

Annex 1

General Comments

- Any CIL or open space contribution requirements should not jeopardise delivery of the Plan.
- The proposals will have an adverse impact on the National Park
- Concerns about the lack of detail in the Plan relating to specific sites.

Housing

- Plan is over reliant on the Ryedale Local Plan figures. Housing figure must consider housing requirements of both the National Park and Ryedale District Council. The housing provision figure of 150 units is not enough to meet all the affordable housing requirements of the town.
- The policy provision on windfalls should make it clear that they do not count towards the overall provision figure.
- Further explanation is required in reference to affordable housing for local people.
- The housing provision figures are not adequately justified in the plan. There is not enough evidence to support the proposals, i.e. where is the need for the housing?
- The housing needs to be built gradually over the next 15 years.
- The National Park Authority has put its desire to help Ryedale with their housing targets above National Park Purposes.
- Development should take place on brownfield sites within the town not Greenfield.
- The development of 200 houses in such a short space of time will have an adverse impact on the special qualities of the National Park.
- Concern that new houses will be used as second homes.

Site NYMH1

- Objections to the development of this site at Discussion Stage have been ignored.
- The development will harm the parkland setting of this part of Helmsley.
- The development will result in a loss of wildlife.
- Local people enjoy the existing open countryside at the edge of the town.
- Object to requirements of design brief as this will stifle innovation.
- Requirement to retain the remnant orchard will result in inefficient use of the land.
- Objection to seeking to control the housing mix in the absence of justification for both affordable and open market housing.

Site NYMH3

- The Extra Care facility itself will generate need for more affordable housing
- Concern about use of Ashwood Close as the only access to the site. Existing access through Ashwood Close is inappropriate.
- Loss of the sports field would have significant impact on the cricket, football and tennis clubs. Increased population will require more not less sports provision.
- Plans for some of the site to be used to extend the Bowling Club facilities.
- Design of the extra care facility is not in keeping with Helmsley
- Height of up to 2.5 storeys is not appropriate on this site. A low level, low density development is more appropriate.
- The level of development proposed for this site is out of proportion for the town.

- Impact of increased traffic generation, noise and light pollution
- Reduction in value of existing residential properties.
- Loss of connectivity between built form and open countryside.
- The 60 units should not be separated from the overall housing provision figure.
- Existing owners would need to be given access to the rear of their properties.
- The Extra Care Facility should be located on the A170.
- The view of the town from footpath through Ashwood Woods would be ruined.

Site NYHM8

In relation to proposed use as a convenience store

- Increased traffic from the use of a supermarket
- Housing sites should not be able to mutate into retail use
- Proposed convenience store is too far away from town centre.
- Will have a devastating impact on the viability of Helmsley town centre.
- The Co-op could extend into the area currently rented by Thomas the Bakers.
- There are already empty shops in the town and an out of town convenience store would make this worse.

Residential allocation of site NYMH8

- Concerns regarding residential amenity of existing residents.
- Concerns over the use of the existing footpath/field access track by vehicles accessing the housing.

Sites 174 and 183

- Concerns about increased flood risk resulting from development.
- Cannot get insurance for the properties on Storey Close, further development will exacerbate the problem of flooding.
- Development will have detrimental effect on local wildlife.
- There are restrictive covenants on site 183 and therefore it cannot be allocated for residential use.

EMP1 and EMP2

- Support for these sites coming forward early in the plan period
- Support for the allocation of these sites for employment use.
- No need for any more industrial development in the town.

Sites not allocated

- The justification for not allocating the larger area of site NYMH1 on the basis of medieval field patterns lacks evidence and justification.
- There is no visual impact assessment to justify that the development of the larger area of site NYMH1 will have an adverse impact on long distance views.
- There is a lack of evidence that the development of site NYMH2 would change the open landscape character of this part of the town.