

MALTON TOWN COUNCIL



**MPC SKEHAN Town Clerk
2 LEYSTHORPE COTTAGES
OSWALDKIRK YORK
YO 62 5YD**

**Telephone: 01439 748500
E-mail: maltontc@btinternet.com**

**NORTON-ON-DERWENT
TOWN COUNCIL**



Town Clerk: Mrs R.Tierney

The Old Courthouse
84B Commercial Street
Norton-on-Derwent
Malton

North Yorkshire YO17 9ES

**Tel/Fax: 01653 695348
E – mail : norton.tc@btconnect.com**

7 August 2011

Gill Thompson
Forward Planning Manager
Ryedale District Council

Dear Gill

Malton and Norton Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Results.

We write on behalf of both Town Councils to thank you for meeting with us today 4 August to discuss how we would wish the consultation responses to be presented to and used by the District Council. The following is a summary of our presentation.

The District Council has been provided with two documents covering the responses to the Consultation carried out in May/June of this year; the first a full listing of all responses, and the second a comprehensive compilation of the results entitled 'Summary of responses'. This document describes the nature of the consultation and summarises the results in terms of responses to the questions, interactive feedback, comments and observations.

The Town Councils consider that the consultation was comprehensive, positive, and professionally guided. The responses are statistically significant and up to date, and can usefully inform both considerations for LDF and also matters outside LDF where relevant.

We further vouch for the accuracy of the data. The source documents are held securely and can be examined on request.

1 Housing Development

In testing opinion the consultation addressed not only the extent of Housing Development over LDF period, but also the community views on the suitability of various sites.

In general respondents favoured house build targets of less than proposed, a clear indication that a view is taken either that there is not sufficient local need for the proposed numbers, that Malton and Norton is not the right location for larger scale development, or that the towns' existing infrastructure is insufficient to support the level of housing development proposed. This last view misses the key point that only development can really generate the funds necessary to improve infrastructure.

The responses to appraisal of sites and the relative need for social rented or affordable housing might suggest that people are concerned that there is a need for provision of additional housing to serve specific needs.

Recommendation

The responses could be viewed as somewhat contradictory, and might suggest that there needs to be further work done

1. To understand why people are apparently fearful of larger scale housing development
2. To investigate whether there is there local evidence to support the view that the current target being advanced by Ryedale DC is indeed too big?
3. To get across the message that only development can effectively provide the necessary funds to improve infrastructure.
4. To consider whether focusing on numbers the best way to address this issue? Would local input into consideration of the suitability and allocation of sites be a better way of resolving differences on the extent of housing development?

2 Employment

1. The responses generally support the view that the future of the economy of Malton and Norton lies primarily in small and medium sized businesses.
2. Respondents favoured the view that employment should influence housing policy rather than react to it.
3. Respondents were less supportive of the view that existing employment sites should be protected from redevelopment for other uses.
4. It may be useful to understand more about why a significant minority did not agree that employment sites should be protected. Do they feel that current market conditions require more flexibility or that some sites are ill-suited to current use.
5. The consultation raised the issue of appropriateness of identified sites. The responses may be used to inform decisions on allocation of sites for development.
6. The responses will not necessarily lead the Town Councils to form a view on specific sites for input to the LDF consideration. The responses do highlight key development

sites and it may be useful to undertake further work to explore these sites further in developing a strategic view.

3 Retail

1. Notably 30% of respondents indicated that quantity in terms of supermarket provision was already sufficient or in excess.
2. The 50% response in favour of a smaller store development of the Livestock market over only 9% support of a larger store development on the Car Park would appear to solidly confirm the public's preference for any further provision to be in quality rather than quantity terms. Ryedale DC must also consider to what extent this response represents a clear statement by the community that it simply does not want to see its car park developed.
3. However during and since the consultation the goalposts have moved somewhat. It appears that there may be three effectively competing planning applications covering three sites and possibly three very different scales of provision. Additionally, decisions in respect of one or more of these will need to be made prior to the LDF being finalised.
4. For the benefit of the community a plan-led approach needs to be taken. The consultation responses could very usefully inform the development of a 'best retail development strategy': best for the towns and best for developers.
5. The Town Councils would hope to encourage Ryedale DC to bring all parties of influence and direct interest together to discuss a best way forward, which best addresses the returns for relative investment but also provides the best solution for the Town. A strategic view needs to be developed which also looks at potential other uses for these key sites. It is essential that there is a dialogue between the key parties.

4 Highways

Strategic

The key developments in terms of highways needs were identified as an A64/B1275 junction in Malton and a Beverley Road Scarborough Rd link in Norton. These are identified as priorities ahead of improvements at the Musley bank junction.

The Town Councils would like to see further investigation of these two proposals to determine feasibility, costs and potential benefits, which may lead to identification of one as a priority. As these issues are seen as key by the community we need to determine as early as possible the practicality and status of each, and decide whether and when would be appropriate to assign planning gain proceeds.

Local

The removal of HGVs from the centre is clearly supported. The Public is less clear in its support of a one-way system. It is recommended that trial remedies towards this end be tested before committing to permanent solutions.

5 Development Sites

Responses were received specific to many of the more significant sites considered as providing

potential for development. The Town Councils would hope that the District Council would take into account the public view on these sites both when considering the LDF and prior to LDF where appropriate.

6 River

While the community is supportive of investigating the potential for other use of the river and its banks, it does recognise the flood risk issues and the importance of SSSI status.

It is recommended that further investigation is needed, to include consideration of leisure rather than development potential for vacant sites.

7 Car Parking

The responses confirm a clear desire for the development of a car parking strategy for the two towns. There is a clear expectation that the two Town Councils play a lead role, and that stakeholders should be involved. A strategy should address price, range and quantity of provision, as well as temporary provision during construction phases of schemes in the towns.

8 Other topics

The Consultation response covers a number of additional topics such as the future of Malton Hospital, the libraries, tourism, the Museum, the racing industry, recreation and leisure and more. On education it is evident that there is considerable concern about the quality and capacity of provision at junior and infant level in Norton, and fear that this will be exacerbated by any further addition to population brought about by planned housing expansion..

9 Where to go from here

1. The Town Councils would wish to see Ryedale DC make use of these consultation responses in whatever scenario they may be useful. Whilst principally offered to inform the LDF process, they may assist other earlier considerations.
2. Responses in respect of retail are relevant to planning applications already submitted or expected. These responses should be fed into the pre-application consultation information accompanying the major retail applications.
3. The Town Councils would like to proceed in redrafting the Neighbourhood Plan, but there are aspects of the consultation responses which suggest that more investigation work would be beneficial, either to gain a better understanding of the issues or to take opportunities to build a consensus among interested parties.
4. Given the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework, which sets out the role of Neighbourhood Plans, the towns would welcome the opportunity to work with the District Council to consider ways of taking this work forward together. In particular there is an up coming opportunity for local authorities to apply to CLG for funding in order to provide financial support to Town and Parish Councils in preparing Neighbourhood Plans. The deadline for bids is 8 November. £20,000 is available to help Town and Parish Councils undertake the process of preparing

Neighbourhood Plans. However, local authorities have to apply for the funding on behalf of the Town or Parish Council. The process reflects the responsibilities of local authorities in supporting Town and Parish Councils under the Localism Agenda.

5. Given the extra work required following the consultation, it is the Town Councils' intention to complete the redraft of the Neighbourhood Plan to reflect the consultation response as soon as practicable. However this may take several months given the nature of the additional work considered desirable. This letter is therefore in order that the Town Councils' views can be communicated into the Agenda for the Draft Core Strategy consideration meeting on 1 September 2011.

Thank you again for the opportunity to discuss these matters with you. We remain available at anytime to respond to queries on the consultation, or matters arising from further consideration of today's discussion.

Yours sincerely

Councillor J.W. Fitzgerald-Smith
Mayor
Malton Town Council.

Councillor Mrs D. Keal
Mayor
Norton on Derwent Town Council