government policies can change and I feel that it is wrong to commit both towns to future development which could prejudice future plans. An exception to this is the Beverley Road site which will come with a spine road which everybody wants. The Neighbourhood Plan has to be consistent with the Ryedale Plan. The Ryedale Plan authorises 1800 new houses. These new proposed site allocations should not be used to give RDC the opportunity to increase the number of houses beyond the number stated in the district plan.	delivery of such improvements. NB the policy as consulted on does not embody any new proposed site allocations for housing or any other form of development.	
Transport & Movement - General	Pedestrian finger signs to places around the towns should mention the average time taken to walk the distance e.g. station to Market Place 5 minutes. This may encourage motorists to walk more as it's been shown that people generally over-estimate the time taken to walk a given distance.	NOTED – could be encompassed by NP public realm policy provisions and/or through a community action.	ACTION – encompass as indicated.
River Corridor Site Site RC3 – Land North and South of County Bridge	Owner (5 Church St) – 1) The site at 5 Church Street Norton is physically separated from the river frontage by the York to Scarborough railway lines, and thus is unsuitable for riverside related recreational and leisure use. 2) Similarly, being sandwiched between a railway line and a major road leaves very little scope for encouraging wildlife. 3) This then leaves development as the third option, which appears to be the conclusion that the draft plan is proposing for this area, for employment and/or housing uses. Some ten years ago, we spent some £70,000 on a planning application for this site with the aim of providing a mixed development of ground floor shops with residential flats above. This application failed because of Environment Agency (EA) opposition to it. The EA required dry access to be provided to and from the site in the event of a total failure of the flood prevention system, something that it is not possible to provide for this site. The EA now class this site as high risk, danger to all with	1) NOTED – the draft policy does not propose such use for the site. 2) NOTED - the draft policy does not propose such use for the site. It should however be noted that the location of this part of the site would not necessarily mitigate against its potential wildlife value – railway and road verges often perform useful functions as wildlife corridors. 3) NOTED – the owner is effectively ruling out housing/retail uses on his portion of the site. He does not however seem to be ruling out employment uses. It is considered that the policy would benefit from being generally less specific in terms of the identification of particular use.	1) NO ACTION 2) NO ACTION 3) ACTION – delete ‘for employment and/or housing uses’ from the end of policy para 1.

	<p>regard to flood risk. Consequently the ongoing likelihood of obtaining planning permission for any form of housing on the site is practically zero. That leaves employment use. This site is still prone to surface flooding when the river is high, due to inadequate systems for dealing with rain and top water in the area, and so development options are very limited. Since 2011 this site has been utilised as a hand car wash, which provides employment and makes productive use of the site, and so accords with the draft NP. Unfortunately planning permission is only granted on a temporary basis for 3 years at a time, and this is preventing investment in the site for the long term to make the site more attractive, and thus an opportunity for enhancement of the area is being missed.</p> <p>RDC - The District Council owns the public conveniences which are located within this wider area. In addition, it has provided a wayleave to Yorkshire Water over some of its land to allow for pumping when required. If a comprehensive scheme for the redevelopment of the area comes forward, the District Council would look to ensure that access provision for Yorkshire Water is retained and that replacement public conveniences are secured/provided as part of any scheme.</p> <p>Owner (47 Castlegate) - I hereby support any planning policy proposals which aim to facilitate the development of mine and surrounding properties. Should the NP be approved and put into place, I look forward to working with RDC to develop the property for use as either employment and/or housing as suggested in the plan letter.</p>	<p>NOTED – Yorkshire Water access and public convenience retention /replacement could be added to list of things to which regard should be had in any development scheme.</p> <p>NOTED – support welcomed.</p>	<p>ACTION – add to policy 'regard should be had to' list as indicated.</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
Local Green Spaces E3 - General	Green open areas (E3) are most important!	NOTED – support welcomed.	NO ACTION

	All these green spaces are important – for wildlife, for people’s health and happiness and for general appearance of the town. Retain them!	NOTED – policy aims to protect those green spaces which meet Local Green Space eligibility criteria.	NO ACTION
Local Green Spaces Site E3-1 – Lady Spring Wood & River Walk to Malton	Very important policy (<i>NB E3</i>), support all proposals while recognising that special circumstances do sometimes apply, i.e. Jockey Rehabilitation Centre. However, rather than consider the sites in isolation, thought should be given to linking them with green corridors, providing a possible link for wildlife and perhaps for people. We also need a coherent management plan to increase biodiversity. So let’s not have simply a protection policy but a ‘greenspace strategy’ and ‘action plan’.	NOTED – support welcomed. The adopted Local Plan Strategy (LPS) already embraces the ‘green corridor’ approach (ref Policy SP15 Green Infrastructure Networks), specifically identifying the River Derwent in this regard. The Strategy also identifies ‘Areas of High Landscape Value’ (SP13) and ‘Visually Important Undeveloped Areas’ (VIUA) (SP16) within the Neighbourhood Area (NA). The submitted Local Plan Sites Document further defines the extent of VIUA within the NA. Scope may nonetheless exist to add to this overall green infrastructure network and to policy provisions relating to it through the NP. The LPS further provides (SP15) for the production of a Green Infrastructure Strategy by RDC in conjunction with partners including town councils.	ACTION – consider whether NP can identify additions to the existing ‘green infrastructure network’ with associated policy provision.
Local Green Spaces Site E3-2 – Castle Garden	Very important policy (<i>NB E3</i>), support all proposals while recognising that special circumstances do sometimes apply, i.e. Jockey Rehabilitation Centre. However, rather than consider the sites in isolation, thought should be given to linking them with green corridors, providing a possible link for wildlife and perhaps for people. We also need a coherent management plan to increase biodiversity. So let’s not have simply a protection policy but a ‘greenspace strategy’ and ‘action plan’.	NOTED – support welcomed. The adopted Local Plan Strategy (LPS) already embraces the ‘green corridor’ approach (ref Policy SP15 Green Infrastructure Networks), specifically identifying the River Derwent in this regard. The Strategy also identifies ‘Areas of High Landscape Value’ (SP13) and ‘Visually Important Undeveloped Areas’ (VIUA) (SP16) within the	ACTION – consider whether NP can identify additions to the existing ‘green infrastructure network’ with associated policy provision.

	<p>RDC - The District Council leases some of the land identified as E3-2 on the map. The land is identified as a Visually Important Undeveloped Area in the Development Plan and is valuable open space in Malton. The designation of the site as Local Greenspace would be consistent with the current use of the site.</p> <p>The Informal Sites Consultation states that the protection of green spaces in line with the Local Plan Strategy aspiration to increase awareness and use of strategic green spaces, including Lady Spring Wood, Orchard Fields and Castle Gardens. The last named is one of the best assets, but does require money to be spent on maintenance to improve the vista over Norton and to the wolds. Increasing awareness of it would be improved by publishing the times when the gate on Castlegate is open. The transition from the bustle of Castlegate to the peace of Castle Gardens is a magical experience.</p>	<p>Neighbourhood Area (NA). The submitted Local Plan Sites Document further defines the extent of VIUA within the NA. Scope may nonetheless exist to add to this overall green infrastructure network and to policy provisions relating to it through the NP. The LPS further provides (SP15) for the production of a Green Infrastructure Strategy by RDC in conjunction with partners including town councils.</p> <p>NOTED – support welcomed.</p> <p>NOTED – there is scope to include some of this detail in the NP.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>ACTION – add detail as suggested.</p>
Local Green Spaces Site E3-3 – Norton Ings	Very important policy (<i>NB E3</i>), support all proposals while recognising that special circumstances do sometimes apply, i.e. Jockey Rehabilitation Centre. However, rather than consider the sites in isolation, thought should be given to linking them with green corridors, providing a	NOTED – support welcomed. The adopted Local Plan Strategy (LPS) already embraces the ‘green corridor’ approach (ref Policy SP15 Green Infrastructure Networks), specifically	ACTION – consider whether NP can identify additions to the existing ‘green infrastructure network’ with associated policy provision.

	<p>possible link for wildlife and perhaps for people. We also need a coherent management plan to increase biodiversity. So let's not have simply a protection policy but a 'greenspace strategy' and 'action plan'.</p> <p>RDC -The Council has managed Norton Ings for nature conservation and some of the site is open space which is owned by the District Council. The designation of the site as Local Greenspace would not be inconsistent with the current use of the site. It should be noted that the District Council does not own all of the land identified as E3-3 on the map.</p>	<p>identifying the River Derwent in this regard. The Strategy also identifies 'Areas of High Landscape Value' (SP13) and 'Visually Important Undeveloped Areas' (VIUA) (SP16) within the Neighbourhood Area (NA). The submitted Local Plan Sites Document further defines the extent of VIUA within the NA. Scope may nonetheless exist to add to this overall green infrastructure network and to policy provisions relating to it through the NP. The LPS further provides (SP15) for the production of a Green Infrastructure Strategy by RDC in conjunction with partners including town councils.</p> <p>NOTED – support welcomed. All site owners need to be identified in preparation for future consultations.</p>	<p>ACTION – identify all site owners.</p>
<p>Local Green Spaces Site E3-4 – County Bridge Island & Riverside</p>	<p>Very important policy (<i>NB E3</i>), support all proposals while recognising that special circumstances do sometimes apply, i.e. Jockey Rehabilitation Centre. However, rather than consider the sites in isolation, thought should be given to linking them with green corridors, providing a possible link for wildlife and perhaps for people. We also need a coherent management plan to increase biodiversity. So let's not have simply a protection policy but a 'greenspace strategy' and 'action plan'.</p>	<p>NOTED – support welcomed. The adopted Local Plan Strategy (LPS) already embraces the 'green corridor' approach (ref Policy SP15 Green Infrastructure Networks), specifically identifying the River Derwent in this regard. The Strategy also identifies 'Areas of High Landscape Value' (SP13) and 'Visually Important Undeveloped Areas' (VIUA) (SP16) within the Neighbourhood Area (NA). The</p>	<p>ACTION – consider whether NP can identify additions to the existing 'green infrastructure network' with associated policy provision.</p>

		submitted Local Plan Sites Document further defines the extent of VIUA within the NA. Scope may nonetheless exist to add to this overall green infrastructure network and to policy provisions relating to it through the NP. The LPS further provides (SP15) for the production of a Green Infrastructure Strategy by RDC in conjunction with partners including town councils.	
Local Green Spaces Site E3-5 – Norton Grove/Scarborough Road Woodland	Very important policy (<i>NB E3</i>), support all proposals while recognising that special circumstances do sometimes apply, i.e. Jockey Rehabilitation Centre. However, rather than consider the sites in isolation, thought should be given to linking them with green corridors, providing a possible link for wildlife and perhaps for people. We also need a coherent management plan to increase biodiversity. So let's not have simply a protection policy but a 'greenspace strategy' and 'action plan'.	NOTED – support welcomed. The adopted Local Plan Strategy (LPS) already embraces the 'green corridor' approach (ref Policy SP15 Green Infrastructure Networks), specifically identifying the River Derwent in this regard. The Strategy also identifies 'Areas of High Landscape Value' (SP13) and 'Visually Important Undeveloped Areas' (VIUA) (SP16) within the Neighbourhood Area (NA). The submitted Local Plan Sites Document further defines the extent of VIUA within the NA. Scope may nonetheless exist to add to this overall green infrastructure network and to policy provisions relating to it through the NP. The LPS further provides (SP15) for the production of a Green Infrastructure Strategy by RDC in conjunction with partners including town councils.	ACTION – consider whether NP can identify additions to the existing 'green infrastructure network' with associated policy provision.
	Owner - I have been consulted on local green space site E3-5 and its designation of woodland, and am broadly	NOTED – support welcomed. Liaison with owner re extent/boundary would be useful as part of overall re-	ACTION – liaise with owner re site extent/boundary as part of wider re-

	supportive though have some reservations about the extent of it.	assessment of candidate LGS sites using new pro-forma.	assessment of all candidate LGS sites using new pro-forma.
Local Green Spaces Site E3-6 – Scott’s Hill	<p>Very important policy (<i>NB E3</i>), support all proposals while recognising that special circumstances do sometimes apply, i.e. Jockey Rehabilitation Centre. However, rather than consider the sites in isolation, thought should be given to linking them with green corridors, providing a possible link for wildlife and perhaps for people. We also need a coherent management plan to increase biodiversity. So let’s not have simply a protection policy but a ‘greenspace strategy’ and ‘action plan’.</p> <p>Owner - This area should be registered as a ‘Visually Important Undeveloped Area’ (VIUA.). This area has permissive access and by calling it Local Green Space, it will send the wrong message to the public who will have the impression that they have a right to access it. As this land is under contract to Natural England in the Higher Level Stewardship scheme, we must ensure that we retain control of where the public walk. We have every intention of continuing the public access and would like to build a good working relationship with the councils to help manage and improve the area for local residents. We</p>	<p>NOTED – support welcomed. The adopted Local Plan Strategy (LPS) already embraces the ‘green corridor’ approach (ref Policy SP15 Green Infrastructure Networks), specifically identifying the River Derwent in this regard. The Strategy also identifies ‘Areas of High Landscape Value’ (SP13) and ‘Visually Important Undeveloped Areas’ (VIUA) (SP16) within the Neighbourhood Area (NA). The submitted Local Plan Sites Document further defines the extent of VIUA within the NA. Scope may nonetheless exist to add to this overall green infrastructure network and to policy provisions relating to it through the NP. The LPS further provides (SP15) for the production of a Green Infrastructure Strategy by RDC in conjunction with partners including town councils.</p> <p>1) NOTED – Local Green Space (LGS) designation does not bring with it any legal right of public access. Neither is it in any way inconsistent with nature conservation interests, ‘wildlife richness’ being one of the eligibility criteria against which candidate LGS must be assessed. That said, the respondent/owner is clearly concerned that designation will send out an undesirable message re public access</p>	<p>ACTION – consider whether NP can identify additions to the existing ‘green infrastructure network’ with associated policy provision.</p> <p>1) ACTION – reassess all proposed LGS as indicated.</p> <p>2) ACTION – consider whether NP can identify additions to the existing ‘green infrastructure network’, including re the sit in question/VIUA with associated policy provision.</p>

	<p>strongly object to the Local Green Space allocation for this area as it will cause us problems, both with the public and potential future conservation projects and our relationship with Natural England. We would like to propose that this area be put into the NP as a VIUA rather than Local Green Space. After speaking with a member of Jill Thompson’s team at Ryedale Council they felt that the use of VIUAs in the NP would be perfectly acceptable and would provide a good solution for these areas. It is too late to include as VIUA in the Ryedale Plan.</p>	<p>which in turn could run counter to nature conservation objectives. It is considered on balance that LGS designation continue to be pursued in the face of landowner opposition. It is further considered that this and all proposed LGS designations be reassessed using more robust pro-forma in light of recent rigorous examiner interrogation of LGS proposals at NP examinations. 2) NOTED – re VIUA - scope exists to explore this/the overall green infrastructure network and policy provisions relating to it through the NP.</p>	
<p>Local Green Spaces Site E3-7 – Orchard Fields</p>	<p>Very important policy (<i>NB E3</i>), support all proposals while recognising that special circumstances do sometimes apply, i.e. Jockey Rehabilitation Centre. However, rather than consider the sites in isolation, thought should be given to linking them with green corridors, providing a possible link for wildlife and perhaps for people. We also need a coherent management plan to increase biodiversity. So let’s not have simply a protection policy but a ‘greenspace strategy’ and ‘action plan’.</p>	<p>NOTED – support welcomed. The adopted Local Plan Strategy (LPS) already embraces the ‘green corridor’ approach (ref Policy SP15 Green Infrastructure Networks), specifically identifying the River Derwent in this regard. The Strategy also identifies ‘Areas of High Landscape Value’ (SP13) and ‘Visually Important Undeveloped Areas’ (VIUA) (SP16) within the Neighbourhood Area (NA). The submitted Local Plan Sites Document further defines the extent of VIUA within the NA. Scope may nonetheless exist to add to this overall green infrastructure network and to policy provisions relating to it through the NP. The LPS further provides (SP15) for the production of a Green Infrastructure</p>	<p>ACTION – consider whether NP can identify additions to the existing ‘green infrastructure network’ with associated policy provision.</p>

		Strategy by RDC in conjunction with partners including town councils.	
Local Green Spaces Site E3-8 – Mill Beck Corridor	<p>Very important policy (<i>NB E3</i>), support all proposals while recognising that special circumstances do sometimes apply, i.e. Jockey Rehabilitation Centre. However, rather than consider the sites in isolation, thought should be given to linking them with green corridors, providing a possible link for wildlife and perhaps for people. We also need a coherent management plan to increase biodiversity. So let's not have simply a protection policy but a 'greenspace strategy' and 'action plan'.</p> <p>This area should be registered as a 'Visually Important Undeveloped Area' (VIUA.) like the surrounding land. I feel this better represents what the area is. By registering it as Local Green Space this will give the public the impression that they have the right to access it. We already have enough problems with the public accessing the beck and the build-up of a large amount of litter. On top of this, we are now in the middle of a conservation project on the beck in partnership with East Yorkshire Rivers Trust. We strongly object to this area being allocated as Local Green Space for the reasons above. We would like to propose</p>	<p>NOTED – support welcomed. The adopted Local Plan Strategy (LPS) already embraces the 'green corridor' approach (ref Policy SP15 Green Infrastructure Networks), specifically identifying the River Derwent in this regard. The Strategy also identifies 'Areas of High Landscape Value' (SP13) and 'Visually Important Undeveloped Areas' (VIUA) (SP16) within the Neighbourhood Area (NA). The submitted Local Plan Sites Document further defines the extent of VIUA within the NA. Scope may nonetheless exist to add to this overall green infrastructure network and to policy provisions relating to it through the NP. The LPS further provides (SP15) for the production of a Green Infrastructure Strategy by RDC in conjunction with partners including town councils.</p> <p>1) NOTED – Local Green Space (LGS) designation does not bring with it any legal right of public access. Neither is it in any way inconsistent with nature conservation interests, 'wildlife richness' being one of the eligibility criteria against which candidate LGS must be assessed. That said, the respondent/ owner is clearly concerned that designation will send out an undesirable message re public access</p>	<p>ACTION – consider whether NP can identify additions to the existing 'green infrastructure network' with associated policy provision.</p> <p>1) ACTION – reassess all proposed LGS as indicated.</p> <p>2) ACTION – consider whether NP can identify additions to the existing 'green infrastructure network', including re the sit in question/VIUA with associated policy provision.</p>

	<p>that this area be put into the NP as a VIUA rather than Local Green Space. After speaking with a member of Jill Thompson’s team at Ryedale Council they felt that the use of VIUAs in the NP would be perfectly acceptable and would provide a good solution for these areas. It is too late to include as VIUA in the Ryedale Plan.</p>	<p>which in turn could run counter to nature conservation objectives. It is considered on balance that LGS designation should continue to be pursued in the face of landowner opposition. It is further considered that this and all proposed LGS designations be reviewed using more robust pro-forma in light of recent rigorous examiner interrogation of LGS proposals at NP examinations. 2) NOTED – re VIUA - scope exists to explore this/the overall green infrastructure network and policy provisions relating to it through the NP.</p>	
<p>Local Green Spaces Site E3-9 – Orchard Fields/Old Malton Recreation Land</p>	<p>Very important policy (<i>NB E3</i>), support all proposals while recognising that special circumstances do sometimes apply, i.e. Jockey Rehabilitation Centre. However, rather than consider the sites in isolation, thought should be given to linking them with green corridors, providing a possible link for wildlife and perhaps for people. We also need a coherent management plan to increase biodiversity. So let’s not have simply a protection policy but a ‘greenspace strategy’ and ‘action plan’.</p>	<p>NOTED – support welcomed. The adopted Local Plan Strategy (LPS) already embraces the ‘green corridor’ approach (ref Policy SP15 Green Infrastructure Networks), specifically identifying the River Derwent in this regard. The Strategy also identifies ‘Areas of High Landscape Value’ (SP13) and ‘Visually Important Undeveloped Areas’ (VIUA) (SP16) within the Neighbourhood Area (NA). The submitted Local Plan Sites Document further defines the extent of VIUA within the NA. Scope may nonetheless exist to add to this overall green infrastructure network and to policy provisions relating to it through the NP. The LPS further provides (SP15) for the production of a Green Infrastructure</p>	<p>ACTION – consider whether NP can identify additions to the existing ‘green infrastructure network’ with associated policy provision.</p>

		Strategy by RDC in conjunction with partners including town councils.	
Local Green Spaces E3 – ‘High Malton’	This site (the site of the previous Fitzwilliam Estate application) should also be included within this policy as a site where new development is excluded.	NOTED – unclear to which site exactly the comment relates (NB no site map/boundary provided). Once clearly identified, site should be assessed as a candidate LGS using new pro-forma.	ACTION – assess site as candidate LGS, once clearly identified.
Tourism Site Site T9 – Orchard Fields	<p>Strongly support this policy. Orchard Fields is an extraordinary and important site right in the near centre of the market town. There is a major opportunity to enhance and promote this site to local benefit and to attract tourism. A quick win would be to provide much better signing and seating but there is also scope for much more. I hope a plan of action can be an early priority.</p> <p>Some good quality interpretation boards are necessary at this major historical site. Adequate number of litter bins and recycling bins should be provided and signs to remind people not to drop litter. Mowing regime for grass outside of picnic area should be wildflower friendly.</p> <p>Development of ‘Roman Museum’ would be great (I am volunteer at present museum) – but depends on the Estate! Development of an ‘arts trail’ around Orchard Fields? (there is already a community mosaic there) – and expand around both Malton & Norton.</p>	<p>NOTED – support welcomed. Scope does exist to achieve the suggested quick win.</p> <p>NOTED – there is scope to include some of this detail in the NP.</p> <p>NOTED – there is scope to include ‘arts trail’ detail in the NP.</p>	<p>ACTION – by TC in partnership with the estate owner.</p> <p>ACTION – include detail as suggested.</p> <p>ACTION – include detail as suggested.</p>
Norton Specific Site Site N1 – Land to the Rear of Commercial Street	<p>Owner – Paragraph 1: I agree with you that the land could be redeveloped. As planning was given to the adjacent land, i.e. ATS site for building houses on, I find this very hard to believe that it could not be built on.</p> <p>-Paragraph 2 – I think that your idea of parking and serving the shops to be a good idea. I also think that with the same outlook as was discussed about Wentworth St car</p>	<p>1) NOTED</p> <p>2) NOTED – site is outside town centre commercial limits (Local Plan Strategy SP1). It is considered that policy encouragement should additionally be given to wider regeneration.</p>	<p>1) NO ACTION</p> <p>2) ACTION – amend policy wording to indicate encouragement for regeneration.</p>

	<p>park, that to build on stilts a shopping precinct, i.e. a small one which would benefit the growing town and cut congestion and emission levels going up Malton as a lot of people would be able to walk or cycle to it. Also hopefully more footfall to the existing business.</p>		
General	<p>Environment Agency – Questions Are the sites allocated within the local plan? If not it is difficult to tell where these are due to the small maps but are any of these in a flood Zone? If they are not allocated under the local plan and are within Flood Zone 2 & 3 do you realise these will have to pass the sequential test for the whole area? We understand that TM3 (although not shown on the map and TM2 are like to be cycle paths, What are the other allocations for e.g. Houses/commercial? Recommendations Map showing the whole area to be within the Neighbourhood plan. More information on the allocations Maps showing allocation on a larger map showing more of the area or provide postcodes/grid reference.</p> <p>The area covered by the neighbourhood plan, which I understand has to be based on whole parishes, does not cover part of the York Road industrial estate, which I for one would regard as an important part of the Malton economy. It should where there is doubt cover a wider rather than a smaller area in my mind.</p>	<p>NOTED – on receipt of comments, EA officer appraised of the fact that none of the consultation sites are subject to development allocations. Officer has advised that initial response constitutes the Agency’s consultation response and that the town councils do not need to respond to the questions posed and that there will be no further detailed comments on any individual sites.</p> <p>NOTED – the Neighbourhood Area will, once formally agreed, cover the parishes of Malton and Norton and in so doing exclude that part of the industrial estate which lies in a third parish. This is due to difficulties obtaining the necessary agreement of that parish to the inclusion of land in their area within the Neighbourhood Area.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>

	<p>The Plan has reference to housing in Norton and I am not sure if the transport links between the Beverley and Scarborough Roads is being considered as part of this exercise.</p> <p>The policy on housing seems to have produced a plethora of what I would describe as minimally acceptable dwellings with little thought given to additional knock on effects on health, schools and water to take three subjects. For example the Derwent surgery is at its full capacity and is located on the wrong side of the railway tracks for the majority of the population in Malton and Norton.</p>	<p>NOTED – it is unclear to what this comment relates. Neither the current consultation nor the draft NP includes any Norton housing proposals.</p> <p>NOTED – the comment seems to relate to Local Plan rather than NP policy.</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p> <p>NO ACTION</p>
--	--	---	-----------------------------------

NOTES

1. The consultation attracted 19 separate responses, with 16 made by response form (with/without supplements) and a further 3 by e-mail or letter.
2. The 19 responses related to 19 of the 21 consultation sites as well as to a small number of more general issues.